# THE EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL AWARENESS AND REGIONALISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

ITO MITSUOMI

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR
2017

# THE EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL AWARENESS AND REGIONALISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

ITO MITSUOMI

THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR
2017

# UNIVERSIT MALAYA
## PERAKUAN KEASLIAN PENULSAN

Nama: **Ito Mitsuomi**

No. Pendaftaran/Matrik: **AHA100001**

Nama Ijazah: Ph.D (Sejarah)

Tajuk Disertasi: **The Evolution of Regional Awareness and Regionalism in Southeast Asia**

Bidang Penyelidikan: **Regionalism in Southeast Asian**

Saya dengan sesungguhnya dan sebenarnya mengaku bahawa:

(1) Saya adalah satu-satunya pengarang/penulis Hasil Kerja ini;

(2) Hasil Kerja ini adalah asli;

(3) Apa-apa penggunaan mana-mana Hasil Kerja yang mengandungi hakcipta telah dilakukan secara urusan yang wajar dan bagi maksud yang dibenarkan dan apa-apa petikan, ekstrak, rujukan, atau pengeluaran semula daripada atau kepada mana-mana hasil kerja yang mengandungi hakcipta telah dinyatakan dengan sejelasnya dan secukupnya dan satu pengiktirafan tajuk Hasil Kerja tersebut dan pengarang/penulisnya telah dilakukan di dalam Hasi Kerja ini;

(4) Saya tidak menpunyai apa-apa pengetahuan sebenar atau patut semunasabahnya tahu bahawa penghasilan Hasil Kerja ini melanggar suatu hakcipta Hasil Kerja yang lain;

(5) Saya dengan ini menyerahkan kesemua dan tiap-tiap hak yang terkandung di dalam hakcipta Hasil Kerja ini kepada Universiti Malaya (UM) yang seturusnya mula dari sekarang adalah tuan punya kepada hakcipta di dalam Hasil Kerja ini dan apa-apa pengeluaran semula atau pengunaan dalam apa jua bentuk atau dengan apa juga cara sekalipun adalah dilarang tanpa terlebih dahulu mendapat kebenaran bertulis dari UM;

(6) Saya sedar sepunyhnya sekiranya dalam masa penghasilan Hasil Kerja ini saya telah melanggar suatu hakcipta Hasil Kerja yang lain sama ada dengan niat atau sebaliknya, saya boleh dikenakan tindakan undang-undang atau apa-apa tindakan lain sebagaimana yang diputuskan oleh UM.

Tandatangan Calon:                                     Tarikh:

Diperbuat dan sesungguhnya diakui di hadapan,

Tandatangan Saksi                                     Tarikh:

Nama: Profesor Madya Dr. Joseph M. Fernando

Jawatan:

# THE EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL AWARENESS
# AND REGIONALISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA
# ABSTRACT

This study examines the manner in which politicians and intellectuals in four ASEAN founding member countries, namely, Siam/Thailand, the Philippines, Malaya/Malaysia and Indonesia, were aware of a regional consciousness and developed a regional concept. The study uses the conventional historical, chronological and analytical approaches. The time frame of the study is between the nineteenth century and the year 1976. In the nineteenth century the term 'Southeast Asia' was born and nationalists in each country became aware of a region in the colonial era, and in 1976 political leaders in the countries declared their goal to an ASEAN community with an ASEAN identity in the First Summit of ASEAN.

While the study argues that Europeans, especially the British, were quite familiar with the term 'Southeast Asia' prior to the Second World War, the concept varied from writer to writer by the 1960s. Nevertheless, the British popular term had seldom been used among politicians and intellectuals in the region. Instead, the royal court in Siam/Thailand has been aware of the region of Asia/East, and identified them as a broad region. On the other hand, islanders in the maritime region had their own regional terms, and since the end of the nineteenth century, intellectuals in the region who accepted a Malay identity also began to have a regional consciousness based on the area that Malays dwelt. However, after the Second World War all the consciousness shifted to the region of Southeast Asia, which combined the mainland (called Further India before the war) with the maritime (called Malay Archipelago etc.). As the term Southeast Asia was politically used, such as in SEAC and SEATO, the four countries gradually attempted to dilute the politically-coloured term to a softer image through their economic and cultural co-operation, prior to the formation of ASEAN. While ASEAN

was formed for the economic co-operation, the members strengthened their regional consciousness by embracing political discussions at the same time. To protect their national security, ASEAN countries became the centre to define their own regional concepts since the early 1970s. Consequently, the 1976 ASEAN summit started their project to form and invent an ASEAN community.

Key words: Southeast Asia, regionalism, region, ASEAN

# THE EVOLUTION OF REGIONAL AWARENESS
# AND REGIONALISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA
# ABSTRAK

Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk memahami cara bagaimana para ahli politik dan cendikiawan diempat negara yang mempelopori penubuhan ASEAN iaitu Siam/Thailand, Filipina, Malaya/Malaysia dan Indonesia tentang kesedaran disamping membina konsep serantau menggunakan pendekatan konvesional, sejarah, kronologi dan analitikal. Kajian dibuat untuk tempoh diantara abad ke 19 sehingga tahun 1976. Pada abad ke 19, terma 'Asia Tenggara' mula digunapakai dan negarawan disetiap negara mula sedar tentang 'kawasan' mereka semasa di zaman penjajahan. Dan pada tahun 1976, para pemimpin politik negara-negara ini telah berikrar untuk bekerjasama merealisasikan penubuhan identiti ASEAN untuk komuniti ASEAN di Persidangan Pertama ASEAN.

Kajian membahaskan tentang masyarakat Eropah, terutamanya rakyat Inggeris yang amat sinonim dengan terma 'Asia Tenggara' sebelum perang Dunia Ke 2, namun konsep ini berbeza di antara seorang penulis dan penulis yang lain sehingga tahun 1960-an di mana terma yang popular dikalangan rakyat Inggeris ini jarang digunapakai oleh ahli-ahli politik dan cendikiawan serantau. Sebaliknya Mahkamah Diraja Siam/Thailand telah menyedari kewujudan rantau Asia/Timur dan mengiktirafnya sebagai satu kawasan yang lebih besar. Sebaliknya, penduduk-penduduk di pulau-pulau pula memberikan penafsiran terma serantau mereka sendiri. Dan bermula dari penghujung abad ke 19, cendikiawan di rantau ini yang menerima identiti Melayu juga mula mempunyai kesedaran serantau berdasarkan kawasan-kawasan yang diduduki oleh orang Melayu. Walaubagaimanapun, selepas Perang Dunia Ke 2, kesemua kesedaran ini telah beralih kepada rantau Asia Tenggara yang menggabungkan tanah besar (dikenali sebagai India Jauh sebelum perang) dengan pulau-pulau (dikenali sebagai Kepulauan Melayu dsb.).

Terma Asia Tenggara kemudian telah banyak digunakan diarena politik seperti SEAC dan SEATO, yang menyebabkan empat negara ini berusaha beransur-ansur melenyapkan terma

berbaur politik ini melalui kerjasama ekonomi dan budaya sehinggalah tertubuhnya ASEAN. Walaupun tujuan utama penubuhan ASEAN adalah untuk menjalin kerjasama, negara-negara ini juga pada masa yang sama menguatkan kesedaran serantau dengan berkongsi perbincangan politik. Untuk menjamin keselamatan setiap negara anggota, negara-negara ASEAN telah dijadikan pusat untuk mewujudkan konsep keaslian komuniti serantau mereka sendiri sejak awal tahun 1970-an, yang membawa kepada Persidangan ASEAN pada 1976.

Kata kunci: Southeast Asia, regionalism, region, ASEAN

# ACKNOWLDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Joseph M. Fernando for the continuous support of my Ph.D study, for his patience, motivation, and immense knowledge. His guidance greatly helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I could not have imagined having a better supervisior and mentor for my Ph.D study.

Besides my supervisor, I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Danny Wong Tze Ken, who supported me as a referee when I applied for my Ph.D programme. My sincere appreciation goes to Dr. Fujio Hara, who gave me informative comments, and to Professor Dr. Leonard Andaya, who had unforgettable discussion with me and gave me highly helpful comments.

In addition, I have to admit that there are many friends who have showered me with help and encouragement. Among them my best friends, Mr. Tay Chee Chong and Mr. Keng Ann Chua have greatly helped me. My many thanks also must go to my family in Tokyo. Last but not least, I would like to thank my elementary school teacher, the late Abe Atsushi, who had a sudden death in 2015. This thesis would not be done without his touching advice.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLE

# ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| ADB | Asian Development Bank |
| AEC | ASEAN Economic Community |
| AFTA | ASEAN Free Trade Area |
| AMCA | ASEAN Ministers Responsible for Culture and Arts |
| AMDA | Anglo-Malayan Defence Agreement |
| ARF | ASEAN Regional Forum |
| ASA | Association of South East Asia |
| ASAS | Association of South East Asia States |
| ASEAN | Association of Southeast Asian Nations |
| CENTO | Central Treaty Organisation |
| COCI | ASEAN Committee on Culture and Information |
| DRV | Democratic Republic of Vietnam |
| EAEC | European Atomic Energy Community |
| ECAFE | Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East |
| ECSC | European Coal and Steel Community |
| EEC | European Economic Community |
| EFTA | European Free Trade Association |
| FPDA | Five-Power Defence Arrangements |
| ICCS | International Commission for Control and Supervision |
| ILO | International Labour Organisation |
| MAPHILINDO | Malaysia, Philippines, and Indonesia |
| MCP | Malayan Communist Party |
| NAM | Non-Alignment Movement |

| | |
|---|---|
| PKI | Partai Komunis Indonesia; Indonesian Communist Party |
| SEAARC | Southeast Asian Association for Regional Co-operation |
| SEAC | South East Asia Command |
| SEACOR | Southeast Asia Community Organisation |
| SEAFET | South-East Asia Friendship and Economic Treaty |
| SEA Games | Southeast Asian Games |
| SEAMEO | South East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation |
| SEAP Games | South East Asia Peninsular Games |
| SEATO | South East Asia Treaty Organisation |
| TAC | Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia |
| UMNO | United Malays National Organisation |
| U.N. | United Nations |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation |
| U.S. | The United States |
| ZOPFAN | Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality |

**CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION**

**Regions and Southeast Asia[1]**

The term 'region' has two meanings. According to the Oxford Dictionary, 'region' means: (1) a large area of land, usually without exact limits or borders; and (2) one of the areas that a country is divided into, that has its own customs and/or its own government. [2] Examples of the latter definition include the North-East region in Thailand, the Southwest China region in China, the Northwest region in England, the Kanto region in Japan and so forth. All these terms indicate certain areas within the countries. This thesis however focuses on the former definition.

As Andrew Hurrell argued, '[t]here are no "natural" regions' and 'all regions are socially constructed and hence politically contested.'[3] While outsiders or insiders of a region usually refer to their area as a region, an outsider's perspective is often accepted if there is consensus. The consensus would be achieved if some essential conditions are satisfied. One extreme case is to propose a region consisting of Japan, Malaysia and the United States, which would naturally be opposed. Contiguity or proximity[4] is one of the most essential elements of what constitutes a region.

Many regions in the world such as Africa, Asia, South America and so forth are defined by the proximity of its constituents. Among all the regions, Europe has a long

---

[1] The term 'Southeast Asia' has originally been used as 'South East Asia' in the nineteenth century. The selection of the varied spelling (e.g. 'South-East' and 'South East') highly depends on writers' preferences. According to D. G. E. Hall (See *A History of South-East Asia*, London: Macmillan, 1968 (third edition), p. 3.), American writers have standardised the spelling form to 'Southeast Asia,' and have followed it in the U.S. since the 1950s, though SEATO, which the U.S. government took initiative to set-up in 1954, officially used the spelling form 'South-East Asia.' In the case of the name of the regional associations such as ASA, the founders have adopted the form 'South East Asia.' On the other hand, ASEAN official documents initially used 'South-East Asia' in 1967, but thereafter, they used the forms 'South East Asia' and 'Southeast Asia.' Currently, 'Southeast Asia' has been adopted by the members themselves, but it has been used since 1976, when the Declaration of the ASEAN Concord and the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia. Thus, this thesis uses the original spellings when the author mentions the official names of the organisations before 1976. In the case of naming geographic region as a general meaning, or unless there is a special reason, the regional term will be referred to as 'Southeast Asia.'
[2] *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005 (Seventh edition), p. 1226.
[3] Andrew Hurrell, 'Regionalism in Theoretical Perspective,' in Louise Fawcett and Andrew Hurrell (eds.), *Regionalism in World Politics: Regional Organization and International Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 38-39.
[4] Nicholas Tarling, *Regionalism in Southeast Asia: to foster the political will*, London: Routledge, 2006, p. 7.

history as a region with its own regional scope and sense of consciousness. The scope of what constitutes Europe has been quite clear for centuries. Geographically, it was quite easy to delimit its natural sea borders in the north, south and west, but the limit of its eastern border was a source of contention for many centuries. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there were controversies over where exactly the eastern border of Europe was. The then Russian government suggested in 1730 that the border should be 'pushed back from the Don (river) to the Ural Mountains and the Ural River.'[5] This was because the capital, Moscow, was not included in Europe when the Don river was drawn as a border. The idea of 'Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals' gained general acceptance by 1833.[6] Since then, this definition has remained. After the European Economic Community (EEC) was formed in 1957,[7] Europeans pursued a European identity. However, this is still a topic of debate among many scholars. While the basis and criteria for this identity is Christian culture,[8] some argue that there are various elements of the identity.[9] Although a European identity was their final goal, it would seem that sub-regional identities such as West Europeans and South Europeans hardly gained prominence. The region is home to a variety of cultures in each country and each sub-region.

On the other hand, the term 'Asia' was coined and labelled by Europeans in ancient times.[10] A historian of civilizations, Ito Shuntaro, argues that Europeans expanded the scope of Asia from the current Middle-East and Central Asia to the present

---

[5] Norman Davies, *Europe: A history*, HarperPerennial, 1998, p. 8.
[6] Ibid.
[7] See the origins and history of the organisation in Klaus-Dieter Borchardt, *European unification: the origins and growth of the European Community*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Community, 1989.
[8] Norman Davies, ibid., p. 9.
[9] David Michael Green, *The Europeans: Political identity in an emerging polity*, Boulder (Colorado): Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2007, p. 43.
[10] Christopher W. A. Sapilman and Sven Saaler, 'Pan-Asianism as an ideal of Asian identity and solidarity, 1850-Present,' *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus*, Vol. 9, Issue 17, No. 1 (Apr. 2011), p. 1. For the detail ancient scope of Asia among ancient Greeks, refer to Ito Shuntaro, 'Koten kodai ni okeru ajia (Asia in classical literature in ancient time),' in Ishii Yoneo (ed.), *Ajiano identity (Asian identity)*, Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppannsha, 2000, pp. 174-184.

understanding at the end of the fifteenth century, i.e. since the Age of Exploration.[11] Asians readily adopted the term, especially with the rise in regional consciousness due to anti-colonialist movements in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. One case in point was the emergence of Pan-Asianism in Japan.[12] Subsequently, Asian regional consciousness gained a foothold among the Asians.

While Asians have been well aware of their identity, the sense of consciousness and sub-regional identity is not as strong except for perhaps Southeast Asia. For example, take East/Eastern Asia, which includes China, Japan and Korea. The sense of East Asian consciousness in Japan was born in the nineteenth century[13] and the three governments have attempted to form an East Asian community. Comparatively, however, it is relatively weak even today.

On the other hand, the peoples in Southeast Asia have a relatively strong sense of sub-regional consciousness, compared to people in other sub-regions. The then Prime Minister of Malaysia, Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, promoted regional identity and declared in his speech in 1994: 'I am a Southeast Asian and an East Asian.'[14] The awakening and development of regional consciousness was precisely because of all the efforts of the indigenous political leaders and intellectuals in the region.

Geographically, Southeast Asia lies south of China, east of India, and north of Australia. The region consists of two sub-regions: Mainland and Maritime. While the former consists of Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam, the latter forms a string of archipelagos in the southern part of the region including Brunei, East Timor,

---

[11] Ito, *ibid.*, p. 183.

[12] See details in Christopher W. A. Sapilman and Sven Saaler, ibid., pp. 1-29, and Anthony Milner and Deborah Johnson, 'The idea of Asia,' in John Ingleson, *Regionalism, Subregionalism and APEC*, Clayton (Victoria): Monash Asia Institute, 1997, pp. 1-19.

[13] Arano Yasunori, 'Kinsei Nihon niokeru "higashi ajia" no "hakken"' ("Discovery" of "East Asia" in the modern Japan), pp. 21-51, in Toshihiko Kishi, Yasunori Arano, Hideo Kokaze (eds.) *'Higashi Ajia' no jidaisei (Timeness of "East Asia"),* Tokyo: Keishuisha, 2005. The term 'East Asia' in Japanese means only China, Korea and Japan, though the term in English includes the sub-region of Southeast Asia.

[14] Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, 'The opening of the tenth international general meeting of the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (PECC X),' in *Regional development and the Pacific community: Selected speeches by Dr Mahathir Mohamad, Prime Minister of Malaysia, Vol. 1*, Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications (M), 1995, p. 41.

Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore. Close proximity of countries to each other binds the region together.

Nevertheless, the region of Southeast Asia has lesser common elements to form a region, compared with the cultural criteria of Europe. The region of Southeast Asia is one of the most diverse regions in the world, and even in each member country there is a diversity of cultures. Factors such as climate, ethnic composition, linguistic composition, religions, and government systems all differ within this region.

The climate in Southeast Asia is generally tropical with heat and humidity, but the seasonality depends on rainfall. It rains throughout the year in the whole region, but the pattern of the seasonality is divided into the two climates: an equatorial monsoon, and the dry and wet monsoon. The equatorial monsoon covers nearly all parts of Indonesia and the Malay Peninsula including southern Thailand, and southern Philippines. Annual rainfall in the area from equatorial monsoon is over 2,000 mm. For example, the rainfall of Singapore is 2,360 mm annually, and for Ujung Pandang, Sulawesi, Indonesia is 2,850 mm. On the other hand, the dry and wet monsoon including mainland Southeast Asia, eastern Indonesia, and the Philippines has less than 2,000 mm rainfall per a year. Mahasarakham in northeast Thailand receives only 1,240 mm and the annual rainfall in Kupang, Timor island, Indonesia reaches only 1,685 mm.[15]

The temperature in Southeast Asia is above 25°C on average, though it drops to below 20°C overnight primarily in the mainland region from December to February. For example, Luang Prabang, the second main city of Laos, has a greater range of temperature. The night time in the months of December to February is quite cold, while the temperature reaches around 35°C from March to May. Naturally, and consequently,

---

[15] Jonathan Rigg, *Southeast Asia: A region in transition*, London: Unwin Hyman, 1991, pp. 6-11.

the great differences in climate influence the diverse vegetations and traditional cultures.

Language in Southeast Asia is mainly characterised by diversity. With the exception of some languages in the eastern part of Indonesia, languages in the region are categorised in the following five families: *Austroasiatic*, *Austronesian*, *Tai*, *Tibeto-Burma*, and *Hmong-Mien*.[16] Austroasiatic languages are often called Mon-Khmer, including Vietnamese and Cambodian. The *Austronesian* family, spoken mainly in the maritime Southeast Asia, is the largest group in the world, and has 1,200 languages with the two sub-groups, Malayo-Polynesian and Formosa languages.[17] There are two exceptions for this category in the region: *Orang Asli* of interior Malay Peninsula, as well as some groups who speak Papuan languages in east Indonesia.[18] A few languages in this category are also spoken in the highlands of central and southern Vietnam and north-eastern Cambodia. The *Tai* family includes Thai and Lao languages, as well as some groups in Vietnam and Myanmar. *Tibeto-Burma* is spoken in Myanmar and in the uplands of the north parts of Southeast Asia. Finally, The *Hmong-Mien* family is spoken in the uplands of Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand, who are generally the descendants of migrants from China.[19]

Most scholars currently agree that almost all of the Southeast Asian languages can be dated back to roots in southern China, and thus, most of the indigenous peoples originated from the descendants who migrated from various parts of China. In particular, the major language family, *Austroasiatic* and *Austronesian*, can be linked to migration. While the former is believed to originate in the south eastern coast of China 4,000-5,000 years ago, the latter, which is dominated in mainland Southeast Asia, likely came for

---

[16] M.C. Ricklefs et al., *A New history of Southeast Asia*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, p. 1.
[17] Peter Bellwood, *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian archipelago*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997 (revised edition), p. 97. Refer to the major sub-groups of Austronesian in p. 105.
[18] Ibid., p. 97.
[19] M.C. Ricklefs et al., *ibid*., p. 2.

the spread of rice cultivation around 3,000 BCE.[20]

In the contemporary period, English is currently widely spoken in each country in the region. While the language is well-spoken in Singapore as one of the national languages, Malaysia, Brunei, and the Philippines have also used English in daily conversation, since before their independence. Other countries such as Thailand and Cambodia also converse the language with the increase of foreign tourists.

As to written characters, different types are used in Southeast Asia. While Burmese, Thai, Laos and Vietnamese have their own characters in the mainland, the characters in the maritime languages mainly use the Latin/Roman alphabet. Muslims also use the *Jawi* alphabet, which is based on the Arabic alphabet, to express Malay and other languages. Chinese and Tamil characters are widely used among the Chinese and Indians, respectively.

Ethnic groups in Southeast Asia also have diversity and complexity. Scholars describe Southeast Asia as 'an ethnic museum'[21], or 'a chaos of races and languages.'[22] As mentioned above, maritime Southeast Asia is dominated by the *Austronesian* language family. Based on this category, there are approximately twenty-five major languages and more than two hundred-fifty dialects in Indonesia alone.[23] Mainland Southeast Asia also has over 150 various ethnic groups.[24] According to Joachim Schliesinger, Thailand has 38 ethnic groups as non-Thai peoples, such as Sgaw Karen, Kui, Mon, and Lawa. The groups are categorised as minor ethnic groups.[25] Furthermore, it should be noted that the Chinese and Indians who have had impacts on the local cultures migrated into Southeast Asia. While the Chinese inhabited each country as a

---

[20] Ibid.
[21] Nicholas Tarling, *Southeast Asia: Past and Present*, F.W. Cheshire: Melbourne, 1966, p. 9.
[22] D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, London: Macmillan, 1968, p. 5.
[23] Donald G. McCloud, Southeast Asia: Traditiona and modernity in the contemporary world, Boulder: Westview Press, 1995, p. 10.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Joachim Schliesinger, *Ethnic Groups of Thailand: Non-Tai-Speaking Peoples*, Bangkok: White Lotus, 2000, pp. 1-3.

minority, Singapore and Malaysia have a higher Chinese population - enough to politically and economically influence the countries. This resulted from the colonial policy. A great number of Indians inhabit mainly Malaysia, Myanmar, and Singapore – areas which the British colonised in the nineteenth century. Though they worked mainly as labourers at rubber plantations in the Malay Peninsula, the Indians in Myanmar worked as soldiers, civil servants, traders, etc. in the same period. Arabic people and Europeans also moved into the area. Not only have these factors allowed for a flourish in the various existent cultures, but have also led to a diverse ethnic composition in Southeast Asia.[26]

Religions are deeply rooted in people's lives in Southeast Asia. Four major religions in the region are: Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism and Islam. Theravada Buddhism was founded in India in ancient times, and later spread into Southeast Asia. Though Buddhism came to Sumatra and Java along with Hinduism, it is currently the dominant religion in Burma, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand. The Vietnamese mainly believe in Mahayana Buddhism. Christianity had arrived into the region by the Europeans in the sixteenth century. The Philippines islanders have long been devoted to animism before the arrival of Christianity, so that it is believed that the religion was easily spread to the islands. That is why the Philippines has the largest Christian population in Asia. On the other hand, when the Europeans came to spread the religion, other religions had already dominated the major cities and ethnic groups. Thus, Christianity had only reached the minorities in Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia and Vietnam. Hinduism had already spread into the region by the beginning of the Christian era, and flourished in the islands of Java and Sumatra and currently Hinduism is predominant in the island of Bali, Indonesia. Indians in Malaysia also believe in this

---

[26] D. R. SarDesai, *Southeast Asia: Past and present*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1994 (Third edition), pp. 9-13.

religion. Islam had rapidly spread through mainly traders to the Sumatran and Javanese islands, the Malay Peninsula and other islands between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The religion dominates in maritime Southeast Asia, in particular in Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, southern Philippines and southern Thailand. Among them Indonesia has the largest Muslim population in the world. [27]

In addition to the above cultural diversity, the governments in the region have adopted their own governmental type after their independence.

Southeast Asia became one of the main stages of the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the West. The independent countries in the region were forced to join either side, but some of them sought the Non-Alignment line. This background influenced the formation of the different governmental systems. First, the republic was introduced in Indonesia, the Philippines, Singapore, and East Timor. Second, Cambodia, Malaysia, and Thailand adopted the constitutional monarchy. Brunei is a constitutional sultanate known as an Islamic monarchy. Laos and Vietnam are single party-led states under communism. Lastly, Burma had maintained their military regime since 1962. The country has now changed to a presidential republic since January 2011, and currently civilians have taken over governmental positions.

The region has great diverse elements. This made Nathaniel Peffer doubt in the 1950s whether Southeast Asia can be termed a region or not because the region is 'a place on the globe where certain groups of people, holding little in common, live contiguously to one another,' [28] but Southeast Asia became a region. The common element between the nation-states made them group as a region – situated in between China and India.

---

[27] See D. R. SarDesai, ibid., pp. 17-20. Also refer to Norman G. Owen (ed.), *The emergence of modern Southeast Asia: A new history*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005, pp. 35-51 (Chapter 2).
[28] Nathaniel Peffer, 'Regional Security in Southeast Asia,' *International Organization*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Aug., 1954), p. 312.

This study defines a region as a space created and delimited with neighbouring nation-states, in particular after the Second World War. A region essentially is an invented and bordered construct, and is imagined. [29] In the case of Southeast Asia, the region was framed regardless of the cultures, ethnic groups, languages, religion that exist in the region. The region is not a natural unit, [30] but clear geographical borders delineate the region.

For regionalism it means co-operation between nation-states within a region. In the case of Southeast Asia, regionalism or regional co-operation were used to secure independence and sovereignty of nation-states. James Mayall argues that 'regionalism should be designed ... to help manage the inevitable problems that arise from the coexistence of competing national groups.'[31] In this respect, regionalism is the result of the creation of nation-states. Thus, it is impossible to see regional co-operation before Southeast Asian countries' independence,

Both nation-states and regions are imagined entities. Despite this, regionalism and nationalism are two entirely different concepts. Nationalism is the sentiment that drives the formation of a nation-state. Nicholas Tarling argues that one of the factors of nationalism is that '[s]tage by stage, a people becomes conscious of a sense of community as a nation, and of its position as a nation among nations, in what becomes a world of nation-states.'[32] It would be impossible to replace the term 'nation-states' and 'nation' in the previous sentence with 'region.' SarDesai said that '[a] conscious sentiment of kinship is the bedrock of nationalism, fostered by common characteristics

[29] Amitav Acharya, 'Imagined Proximities: The Making and Unmaking of Southeast Asia as a Region,' *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 27, No. 1, 1999.
[30] Brian Harrison, *South-East Asia: A short history*, London: Macmillan, 1967 (third edition), p. ix.
[31] James Mayall, 'National identity and the revival of regionalism,' in Louise Fawcett and Andrew Hurrell (eds.) *Regionalism in world politics: Regional organization and international order*, London: Oxford University, 1995, p. 191.
[32] Nicholas Tarling, *Nations and states in Southeast Asia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 73-74.

like language, territory, religion, race and heritage.'[33] As mentioned above, each nation-state in the region has no common factor to share within the framework of regionalism. As James Mayall also argues, 'it is unlikely that regionalism will come to represent an alternative locus of human identity.'[34] In this sense, regionalism should be clearly distinguished from nationalism.

Due to their colonial experiences and national security, Southeast Asian nation-states needed to co-operate within the region. Accordingly, the following are the proposed research questions:

**Research Questions**

1. When and how did regional concepts emerge in Southeast Asia?

2. When and how did indigenous political leaders and intellectuals of the four countries, i.e. Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia, pursue a regional consciousness?

3. How did ASEAN consolidate the regional concept?

**Objectives of the study**

This research has three main objectives. The thesis intends, first, to establish the extent to which Westerners used the regional term 'Southeast Asia' and how it was conceptualised between the nineteenth century and before the Second World War. Scholars agree that the term has been in use since the formation of the South East Asia Command (SEAC) in 1943, but they paid little attention to the usage of the term before

---

[33] D. R. SarDesai, *Southeast Asia: Past and present*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1994 (third edition), p. 135.
[34] James Mayall, *ibid.*, p. 191.

the war.

Second, this research will examine how political leaders and intellectuals in Southeast Asia perceived their sense of belonging to the region. It also will consider how the locals accepted and defined their region before and after the Second World War.

The third objective is to determine the origins of the ASEAN Community after they deepened their regional consciousness and adopted their own concept. At the same time, this study will discuss the way in which political leaders and intellectuals became aware of their region and enhanced their regional consciousness.

**Scope of the study**

This study targets the period between the nineteenth century and the ASEAN First summit in 1976, in which the term 'Southeast Asia' was born in the century and the ASEAN members set a goal to create ASEAN community. I assume that the regional consciousness matured by 1976.

This case study focuses mainly on the four founding members of ASEAN, namely Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia. The main reason these four particular countries were selected is due to the fact that they were the founding members of ASEAN. The reason for the inclusion of each country is specified below.

Siam/Thailand was selected because the country was never politically colonised. Under the circumstances its neighbouring kingdoms such as Burma and Vietnam were colonised, Thailand faced threats to lose its territory. These threats caused the kingdom to become modernised, and this influenced the regional consciousness of the kings and their subordinates.

The Philippines was selected due to the fact that it had been colonised by Spain and the United States over three centuries. On the edge of the eastern part of the

mainland and the northern part of the maritime Southeast Asia, the country had different perspectives of a region, influenced by the colonisers.

The locals in Malaya/Malaysia have been in contact with the people in the Indonesian archipelago, but the Malay Peninsula was separately colonised by the British after the agreement with the Dutch in 1824. Compared to the Dutch colony, the Peninsula was colonised in a 'soft' approach, or in an indirect way. On the other hand, Indonesia had harsh colonization experiences, in a more direct and aggressive manner. These historical experiences in the two countries also created different regional consciousness.

These non-colonial and colonial experiences were the major factors responsible for the selection of these four countries in this study.

The exclusion of Singapore was because the island was a new country with a majority of immigrant Chinese who moved from mainland China in the nineteenth century, and because the island was deeply related to the Malay Peninsula or called later on Malaya. Singapore was originally a part of Johor, but Stamford Raffles founded the island as a seaport in 1819. Since then, many Chinese immigrated to the island for trading business.

This thesis targets indigenous politicians and intellectuals in the countries, not common people. This is because politicians and intellectuals, whether locally educated or Western-educated, had acquired much more knowledge than common people and played a significant role in gaining independence.

**Significance of the study**

This study will shed more light on regional concepts applied to the present-day Southeast Asia by Europeans and the locals before the Second World War. This is

because prominent scholars of Southeast Asian studies such as D. G. E. Hall, George Kahin, Nicholas Tarling[35] and so forth, paid little attention to the historical evolution of regional term and the various terms used to describe the region. Second, it will contribute to the limited historical writing on the emergence of a regional consciousness in Southeast Asia and add to existing historiography. Third, this study offers some new perspectives on the origins and evolution of the term 'Southeast Asia,' and the emergence of a regional consciousness that are not found in existing literature.

**Research Methodology**

This study uses the conventional, historical, chronological and analytical approaches. The study uses extensive primary sources such as the collection of speeches, letters and writings of political leaders and intellectuals available in libraries in Indonesia, Singapore, and Thailand. In addition, the study uses relevant materials found in newspapers and other publications.

Fortunately, historical newspapers and magazines in Singapore, Britain, Australia and historical English books such as travelogues and academic journals could now be found in a digitalized format. Through the digital data I searched targeted terms or phrases by using the digital search engine on media and then analyzed how writers used regional terms. For the digital books, whether in the nineteenth century or in the twentieth century, I did the same approach and analised the contents.

---

[35] D.G.E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, London: Macmillan Press, 1968 (Third edition). Kahin, George (ed.), *Governments and politics of Southeast Asia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959, and *Southeast Asia: A testament*, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003. Nicholas Tarling, *Southeast Asia: Past and present*, Melbourne: F. W. Cheshire, 1966 and *Southeast Asia: A Modern History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. All the above books hardly discuss the regional term and scope.

**Limitation of the study**

This research is limited to four countries, namely Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia. This is because the four countries are the core founding of ASEAN. Southeast Asian regionalism has deeper roots in these four countries compared to others in the region.

It must be noted that cabinet minutes in the four countries and minutes in ASEAN ministerial meetings and other related meetings were not available at all. Also, some private documents such as diaries and letters of leaders from the four countries were not accessible.

**Literature review**

While there is literature which have researched the term 'Southeast Asia,' these works do not go deep enough to trace the evolution of regional concepts of Southeast Asia. Neither do the existing literature discuss sufficiently the evolution and emergence of a Southeast Asian consciousness.

Russell Fifield's work, 'The concept of Southeast Asia: Origins, development, and evaluation'[36] is a classic article analysing the regional concept. Focusing on the period during and after the Second World War, the author traced the origins of the regional term 'Southeast Asia' and also explained how the regional concept was developed, using mainly the American sources. According to Fifield, though 'the Japanese conquest of the entire area contributed to the regional concept' because the

---

[36] Russell Fifield, 'The Concept of Southeast Asia: Origins, Development, and Evaluation,' *South-East Asian Spectrum*, Vol. 4, No. 1, (Oct. 1975), pp. 42-51.

Japanese destroyed the colonial borders,[37] the regional concept did not develop without being accepted by indigenous people in the process of de-colonisation, which was a prerequisite for the evolution of regionalism. None the less, the author paid little attention to the evolution of regional consciousness and regionalism among the countries, and placed emphasis on only political aspects of the regional concept. He does not analyse how the Association of South East Asia (ASA) and the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) had impacts on regional consciousness of the locals, either.

Donald Emmerson's article '"Southeast Asia": What's in a Name?'[38] dates back to the origins of the regional term in the nineteenth century and examines the regional concepts developed from the period before the Second World War to the establishment of ASEAN by using extensive sources in English, French and German. The author also argues, like Russell Fifield, that the Second World War affected the regional concept. In terms of the regional name, he said that the term was more stable than others such as 'Far East' because there is no betrayal of the location of an outsider naming the region nor are there benefits for specialists. For regional co-operation and integration within the entire region, he also argues that if the founding ASEAN members remain a political bloc, it would be difficult for regional integration. There is little discussion of how the regional consciousness in the region emerged. Although he considers ASEAN a political bloc, he does not discuss at all the ZOPFAN and ASEAN Summit, which had an impact on the consciousness and identity of the entire region.

Philip Charrier's 'ASEAN's inheritance: The regionalization of Southeast Asia, 1941-61' focuses on how the regional boundaries and concepts developed in an U.S.

---

[37] Ibid., p. 45.
[38] Donald Emmerson, '"Southeast Asia": What's in a Name?,' *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 1, (1984), pp. 1-21.

academic circle prior to the formation of ASEAN.[39] The article is divided into the two stages to develop the regional concept during and after the Second World War. Presenting quite rare and old materials, the author argues that in the first stage academics conceived and built up the regional space with boundaries and connections. Once regional ideas and concepts were used repeatedly by a variety of regionalists, it would be fixed in a cultural context. This was the second stage before 1961. The article concludes that at the formation of ASA in 1961 the concept of the region was an 'already meaningful concept' politically and spatially speaking, and this concept led to ASEAN. The article see the regional concept from the American view. While the author analyses SEAC, strangely enough, he overlooks SEATO, which the U.S. took the initiative to form in 1954.

Paul Kratoska, Remco Raben and Henk Schulte Nordholt (eds.)'s book, *Locating Southeast Asia: Geographies of knowledge and politics of space*[40] discusses the ways in which geography, politics and knowledge are intertwined from the perspectives of nations and non-nations by fifteen specialists such as Wang Gungwu, Heather Sutherland, Thongchai Winichakul, and Ruth T. McVey. The introductory chapter by three authors explains the development of the regional concepts before the Second World War and the flow of Southeast Asia studied in the world after the war. The authors argue that the concept of Southeast Asia evolved from the necessity of Europe, the U.S. and Japan, but the efforts to define the region have been inconclusive. They emphasise that to understand the region, one should pay attention to the locals and their networks, not nation-states. Although the discussion is interesting, the authors do not discuss how Southeast Asians perceived their belonging to their region. This chapter also focuses on

---

[39] Philip Charrier, 'ASEAN's inheritance: the regionalization of Southeast Asia, 1941-61,' *Pacific Review*, Vo. 14, No. 3 (2001), pp. 313-338.
[40] Paul H. Kratoska et al., *Locating Southeast Asia: Geographies of knowledge and politics of space*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005.

only the term 'Southeast Asia' and overlooks the 'old' regional terms such as 'Malay Archipelago' and 'Farther India,' which was often used before the Second World War.

Anthony Reid's famous work, *Southeast Asia in the age of commerce*,[41] once considered the region of Southeast Asia as a human unit and believes that there were common elements even before the arrival of colonisers: the languages, environment including 'a diet derived overwhelmingly from rice, fish and various palms,'[42] and commercial intercourses within the region. In his subsequent work, 'A Saucer Model of Southeast Asia identity'[43] argues with extensive sources that two factors led the region of Southeast Asia to become one. Dating back to the origins of Southeast Asian ideas, the article points out the two factors in which the region would become one as a single unit. First, as a positive view, people in Malaya and Singapore have a self-consciousness centrality based on communications. Second, as a negative view, Southeast Asians hated to be an appendant to the major neighbouring powers as a periphery. This led them to choose to become a region. While the author discusses regional consciousness among the Westerners from the nineteenth century, the last section shows that the local politicians had varied their regional consciousness between the 1930s and immediately after the World War. This article does not dwell on various regional terms used before the Second World War, either. Further, ASA and ASEAN as a source of Southeast Asian identity are not debated.

Milton Osborne's book, *Southeast Asia: An introductory history*, [44] briefly explains the history from ancient times to the 1970s after the regional countries gained independence. The author asks a question 'What is Southeast Asia?' and replies to this

---

[41] Anthony Reid, *Southeast Asia in the age of commerce, 1450-1680, Vol. 1: The lands below the winds*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988, pp. 4-10.
[42] Ibid., p. 5.
[43] Anthony Reid, 'A Saucer Model of Southeast Asia identity,' *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (1999), pp. 7-23.
[44] Milton Osborne, *Southeast Asia: An Introductory History*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1979, pp. 9-20.

in its first chapter. Explaining the size of the region, he exemplifies the similarities and differences in the region by using the term 'Southeast Asia' in general fashion. He pointed out that, while neither foreigners who lived in the region prior to the Second World War nor the locals who lived in the region had perceived the region as Southeast Asia, anthropologists and historians in the 1920s and the 1930s attempted to see the region as a unit. Emphasising the impact by China and India, he explained that the region is culturally considered to be an independent unit and is neither 'little India' nor 'little China.' The author only refers to the regional concept from the cultural aspects, not from the political and economic views. For this, SEAC and SEATO were not explained at all. Moreover, the later chapter also does not explain the indigenous regional organisations, ASA and ASEAN.

Leonard Y. Andaya 'Ethnonation, nation-state and regionalism in Southeast Asia'[45] traces the relations among ethnonations, nation-states, and the Southeast Asian region. Using the concept of the *Mandala* system by Wolters, he explains that in both areas of mainland and maritime, the system, which is suitable to ethnonation, survived. However, while the countries in the mainland were able to maintain the *Mandala* structure with ethnonation and developed to nation-states, the system came to end when the colonial powers controlled the insular area. The archipelagic countries struggled to establish nation-states without the system. According to him, nation-states have begun to relinquish some of their sovereign rights, but at the same time ethnonationalism has emerged in the maritime countries. He concludes that they need to compromise the ethnonationalism and through regional co-operation this can lead to survive nation-states. The author said that 'Southeast Asia is being reborn by means of a solid core

[45] Leonard Y. Andaya 'Ethnonation, nation-state and regionalism in Southeast Asia,' in *Proceedings of the international symposium Southeast Asia: Global area studies for the 21st century*, Kyoto: Centre for Southeast Asian Studies Kyoto University, 1997, pp.131-149.

consisting of the ASEAN nations,'[46] but paid no attention to reasons how the locals in the region accepted and built up the regional consciousness.

D. R. SarDesai's main book, *Southeast Asia: Past and Present*,[47] explains the whole history from ancient times to modern times, attempting to analyse issues of colonialism, nationalism, and international relations from the Asian point of view in combination with thematic and chronological approaches. He explains the region's name and its significance in the first two pages, and argues that the region was transformed into a single and strategic region with diverse cultures because of a few events such as the Japanese occupation during the World War, the birth of the People's Republic of China, and conflicts in Vietnam. While the author explains the external factor to delimit the region, he does not dwell on the internal factor as to how the regional concept emerged from within.

Arnfinn Jorgensen-Dahl's *Regional Organization and order in South-East Asia*[48] discusses regional co-operation in the period between the end of the Second World War and 1976, in particular comprehensively examining ASA and ASEAN. The author argues that even though the two regional organisations are for economic and cultural fields, their formation and development much reflected the political conditions and regional security at the time. Thus, after discussing in detail the historical flow of regional co-operation, the book explores national security, patterns of diplomacy, conflicts and regional order. The book concludes that although ASEAN has achieved regional peace and regional order, it has not built up a sense of community and reached regional integration. Nevertheless, the author overlooks the fact that ASEAN begun pursuing to form an ASEAN Community in 1976. Further, the book does not discuss

---

[46] Ibid., p. 135.
[47] D. R. SarDesai, *Southeast Asia: Past and Present*, Boulder: Westernview Press, 1994 (Third edition).
[48] Arnfinn Jorgensen-Dahl, *Regional Organization and order in South-East Asia*, Hampshire: The Macmillan Press, 1982.

the significance of regional consciousness to deepen the regional co-operation.

In historical analysis for regionalism, Nicholas Tarling's work *Regionalism in Southeast Asia: To foster the political will*, [49] is the best work to understand the regionalism in the region from the historical approach. Focusing on a regional perspective, the author examines regional concepts in the pre-World war such as 'Further India' and '*Nan-yo*' and analyses the regional activities from the Bandung conference in 1955 to the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in the 2000s. Using disclosed materials from the Public Record Office in London for the early regionalism prior to the formation of ASEAN, he also explores the history of regional co-operation for the time. Although the extensive materials are used, the primary sources are limited to the documents in English, which are archived in the West. Even the secondary sources used are only in English. He does not explain how the regional consciousness deepened and developed among the countries through regional co-operation, either.

Frank Frost 'The origins and evolution of ASEAN' [50] explains the historical background to ASEAN and outlines the historical obstacles and the development of regional co-operation. The lack of an indigenous power to dominate the region and the political and economic domination by Europeans in the region impeded the development of 'regional identification' and 'regional sentiment.'[51] Although Japanese occupation had great impact on the people in the region to evolve a regional identification, the regional co-operation between the countries was obstructed because of anti-colonialism in Indonesia and Vietnam, and anti-communist sentiments by the external powers. The author evaluates the historical significance of ASA and

---

[49] Nicholas Tarling, *Regionalism in Southeast Asia: To foster the political will*, London: Routledge, 2006.
[50] Frank Frost 'The origins and evolution of ASEAN,' *World Review*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Aug. 1980).
[51] Ibid., p. 5 and p. 6.

MAPHILINDO and appreciates that ASEAN made a good system to keep regular contacts between the countries. He suggests that ASEAN attempted to establish its presence as a unifier in the region. However, the article lacks discussion of the reason why Southeast Asians accepted their region and also overlooks the ASEAN countries' wishes to form an ASEAN region, not Southeast Asian region, and to set up a community, which the countries expressed in the 1970s.

Susumu Yamakage's book published in 1991, *ASEAN – from symbol to system*,[52] discusses the origins and development of ASEAN from the beginning of the 1960s to the end of the 1970s. It analyses the predecessors of the regional organisation, ASA and MAPHILINDO in details. Focusing on the internal system and structure, external attitudes of ASEAN and international relations of the founding members, most of the chapters place emphasis on the political aspects and roles, although the organisation was formed for economic and cultural co-operation. The author does not analyses how other regional organisations helped to build up regional consciousness. This book does not discuss how the consciousness developed through ASEAN activities.

Iwamoto Yujiro, a Japanese scholar on international relations, focuses on how regionalism in economic and political fields developed in the period between the end of the World War and the early 1970s in his article, 'Regionalism in Southeast Asia.'[53] Focusing on motives to promote regional co-operation, the author analyses the policies of security and national economy in each country and acknowledges various obstacles in the two fields in each country. He argues that regional co-operation in Southeast Asia was to establish an independent national economy without depending on major powers and to secure national independence and maintain national security. The article

---

[52] Yamakage Susumu, *ASEAN kara shimboru he* (*ASEAN – From Symbol to System*), Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1991.
[53] Iwamoto Yujirou, 'Tounan ajia ni okeru chiiki shugi' (Regionalism in Southeast Asia), in *1960 nendaini okeru chugokuto tounan ajia* (*China and Southeast Asia in the 1960s)*, Tokyo: Ajia Seikei Gakkai, 1974, pp. 125-183.

discusses, based on the premise that local political elites had already gained regional consciousness, but it does not explain how the regional consciousness was shared and developed among the countries through regional co-operation. At the same time the author does not discuss how and why the ASEAN members chose the countries to co-operate.

Michael Leifer's *Dilemmas of statehood in Southeast Asia*[54] is a short book for general readers to explain the problems of political integration and regional association. His emphasis is on political integration to strengthen each government. He examines that ethnic dissent and economic grievances which were their obstacles to politically integrate. The last two chapters discuss regional association. Examining the source of conflicts from the end of the world war to the early 1970s within the region, he concludes that there are the same disturbing elements in the region as anywhere else in other regions. Promising that the regional integration by ASEAN is limited because of separate territoriality of the regional countries, he concludes that ASEAN will not promote 'any sentimental notion of brotherhood.'[55] However, he has shed light on only the political and economic co-operation and overlooks the significance of the cultural and social co-operation to help to enhance the regional consciousness.

Amitav Acharya, *The quest for identity: International relations of Southeast Asia*,[56] chronologically pursues the origins of the Southeast Asian identity in his book. Understanding the importance of the development of regionalism to nurture the regional identity, he concludes that regionalism between the 1970s and the 1980s gave the region a regional identity. Probably what he is saying is the emergence of regional consciousness, not identity. The regional consciousness among the locals at the time of

---

[54] Michael Leifer, *Dilemmas of statehood in Southeast Asia*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1972.
[55] Ibid., p. 151.
[56] Amitav Acharya, *The quest for identity: International relations of Southeast Asia*, Oxford: Oxford University press, 2000.

the proposals to set up the organisations are not explain at all. Besides, the author does not use any primary sources and is heavily dependent on secondary sources.

Last but not least, O. W. Wolters' *History, Culture, and Region in Southeast Asian Perspectives*[57] discusses his famous theory of *Mandala* system, which draws on the human networks between kings/rajas and subordinates. The book provides the possibilities of communality and framework in forming a region because the region of Southeast Asia was not self-evident. The author argues that communication relied on commercial trading with vessels on the 'single ocean,' located from the coasts of Eastern Africa and Western Asia to the long coastal line of the India and on to China. Communication through vassals resulted in the proliferation of Indian literature into the region, which in turn allowed for cultural commonality. Nevertheless, the system was destroyed and all networks and communications were cut off in the colonial era. The author attempted to trace the history of communality in the diverse culture in the region. However, the work does not discuss to what extent indigenous intellectuals and nationalists retained that sense of commonality and had aspirations of 'regional' consciousness in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

There are few discussions of regional concepts and consciousness by Southeast Asian scholars, but some scholars have provided useful arguments.

The Indonesian scholar, Leo Suryadinata believes that ASEAN identity was still weak.[58] His small article argues that although ASEAN was originally a construction of the political elites, it is necessary for the common people to have ASEAN identity in the diverse-cultural Southeast Asia. He said that 'if diversity is overstressed, there will not be a "common" identity but a "diverse identity."' Thus, promoting ASEAN identity

---

[57] O. W. Wolters, *History, culture, and region in Southeast Asian perspectives*, Singapore: ISEAS, 1999.
[58] Leo Suryadinata, 'Towards an ASEAN Charter promoting an ASEAN regional identity,' in Rodolfo Severino (ed.), *Framing the ASEAN charter: An ISEAS perspective*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2005.

aims at promoting 'unity in diversity' (p. 43), which would result in guaranteeing regional integration. While the author is aware of Southeast Asia as a geographical region, he opines that ASEAN is a political, economic, social and cultural region. As ASEAN exists based on Southeast Asia, it will be impossible to create an ASEAN identity without regional consciousness of Southeast Asia, but the author does not mention and discuss this matter.

Wang Gungwu's article 'Nation Formation and Regionalism in Southeast Asia'[59] discusses how nationalism in Southeast Asia hindered regional co-operation. The article analyses two types of nationalism in the region, namely revolutionary nationalism (Burma, Vietnam and Indonesia) and moderate nationalism (Thailand, the Philippines and Malaysia) and nation formation, which has three stages. He argues that the third stage, which is the period after the Second World War, created a big gap between the nationalisms. He concludes that although the countries have common problems and inferiority in political, economic, cultural and technological fields, they had no common action against the problems and the non-action greatly caused to impede regional co-operation. The article is only partly useful for understanding the development of regionalism. However, when this article was published in 1964, the economic and cultural organisation, ASA was dormant, but other cultural and social organisations were active and achieved some results. The author does not focus on this point.

Tommy Koh, the then Singaporean ambassador to the United Nations and Canada, brought up the regional concept in much earlier stage among the local scholars and intellectuals.[60] Questioning whether Vietnam is part of Southeast Asia, he argued that strong nationalism and ethnic identities impeded the development of the regional

---

[59] Wang Gungwu, 'Nation Formation and Regionalism in Southeast Asia,' in Margaret Grant (ed.), *South Asia Pacific Crisis: National Development and the World Community*, New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1964, pp. 125-135.
[60] T. T. B. Koh, 'International collaboration concerning Southeast Asia,' *The Annals of the American academy of political and social science*, Vol. 390, (July, 1970), pp. 18-26.

identity in Southeast Asia. He also pointed out that regional identity was weak even among the political elites. This was mainly because the colonial regimes deterred the locals away from neighbours. However, the ambassador did not indicate that the regional term was used as a military term and the indigenous politicians sought to regionally co-operate in the 1940s and the 1950s.

Chin Kin Wah's article 'ASEAN: The long road to "One Southeast Asia"'[61] explores how the region of Southeast Asia was delineated for thirty years since the formation of ASEAN. The Association was formed for the purpose of economic and cultural co-operation, but he argues that since political and security concerns were the real driving forces that established the organisation, ASEAN's political definition of the Southeast Asian region shaped regional delineation given the process of expansion. During that period, there were many impediments to ASEAN's expansion, but the members effectively addressed and cleared the impediments. Although scholars and indigenous politicians already had an awareness or consciousness of Southeast Asia with a vague and rough delineation before the establishment of ASEAN, the author does not discuss this. It would be difficult for the regional definition to be made in the process of expansion.

Singaporean geographer, Victor Savage's work 'Changing Landscapes: Cultural Geologies and Cosmic Space in Southeast Asia'[62] argues that Southeast Asians had no spatial consciousness prior to the colonial era. This is because migration was a common occurrence and because kingdoms in the region in early era were located along rivers or on coasts. Thus, communication was done through vessels. Quoting Wolters, the author concludes that kings/rajas had neither land-based territorial consciousness nor

---

[61] Chin Kin Wah, 'ASEAN: The long road to "One Southeast Asia,"' *Asian Journal of political science*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (June 1997), pp. 1-19.
[62] Savage Victor, (trans. Komeie Taisaku), 'Changing landscapes: cultural geologies and cosmic space in Southeast Asia,' *Historical Geography* (Japan), Vol. 237 (January, 2008). The article is translated into Japanese. It would seem that there are no English version published.

spatial consciousness. Instead, colonial powers brought the concept of a defined space into the region. Although it is a suggestive article, his discussion focuses mainly on the era before the arrival of colonial powers. Not enough emphasis was placed on spatial consciousness among the locals in the colonial era.

Estrella D. Soldium[63] examines the nature of co-operation among the founding members of ASEAN through the attitudes of the political elite in the period between 1959 and 1969, in which Southeast Asian countries attempted to have three different forms of regional co-operation, i.e., ASA, MAPHILINDO and ASEAN. The book shows how members attempted to co-operate to settle common problems. Her study shows that attitudes of political leaders of the five members of ASEAN are tied to actual co-operation. Although trade among the member countries was quite slow, cultural co-operation created situations in which greater understanding and cooperation could be forged. She concludes that close communication between the elites helped to crystalize a community of sentiments. However, the author laid the region as an axiom. Although 'regional co-operation' should be based on a 'region' in which all 'regional' players share the same consciousness, she did not discuss how the regional consciousness was born and the agreement of regional concept was reached by the members.

Her other book, *The Politics of ASEAN: An Introduction to Southeast Asian Regionalism*,[64] traced the development of the concept of Southeast Asia by the West. Explaining Wolters' argument that intra-state exchanges were ongoing in the economic, social and political fields before the colonial era in the region, the book opines that colonialization brought territorial boundaries to the region and resulted in the division of ethnic groups. She also said that initial concepts of the region were 'the identification

---

[63] Estrella D. Soldium, *Towards a Southeast Asian Community*, Quezon City: University of Philippines Press, 1974.
[64] Estrella D. Solidum, *The politics of ASEAN: An introduction to Southeast Asian Regionalism*, Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 2003.

of the region in military and political terms' (p. 5) by the South East Asian Command (SEAC). It is true the term 'Southeast Asia' was coined by the West, but the book does not discuss how the regional concept was adopted by locals.

**Division of Chapters**

The primary aim of this dissertation is to trace how and when the people, in particular political leaders and intellectuals, in Southeast Asia had gained a regional awareness and consciousness. This paper is composed of seven chapters.

After discussing the regional terms used in India, China and Japan, Chapter 2 focuses on the early usages and the concepts of regional terms of present-day Southeast Asia by Westerners. This period is from the nineteenth century to the 1960s. The regional terms used by the Westerners are not limited to Southeast Asia, but also terms such as the 'Malay Archipelago,' 'Indian Archipelago,' and 'Farther India.' The chapter reveals that the conception of the term 'Southeast Asia' varied from writer to writer, especially after the Second World War.

Chapters 3 and 4 discuss how a regional consciousness emerged among political leaders and intellectuals in the four countries: Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia. Chapter 3 examines Thailand and the Philippines. In Thailand, a politically non-colonised country, the kings had relationships with colonisers to keep its independence. The section focuses on how the kings realised the regional consciousness through interactions with the Westerners. The section on the Philippines discusses how nationalists saw their belonging in the region in the colonial era. In the case of the Filipinos, it is quite related to their identities. The section analyses how their two identities have developed and had impact on their regional consciousness.

Chapter 4 deals with Malaysia and Indonesia. The part on Malaysia first discusses

how the regional terms 'Malay Archipelago' and 'Malaysia' emerged and were used by the Westerners because they were defined based on the Malay race. The section also considers how the locals began sensing their own identity and how it created their regional consciousness. The section on Indonesia discusses first the term 'Indonesia.' This is due to the fact that the term was originally used as a regional term by the Westerners. It also focuses on how the nationalists employed and defined it as their own country name from the regional term.

Chapter 5 examines how regional co-operation emerged between the 1940s and 1967. It sheds light on not only political and economic co-operation, but also cultural and social co-operation, to which is paid little attention by scholars. It considers how regional organisations in this period had impact on their regional consciousness.

Chapter 6 examines how the members developed the organisation and tried to strengthen regional consciousness through ASEAN. While ASEAN is officially an economic and cultural regional organization, there is also some political co-operation. The chapter explores the way the members developed and built up their own regional consciousness through ASEAN activities up to the first ASEAN Summit in 1976.

The last chapter draws some important conclusions from this study.

# CHAPTER 2: EARLY USES AND CONCEPTUALISATION
# OF THE TERM 'SOUTHEAST ASIA'

**Introduction**

Southeast Asia is one of the sub-regions in Asia. It lies south of China, east of India, and north of Australia, geographically dividing into 'mainland' and 'maritime.' While the former consists of Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam, the latter forms a string of archipelagos in the southern part of the region and includes: Brunei, East Timor, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore. This region is among the most diverse region in the world. Climate, ethnic composition, linguistic composition, religions, and government systems all exhibit differences in each country of the region.

Although the region has emerged as a single region over the last sixty years, the origins of the geographic term 'Southeast Asia' remain unclear. The term was widely used by government officials, newspapers' writers and businessmen in the nineteenth and in the first half of the twentieth centuries. However, the conception of the term varied from writer to writer. Some of them used the term in a larger geographical scope than as used presently In addition, 'Further/Farther India,' 'the Indian Archipelago' and 'the Malay Archipelago' (hereafter collectively referred to as the 'old terms'), which were generally used by the 1940s, were also often used with no clear distinction from 'South Eastern Asia,' 'South East Asia,' and 'Southeast Asia' (hereafter referred to as the 'new terms').

This chapter traces the earlier use and conception of the term 'Southeast Asia.' It examines how the old and new terms have been defined and used in English newspapers published in the United Kingdom and Singapore in the past. This chapter will first examine the terms for the region used in India, China and Japan, before tracing

the emergence of the English usage of the regional terms. The next section focuses on how the old terms were used in English newspapers prior to the nineteenth century. The usage of the new terms in the period are examined in the third section. The last section shed lights on the usage and the conceptions of the regional term 'Southeast Asia' after the 1940s among scholars and writers. We shall now examine how the neighbouring countries of India, China, and Japan referred to the region known to the West as Southeast Asia.

**Terms used in India, China, and Japan**

The Indians and Chinese sailed to Southeast Asia and were familiar with the region in the centuries before the arrival of Europeans.[1] The geographical location of the region was known to them and they had their own regional terms for the whole or part of the region since ancient times. The Japanese, too, knew the geographical region and conducted business with local traders but only from the beginning of the twentieth century.

Indian manuscripts used the term '*Suvannabhumi'* (the Golden Land) as a regional term loosely, sparking some controversies about its exact location. Jack-Hilton opined that the term 'seems to have been [used in] general rather than [for] particular names for the area.'[2] Paul Wheatley however pointed out that although Indians had several terms to refer to a part of the region in earlier periods,[3] it 'is not unlikely that the name (*Suvannabhumi*) came to be applied to the whole of the archipelago and the peninsula.'[4]

[1] O. W. Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce: A study of the origins of Srivijaya*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967, pp. 31-48 and C. P. Fitzgerald, 'Early Chinese contacts with South-East Asia', pp. 39-54, in Geoff Wade (ed.), *China and Southeast Asia: Routledge Library on Southeast Asia, Volume I: Introduction and history to the fourteenth century*, London: Routledge, 2009.
[2] Colin Jack-Hilton, 'Marco Polo in South-East Asia: A preliminary essay in reconstruction,' *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, Vol. 5 (1964), p. 84.
[3] Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese: Studies in the historical geography of the Malay Peninsula before A.D. 1500*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1961, pp. 177-179.
[4] Ibid., p. 182.

George Coedès also interpreted the term as a reference to Sumatra or the Malay Peninsula.[5] On the other hand, other scholars concluded that the term was used for Lower Burma and for Sumatra only. [6] Though the Indian term might not have included the whole of modern Southeast Asia, at the very least, the term identified parts of the region.

China used two regional terms in ancient times, namely '*Nanhai*' (South Sea) and *Nanyang* (South Ocean) to refer to the region. According to Miyazaki Sadaichi, a prominent Japanese scholar on Chinese history, '*Nanhai*' was defined as a collective term for southern countries in the era of the Emperor Xianzong of the Tang dynasty.[7] *Nanyang* referred to the southern countries from Quanzhou or Guangzhou, where the major international seaports were located. Hence, according to the Chinese, *Nanyang* was divided into two sub-regions, namely the East ocean and the West ocean.[8] While these regional terms had been used since the ninth century, '[i]t was not until the British had confirmed their power in India and sharpened their taste for the China market that the basic condition for a Southeast Asia in-between region appeared during the nineteenth century.'[9] The scope of *Nanyang* remained unclear till the beginning of the twentieth century, though it was much closer to the modern idea of Southeast Asia.[10] However, with the establishment of *Nanyang Zhibu* (*Tongmeihui* headquarters of South Ocean) in Singapore by Sun Yat-Sen in 1907,[11] the term '*Nanyang*' became well known among Chinese. Sun Yat-Sen's political campaigns in the region to topple the Qing dynasty attracted much interest among the Chinese within and outside China, and the

---

[5] George Coedès, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1968.
[6] Kanai Lai Hazra, *History of Theravada Buddhism in South-East Asia*, Munshiram Manoharlal, 1982, p. 58. For Sumatra, O. W. Wolters, ibid., pp. 34-35.
[7] Miyazaki Ichisada, 'Nanyo wo touzaiyouni wakatsu konkyo nitsuite (Evidences divided the East and the West ocean in the South ocean),' *Toyoshi Kenkyu* Vol. 7, No. 4 (1942), p. 200.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Wang Gungwu, 'Two Perspectives of Southeast Asian Studies,' in Paul H Kratoska, Remco Raben, and Henk Schulte Nordholt, *Locating Southeast Asia: Geographies of knowledge and politics of space,* Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005, pp. 64-65.
[10] Ibid., p. 65.
[11] See his activities in *Nanyang* to Yen Ching-hwang, 'Tongmenghui, Sun Yat-Sen and the Chinese in Singapore and Malaya: A Revisit,' in Leo Suryadinata (ed.), *Tongmenghui, Sun Yat-Sen and the Chinese in Southeast Asia: A Revisit*, Singapore: Chinese Heritage Centre, 2006, p. 117.

term '*Nanyang*' was woven into the fabric of Chinese society. Although the term *Nanyang* was often used, it was gradually replaced by '*Dongnanya*' (Southeast Asia, literally East-South Asia) after the Second World War. According to Wang Gungwu, it was due to change of an ideological shift against Communist China among Western powers and Deng Xiaoping's economic reforms.[12] While academic journals in China continued to use *Nanyang* between the 1950s and the 1960s, the term disappeared completely from academic journals by the 1980s.[13]

Another neighbouring country, Japan, named the region '*Nanyo*' (South Ocean), before the term '*Tounan Ajia*' (Southeast Asia, literally East-South Asia) became widely used. The term '*Nanyo*' was derived from the Chinese term *Nanyang,* pronounced in the Japanese language. The early use of '*Nanyo*' dates back to the eighteenth century. According to Shimizu Hajime, the term was first used in *Seiiki Monogatari* (Tales of the Western Regions) by an intellectual, Honda Toshiaki, in 1798. Shimizu argued that the concept of '*Nanyo*' was almost the same as that of the current Southeast Asia.[14] This regional term was popularly associated with the idea of 'southward advance' (Nanshin-ron) during the Meiji (1868-1912) and the Taisho (1912-1926) eras, indicating the expansion of business and immigrating to the region. During this period, two books on the region were published, namely *Nanyo Jiji* (the South Seas Affairs) by a geographer, Shiga Shigetaka, in 1887, and *Nangokuki* (Travels in Southern Country) by a historian, Takekoshi Yosaburo, in 1910, helped the Japanese people navigate the region.[15] Although other terms such as '*Nanpo*' (the South) and '*Nanpo-ken*' (the Southern sphere) were also popular by the time of the Second World War, '*Nanyo*' was more frequently

---

[12] Wang Gungwu, 'Two Perspectives of Southeast Asian Studies,' pp. 64-65.
[13] Ibid., p. 69.
[14] Shimizu Hajime, 'Southeast Asia as a Regional Concept in Modern Japan,' in Paul H. Kratoska et al., *Locating Southeast Asia: Geographies of Knowledge and Politics of Space*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005, pp. 85-86.
[15] See the analysis for the two books in Yano Toru, *Nanshin no Keihu (The lineage of southern expansion)*, Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha, 1975, pp. 55-64.

used among the Japanese. The region was attracted much attention as it was rich in natural resources. The invasion of the region by the Japanese military in 1941 was also to gain access to these resources. After the end of the Second World War, the Japanese terms were gradually replaced with the term '*Tounan Ajia*' (Southeast Asia)[16] because the older terms, along with '*Daitoua*' (Greater East Asia), had overtones of military aggression.

While the Asian countries surrounding the region had their own terms and concepts since early times,[17] the emergence of the term 'South East Asia' in English, led to Asian countries using the English translation of this term in their local languages. The next section examines the regional terms used to describe the current East Asia in English.

**The usage of the old terms by the nineteenth century**

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the present Southeast Asia was not collectively described and was divided into two areas. Modern mainland Southeast Asia was referred to as 'Farther/Further India,' while the maritime area was referred to as the 'Indian Archipelago,' or 'Malay Archipelago.' While the term 'Farther India' was first used in a newspaper article about the kingdom of Pegu in Burma in 1742,[18] the term 'Further India,' which has a slight spelling difference, appeared in 1788. A passage in the article stating 'the Peninsula of Further India to the mouth of Ganges' referred to the current mainland area.[19] With regard to the maritime area, *The Ipswich Journal*, a newspaper in a country town of England, begun using the term 'Indian Archipelago' in

---

[16] This term was used in text books in elementary and middle school immediately after the First World War. See Shimizu Hajime, ibid., pp. 82-112.
[17] For the conceptions of Southeast Asia used by Arabians, See G. R. Tibbetts, *A Study of the Arabic texts containing material on South-East Asia*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979.
[18] *Newcastle Courant*, 25 Sept. 1742, p. 2.
[19] *Norfolk Chronicle*, 21 June 1788, p. 2

1751.[20] This term was sometimes used in other newspapers after that. Another term for the same area, 'the Malay Archipelago,' appeared for the first time in a newspaper, *Inverness Courier*, in 1824.[21]

An attempt was made to define clearly the old terms. Howard Malcom, who travelled as a missionary to the region, defined the term 'Farther India' as 'India beyond the Ganges, embracing Burmah, Asam, Munnipore, Siam, Camboja, and Cochin-China and all the region between China and the Bay of Bengal, south of the Tibet Mountains.'[22] In 1905, Hugh Clifford, a British colonial officer, outlined the boundaries of 'Farther India'[23] which consisted of Burma, Malaya, Siam, and Indo-China. Unlike Malcom, Clifford narrowed it to only what is now mainland Southeast Asia.[24] This term was relatively commonly used in British newspapers in the second half of the nineteenth century, but was hardly used in the twentieth century.[25]

The term 'Indian Archipelago,' on the other hand, was used more often in British newspapers in the late eighteenth century. Growing interest in the Asian islands in the nineteenth century popularised the use of the term, 'Indian Archipelago.' A clear definition was made by John Crawfurd in 1820. His concept of the 'Indian Archipelago' covered from Sumatra as the most east island to Papua New Guineas as the most west including the Malay Peninsula, and from Java as the most south island to the Philippines

---

[20] *The Ipswich Journal*, 16 Nov. 1751, p. 2.

[21] *Inverness Courier*, 4 Nov. 1824, p. 2.

[22] Howard Malcom, *Travels in South-Eastern Asia: Embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam, and China*, Vol. I, Boston: Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln, 1839, p. 133.

[23] Hugh Clifford, *Further India: Being the story of exploration from earliest times in Burma, Malaya, Siam and Indo-China*, London: Alston Rivers, limited, 1905.

[24] George Coedès later made a definition of the Further India which stated: 'island Southeast Asia except for the Philippines and the Indochinese Peninsula.' Some conceptual confusion might have been made. Refer to *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1968, p. xv.

[25] See the Table 1 in the next page.

**Table 1: The number of usage by year[26]**

| | South East Asia | South Eastern Asia | Further India | Farther India | Indian Archipelago | Malay Archipelago |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Before 1830 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 140 | 5 |
| 1830-1839 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 153 | 0 |
| 1840-1849 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 538 | 20 |
| 1850-1859 | 0 | 6 | 35 | 16 | 971 | 23 |
| 1860-1869 | 2 | 4 | 28 | 0 | 350 | 199 |
| 1870-1879 | 2 | 28 | 14 | 32 | 200 | 164 |
| 1880-1889 | 4 | 46 | 84 | 15 | 224 | 251 |
| 1890-1899 | 8 | 38 | 111 | 65 | 114 | 268 |
| 1900-1909 | 8 | 10 | 19 | 3 | 34 | 70 |
| 1910-1919 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 15 |
| 1920-1929 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 16 |
| 1930-1939 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 30 |
| 1940 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 1941 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 1942 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 1943 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1944 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1945 | 98 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1946 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1947 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1948 | 47 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1949 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

as the most north.[27] In short, this term applied to the entire archipelago or what was known as maritime Southeast Asia. Malcom also defined in his book above mentioned that 'the Indian Archipelago' covered 'Ceylon, the Laccadives *(Lakshadweep islands in India)*, Maldives, Andaman's Nichobars, Moluccas, Philippines, Borneo, Sumatra, Java, Celebes, and all their minor neighbours.'[28] The scope of the latter term was more extensive than the concept expounded by J. H. Moor in a publication two years earlier.

---

[26] The British Newspaper Archive: www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk (accessed on 18 and 19 March 2012).
[27] John Crawfurd, *History of the Indian Archipelago containing an account of the manners, arts, languages, religions, institutions, and commerce of its inhabitants*, London: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 1820, pp. 2-7.
[28] Ibid., p. 134. The emphasis in Italic was made by the author.

Moor's definition was straightforward because the scope of the term was almost the same as modern maritime Southeast Asia.[29] Horace John who wrote about the history of the Archipelago[30] thirty years after Crawfurd's publication, adopting the latter's concept. It appears that no writer attempted any further definition of the 'Indian Archipelago' till the twentieth century. It might be said that newspaper editors in Britain accepted the definition of the 'Indian Archipelago.'

Besides these terms, there was another regional term which was used to describe the whole of the archipelago, namely the 'Malay Archipelago.' This regional term became well known after a British naturalist, Alfred Russel Wallace, published *The Malay Archipelago* in 1869. He explained that there were 'a number of large and small islands forming a connected group distinct from those great masses of land, and having little connection with either of them' between Asia and Australia. He named this area the 'Malay Archipelago' simply because of the Malay inhabitants in this region.[31] The author writes, '[t]he Malay Archipelago extends for more than 4,000 miles in length from east to west, and is about 1,300 [miles] in breadth from north to south.'[32] As is clear from the passage, the regional term had a concept that was almost similar to that of modern maritime Southeast Asia. Compared with the term, the 'Indian Archipelago,' the scope of the 'Malay Archipelago' by Wallace was slightly larger because it included the Tenasserim Island in Burma and the Nicobar Islands in India. In fact, the term the 'Malay Archipelago' was not created by Wallace. This regional term had appeared in British newspapers in the 1820s.[33] The use of this term subsequently became more frequent after the publication by Wallace in 1869.[34] This book inspired newspaper writers to use it more

---

[29] J. H. Moor, *Notices of the Indian Archipelago, and adjacent countries*, Vol. I, Singapore, 1837, p. iv.
[30] Horace St. John, *The Indian archipelago: Its history and present state*, London: Longman, 1853, p. 4.
[31] Alfred Russel Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago*, Oxford: John Beaufoy Publishing, 2009, p. 1.
[32] Ibid., pp. 2-3.
[33] See *Royal Cornwall Gazette*, 9 Dec. 1820, p. 4, *Leads Intelligencer*, 28 Oct. 1824, p. 3, *Northampton Mercury*, 30 Oct. 1824, p. 1 and so on.
[34] See the Table 1 in p. 31.

often. This regional term was also often used along with the 'Indian Archipelago' by the twentieth century. For example, a search in the British Newspaper Archive shows that in the nineteenth century the terms, the 'Indian Archipelago' and the 'Malay Archipelago' were still frequently used. The frequent usage of the former appellation peaked in the 1850s when it was used in 971 articles. As the Table 1 shows, it gradually decreased by the end of the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the usage of the 'Malay Archipelago' increased from the 1860s; the term was used in 251 articles in the 1880s, surpassing 224 articles which referred to the 'Indian Archipelago.' The usage of the 'Malay Archipelago' further increased, finding its way into 268 articles, exceeding the mention of the 'Indian Archipelago' in 114 articles in the 1890s.[35]

**The use of the new terms in the nineteenth century**

One of the new terms in English for Southeast Asia emerged between the 1820s and the 1830s. A newspaper, *Bells Weekly Messenger* in 1822 used the term 'south-east of Asia' in an article, defining it as the 'dominion of the waters between the south-east of Asia and south-west of America from the 51st degree of north latitude.'[36] The term did not have the same geographical span as modern day Southeast Asia, as it described a much larger area from China to modern Southeast Asia. The writer of the article perceived the whole area as a single regional unit.

The earliest book to use the other new term 'South-Eastern Asia' was *Travels in South-Eastern Asia: Compiled from the most authentic and recent sources*, which was published in 1831.[37] The author is unknown, but this book indicates clearly the scope of

---

[35] See the Table 1 in p. 31.
[36] *Bells Weekly Messenger*, 7 July, 1822, p. 4, *Royal Cornwall Gazette*, 13 July, 1822, p. 4. Both papers used the same article titled 'Pretentions of Russia' by Sir James Mackintosh who was a professor in the East India Company's College in Britain.
[37] *Travels in South-Eastern Asia: Compiled from the most authentic and recent sources*, London: C.J.G. and F. Rivington, 1831.

the regional term; it embraces 'the British possessions in the East, Hindostan, and the countries adjacent, Caubul, Nepaul, and the Birman empire' and also the vast empire of China, 'which on account of its commerce with England, passing through the hands of the East India Company.'[38] It should be noted that this description was much more extensive than the scope of 'south-east of Asia' in 1822.

Howard Malcom, as mentioned above, published his travelogue of the region[39] and, interestingly enough, this book has the same title as the previous book published in 1831. While the author did not provide the definition of his 'South-Eastern Asia,' judging from the title, it is probable that the four geographic names in the title, i.e. Hindustan, Malaya, Siam, and China, indicates the scope of the term. Nevertheless, the attached map in the book shows the regional scope from the East of India to the Indochina Peninsula, the Malay Peninsula and the north of Sumatra Island. The exact demarcation of the region thus remains unclear. Malcom might have construed South-Eastern Asia as a collective term encompassing both 'Farther India' and the 'Indian Archipelago.' Although Yano Toru argues that his scope of South Eastern Asia might have referred to only modern mainland Southeast Asia excluding most of maritime Southeast Asia,[40] Malcom might have made the definition of the region. Additionally, the term 'South-Eastern Asia' might have been 'self-evident enough to need no definition'[41] in the author's and readers' opinions even in this period.

*The Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia,* which was first published in 1847 and became '[t]he first regional scholarly journal,'[42] published two articles on

---

[38] Ibid., p. v.
[39] Haward Malcom, *Travels in South-Eastern Asia: Embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam, and China*, Boston: Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln, 1839.
[40] Yano Toru, *Tonan ajia sekai no kouzu: Seijiteki seitaishikan no tachibakara (Structures of Southeast Asian World: From view of point of political ecological history)*, Tokyo: Nihon housou kyoukai, 1984, p. 18.
[41] Donald Emmerson, ibid., p. 5.
[42] Anthony Reid, 'A Saucer Model of Southeast Asian Identity,' *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (1999), p. 12.

Southeast Asia: 'The Ethnology of Eastern Asia'[43] by J. R. Logan, which had a section entitled 'The ethnology of South Eastern Asia,' and 'Contributions to the physical geography of South-Eastern Asia and Australia'[44] by George Windsor Earl. Both of them do not provide us the definition of the term 'South (-) Eastern Asia' but it seems clear that while Logan applies the term to the modern mainland Southeast Asia, China, and a part of India, Earl uses it only for current mainland Southeast Asia because he distinguished the term 'South Eastern Asia' from the 'Indian Archipelago' in his article. Logan also proposed other regional terms, 'Ultraindia' or 'Transindia' for the regional name between China and India,[45] but no one used the terms.

After the 1870s, the new terms 'South Eastern Asia' and 'South East Asia' were more popularly used.  For example, though it is not well known presently, a book *The land of the elephant: Sights and scenes in South-Eastern Asia* was published by Frank Vincent in 1874. This book does not provide a clear definition of South-Eastern Asia, either, but it was reviewed and advertised in several newspapers.[46]  Also, *The Graphic*, a weekly illustrated newspaper, shows a clear and detailed map using the title 'South-Eastern Asia' in 1883, demarcating the region including China, India, Ceylon, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and all present ASEAN countries. [47] Thus, in the period the terms were quite popular for writers and readers.

The term 'South Eastern Asia,' which was used mainly in travelogues by then, were found in articles on economy such as trading, ship transportation and natural resources, and international politics in the 1890s. At the same time these articles using

---

[43] J. R. Logan, 'The Ethnology of Eastern Asia,' *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. 4 (1850).

[44] George Windsor Earl, 'Contributions to the physical geography of South-Eastern Asia and Australia,' *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. 6 (1852).

[45] J. R. Logan, 'The ethnology of the Indian Archipelago,' *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. 4 (1850), p. 278n.

[46] Jun Frank Vincent, *The land of the white elephant: sights and scenes in South-Eastern Asia: A personal narrative of travel and adventure in Farther India, embracing the countries of Burma, Siam, Cambodia, and Cochin-China (1871-2)*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1874. For book review, see *The Nonconformist*, 17 Dec. 1873, p. 14, *The Morning Post*, 6 March, 1874, p. 3, *The Guardian*, 12 Aug. 1874, p. 27 and more. For advertisement, see *The Graphic*, 18 Oct. 1873, p. 1, *The Examiner*, 29 Nov. 1873, p. 24, *Leeds Mercury*, 4 Dec. 1873 and more.

[47] *The Graphic*, 22 Sept. 1883, p. 28.

the term were published in local newspapers in urban and rural areas in Britain. The same phenomenon was born in the U.S.[48] with use of some varieties of the regional term: 'Southeast of Asia' and 'Southeast Asia.'[49]

In Singapore, the regional terms were often used in local newspapers. Earlier usage of the term was in *The Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser*, which introduced that the U.S. sent a diplomatic agent to 'South Eastern Asia.'[50] *The Straits Times* also started to use the term 'South Eastern Asia' in 1850.[51] When Joseph Balestier, Consul of the United States to Singapore, was staying on the island, his letter to Secretary of State, John Clayton, was published in the newspaper. The Consul described the term 'South Eastern Asia' twice in the letter. In fact, Balestier was appointed in 1849 as 'Special Agent of the United States to Cochin-China and the other portions of South Eastern Asia' by the President, Zachary Taylor, in order to improve relations with Cochinchina, 'negotiate a commercial treaty with Cochinchina,' persuade the Siamese to follow the terms of a treaty, and 'negotiate treaties with several principalities' in the Archipelago.[52] As a Special Agent, his reference to the term covered a region corresponding to the whole of modern Southeast Asia. However, the regional term was hardly used for almost the next forty years in the local newspapers since then. It appeared again in 1887 in the newspaper which reported the speech of Holt S. Hallett, a British administrator who simply described the term 'South-eastern Asia' as a region roughly between India and China.[53] Another article described the scope of the term in 1898: 'From south eastern Asia, the Malay Peninsula stretches like a long arm for nearly a

---

[48] From the filtered list on www.britishnewspaperchrchive.co.uk and http://newspaperarchive.com (accessed on March 2012). The terms are found in newspapers in Lancashire, Sheffield and York in England, Glasgow in Scotland, Belfast in North Ireland, Waterloo in Iowa, Iola in Kansas, Lima in Ohio, Gettysburg in Pennsylvania, Newport in Rhode Island, San Antonio in Texas and so on.

[49] The first use of the term 'Southeast of Asia' is in *The New York Times*, 3 April 1896, p. 8 and 3 Sept. 1896, p. 16. For the earlier use of the term 'Southeast Asia,' see *The San Antonio Express* in Texas, 23 April, 1868, p. 8, *The Indiana Progress*, 28 Sept. 1876, p. 3 and *The Atlantic Telegraph*, 12 February, 1879, p. 4.

[50] *The Singapore Free Press* and *Mercantile Advertiser*, 16 Nov. 1849, p. 4.

[51] *The Straits Times*, 13 Aug. 1850, p. 3.

[52] Robert Hopkins Miller, *The United States and Vietnam 1787-1941*, Washington D. C.: National Defense University Press, 1990, p. 47.

[53] *The Straits Times*, 12 July, 1887, p. 3.

thousand miles down into the greatest archipelago on the globe.'[54] This scope covered

only the present-day mainland Southeast Asia. Thus, during this period the scope of the

term 'South Eastern Asia' had two definitions, in which the preferred definition differed

depending on the writers. The advent of the twentieth century saw wider use of the term

not only in newspapers but also in government documents, academic journals, and

corporate documents.

The British government officially started to use the term *South-East Asia* in

documents at the start of the twentieth century. When the British government published

importation rules in 1919, it used the phrase 'importation to Australia from India, Ceylon,

South Eastern Asia, East Indian Islands, Philippine Islands and Japan.'[55] In this context,

'South Eastern Asia' was applied only to the modern mainland Southeast Asia, because

it was separately referred from East Indian Islands under the possession of Dutch and the

Philippines, which is now labelled as the maritime Southeast Asia.

However, the scope was broadened to the whole modern region ten years later. S.

P. Waterlow, a British officer in Bangkok, referred to the term in a letter which was sent

on 28 May 1928 to Sir Austen Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs,

in which he mentioned that the countries of South-East Asia were 'Siam, India, Burma,

Malaya, Indo-China, Hong Kong, Manila and the Dutch Indies.'[56] Compared with the

importation rules in 1919, the British government saw that the scope was extended to the

whole of current Southeast Asia. It is not clear why the government referred to Siam and

South-East Asia separately in the title but it is noteworthy that government officials had

used internally the clearly defined term much earlier than the Second World War, with

---

[54] *The Singapore Free Press* and *Mercantile Advertiser*, 17 Jan. 1898, p. 3.
[55] *The Straits Times*, 14 Jan. 1919, p. 6.
[56] *Further Correspondence Respecting Siam and South-East Asia: Part 1*, 1928, FO422/85, p. 76.

the scope being enlarged from mainland Southeast Asia only to the whole of present day Southeast Asia.

Academicians also have used the term frequently. When Dr. Stein van Callenfels, a Dutch archaeologist who was 'well known as an authority on the pre-history of the Far East,'[57] had an audience with the King Prajadhipok and Queen Rambhai Barni of Thailand in 1931, the professor spoke about 'the Pre-history of South Eastern Asia.'[58] Evidently, the indigenous people of the region had already learnt the term. Callenfels also used the term 'South Eastern Asia' in an academic seminar later. In the Third Congress of Prehistorians of the Far East in 1938, he gave three presentations on the prehistory of South-East Asia.[59] Although other presenters did not use the regional term, it was widely accepted in the academic circles.

Companies set up in Singapore used the regional term in the names of branch offices. For example, while most insurance companies were established and operated as 'a Singapore branch' or 'an Eastern branch,'[60] Federal Life Assurance Company of Canada, a British-Canadian company incorporated in 1882, formed a 'branch of South Eastern Asia' in 1908.[61] This company regularly placed advertisements of the South Eastern Asia branch in local newspapers in the 1910s. After this branch was founded, other leading insurance companies such as the Sun Life Insurance, The National Mutual Life Association of Australasia, and The Motor Union Insurance also formed branches of South Eastern Asia.[62] The scope of the term might have had the same definition as that of modern Southeast Asia. It is significant to note here that by using it frequently, corporations clearly gave recognition to the regional term.

---

[57] *The Straits Times*, 2 Jan. 1935, p. 11.
[58] Ibid., 12 Dec. 1931, p. 12.
[59] *Proceedings of the Third Congress of Prehistorians of the Far East*, Singapore: The Government Printing Office, 1940.
[60] Commercial Union Assurance Company, Limited. had an Eastern branch. See to *Weekly Sun*, 8 Oct. 1910, p. 1.
[61] *The Singapore Free Press* and *Mercantile Advertiser*, 21 Nov. 1908, p. 12.
[62] *The Straits Times*, 3 Feb. 1908, p. 22. Ibid., 12 June, 1912, p. 3 for The National Mutual Life Association of Australasia, Limited and ibid., 6 July, 1918, p. 14 for The Motor Union Insurance Co., LTD.

Asian politician, too, learnt the regional term in this period. On 17 January, 1931, Jawaharlal Nehru, who would later become Prime Minister of India, referred to 'south-eastern Asia' in a letter to his daughter.[63] In the following year, he wrote another letter entitled 'Farther India and the East Indies' in which he explained the scope of 'south-east Asia' to his daughter. According to Nehru, the regional definition embraced the mainland and maritime area of modern Southeast Asia.[64] As he studied between 1907 and 1912, he might have learnt the term through English newspapers. His conceptualization of the regional term was exactly the same as the current regional scope. The passage deserves attention not only because the two regional terms, i.e. 'Farther India' and 'the East Indies,' had been used to respectively identify the mainland and the maritime sections of modern Southeast Asia, but also because the term 'south-eastern Asia' was used with the combined conceptualizations of both 'Farther India' and 'the East Indies.' After the Second World War, *The Discovery of India*,[65] published by Nehru in 1956, discussed the history of relations between India and South East Asia. Judging from the contents of the book, his conceptualization of the term seems to be the same as his earlier conceptualization in 1932, but at least India was not included in the conceptualization.

**Increased popularity of the term 'South East Asia,' post-1940s**

The term 'South East Asia' leapt to public attention in the 1940s. As most of scholars emphasised, the formation of South East Asia Command (SEAC) in 1943 made the term more prevalent. Although the military body had no stable regional concept for political reasons, its formation was an important step towards official identification of

---

[63] Jawaharlal Nehru, *Glimpses of world history*, Asia Publishing House, 1962, p. 31.
[64] Ibid., pp. 483-490.
[65] Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, London: Meridian Books, 1956, pp. 192-199.

the region. Initially, the organization covered only Burma, Malaya, Siam, Singapore, and Sumatra. French Indo-China was controlled by Chiang Kai-shek, who became the President of the Republic of China later on. The Philippines was then under the control of the U.S. Subsequently, Borneo, Celebes and Java islands were covered by SEAC.[66] Its region, South East Asia, was separately controlled by several external powers because of political reasons. Nevertheless, the term 'South East Asia' began to gain recognition uniting the region of 'Farther India,' the 'Indian Archipelago,' and the 'Malay Archipelago.' It was, therefore, logical to identify the region as 'South East Asia' after the name of the military body. In this sense, Fifield was right in saying that the formation of SEAC 'was a major step in the military and political identification of the region.'[67]

In addition, since the 1940s, there has been increased research in area studies of South East Asia. Scholars began to focus on the region 'as a new "space" 'for academic concentration as part of an Anglo-American movement which established 'area studies' as a legitimate and important field of academic endeavor.'[68] However, as there was no consensus regarding the regional definition among researchers, the scope of the region varied with each scholar. Furnivall's book in 1941[69] was the earliest academic work which had the regional term in its title; subsequently, by 1943 he wrote three books on the region.[70] In all his books, Furnivall's interpretation of the region included the modern day Southeast Asia as well as India and Formosa (Taiwan). John Christian, who analysed the literature of the region, defined the regional concept as one which included the Yunnan province in China.[71] Lennox Mills edited the special issue on 'Southeastern

[66] Russell Fifield, ibid., p. 44.
[67] Ibid., p. 43.
[68] Philip Charrier, ibid., p. 317.
[69] J. S. Furnivall, *Progress and welfare in Southeast Asia: A comparison of colonial policy and practice*, New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1941.
[70] J. S. Furnivall, *Problems of Education in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1942 and *Educational progress in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943.
[71] For example, John L. Christian, 'Recent Literature Relating to Southeast Asia', *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 4, (Aug. 1942), Robert Heine-Geldern 'Conceptions of State and Kingship in Southeast Asia', ibid., Vol. 2, No. 1, (Nov. 1942), Kenneth Perry Landon, 'Nationalism in Southeastern Asia', ibid., Vol. 2, No. 2, (Feb. 1943), Rupert Emerson, 'An Analysis of Nationalism in Southeast Asia', ibid., Vol. 5, No. 2, (Feb. 1946).

Asia' and the Philippines in an American journal in 1943,[72] isolating the Philippines from the grouping, but his book published in 1949 included the island country into the region.[73] Helmut Callis and Rupert Emerson's books in 1942[74] covered Taiwan, but Emerson added Hong Kong in the region. K.M. Panikkar, a prominent Indian scholar, excluded the Philippines from the region.[75]

Even after the end of the Second World War, the scope of the region differed from the current understanding of the regional term. First, *The Journal of Politics* in 1947, which focused on politics in the Asian region, saw the modern day Southeast Asia as being divided into four areas, namely the Netherlands East Indies, the Philippines, French Indo-China, and British Southeast Asia. There was a different writer for each area. Duncan Hall, who wrote about British Southeast Asia, embraced Ceylon (Sri Lanka) as a part of the region.[76] Second, Virginia Thompson, an expert in Thai studies, separated the Philippines from the region. Even her subsequent book published in 1955 excluded the Philippines from the region.[77]

Regional concepts among scholars in the 1950s were 'flexible.' With the development of area studies of South East Asia, the publication of books and journals on the region considerably increased in the 1950s. While H.J. van Mook defined South East Asia as the region covering 'Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, French Indo-China, Malaya, Indonesia, the Philippines, and the smaller territories of British Borneo and Portuguese Timor,'[78] D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia* in 1955 (first edition) hesitated to include the Philippines because it was 'outside the mainstream of historical

---

[72] Lennox A. Mills (ed.), 'Southeastern Asia and the Philippines,' *Annals of the American Academy of Politics and Social Science*, Vol. 226, (March 1943).
[73] Lennox A. Mills (ed.), *The New World of Southeast Asia*, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1949, p. 3.
[74] Helmut Callis, *Foreign capital in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institution of Pacific Relations, 1942, and Rupert Emerson, Lennox Mills, and Virginia Thompson, *Government and Nationalism in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institution of Pacific Relations, 1942.
[75] K.M. Panikkar, *The Future of South-East Asia: an Indian View*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943.
[76] Duncan H. Hall, 'Post-war government and politics of British South East Asia,' *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 9, No. 4, (1947), pp. 692-716.
[77] Virginia McLean Thompson, *Labor problems in Southeast Asia*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947. Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, *Minority problems in Southeast Asia*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955.
[78] H.J. van Mook, *The Stakes of Democracy in South-East Asia*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1950, p. 33.

developments,'[79] but the second edition (1964) included the country. As another case, probably Tibor Mende's concept of South East Asia had the widest scope of the region among scholars in the period, as it included India, Pakistan, and Ceylon into the region.[80] In the works by Army Vandenbosch and Richard Butwell, and George Kahin,[81] the scope of the region used by them then and that of the present day South East Asia are similar. The former clearly listed the countries which comprised the region in 1967, and provided justification for doing so. The region is 'forced by physical circumstances to be wholly internally oriented.' It is because 'high mountains divide the area from China and India to the north … and oceans from natural boundaries to the east, south, and west.'[82] The latter grouped the present Southeast Asian countries together without any clear definition.

As discussed above, the regional concept varied from one writer to another even in the 1950s. This phenomenon of 'flexible concepts' was reflected not only in the academic circle, but also in the political arena.

Although the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), which was formed in 1954, derived its name from the regional term, the term was not clearly defined.[83] Considering that a great number of scholars had different conceptualizations of the regional term, the articles laid out in the treaty described vaguely the scope of the term in the phrase 'the general area of South East Asia, including also the entire territories of the Asian Parties' and the general area of the Southwest Pacific excluding north of the Philippines.[84] The former 'general area' is evidence that the military body itself was not able to clearly demarcate the regional concept. This organization, as Liefer said, was to

---

[79] D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, London: Macmillan, 1955 (First edition), p. 3.
[80] Tibor Mende, *South-East Asia between Two Worlds*, London: Turnstile Press, 1955.
[81] Army Vandenbosch and Richard Butwell, *Southeast Asia among the world powers*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1957. George Kahin (ed.), *Governments and Politics of Southeast Asia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959.
[82] Army Vandenbosch and Richard Butwell, *The Changing Face of Southeast Asia*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967, pp. 3-4.
[83] See SEATO in the Chapter 5.
[84] Leszek Buszynski, *SEATO: The Failure of an Alliance Strategy*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1983, p. 229 (Article VIII).

protect Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam from communists.[85] Though the countries under its protection included those in the modern day Southeast Asia, its actual members were only Thailand and the Philippines. Some of the abovementioned scholars excluded the Philippines from the definition of the regional term, but the Philippines recognised itself as a member of South East Asia. The Philippines included itself in SEATO because of 'an opportunity to develop close relations with Asian states.'[86]

While the 1960s saw a consensus among scholars being gradually built up partly because of the formation of indigenous regional organizations, different concepts of the region still prevailed in this period. John Cady and Nicholas Tarling explain the history of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands under the Republic of India in their books. Tarling places emphasis on the inclusion of the islands in the region and pointed out that 'the establishment of territorial dominion in India and the development of trade to China gave the Andaman and Nicobar Islands their importance in British policy in the late eighteenth century.'[87] This implies that the inclusion of the islands was from a historical point of view based on the British policy. On the contrary, Denis Warner's definition of the regional concept excludes Burma and the Philippines.[88] Another scholar, George Coedès, also excludes the Philippines and the north of Vietnam on the grounds that they were not historically *Indianised* along with the Assam region. [89]

There were slightly different definitions of the region in the 1960s, but scholars have reached a consensus of the regional definition since the 1970s. Since then it has been quite rare to include countries except for the present-day ASEAN members into the region of Southeast Asia. As will discuss in the chapter five, Ceylon (now Sri Lanka)

---

[85] Michael Leifer, *Dilemmas of statehood in Southeast Asia*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1972, p. 134.
[86] Leszek Buszynski, ibid., p. 58.
[87] John Frank Cady, *Southeast Asia: Its historical development*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964, and Nicholas Tarling, *Southeast Asia: Past and Present*, Melbourne: F. W. Cheshire, 1966, p. 142.
[88] Denis Warner, *Reporting South-East Asia*, Sydney: Argus and Robertson, 1966.
[89] George Coedès, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1968, p. xv. This book is a translation. The original book in French was published in 1947.

was invited to join to the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) immediately before the formation in 1967. The island country, in which the headquarters of SEAC was located during the war, was regarded as one of the countries of the region. The country, however, has been considered not under Southeast Asia, but South Asia since then. As the Ceylon government turned down the invitation due to its domestic issues,[90] scholars also have perceived that Sri Lanka belongs to South Asia.

In a similar fashion, other neighbouring countries, for example, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Taiwan, have not been taken in the region since the 1970s. Pakistan became a member of SEATO, and Bangladesh, which formerly called the East Pakistan and gained independence in 1971, is adjacent to Burma. The majority of Pakistan and Bangladesh is Muslim and shared the religion with Indonesia and Malaysia, but the regional organisations such as the Association of South East Asia (ASA), ASEAN and others never invited them and accepted the country as a member of the region probably because of diplomatic relations between the organisations' members and India. Even most of historians and other scholars do not consider them as the parts of Southeast Asia.

In the case of Taiwan or Formosa, some writers included in the 'Malay Archipelago,' that is, the part of maritime Southeast Asia, in the nineteenth century. The people of the island originally were aborigines, but the Chinese population reached to 50,000 by the end of the Dutch, and has kept growing. The number of Chinese migrations grew to approximately 2.5 million by 1905.[91] Taiwan became 'China issue' when Kuomintang members evacuated and formed the Republic of China after they were defeated by the Communists in mainland China. The Southeast Asian countries took different positions towards the governments in Taipei and Beijing because of its international legitimacy, which was related to the Cold War. After the issue of China

---

[90] *The Straits Times*, 9 Oct. 1967, p. 1.
[91] Murray A. Rubinstein (ed.), *Taiwan: A new history*, New York: M.E. Sharp, 2007, p. 10.

representative seat in United Nations was solved, the countries adopted 'One-China policy' supporting the Beijing government.[92] Taiwan showed its desire to join ASA in 1966, but the members agreed that 'China is not in Southeast Asia.'[93] Even scholars has not defined Taiwan and China as the parts of the region.

Thus, most of scholars have fixed the scope of the region, i.e. the 10 ASEAN countries and East Timor since the 1970s. These countries have not been excluded from the region and at the same time other countries have not been included in Southeast Asia.

**Conclusion**

The present-day Southeast Asia was originally broken up into the two areas. While the mainland was called 'Farther India' by the beginning of the twentieth century, the insular area was called 'India Archipelago' and 'Malay Archipelago.' Nevertheless, the new word 'South East Asia' was born in Europe in the nineteenth century. Although this appellation originally indicated the large area including the surrounding area of the mainland Southeast Asia with China and India, Europeans did not take in the archipelago area.

So far it is said that the term 'Southeast Asia' has been used since 1943 when the SEAC was established. However, this research shows that the regional term has been used since the nineteenth century and has been popular in English newspapers at least since the second half of the century or at the latest since the beginning of the twentieth century. Also, the term was well recognised by government officials, scholars, writers and even businessmen.

---

[92] Michael Leifer, 'Taiwan and South-East Asia: The Limits to Pragmatic Diplomacy,' *The China Quarterly*, No. 165, Taiwan in the 20th Century (Mar., 2001), p. 173.
[93] Estrella D. Solidum, *Towards a Southeast Asian Community*, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1974, p. 44.

However, the definition was always not the same as the current definition. As mentioned previously, Europeans named the term with quite large area including China and India, but the British government has begun using for the region combined the mainland with the archipelago since the 1920s. Although the redefined area covered Indian and Hong Kong, which was colonised by the government, it was an epoch-making invention to include the insular area in the term. Since the formation of the military 'regional' organization, SEAC, which operated beyond the two areas (mainland and maritime), playing an important role to further promote recognition of the region. Thus, regional terms to indicate the region between China and India have unified into only the term 'Southeast Asia.'

The following years saw area studies of the region being given much attention in the United States, and this resulted in the publication of numerous books and journals on South East Asia. Nevertheless, the definition of South East Asia still varied from one scholar to another for about twenty years, before a consensus on the regional term among scholars was reached in the 1960s.

# CHAPTER 3: EMERGENCE OF A REGIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

# IN SIAM/THAILAND AND THE PHILIPPINES

**Introduction**

This chapter focuses on the emergence of a regional consciousness in Thailand and the Philippines. As is well known, the Kingdom of Siam, located in mainland Southeast Asia, was the only country in the region never to have been colonised by the Europeans. Students of Thai history focus mainly on how kings sought to prevent colonisation in the colonial era before the Second World War. Researchers of Thai foreign policy in the colonial era pay attention to the Kingdom of Siam's relations with colonial powers. Relations with neighbouring countries in the period was not sufficiently discussed, as is regional awareness of the Kingdom of Siam. A cursory review of Thai history shows how Siam or present-day Thailand maintained her independence in the colonial era by developing its own foreign policy. The next section explores how Thais in the period were aware of the larger region when they negotiated and discussed issues of territory with Europeans. Siam's entry into the League of Nations as an independent nation after the First World War witnessed great awareness of the region and its perception in the first half of the twentieth century.

In contrast to Thailand, the Philippines, which is located on the shores of the Pacific Ocean, was a Spanish and American colony over three centuries. Scholars on the Philippines tend to discuss nationalism after the Philippine Revolution and relations with the U.S. It is said that Filipinos are of Malay blood, but historians seldom discuss their Malay consciousness in the modern era. Discussions on Malay consciousness have been overlooked in the discussion of nationalism and were not mentioned in terms of the Filipino viewpoint on regionalism. After discussing its historical background, we will

see how Filipino nationalists struggled to create national and regional consciousness based on the Malay race in different religious worlds. With the development of nationalism after the Philippine Revolution, borders of the Philippines were fixed by the U.S., differentiating the nation from the region. The last section discusses how nationalists viewed the region surrounding the Philippines.

**Siam/Thailand**

**Historical background**

The terms Thai and Siam have not been well-discussed among historians. It is well-known that the prime minister, Phibun Songkhram, has changed the country's name from Siam to Thailand in 1932, but historians seldom mention the origins of these terms. According to Briggs, the term 'Thai', or 'Tai', was first written as 'Dai' in the 1292 inscription by king Ramhamheng. 'Thai' or 'Tai' appeared in several records by 1317. The meaning of the term was originally used only for the people of the Sukhothai kingdom, which was free from the Khmer kingdom. On the other hand, according to Briggs, the term 'Siam' is older than 'Thai', and originally 'Syam' designated the upper Menam valley. This term was inscribed as *Syam-kuk* on base-reliefs of Angkor Wat made during the middle of the twelfth century. Briggs also argued that the term and other variations such as *Syam*, *Sien* or *Sienlo* were recognised to indicate the Sukhothai kingdom by the Chinese dynasties during the same century.[1] The terms Siam and Thai have been shared with Europeans since their arrival to Southeast Asia. The colonisers had the perception that the kingdom was different from the kingdoms of Burma and

---

[1] Lawrence Palmer Briggs, 'The Appearance and Historical Usage of the Terms Tai, Thai, Siamese and Lao,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 69, No. 2 (Apr.- Jun., 1949), pp. 61-63. Also see in Preecha Juntanamalaga, 'Thai or Siam?,' *A Journal of Onomastics*, Vol. 36, No. 1-2 (1988), pp. 69-84.

Vietnam. Therefore, the terms never became a term of reference for the geographical region combined with the two kingdoms.

During the early history of Thailand, the Sukhothai and Lanna kingdoms were the most important. The Sukhothai kingdom emerged in the centre of Thailand in the thirteenth century. The third powerful king, Ramkhamhaeng, recorded an inscription in 1292 which mentioned that he controlled Luang Phabang in present-day Laos to the Malay Peninsula. However, a scholar observes that it is highly unlikely that he governed all these territories. No documents prove that even the Chao Phraya river valley was under his control.[2] The kingdom attempted to advance into southern areas of the Chao Phraya valley by the fourteenth century, but it was blocked by another new kingdom, the Ayutthaya kingdom.

On the other hand, a kingdom which emerged in north Thailand during the end of the thirteenth century was the Lanna kingdom. The king, Mangrai, established hegemony over Chieng Saen and Chiang Mai during the early stages, extending its sphere through marriage between his family and another Thai ruler's family. Moreover, in order to defend his kingdom from the Mongol Empire, which had powerful forces at the time, king Mangrai made a pact with the Sukhothai kingdom.[3] However, the Lanna kingdom became among the rulers under Burma in the middle of the fifteenth century. The capital was moved several times and ruled by the Burmese for the last two centuries. The kingdom was governed by an unpopular Burmese governor who was toppled by locals in the last capital Chiang Mai, in 1775.

In terms of laying Thai cultural foundation, the Sukhothai kingdom was significantly important. The kingdom was geographically located on the 'dividing-line'[4] between the spheres of Khmer in the east and of Mons and Burmese in the west. Its

---

[2] M. C. Ricklefs, et al., *A New History of Southeast Asia*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 52-53.
[3] David K. Wyatt, *Thailand: A short history*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984, p. 47.
[4] D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia,* London: The Macmillan Press, 1968 (Third edition), p. 172.

location made a distinction from neighbouring cultures during the same period. Furthermore, because of easy communication with lower Burma, the kingdom was able to build up and keep relations with Ceylon, which was the centre of Buddhism. The facts resulted in absorbing and incorporating in the civilisation of Siam.[5] The Sukhothai kingdom was gradually merged into the Ayutthaya kingdom in the middle of the fifteenth century.

The Ayutthaya kingdom had been in existence before 1351. It flourished as a trading centre, and represented the culmination of a process of alliance-building and territorial consolidation.[6] The kingdom sought to extend its influence over Cambodia and the Malay Peninsula. Its diplomacy with the West was good and the Westerns were interested in trading only, neither attacking nor colonising. The number of trades with the West, especially after 1500, increased, but the Burmese was the main threat to its security. The kingdom was attacked by the Burmese in 1569. During the siege, King Chakrap'at and Prince Mahin died. A pro-Burmese king was appointed and the kingdom was controlled by the Burmese for over fifteen years.[7] Subsequently, Naresuen swept away the Burmese soldiers in the capital and made a glorious era for Ayutthaya. However, the kingdom was attacked again by the Burmese in 1767. This time the aggression brought to an end to the kingdom.[8] The kingdom existed for over four centuries.

Taksin, who was a provincial governor at the end of the Ayutthaya kingdom, established his base in Thomburi after sweeping away Burmese and defeating many rivals. His reign began in 1767. However, his dynasty did not last long. He desired to be a higher spiritual status as a king, and attempted to force Buddhism monks to accept him

---

[5] Ibid.
[6] M. C. Ricklefs, et al., ibid., p. 99.
[7] D. G. E. Hall, ibid., p. 268.
[8] Ibid., pp. 272-276.

as the status. In 1782, his dynasty was toppled by his General Chao Phraya Chakri and other subordinates, and the king was later executed.[9]

After the downfall of the Thonburi dynasty, Chao Phraya Chakri moved the capital to opposite Thonburi and established a new capital, Bangkok. He was enthroned as King Ramathibodi in 1782 (generally referred to as Rama I), and reigned the Chakri dynasty. The dynasty stable and prosperous after internal chaos by the eighteenth century. During the early stage of Rama I, there were conflicts with the Burmese, but the Burmese they later stopped posing threats. Although Burmese attacked Phuket island in 1810 in the reign of Rama II, it was easily expelled and the reign was almost free from any major conflicts. [10] While Siam continued to control over the northern Malay Peninsula, Cambodia and Lao kingdoms, the dynasty faced British threats after the acquisition of Penang and Singapore in the reign of Rama I and II, and Bangkok had tension with the British on the affairs in the Peninsula since then.[11] On the other hand, the reign of Rama II introduced a commercial sugar production by the Chinese, which later became an export item to trade with Western merchants. The sugar trade grew during Rama III, especially to Singapore,[12] but increasing trade was targeted to be negotiated with the British.

During the reign of King Rama III, the British sent an agent of the British East India Company, Henry Burney, to seek Siam to join the British side in a war in Burma, but to no avail. The British invaded parts of Burma and occupied some seaports such as Tenasserim in the south. This occupation forced Siam to wake up and negotiate with the British, as the Siam court always rejected discussions.

---

[9] M. C. Ricklefs at el, ibid.,pp. 138-139.
[10] D. G. E. Hall, ibid., p. 466.
[11] M. C. Ricklefs at el, Ibid., p. 140.
[12] Norman G. Owen (ed.), *The emergence of modern Southeast Asia: A new history*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005, pp. 95-96.

After extensive discussions, the British and Siam concluded a treaty (called Burney Treaty) in 1826. The treaty agreed that, while the British recognised the Siam's position in the Malay Peninsula, the Siam accepted to change the trading processes and to take a cut in its trading revenue.[13] Nevertheless, British and U.S. officers came to demand free trade and extraterritoriality between 1850 and 1851, but no agreements were made.[14] The issues were not settled, but Rama III demised, while his brother, Mongkut, was crowned as Rama IV.

**The formation of territory**

Thailand, formerly called Siam, is surrounded by four countries: Burma in the west, Cambodia in the east, Laos in the north, and Malaysia in the south. Whilst all of these countries were once colonised, Thailand has never been colonised and was in fact the only Southeast Asian country which retained its political independence during the colonial era. Its success in preserving its independence was not the outcome of accidental circumstances, but can be attributed to the wise diplomacy of its then two kings: King Mongkut (Rama IV) and King Chulalongkorn (Rama V). With much attention being given to their colonised neighbours, Siam managed to secure its independence during the cruel colonial era.

Although Siam secured its independence, during the reign of Rama III and at the early stages of Rama IV's reign, there was no concept of borders for its territory. As Southeast Asia originally had a small population with long coastlines rivers, and thick forests,[15] people lived in port-towns and villages along shores and rivers. From these towns or villages charismatic kings emerged, established, and governed kingdoms.

---

[13] M. C. Ricklefs at el, ibid., pp. 95-96.
[14] Ibid., p. 97.
[15] See discussion on population in Anthony Reid, *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450-1680, Vol. 1: Lands below the Winds*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988, pp. 11-18.

Nevertheless, unlike European kingdoms, Southeast Asian kingdoms had no fixed borders. Territories of kingdoms were decided not by its boundaries, but by networks or relations between kings and tributary rulers, which was the most important factor for the kingdoms' survival. In other words, the domain of kingdoms were not based on land itself. Wolters called the relations between supreme kings and rulers '*Mandalas* or circles of kings.' He explained that *Mandala* represented a particular and often unstable political situation in a vaguely definable geographical area without fixed boundaries, where smaller centres tended to look in all directions for security. Interestingly enough, *Mandalas* would expand and contract in concertina-like fashion. [16] This system lasted up to the nineteenth century in the European colonial era.

The *Mandala* system also existed in Siam. Tongchai Winichakul discussed the eight characteristics of the premodern boundary in Siam's conception and concluded that '[t]he sphere of a realm or the limits of a kingdom could be defined only by those townships' allegiance to the centre of a kingdom.'[17] In terms of peripheries from the royal court, what was important was not territorial areas, but 'power relationships.'[18] The Siam court had perceived the realm of kingdom not as space, but as points and lines like other kingdoms of Southeast Asia. This concept to no small extent had an impact on the regional consciousness of the kings. Before discussing this aspect, we will see how Siam formed its current territory as an independent country.

Colonial menace had first grown from the west and north of Siam. The first Anglo-Burmese war broke out during the reign of Rama III and the Konbaung Dynasty, a formerly powerful force which had earlier destroyed the kingdom of Ayutthaya in 1767, was defeated in 1826. The defeat caused the Tenasserim area (currently known as Tanintharyi region), which is located at the southernmost part of Burma and once home

---

[16] O. W. Wolters, *History, Culture and Region in Southeast Asian Perspectives*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 1999, pp. 27-28.
[17] Tongchai Winichakul, *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994, p. 79.
[18] Ibid.

to an important seaport called Mergui, to cede to the British. This development posed a large threat to Siam.[19] Further, the defeat of the Qing Dynasty of China in the Opium War in 1842 also led to the apprehension of the Siam court. According to SarDesai, Mongkut, who was still in his monkhood, anticipated from this defeat that Siam would not be able to stay free from colonialism seeing that even the great country, China, had fallen victim to the Western colonialism. He perceived that the Siam society would have to accommodate to the Western ways.[20] After Mongkut became a king, as a first step he decided to abolish paying tribute to China and ended the relationships between lord and vassal in 1854, which changed Asian international relations. In the following year, the new king signed the Bowring Treaty with the British to allow foreign free trade in Siam. Although this was an unequal treaty, the Royal court attempted to preserve its independence by opening up its market to the world. Following the Bowring Treaty, several European countries also concluded similar treaties with Siam. Notwithstanding this, the French attempted to put pressure on the king but Mongkut hoped 'to use the stronger British against the rival French and minimise the losses.'[21]

During Mongkut's reign, Vietnam was the targeted area to be colonised by the French. Since the middle of the 1850s, France had attempted to gain a foothold in Vietnam. After attacking and occupying Da Nang in the middle of the city in Vietnam, it then captured Saigon in 1859. With seizure of other provinces around the city, France called this area Cochin China in 1862. To further expand its colony, France advanced into Cambodia and offered to protect it. Although the Cambodian king accepted the French protectorate over its kingdom in 1863, Siam strongly renounced this because of its suzerainty over the country. As a result, Siam and French signed a new treaty in 1867, whereby Siam gave up its dominion over Cambodia and accepted the French protectorate.

---

[19] Kakizaki Ichiro, *History of Thailand: the truth of a smiling country*, Tokyo: Chuko Shinsho, 2013, p. 104.
[20] D. R. SarDesai, *Southeast Asia: Past and present*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1994 (third edition), p. 124.
[21] Ibid., p. 125.

At the same time, France acknowledged the suzerainty of Siam over Battambang and Siem Reap provinces of Cambodia, which at the time were directly governed by Bangkok. This treaty was the first step of the relinquishment of Siam's territories. France captured Vietnam by 1884 and further attempted to expand territories to the east side of the Mekong river.

Siam was deprived from having authority over the territory in the northeastern part of Laos in 1888 and had received further demand to cede the rest of the Laos territory to France. As Siam regarded all of the above as part of its vassal, it did not find France's demand acceptable. When the strained relations between Siam and France reached breaking point, Siam finally had no choice but to accept the demand. Since France had possibly harboured further territorial ambitions, the British, who had been observing the happenings, realised that it may face threats of commercial interests[22] and was also aware of the possibility that its interests in Burma would clash in the future if France extended its claim.[23] For this reason, the two powers agreed to form a buffer area in 1893 and signed a declaration for a buffer zone along the Mekong river. However, as Likhit Dhiravegin argued, this declaration was not to guarantee the independence of Siam. The declaration only implied that 'the British and France could change the agreement otherwise if they so desired. It was not guaranteed that Siam's integrity and independence would be respected by the two powers.'[24] This buffer zone resulted in Siam securing its independence.

However, the surrender of Siam's territories continuously occurred. In 1897, Siam concluded a secret agreement with the British for the protection of British commercial interests in the northern part of the Malay Peninsula. The agreement stipulated that Siam agreed not to cede the territories or islands lying to the south of Muong Bang Tapan

---

[22] Likhit Dhiravegin, *Siam and colonialism (1855-1909): An analysis of diplomatic relations*, Bangkok: Thai Watana Panich, 1974, p. 24.
[23] D. G. E. Hall, ibid., p. 695.
[24] Likhit Dhiravegin, ibid., p. 55.

without British consent. In return, the British agreed to support Siam in resisting any attempt by a third power to exert influence in the said territories.[25] Further, an Anglo-Siamese treaty was entered into in 1909 where Siam officially transferred the four Malay states, i.e. Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis and Trengganu, under the control of the British. In return, the British promised to grant a loan to construct a railway in the south of Siam, as King Chulalongkorn attempted to strengthen the integration of the southern part of Siam by building railways. All of Siam's vassal territories were ceded by 1909, but this did not cause major problems. In the traditional system of Southeast Asia, it was not regarded as calamitous for concessions of secondary territories to be made. Since the core of the kingdom, i.e., the essence of sovereignty, was not damaged, 'such concessions were a legitimate instrument of policy.'[26] Nevertheless, with their awareness of boundary conceptual nations, Siamese elites felt humiliated during the series of cessions. This humiliation thereafter led to the formation of the 'Pan-Thai movement' in the 1930s to regain the surrendered territories. According to a document issued by the Thailand government in 1940, the total area ceded to France by 1907 was 467,500 sq. km. and the total area ceded to British was 51,200 sq. km. (the total area of Thailand as of 1940 was 513,447 sq. km.)[27]

During the Second World War, Thailand (the new name for Siam since 1939) attempted to recover the lost territories. According to the British report, the *coup d'etat* was 'a turning-point in the attitude of the Siamese towards the Western world,' and Siamese had anti-occidental feeling. The British officer concluded that this feeling caused Siamese to awake jingoism, which has taken the shape of an irredentist movement which aims at recovering the territories surrounding Siam.[28] Prime Minister Phibun

---

[25] Ibid., Appendix D, p. 102.

[26] Robert Solomon, 'Boundary concepts and practices in Southeast Asia,' *World Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Oct., 1970), p. 15.

[27] *Thailand: How Thailand Lost Her Territories to France*, Bangkok: Department of Publicity, 1940. This document has no page number.

[28] DOC 279: Memorandum by Sir J. Crosby on the present-day attitude of Siam towards the Western Powers, and towards Britain in particular, 1938.

Songkhram negotiated with France for the return of the provinces of Battambang and Siem Reap, but the negotiations fell through. Thailand fought with France at the Gulf of Thailand in January 1941 and suffered great damage. The prime minister then asked the Japanese government for support. After intervening and negotiating in Tokyo, Thailand gained the lands on the right side of Mekong River and the west-northern part of Cambodia via the Treaty of Tokyo in May that same year.[29]

The Japanese forces invaded Thailand in December 1941. The Phibun government was pro-Japanese at the time, but after a while became gradually anti-Japanese because of the negative impact of Japanese presence in Thailand and unfair economic treatments.[30] To relieve Thailand's frustration, the Japanese government ceded the Shan state of Burma and the four Malay states to Thailand in 1943.[31] This helped Thailand to regain part of its lost territories, but unfortunately this transfer brought significantly negative impact on Thailand's diplomatic relations with the British after the war.

Having declared war against the British and the United States, Thailand became a defeated nation and was subsequently compelled to return the Shan state and the four Malay states to their former colonial power, the British. While the defeated country was requested to restore the Battambang and Siem Reap provinces to France, Thailand surrendered its claim in exchange of becoming a member of the United Nations, in order to benefit from joining the international community. Almost all the borders of Thailand has remained since then.

The cession of the peripheral territories since the nineteenth century had instilled regional consciousness among the Thai elites. We will now look at the regional consciousness of the two kings who laid foundation on the modern Thailand: Mongkut and Chulalongkorn.

---

[29] Kakizaki Ichiro, ibid., pp. 165-168.
[30] Kobkua Suwannathat-Pian, *Thailand's Durable Premier: Phibun through Three Decades 1932-1957*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 262-271.
[31] David K. Wyatt, *Thailand: A short history*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982, p. 258.

## Regional awareness of the Siam kings

The regional awareness of the Siamese was born when they came into contact with the British and American missions in the nineteenth century. Siam started trading relations with the United States in 1818 under the reign of Rama II, but the commercial relation was not active during the reign of Rama III due to the king's strong suspicions of the West.[32] After Edmund Roberts, who was appointed by the President of the United States as 'special agent or envoy to the courts of Cochin China, Siam, and Muscat,' visited Siam in 1833 'for the purpose of effecting treaties which should place our (American) commerce in those countries on an equality with that enjoyed by the most favoured nations,'[33] the two parties concluded the Treaty of Amity and Commerce despite the king's suspicions. Unfortunately, the king fell ill and passed away in 1836.

After fourteen years, American envoy Joseph Balestier came to Bangkok to negotiate the modification of the treaty of 1833 and to enter into more extended commercial intercourse with the United States.[34] He was officially appointed in 1849 as 'Special Agent of the United States to Cochin-China and the other portions of South Eastern Asia' by the President, Zachary Taylor. Balestier asked to be granted an audience with the king of Siam by using this title, but failed.[35] This was due to the fact that he did not follow the Siam customs to communicate with the king and also due to his overbearing attitude.[36]

What is significant here is not the fact that Belestier's negotiation failed, but that he used his official title with the regional term in his letters to the Siam court. He sent an

---

[32] Frank C. Darling, *Thailand and the United States*, Washington D. C., Public Affairs Press, p. 12.
[33] Edmund Roberts, Embassy to the Eastern Courts of Cochin-China, Siam, and Muscat, in the U.S. Sloop-of-war Peacock, David Geisinger, Commander, during the years 1832-34, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1837, p. 13.
[34] U.S. Congress, Senate, Message from the President of the United States in answer to a resolution of the Senate, calling for information in relation to the mission of Mr. Balestier, Late United States Consul at Singapore, to Eastern Asia. 32nd Congress, 1st session, Doc. 38, Washington D.C., 1852, p. 55.
[35] Sir John Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam: Volume Two*, London: Oxford University Press, 1969, pp. 209-212.
[36] For details, see Walter F. Vella, *Siam Under Rama III, 1824-1851*, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1957, pp. 131-134.

official letter with his title to seek an audience with the Siam king in the middle of March 1850, where he insisted to directly deliver a letter from the President of the United States.[37] In return, Khun Phia Nai Wai Voranat, Commissioner of the Naval Forces of the King of Siam, gave the envoy a confirmation letter that Siam court had received, but this letter from the Commissioner had used the title 'Envoy from the United States of America' only.[38] Though there is no evidence whether the Siamese understood the title, it is obvious that the Siamese learnt the new term 'South-Eastern Asia' for the first time when the letter from Balestier was received.

However, the official letter from the foreign mission customarily did not reach the king. The procedure was that the letter must first be translated into Siam language and carefully checked in the Great Office of Foreign Department before it is read to the king when a visitor is granted an audience.[39] Failure to follow this procedure and the fact that there was no official stamp in the official letter led to the envoy being rejected an audience by the Siam court. When Balestier, who was at a loss, begged to have an audience with the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chan Phyan Phia Klang via a letter, the letter used his official title again.[40] The American mission also addressed the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chaw Khan Phya Sipipat, on 10 April, 1850 with the official title. These letters clearly show that at least the Siam officers learnt the regional term through the title of Balestier during this period. When the President of the United States appointed him with this title, the regional term was familiar among the government officers, but the Siam court had just learnt it for the first time. The Siamese officers might have been curious but perhaps had no idea of the regional concept.

---

[37] U.S. Congress, Senate, Message from the President of the United States in answer to a resolution of the Senate, calling for information in relation to the mission of Mr. Balestier, Late United States Consul at Singapore, to Eastern Asia. 32nd Congress, 1st session, Doc. 38, Washington D.C., 1852, p. 55.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Walter F. Vella, ibid., p. 132. The King Mongkut also explained this in his letter to John Bowring. See his letter on Manich Jumsai, *King Mongkut and Sir John Bowring*, Bangkok: Chalermnit, 1970, p. 41.
[40] U.S. Congress, Senate, ibid., p. 69.

Incidentally, when the American envoy visited Cochinchina before Siam, a memorandum with the governor of Kwang-nam at the town of Turong was signed. This memorandum also addressed Balestier using the title with the regional term.[41] Further, to pass a letter of the President of the United States to Sultan of Brunei, Balestier sent a letter to seek audience with the Sultan, which used his official title.[42] In short, the officers in Vietnam and Brunei also learnt the regional term in 1850.

Rama III passed away in 1851 and Mongkut was then crowned as Rama IV. Mongkut was born as the eldest child of Rama II, but was not elected as a king by the Council of Princes and Ministers upon Rama II's demise in 1824. At almost the same time when Rama III was enthroned as a king, Mongkut entered into monkhood. His monkhood lasted for twenty seven years before he was installed as a king. This period was important and laid the foundation for him to acquire much knowledge and gain much wisdom. Studying Pali language which was the most significant language for the study of Buddhism, he also learnt Latin, which was the first language of Western knowledge, as well as English, taught by American missionaries.[43] Through his knowledge of these western languages, he also studied chemistry, geography, mathematics, physics, and his favourite subject, astronomy.[44] By reading many books, he acquired much knowledge and accommodated Western ways. This acquisition of knowledge was helpful to lay the foundation for him to accept and adopt the Western styles for domestic modernisation of Siam.

After his enthronement in 1851, King Mongkut signed a new treaty in 1855, i.e., the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce between the British Empire and the Kingdom of Siam (better known as the Bowring Treaty), which opened up Siam to the West. The representative of the British tasked to negotiate this treaty was the then Governor of Hong

---

[41] Ibid., p. 44.
[42] Ibid., p. 83.
[43] Abbot Low Moffat, *Mongkut, the King of Siam*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961, p. 15.
[44] Ibid., p. 21.

Kong, Sir John Bowring, with whom the king communicated with directly in English. While the Treaty of 1855 had no mention of any regional terms, the previous Treaty of 1826, called the Burney Treaty, had stated 'English Country' and 'within the English boundary.' It described the English countries as 'Prince of Wales Island' (Penang), 'Malacca,' and 'Singapore.' [45] Thus, both Rama III and Rama IV understood these terms; they also understood that the British became Siam's neighbour because it annexed parts of Burma during their reigns.[46] Mongkut read through the old treaty before negotiating and producing the new treaty and he understood the meaning of the above two terms, indicating not only the Straits Settlement but also India and Burma.

What is important here is that King Mongkut deeply understood that the British colonised the territorial space with its boundaries next to Siam, not using the Mandala concept without borders. The wise king apparently adopted the same boundary concept as the British and thus made all efforts and took special care to prevent any conflicts from the borders with the British.[47] The king quickly understood the significance of a border concept in the colonial period in Southeast Asia and did his best to maintain Siam's independence by accepting and adopting the Western ways.

Mongkut adopted not only the boundary concept but also the Western regional concept. We can see his regional consciousness from his letters of correspondence with Bowring and other documents. In letters corresponding with Bowring, the term 'Asia' was not used at all. When Mongkut proposed to bestow decorations on Queen Victoria in 1861(?) and in return expected the same from the Queen, he wrote, though the king did not end up being bestowed, It will prove the greatest honor to us here among the Eastern Monarchies.'[48] Obviously he indicated that Siam belonged to the Eastern region.

---

[45] J. de V. Allen, A. J. Stockwell, and L. R. Wright, *A Collection of Treaties and other documents affecting the States of Malaysia, Vol II*, London: Oceana Publications, 1981, pp. 312-318. The description is on p. 316.
[46] The British and Burma had wars three times in the nineteenth century. These resulted in annexing the upper Burma in 1852 and the lower Burma in 1885. In the following year the whole of Burma was incorporated into the Indian empire.
[47] Tongchai Winichakul, ibid., p. 72.
[48] G. Coedes, 'English Correspondence of King Mongkut,' *Journal of Siam Society*, Vo. 21, No. 2, (1927-28), p. 176. See also Abbot Low Moffat, *Mongkut, the King of Siam*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961, p. 97.

After Bowring published the two volumes of books, *The Kingdom and People of Siam* in 1857 and offered them to the King, Mongkut read through the said books, and then proceeded to comment and point out errors and mistakes in the books through a letter. As there was usage of the terms 'Asia,' 'Asiatic,' and 'Eastern Asia' in the books, Mongkut would have understood the meaning of these terms together with the other collective terms referred to in the books, such as 'Eastern Archipelago' and 'the Indian Archipelago.'[49] To cite another piece of evidence, when the American envoy, Townsend Harris, visited Bangkok before going to Japan, he had an audience with Mongkut on 1 May, 1856. The king asked the envoy how many treaties had been made between the United States and 'Eastern nations.'[50] This clearly shows that the king indicated 'Eastern nations' as kingdoms in Asia. The king, who was a great reader and liked to obtain any English books related to Siam,[51] read the book *Narrative of a Residence at the Capital of the Kingdom of Siam*.[52] As this book also referred to the terms 'Eastern Asia' and 'Eastern Archipelago,' these regional terms were familiar for the king. In another case, when the king offered elephants to the then President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, in a letter, he used the term 'Asia' twice, not 'the East.' The king also made a geographical reference that is 'the islands of Ceylon, Sumatra and Java are near to the continent of Asia.'[53]

The king also voraciously read through English newspapers that were published in Bangkok and Singapore. While the newspapers in Bangkok dealt mainly with the affairs of European and American countries, some papers like *Bangkok Readers* reported on the areas surrounding Siam such as Burma, Cochin-china, India, and Java. The king became

---

[49] Sir John Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam, Volume one and two*, London, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1969. See the term Asia in p. 98, p. 104, and p. 204 in Volume one and p. 95, p. 104 and p. 391 in Volume two. The term 'Eastern Asia' is referred in p. 6 and p. 204 in Volume one and 'Eastern Archipelago' and 'Indian Archipelago' are written in p. 24 and p. 67 in Volume two respectively.
[50] Townsend Harris, The Complete journal of Townsend Harris: First American Consul General and Minister to Japan, New York: Japan Society, 1930, p. 135.
[51] Abbot Low Moffat, ibid., p. 53.
[52] Frederick Arthur Neale, Narrative of a Residence at the Capital of the Kingdom of Siam: With a Description of the Manners, Customs, and Laws of the Modern Siamese, London: Office of the National Illustrated Library, 1852.
[53] Abbot Low Moffat, ibid., pp. 92-93.

familiar with the 'regional' affairs through the English newspapers. [54] Interestingly enough, *Bangkok Calendar* referred to 'South-Eastern Asia' in a travelogue of protestant missionary in 1866. The author mentioned that 'Our destination was first to Amherst, Burmah, and thence to Singapore.'[55] As it would appear that the king read this article, he might have understood the regional term, but there is no evidence that the king had used this word.

King Mongkut had regional awareness of the Western concepts through his knowledge of English. Since Rama III was not an English commander and communicated through a Malay interpreter when John Crawfurd visited Bangkok,[56] at least the king had no way of knowing the English regional terms. On the other hand, Mongkut acquired much knowledge in English and had learnt the regional concept. There was the possibility that to some extent the Siam court recognised the term 'South Eastern Asia' as above mentioned, but the king mainly used the term 'East' to indicate the entire of Asia, which was a term of common usage among the Western countries. King Mongkut attempted not to cause friction and conflict with the Western powers as much as possible, accepted a national concept with a border territory as an independent country, not as a vassal of any Western powers,[57] and followed the Western ways in international relations. When Siam adopted the Western-made regional terms, this meant that Siam shared with the powers not only the Western border concept but also the regional concept. In an era that drew borders around the world, a region was transitionally created based on border territories and countries/states, although most of them were under colonial powers. It can be said that Siam, which retained its political independence unlike its colonised neighbouring kingdoms, recognised the Western regional concept earlier than

---

[54] *Bangkok Readers* issued in 1865 stated that the editor had communicated through letters from the king.
[55] *Bangkok Calender*, 1866, p. 74.
[56] John Crawfurd, *Journal of an Embassy to the Courts of Siam and Cochin China; Exhibiting a view of the Actual State of those kingdoms,* Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1967, p. 82. Originally published in 1828. John Crawfurd spoke the Malay language well and published *A grammar and dictionary of the Malay language: with a preliminary dissertation*, London: Elder Smith, 1852.
[57] Donald C. Lord, 'Missionaries, Thai, and Diplomats,' *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Nov., 1966), p. 418 and p. 422.

any other elites in the region. During the period of time when other South-East Asian countries were colonised in the nineteenth century, as Hall said, 'it is not too much to say that Siam owed the preserved independence to Mongkut more than anyone else.'[58]

The king, who had a strong interest in astronomy, was infected with malaria during his observation of the solar eclipse in the southern of Siam and passed away after a few months in 1868. After the demise of King Mongkut in 1868, his son Chulalongkorn was crowned as Rama V at the age of sixteen. Chulalongkorn's English skills contributed towards the modernisation of Siam and the preservation of its independence during the colonial era. For five years prior to his coronation, he learnt English from a British tutor, Anna Leonowens, together with other princes and princesses.[59] His fluent English helped him to navigate global affairs easily like his father.

The king has a great reputation for being successful in preserving Siam's independence along with bringing domestic modernisation to Siam. This was because of his firm decision to do so. The decision led him to visit Singapore and Java on an inspection tour in 1871. The tour had been planned at the final stage of Mongkut's reign, but the plan was halted due to his sudden demise. Despite his sudden death, the tour plan was carried on by the new king Chulalongkorn, and he visited the two islands in 1871. This was the first time that the king of Siam went overseas since King Naresuan went to Burma for war in the seventeenth century.[60]

Though Lim described the tour as a 'Study Tour'[61] to inspect the process of modernisation in the two islands, the trip actually bore much political significance. As a king who was still a minor at the time and governing the country with a Regent, the purpose of the travel was mainly to display his dignity and place Siam on equal footing

---

[58] D. G. E., Hall, ibid., pp. 666-667.

[59] See details in Anna Harriette Leonowens, *The English governess at the Siamese court: Being recollections of six years in the royal palace at Bangkok*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. The author also wrote other book *Siamese Harem Life*, London: Barker, 1952.

[60] Chula Chakrabongse, Lords of Life: The Paternal Monarchy of Bangkok, 1782-1932 with the earlier and more recent history of Thailand, New York: Taplinger Publishing, 1960, p. 223.

[61] Lim Pui Huen, Through the Eyes of the King: The Travels of King Chulalongkorn to Malaya, Singapore: ISEAS, 2009, p. 1.

with the European countries, especially the British which colonised Siam's neighbours. Before the king's departure to Singapore, the Siam court requested the Singapore government to prepare accommodation, events and so on. However, the Singapore government paid little attention to the king's trip until the last minute. Through the Siam Consul to Singapore, the court repeatedly made requests to the British, but the Consul finally received a letter from the Singapore government accepting the requests only right before the king's departure, though the king had already been on board at the time.[62] It seems that the Singapore government's change of mind was due to the activities of the commercial community of Singapore,[63] not from respect towards the king.

Although Siam and the British has had an intimate relationship since the reign of Mongkut, Siam noticed that 'the Singapore Government does not have any respect for Siam's prestige.'[64] The British government followed Siam's requests properly and seemingly respected the king's dignity. In Singapore, the king talked to many officials and businessmen without interpreters. This helped to enhance his dignity and also to deepen his personal relationships. According to the local newspaper in Singapore, the tour - at least in Singapore - was successful.[65] After Singapore, the king continued on to visit Batavia (currently known as Jakarta) and other towns in Java and had discussions with the officials of the Dutch East Indies. As Kannibar argued, through the tour the King Chulalongkorn successfully made the kingdom of Siam visible and appear civilised in the eyes of the two European powers, namely the British and the Dutch. By visiting the two colonial grounds in Asia, the young king presented Siam to be a politically independent presence to the major powers. In this sense, the tour was in effect a political tour. After arriving in Bangkok, the king informed the Regent of his desire to visit Europe,

---

[62] See details to Kannikar Sartraproong, *A True Hero: King Chulalongkorn of Siam's visit to Singapore and Java in 1871*, Bangkok: Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, 2008, p. 163.
[63] Ibid., p. 23.
[64] Ibid., p. 161.
[65] The Straits Times Overland Journal, 29 March 1871, p. 2.

but this request was declined due to the long distance. Instead, with the Regent's recommendation, the king visited Malacca, Penang, Burma, and India in the same year.[66] To prevent from being colonised by the European powers, the Kingdom of Siam attached special importance to building friendly relations with adjacent colonial governments. There were great risks and it was a challenging task for the new king to visit the colonised areas in order to survive in a cruel colonial era. He attempted to build up cordial relations with the major powers, in particular the British, and visited their main cities as the first step. The main purpose of the visit was to preserve Siam's independence, and it is worthwhile to note that the king himself conducted 'regional foreign diplomacy' at the early stage of the reign.

His trip to Europe took place in 1897. This trip lasted for nine months and the number of countries he visited reached fourteen, including Britain and Russia.[67] The direct reason for the trip was due mainly to the fact that in 1893, Siam was forced to cede the left side of the Mekong river to France. The king was angry with this and also with the non-intervention of the British despite Siam's request for assistance.[68] The king's objective for the trip was successfully achieved, especially with regards to his trip to Russia, as he managed to persuade the Russian tsar to oppose new territorial claims by France, which was an ally of Russia. To some extent, Russia was able to exert its influence upon France on this issue.[69]

In a series of inspection during the overseas trip, the king himself visited both the Western and Eastern regions. Given that the use of regional terms such as 'the West,' 'Europe,' 'the East,' 'Eastern countries' and others have been in widespread use in many English books and newspapers at least since the reign of Mongkut, King Chulalongkorn

---

[66] Lim Pui Huen, ibid., p. 27.
[67] Ibid., p. x.
[68] Ishii Yoneo and Sakurai Yumio (eds.), Tounan Ajia shi I, Tairikubu (The history of Southeast Asia, the part of the mainland), Tokyo, Yamakawa shuppansha, 1999, p. 412.
[69] See details in Karen Snow, 'St. Petersburg's Man in Siam: A. E. Olarovskii and Russia's Asian Mission, 1898-1905,' *Cahiers du Monde russe*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 2007), pp. 611-635.

knew of these terms. Unfortunately, the king's English documents made little mention of regional names and his regional perspectives, but his half-brother, Prince Damrong related this.

Prince Damrong accompanied the king to Singapore and Java in 1871 and held several important ministerial posts, such as the minister of education and of the interior. He was also fluent in English. Since he was at the centre of sovereignty, there is a great possibility of sharing regional consciousness with the king and other prince officials. In the speech text titled 'The Introduction of Western Culture in Siam' in 1925, he used the term 'the East' or 'Eastern' as adjectives a few times, which is meant to be equal to the term 'Asia.' He had clearly recognised that the kingdom of Siam was one of the Eastern countries like India and Ceylon.[70] This speech text indicated that the term 'the Far East' was also used as a sub-region under 'the East.' Even though Prince Damrong's speech was made after the king's demise, the regional consciousness in this period was the same as during the reign of Mongkut. Thus, it would not be too much to say that there was already common consciousness during the reign of King Chulalongkorn. It is natural to assume that the king recognised not only Asia and East Asia, but also the Indian Archipelago, Further India, and Indochina as sub-regional names through various English books and newspapers published in Bangkok and Singapore.

King Chulalongkorn made domestic reforms towards Siam's modernisation and put an end to Siam's traditional ways. His foreign policy was, similarly with Mongkut's policy, focused on preserving Siam's independence without giving in to pressure from the British and French. At the same time the king also followed the same regional concept in the Western manner as his predecessor. This was not because of his English commander, but partly because Siam made all effort to keep its independence and did

---

[70] Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, 'The Introduction of Western Culture in Siam,' *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (1926-27), p. 90.

not seek more than that and partly because it took defensive measures by following the Western ways in terms of international politics.

**The League of Nations and realisation of a region**

After the demise of King Chulalongkorn, Prince Vajiravudh ascended to the throne as Rama VI in 1910. As he had studied in Oxford during his teens, he was the first king to be trained in the western manner. Despite his pro-British background, his foreign policy steered towards a neutral course and he took a wait-and-see policy at the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. When the United States joined forces with the Allies, i.e., the United Kingdom, France, and Russia in April 1917, the king decided to declare war against Germany and Austria-Hungary in July the same year. The decision was made due to his belief that the war had become more favourable to the Allies. Siam as a member of the Allies collected military volunteers and sent a small number of soldiers to France in 1918. With the Allies' victory, Siam was able to become the original member of the League of Nations which was established in 1920. Siam was the sole independent country among colonies of Western powers in Southeast Asia.

As a member of the League of Nations, Siam attended various meetings to debate global issues, especially issues in the Far East. As can be seen from the above, the Siam government had had a common regional consciousness with the West since the nineteenth century, and their regional consciousness was strengthened through this global organisation.

The Opium Committee within the League of Nations was set up in 1920 in order to control the use of opium and dangerous drugs around the world. Opium was largely produced in the Asian region and used by the locals. Thus, it was natural that great attention was paid to the Asian region. The fifth session was held in 1923 and Prince

Charoon as the representative of Siam was elected as vice-chairman for this session. Discussions during the session focused on the Far East to control the drugs. Among others, in proposals of the British government regarding the consumption of opium for smoking in the Far East, the Siam vice-chairman used the term 'Far Eastern Possessions.' [71] In the discussion, this phrase was mentioned by many delegates. However, the British representative, Malcolm Delevingne, pointed out that the term 'Far Eastern Possessions' should be replaced with 'Far Eastern territories' because Siam 'was not a Possession.' This suggestion was adopted immediately. [72] It is noteworthy to highlight that, naturally enough, all members of the global organisation recognised that Siam belonged to the Far East and the Siam representative, Prince Charoon, also had a clear understanding of the regional concept at least from Delevingne's statement. The term and definition of 'Far East' was already well-known by this time.

Subsequently in 1925, the League of Nations set up a Health Organisation Eastern Bureau in Singapore to implement the mandate of epidemiological surveys and to assist each government in the region in combating infectious diseases,[73] with the members being British India, British North Borneo, Ceylon, China, Federated Malay States, French Indochina, Hong Kong, Japan, the Netherlands Indies, Siam, and the Straits Settlements. The Philippines also joined as an observer.[74] The establishment of the Bureau had led to the creation of an official regional conference of the Far East where all the regional members met annually. This was not a regional co-operation because there was no co-operation between the countries. However, the annual gatherings of the governments in the Far East formed much clearer regional imaginings and 'embodied' the imaginings of the region, as the governments, though some members were the

---

[71] League of Nations, 'Advisory committee on Traffic in Opium and Other dangerous Drugs: Minutes of the Fifth Session held at Geneva, From May 24th to June 7th, 1923,' C.418. M.184. 1923.XI, p. 65.
[72] Ibid., p. 103.
[73] Stefan Matthias Hell, 'Siam and the League of Nations: Modernization, sovereignty and multilateral diplomacy, 1920-1940,' Leiden University Institute for Area Studies (LIAS) Ph. D dissertation, 31st Oct. 2007, p. 157.
[74] Ibid., p. 158.

colonial powers, never met in a regional conference before. The annual conference sponsored by the League of Nations was a regional meeting at the earlier stage and it was a place for the Siamese to identify the region that Siam belonged to.

The Bandung Conference on Traffic in Women and Children was held in 1937. Interestingly enough, the report clearly defined the regional term 'Far East' as being Japan, China, Hong Kong, Macao, the Philippine Islands, Indo-China, the Netherlands Indies, the Straits Settlements, the Federated Malay States, the Unfederated Malay States, and Siam.[75] This demarcation shows that it is a geographical space combining the current East Asia and Southeast Asia. In this period, it was common to know this regional term and the definition. As an evidence, the book published in 1923 shows that it had already described the same concept of the Far East.[76] Thus, the international consensus had been reached at least since the turn of the twentieth century. The Siam government was also well aware of this and recognised that Siam belonged to the region.

On the other hand, based on the Siam-related documents of the League, it should be noted that the League members seldom used the term 'Asia.' The term 'Asia' itself was rarely used as a single word, but often as 'Asia Minor' to refer to the current Turkey. In most cases, the term 'East' or 'Eastern' as an adjective were substituted for the term 'Asia.' Even Mongkut, other Siam kings and the then Siam representatives to the League employed terms such as 'the East' or 'the Eastern countries' to indicate either Asian countries or the entire Asia.

King Vajiravudh's writings had also mainly used the term 'East.' Domestically, Siam had faced an issue with the Chinese since the turn of the twentieth century. During the reign of the King Vajiravudh, this issue inspired the rise of Siam nationalism. The

---

[75] The League of Nations, *Traffic in women and children: Work of the Bandoeng Conference*, C.516.M.357.1937.IV., Geneve, December 20th, 1937, p. 15. This document also defined the Middle East and Near East. The former is India, Ceylon, and Persia only, and the latter is Iraq, Levant under French Mandate, and Palestine. As the world organisation had no use of 'South Asia,' the then regional concepts were quite different from the current.
[76] Allistes Macmillan (ed.), Seaports of the Far East: Historical and Descriptive Commercial and Industrial Facts, Figures and Facts, London: H. and L. Collingridge, 1923, pp. 9-16.

king himself wrote newspaper articles to raise level of nationalism of the public. Among them are 'Wake up, Siam,' 'The Jews of the Orient,' and 'Education and Unrest in the East,' being famous articles written in Thai. It merits significant attention here that even some of the titles used the terms 'Orient' and 'East,' and not 'Asia.' As discussed above, it has been noted that the Siam kings and the officials of both Siam and the Western countries seldom used the term 'Asia,' and in fact seem to have avoided this term. Hay argued that the term 'Asia' was closely associated with concepts of lavish splendour, vulgarity, and arbitrary authority by the fifth century.[77] Montesquieu, a French political philosopher in the eighteenth century, also believed that Europe represented progress and Asia represented stagnation.[78] Later on, K. M. Panikkar said that '[b]y the nineteenth century, Europe ... represented indeed a civilisation on the march. It challenged the basis of Asian societies.'[79] Conversely, Asia was viewed as uncivilised and discriminated. It is likely that the Siam kings and the government officials would well understand the implications of the term used in a derogatory manner. The king would have learnt the regional term 'Asia' in the United Kingdom. Usage of the term 'East,' not only by the king but also by Siam royal family and government officials, was common and presumably neutral. The regional consciousness of the Siamese was the same as the Western concept: 'The East' indicated the entire of Asia. On the other hand, the Siamese had learnt a new regional term in the 1930s. As mentioned in the chapter one, in 1931 a Dutch archaeologist, Dr. Stein van Callenfels, had an audience with King Prajadhipok and had talked about 'the Pre-history of South Eastern Asia.' The definition remains unknown but significantly enough, the King of Siam and other related officials (including Prince Damrong who was present) had learnt the regional term 'South Eastern Asia.'[80]

[77] D. Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an idea*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1957, p. 3.
[78] Ibid., p. 122.
[79] K. M. Panikkar, Asia and Western Dominance: A survey of the Vasco Da Gama epoch of Asian history, 1498-1945, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1959, p. 17.
[80] *The Straits Times*, 12 Dec. 1931, p. 12.

Nevertheless, the regional term was not used by the Siamese largely because the Western governments did not use it officially before the Second World War. In addition, more importantly, as above mentioned, the term included 'Asia,' a word which implied a discriminatory element. It can be deemed premature to build up the regional consciousness because of colonised neighbours surrounding Thailand. Though Thailand was a member of the global organisation as an independent state, there was possibility that the country would be colonised in the future. Siamese, even though the major powers used the term 'South Eastern Asia,' hesitated to form the sub-region which grouped together with the major colonial powers in this time and had not developed the regional consciousness. In addition, even if the neighbours were not colonised by the West, Siamese would not have a single regional consciousness of the mainland of Southeast Asia. According to Thongchai Winichakul, the Siam kings from Ayutthaya to Bangkok had ego-centric views of countries surrounding Siam. They always perceived their neighbours either as rivals and competitors for supremacy, or as inferior vassals, dependencies and lesser kingdoms.'[81]

Though the political system was changed to a constitutional monarch after the *coup d'tat* in 1932, Thailand's foreign policy, which greatest purpose was to secure Thailand's independence, remained constant. The Thai government maintained its neutral position at the early stages of the Second World War, but in 1941 it became an ally of the Japanese military government which invaded the entire Southeast Asia. As a consequence, Japan became the new neighbour for Thailand, taking the place of the British and the French. Thailand was incorporated into the Japanese imperialistic regional concept, Greater East Asia, which was originally established in the 1930s.

---

[81] Thongchai Winichakul, 'Trying to locate Southeast Asia from its naval: Where is Southeast Asian studies in Thailand?,' in Paul H. Kratoska et al., *Locating Southeast Asia: Geographies of knowledge and politics of space*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005, p. 117.

The Greater East Asia Conference was held in Tokyo in December 1943 for the purpose of holding frank discussions regarding the construction of a New Order in Greater East Asia.[82] Six heads of 'countries' were invited: Zhang Jinghui (Prime Minister of Manchukuo), Wang Jingwei (President of the Reorganised National Government of China) Ba Maw (Head of Burma State), Subhas Chandra Bose (Head of State of Provisional Government of Free India), José P. Laurel (President of the Philippine Republic), and Prince Wan Waithayakon (envoy from the Kingdom of Thailand). The Japanese military government had invited Phibun Songkhram, the Prime Minister of Thailand, but he declined to attend due to his 'health problems'[83] and the premier sent the Prince in his place. In his speech at the conference, he expressed the intention to help the Japanese successfully establish the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere and also recognised it as a regional space by using 'the Greater East Asian region.'[84] However, it is difficult to say that the Thai government built up or had seriously developed the consciousness of the 'Greater East Asian region.' Although Phibun had friendly relations with Japan at the early stage and signed an alliance treaty with Japan in 1941, hence abandoning Thailand's neutral foreign policy, he secretly supported an anti-Japanese movement to contact the Allied Powers, in particular the British and the United States, because the Japanese had displayed bad behaviour in Thailand and had put in place an unfair economic policy. By the time of the conference in Tokyo in 1943, the Thai prime minister was already fed up with the Japanese.[85] This was the real reason why he was absent from the conference and affected the development of a regional consciousness. The Prince's speech used Japanese-coined term, but the Thai government might have much preferred to use the term 'the Far East' which has been used in the West for a long

---

[82] This is the then Prime Minister, Tojo Hideki's opening speech in the conference. Joyce C. Lebra (ed.), *Japan's Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere in World War II: Selected readings and documents*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1975. p. 89.
[83] Daitoushou (Ministery of Greater East Asia Affairs), Daitoua kaigi enzetsushu (Speech collection of the Greater East Asia Conference), 1943, p. 17.
[84] Ibid, p. 17 and p. 23.
[85] Kobkua Suwannathat-Pian, *Thailand's durable premier: Phibun through three decades 1932-1957*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 262-271.

time. In fact, the scope of the Greater East Asia/Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere had almost the same definition as the one of the Far East. According to the then Foreign Minister of Japan, Yosuke Matsuoka, the scope of the sphere was Japan, Manchuria, China, the Dutch Indies, French Indo-China, and other Southern areas.[86] However, with the defeat of Japan in August 1945, the regional name 'Greater East Asia' disappeared and at the same time the other regional term, 'Eastern/East Asia' got a negative image since then.[87]

On the other hand, South-East Asia Command (SEAC), established in 1943 for the purpose of driving away the Japanese, caused the Thai people to develop other regional consciousness. While they had much wider regional consciousness, i.e., the Far East and the East, Thailand, as the discussion is made in Chapter Four, played an active part to establish regional co-operation within the smaller region at quite an early stage after the Second World War. This was mainly in order to survive with the presence of new neighbours in the region.

Thailand secured its independence without being colonised. The kings and princes since King Mongkut learnt foreign languages, among others English and adopted the Western culture and ways for Siam's modernisation. This greatly influenced their regional consciousness. Owing to their foreign knowledge, they voraciously read books and newspaper articles, especially on Siam. Through these media they learnt regional terms such as 'East' and 'the Far East.' The participation of the League of Nations had caused the kings and the Siam government to be aware of the regional consciousness in a more concrete fashion through international issues. Since the 1930s with the invasion of the Asian region, the Japanese-coined regional term 'Greater East Asia' had been used,

---

[86] *Osaka Mainichi Shimbun* (Daily newspaper), 2 Aug. 1940. English translation is available in Joyce C. Lebra (ed.), *Japan's Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere in World War II: Selected readings and documents*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1975, pp. 71-72. A. J. Grajdanzev argued that the Japanese regional concept lacked the precision and the region should cover India, the Soviet Far East, Australia and New Zealand. See his discussion in 'Japan's Co-Prosperity Sphere,' *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (Sep., 1943), p. 311.
[87] See detail discussions for these regional terms in Toshitaka Kishi, Yasunori Arano, Hideo Okaze (eds.), *Higashi Ajia no 'jidaisei' (Timeness of 'East Asia')*, Tokyo: Keisuisha, 2005.

which brings almost the same concept as the Western-coined term, the Far East. Whatever regional names would change under any strong dominant powers in Asia, however, the Siamese elites had retained regional consciousness to which Siam belonged: the geographical space equal to the Far East or the East. Because of the wide acceptance of the Western culture in the nineteenth century, the Siamese followed the Western regional concept.

## The Philippines

## Historical background

The Republic of the Philippines is an archipelagic country located on the Western Pacific Ocean. Luzon and Mindanao are the two largest islands in the country, and there are numerous islands and islets between the two. There exist over 7,000 islands that stretch for over 1,150 miles[88], with a total population of 93 million (2010).[89] The Philippines derived its name from King Philip II of Spain in the sixteenth century during the time the Spanish conquered the country.[90]

Filipinos have various ethnic groups and races, including Negritos, Malays, Chinese, Mestizos and others. Amazingly, there are over 100 languages spoken in the country. Nevertheless, only nine of them (i.e., Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilocano, Hiligaynon, Bicol, Waray, Pampango, Pangasinan and Maranao) are spoken by about 90 percent of the island people.[91]

---

[88] Luis H. Francia, *A history of the Philippines: From Indios Bravos to Filipinos*, New York: The Overlook Press, 2014, p. 11.
[89] The government of the Philippines website:
https://psa.gov.ph/content/highlights-2010-census-based-population-projections (Accessed on 1 Sept. 2016.)
[90] Norman G. Owen (ed.), *The emergence of modern Southeast Asia: A New History*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005, p. xxi.
[91] David Joel Steinberg, *The Philippines: A Singular And A Plural Place*, Boulder: Westview Press, 2000 (Fourth Edition) p. 39.

Religion in the Philippines is predominantly Christianity, which was propagated during the colonial era of Spain. The religion deeply penetrated into their culture, and is reflected in the country's politics as well. Muslims form only five percent of the total population, who live in the southern part of the country on Mindanao and its adjacent islands. In the pre-colonial period, most local people practised animist beliefs in the archipelago.[92] However, Mindanao and its adjacent islands were Islamised through Borneo island. Islam gradually reached Manila and other towns on Luzon Island. But with the arrival of Spain, Christianity spread throughout the archipelago, except at the southern parts. As such, Islam was confined to the south.[93] Renato Constantino pointed out that if Spaniards had not arrived, the Philippines would have been Islamised and thoroughly exposed to the great Asian traditions.[94] The two religions had to a greater or lesser degree impacted their sense of regional consciousness.

The historical development of its pre-colonial era is quite different from Java and the Malay Peninsula due to different influences over local identity at the time of the emergence of nationalism in the nineteenth century. According to Chinese records, there were small polities in the archipelago in the tenth century,[95] but they did not have powerful and centralised kingdoms, unlike other countries in Southeast Asia. Moreover, no nation-states existed during the arrival of the Spanish.[96] This can be seen from a small local community called the *baranganic* society, which was a human settlement on a boat (*barangay*) before the Spanish colonial era. According to Filipino archaeologists, there are a few archaeological evidences of the society as a small political unit in the island country.[97]

---

[92] D. G. E. Hall, ibid., p. 249.
[93] Ibid., p. 254.
[94] Renato Constantino, *Neocolonial Identity and Counter-Consciousness: Essays on Cultural Decolonization*, M.E. Sharpe, 1978, p. 28.
[95] M. C. Ricklefs (ed.), *A New History of Southeast Asia*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, p. 67.
[96] Luis H. Francia, ibid.,p. 27.
[97] Eusebio Z. Dizon and Armand Salvador B. Mijares, 'Archaeological evidence of a baranganic culture,' *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society*, Vol. 27, No. 1/2, (March/June 1999), p. 1.

To seek Asian trading routes that made large profits with spice products, the then Spanish king ordered a Portuguese explorer by the name of Ferdinand Magellan to sail over and reached one of the Philippines islands in 1521, but was killed by locals in the same year. Subsequently, Spain dispatched a vessel to control the Philippines archipelago several times, but to no avail. It was in 1565 that Miguel Lopez de Legazpi successfully established a foothold in Eastern Visayas. He launched several military campaigns to conquer settlements along the coasts of Luzon, and afterwards, Spanish reinforcements from Mexico conquered Cebu and other islands, but uprisings sporadically occurred from 1596 to 1764.[98]

The Spanish empire attempted to seize the islands in the southern area, in particular Mindanao and the Sulu Archipelago, but failed to conquer the entire group of islands. Mindanao and Sulu were already Islamised and had a strong army at the time of the Spanish arrival, which meant that the empire was not able to be subdued.[99] While the Spaniards attempted to control Muslim territories numerous times, the Sulu kingdom also attacked the Spanish side and demonstrated its strength. In the end, the Spanish government was not able to govern the Islamised areas for over 300 years. The Spanish labelled the natives who converted to Christianity after the arrival of Spain as '*Indios*,' while Muslims were derogatorily labelled 'Moros.'[100]

The emergence of nationalism led to the creation of national associations, which resulted in the Philippine Revolution. While Jose Rizal was a prominent member of the 'Propaganda Movement' to reform the Spanish colony from within, not for independence, Andres Bonifacio and others founded a secret society, *Kataastaasan Kagalang-galangang Katipunan nang manga Anak nang Bayan* (*Katipunan*), in 1892. The purpose of this society was to gain independence from Spain by force, and to unite the islands

---

[98] M. C. Ricklefs (ed.), ibid., pp. 87-88 and pp. 162-163.
[99] D. G. E. Hall, ibid., pp. 248-255.
[100] The Spanish colonisers called the Muslims in the south 'Moros' in derogatory sense. It derived from 'Moors' who occupied Spain for a few centuries. M. C. Ricklefs (ed.), ibid., pp. 162-163.

under a 'Filipino' nation-state.[101] The members of the society came into contact with

Rizal in 1896 in Dapitan, Mindanao, where he was deported in 1892. But Rizal turned

down the plans to resort to arms because of premature preparation. With the discovery

of the secret society by the colonial power, members of *Katipunan* began to fight against

the colonial regime.[102] Unfortunately, the armed uprisings led to Rizal's death. Although

Rizal was not a member of *Katipunan* and declined the plans of the uprising by the

organisation, he was accused of being a ringleader and was executed on 30 December,

1896. His execution enraged the locals.

The Spanish military forces regained its territory and subsequently Emilio

Aguinaldo, the leader of *Katipunan*, was forced to retreat to the northern side. However,

during the period a revolutionary assembly held in Tejeros (Cavite) elected Aguinaldo

as President of the Philippine Republic in March, 1897. A new government was

established through the promulgation of the constitution on 1 November, 1897. Though

the Spanish army continued to prevail over the rebellion, the Spanish force lost many

soldiers in a series of clashes, and sought a peace agreement with the rebels. In December

of the same year, a peace agreement was concluded between the colonial and

revolutionary governments with the terms of voluntary exile to Hong Kong, and the

payment of three million Mexican dollars. The nationalists left Manila after the

conclusion of fighting.[103]

The U.S. government engaged in war in Cuba, which was then under the Spanish,

in order to drive them away from the Pacific. Although the Philippines under Spain was

far from America, the U.S. government was interested in seizing the islands because it

wanted to expand trading.[104] Aguinaldo was approached by an American officer to assist

---

[101] D. G. E. Hall, ibid., p. 723.
[102] Ibid.
[103] D. R. SarDesai, *Southeast Asia: Past and present*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1994 (third edition), pp. 139-144 and M. C. Ricklefs (ed.), ibid., pp. 226-227.
[104] See details in D. R. SarDesai, ibid., pp. 144-145.

in removing Spain as a colonial power, and he and other Filipino nationalists landed in Manila in a U.S. battleship, the following year. They successfully seized the Spanish territories one after another, which finally led the Spaniards to surrender. On December, 1898, the two countries, i.e., Spain and the U.S., signed an agreement to end the war and cede the territory from Spain to the U.S. An officer of the U.S. promised the Filipino leader independence when approaching Aguinaldo, but the officer rejected it after seizing the Philippines.[105] Aguinaldo and other fighters began to fight against the U.S. The war continued until 1905, which sacrificed the lives of over a million people. Even after the Philippine Assembly was established and the general elections were held in 1907, the Filipino nationalists repeatedly demanded the independence from the U.S., and complained of the slow progress in power sharing. Hit by the Great Depression, the U.S. government and the Congress granted the Philippines independence by enacting the Philippine Independence Act in 1934, which gave a ten year transition period. The Philippines gained independence from the U.S. in 1946 after the Japanese occupation for three years, in which the Japanese promised independence.[106]

It is important here to see how the U.S. government perceived the territory of the Philippines since it took it over from Spain, because the recognition of the territory by Americans influenced Filipino intellectuals later. When the U.S. defeated Spain and signed the Treaty of Paris in 1898, all the territories of Spain, i.e., Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines and others, were relinquished to the U.S. The treaty defined the territory of the Philippines in detail.[107] The territory definition of the Philippines had to be made because there were lots of scattered islands with unclear limits under the Netherlands and Britain, and the Spaniards attempted to 'hide' some islands.[108] However, this treaty did

[105] D. G. E. Hall, ibid., p. 767.
[106] D. R. SarDesai, ibid., p. 150. George McTurnan Kahin, *Governments and Politics of Southeast Asia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966 (Second edition), p. 696.
[107] See details in Raphael Perpetuo M. Lotilla (ed.), *The Philippine National Territory: A Collection of Related Documents*, Diliman, Quezon City: Institute of International Legal Studies, University of the Philippines Law Center and Manila: Foreign Service Institute, Department of Foreign Affairs, 1995, p. 33.
[108] Rodolfo C. Severino, *Where in the World is the Philippines?: Debating its National Territory*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2011, p. 10.

not include the Sulu archipelago and Sibutu Island in the southern part of the current Philippines, which bordered the British North Borneo. Thus, the U.S. concluded another agreement in 1900 to contain the islands within American territory. Certainly, the treaties created the fundamental territory of the Philippines, but this was the territory created by the colonial regimes, without any local opinion taken into account when Christian nationalists of the northern islands in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries developed a movement demanding independence. On the other hand, Muslims, or Moros, who lived in Mindanao, the Sulu archipelago and their adjacent islands had strongly believed that they kept their independence since before the arrival of Spain and, never recognised the dominion of Spain and the U.S. There was a perception gap between the Christians and Muslims.

The differences resulted from suppressing Muslims by Spain and the U.S. The Spanish colonial government was unable to control the southern areas, despite the fact that it sent an expeditionary force many times. Spaniards considered Muslims as enemies because Muslims were considered uncivilised. Thus, they had a 'mission' to force them to convert to Christianity. Spanish conquerors created a strong sense of animosity between Christians and Muslims. On the other hand, it would seem that Muslims had little sense of their own identity before the arrival of the Spanish, but with its domination over the southern parts, there emerged an identity that distinguished Muslims from Christians. At the same attempt to conquer, the Spanish attempted to transform Muslims through education, but failed because Muslims strongly resisted the establishment of schools.

Nevertheless, the defeated Spanish Empire ceded Mindanao and the Sulu archipelago to the U.S. At the time when the two colonial rulers signed in 1898, it would seem that the U.S. government did not notice that Spain had not controlled the islands for over three centuries, and based on the 1878 treaty between Spain and the Sultan of

Sulu,[109] they concluded a new treaty called the Bates Agreement, with the Sultan in 1899. Peter Gordon Gowing analysed the 1899 treaty and made the two parties misunderstood:[110] The U.S. government was 'to get Moro acknowledgement of the fact that the U.S. had succeeded to the status of sovereign in Moroland'; but the Sultan of Sulu believed that the 1899 treaty was an extension of the 1878 treaty and a *modus vivendi*. The Sultan's emolument given by the Spanish was regarded as just a tribute in exchange for his co-operation in keeping the Sulu peaceful.[111] The U.S. government succeeded in ruling over the southern parts after fierce battles after 1913, and urged the Christians to settle in Mindanao by providing land with a loan. This settlement fundamentally changed Muslim lifestyles and the demographic landscape in Mindanao. The government also carried out 'Filipinization' in the south islands through the set-up of a Moro province and brought many non-Muslims as administrators into the province.[112] These programmes arose discontent in the community and strengthened their own identity, as not Filipino, but Moro.

The Philippines today consists of Christian and Islamic cultures. The colonial powers attempted to govern the Muslim islands, and at the same time discriminated against its inhabitants and suppressed them. The Spaniards made the *Indios*[113] believe that they controlled the areas. Some Christian nationalists in the era sought to assert a 'Malay identity' to supersede their differences in religion.

---

[109] See the full text, 'Protocol between Spain and Sulu Confirming the Bases of Peace and Capitulation' in Raphael Perpetuo M. Lotilla (ed.), ibid., pp. 23-28.
[110] See details in Peter Gordon Gowing, *Mandate in Moroland: The American Government of Muslim Filipinos 1899-1920*, Diliman, Quezon City: Philippine Centre for Advanced Studies, University of the Philippines System, 1977, pp. 31-37.
[111] Ibid., p. 32.
[112] Syed Serajul Islam, *The Politics of Islamic Identity in Southeast Asia*, Singapore: Thomson Learning, 2005, pp. 28-32.
[113] *Indios* discriminatorily meant the natives in the era of Spain.

**The Malay consciousness and regional awareness**

Filipino consciousness emerged in the nineteenth century. The term Filipino originally indicated the Spaniards who were born in the Philippine archipelago. This term was synonymous with another term, *Insulares*. In the middle of the nineteenth century the meaning of Filipino included the Spanish mestizo and the local intellectuals. Subsequently, the term embraced all the people who lived in the archipelago. In the process of the emergence of nationalism, the term Filipino became a concept on an equal level with Spaniards who were born on the Iberian Peninsula. [114]

However, it cannot be ignored that at the same time their racial consciousness as Malays existed. They were also aware of terms coined by the West in the nineteenth century for the region they live in, namely, the Indian Archipelago and Malay Archipelago. There was increased consciousness of Filipinos as belonging to an ethnologic or cultural single area where the Malays dwelt, and Filipino intellectuals in the period came to consider the area as both a geographic and political area. This section focuses on how they became aware of this matter.

Filipino nationalists in the nineteenth and twenties century evolved a consciousness as being Malays and Filipinos. At the early stages of their consciousness, Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, who was a medical doctor, had enrolled in the *Ecole nationale des langues orientales vivantes* in France where he studied the Malay language and earned a diploma. [115] It would seem that he attempted to establish the Malay consciousness through the language, but, like other Filipino nationalists in the nineteenth century, he also had an identity as a Filipino. Nevertheless, his article, *The Filipino Soul*, [116] focused only on Filipino identity without writing anything about Malay identity, which probably

---

[114] Setsuho Ikehata, *Filipin Kakumei to Katorishizumu (The Philippine Revolution and Catholicism)*, Tokyo: Keisou Shobou, 1987, p. 3 and Renato Constantino, ibid., pp. 50-52.
[115] Resil Mojares, Brains of the Nation: Pedro Paterno, T. H. Pardo de Tevera, Isabelo de los Reyes and the Production of Modern Knowledge, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2006, p. 129.
[116] Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, 'The Filipino Soul,' in Vincente Hilario and Eliseo Quirino (eds.), *Thinking for ourselves: A representative collection of Filipino essays*, Manila: Oriental Commercial Co. Inc., 1928, pp. 171-186.

means that at that point in time, his Filipino consciousness was perhaps much stronger than his Malay consciousness. Isabelo de los Reyes, a prominent politician, asserted that the origin of Filipinos were indubitably the Malays, after studying history, ethnography and folklore.[117] Though he wondered about the emigration from the Philippines to Sumatra, i.e. diffusion of the Malays from the Filipino islands, the politician accepted the then general opinion that Filipinos descended from Sumatra.[118] In spite of the fact that there were various languages in the Philippines, he believed that the people in the islands shared a common Malay base.[119]

Jose Rizal was not exceptional. The key leader of nationalists in the Philippines studied in the University of Santo Thomas and subsequently went to Spain to earn degrees in medicine and classical literature. In Spain, he advocated for political reform to students from the Philippines and began the Propaganda Movement. After returning to his hometown, he organised a demonstration against the raising of farm rent. Not to be arrested by the authorities, he escaped. During his time there, he devoted to write for the awakening of their Filipino consciousness. A series of his writings show his two racial consciousness as being a 'double tracked nationalist'[120]: he had the consciousness of being both Filipino and Malay. One of his popular articles, *The Philippines a Century Hence*, used the term 'Malayan Filipino'[121] and at the same time espoused the idea that 'The Philippine races, like all the Malays, do not succumb before the foreigner like the Australians, the Polynesians and the Indians of the New World.'[122] This shows that the author considered the Filipinos as one of the races. Other article, *The Indolence of the Filipinos*, which explained the key causes of Filipino indolence and concluded that

---

[117] Resil Mojares, ibid., p. 300.
[118] Ibid., p. 301.
[119] Rommel A. Curaming, 'Filipinos as Malay: Historicizing an Identity,' in Maznah Mohammad and Muhd. Khairudin Aljunied (eds.), *Melayu: The Politics, Poetic and Paradoxes of Malayness*, Singapore: NUS Press, 2011, p. 247.
[120] Zeus A. Salazar, 'The Malay World: Bahasa Melayu in the Philippines,' in *The Malayan Connection: Ang Pilipinas sa Dunia Melayu*, Lunsod Quezon: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 1998, p. 101.
[121] Jose Rizal, *The Philippines a Century Hence*, Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1912, p. 46.
[122] Ibid., pp. 59-60.

sufficient education and liberty would be the key factors to cure the local indolence. The single word, 'Malays'[123] was also used but this article focuses mainly on the Filipinos.

Rizal attempted to trace the origins of the Malays through Western-published books and journals, and also discussed a prerequisite element of the Malays. He authored two memos on this.[124] His two memos were written about the books on the archipelago. One of the memos was titled 'The People of the Archipelago' which reviewed books and discussed the origins of the Malays. He clearly read books by Crawford and Marsden, but no book titles were mentioned. Quoted from the passage of Marsden, he said that 'the name "Malay" is now often used loosely in such a way that it is applied solely to the Muslim population of the archipelago without considering its language.'[125] He also pointed out that other scholars did not call the Malays Christians and Pagans who speak Malay language, and he did not agree this. The nationalist complained that *the Annals of the Malays* (*Sejarah Melayu*) translated into English did not discuss any language matters,[126] and placed emphasis on the significance of the Malay language as a fundamental element of the Malays.[127] It would seem that his requirement to be Malay was to speak the Malay language. Probably for this, Rizal studied the language very hard and commented after studying: 'I am becoming more and more convinced that Tagalog could not have been derived from Malay... However, there is no doubt that they have many common words.'[128] He attempted to find a commonality between Tagalog and Malay and further to share a Malay identity. Also, he might have had concerns that the people of the Christian areas did not speak the language, while the Muslims in the south

---

[123] Jose Rizal, *Jose Rizal's Political Writings*, Manila: The National Historical Institute, 2007, p. 233 and p. 241.
[124] Ibid., 'The People of the Indian Archipelago' and 'Notes on Melanesia, Malaysia and Polynesia,' pp. 364-382. Unfortunately it is not sure when the memos were written.
[125] Ibid., p. 367.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid.
[128] In a letter to Blumentritt on 10 April, 1895. In *The Rizal-Bluementritt Correspondence, Part Two, 1890-1896*, Manila: Jose Rizal National Centennical Commission, 1961, p. 504.

could do because the Muslims had close relations with other Malay areas. Thus, he had great concern that the term 'Malay' applied only to Muslims.

On the other hand, in his tracing the origins through the Western publications, he also acquired the knowledge of a frame of a region in the Pacific and did not object to the Western-coined regional concept. Other memos of his described a region of the Pacific: Melanesia, Polynesia and Malaysia. It would seem that this division was brought into the mainstream in the period after a French explorer, Dumond d'Urville officially framed the regions as such. Rizal followed the regional framework possibly based on Dumond d'Urville's book and others.[129] Interestingly enough, Rizal's memo employed the regional name 'Malaysia' as a more proper expression than the East Indies.[130] Probably Rizal much preferred to use 'Malaysia' partly because the term 'Malaysia' contains the meaning of the region that the Malays inhabited and partly because Rizal had discovered a consciousness of the Malays. It is significantly important here that he used the term 'Malaysia' due to the fact that he might have sought a nation based on this regional concept in the long term. He wrote in a letter to his European friend:

Formerly I had not reflected on your observation that 'Those peoples would better be assimilated by a greater Malayan nation than by a Spanish one ... ' I admit now that this is true. I have never thought of it ... [131]

Another case shows that he had the same idea in his own organization. The Filipino association, the *Indios Bravos* formed in Paris in 1889 had a secret inner group. Although

---

[129] In a correspondence letter to Bluementritt on 17 April, 1890, Rizal mentioned book titles which he read. Among them are Marsden, *History of Sumatra*, Dumont d'Urville, *Picturesque Voyage around the World*, Rienzi, *Malaysia (The Universe)*, and others. While the books of Dumont d'Urville likely included *Voyages Pittoresque Autour de Monde* publsihed in Paris in 1834, Rienzi's book might be G. L. Domeny de Rienzi, *Oceanie ou cinquieme partie du monde. Revenue Geographique et ethnographique de la malaisie, de la Micronesie, de la polynesie et de la Melanesie; offrant les resulatats des voyages et des decouvertes de l'auteur et de ses devanciers, asinsi que ses nouvelles classifications et divisions de ces contrees*, Paris: Firmin Didot Freres, 1837. See other book titles on *The Rizal-Bluementritt Correspondence*, p. 349. The d'Urville's regional concept will be discussed in the next chapter of Malaysia.
[130] Jose Rizal's Political Writings, p. 372.
[131] In the letter dated 20 July, 1890. *The Rizal-Bluementritt Correspondence*, p. 374.

this association aimed at keeping the Spanish colony of the Philippines united, the secret group members pledged to liberate the Malay peoples from colonial rule. Their plan was to release the burdens in the Philippines first, 'later to be extended to the inhabitants of Borneo, Indonesia and Malaya.'[132] Thus, it can be said that Rizal considered the Malay region to be a single entity. Although there are no records of the secret group, 'liberation' might have meant gaining independence from the colonisers and integrating all the islands under a single nation.

Interestingly enough, Rizal visited Sandakan city of North Borneo to settle his family and others in 1892 because of harsh environment pressed by Spain. He was negotiating with an officer of the North Borneo Company to lease a large piece of land. The officer offered 100,000 acres with a 999-year lease to Rizal and the nationalist agreed to obtain it jubilantly. However, unfortunately, the agreement was rejected by the head of the Company after a while. [133] The nationalist might have had a long term plan to bring together all the Malays who were suppressed by the colonial powers. As Austin Coates also argued, should Rizal's colony succeed, it would be a great step to unify all the Malay people from Borneo, the Philippines, Indonesia and Malaya.[134]

In the context of 'regional consciousness,' what is important is that Rizal had learnt of the term 'Malaysia' quite early as compared to other Southeast Asian intellectuals and he also had rough ideas to demarcate a national framework, even though he advocated to politically reform within the Spanish colony. His philosophy and political ideas were taken over by Filipino nationalists after his execution.

---

[132] Austin Coates, *Rizal: Philippine Nationalist and Martyr*, Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1968, p. 175. It is interesting that Rizal had learnt the term 'Indonesia' delimiting the territory of the Dutch colony because the term originally had the synonym with the term 'Malaysia.' See the next chapter.
[133] Austin Coates, 'The Philippines National Hero: Rizal in Sandakan,' *The Sarawak Museum Journal*, Nos. 19-20, Vol. X, 1962, pp. 550-551.
[134] Ibid., p. 553.

Apolinario Mabini, one of the key revolutionary leaders, became a member of *La Liga Filipina* (The Philippine League) which Rizal established in 1892.[135] After Rizal was arrested immediately after the formation, Mabini became a secretary of the new Supreme Council and at the same time followed Rizal's dream. He, as well as, Rizal had a wide political vision of the Philippines. This would be not unrelated to his Malay consciousness. Mabini said that the Philippine Revolution had 'its sole and final end to maintain alive and resplendent the torch of liberty and civilization in Oceania, to illuminate the gloomy night in which the vilified and degraded Malay race find itself, in order that it may be led to the road of social emancipation.'[136] Furthermore, he also wished to have future co-operation with 'the different peoples of Malaysia … if not unity.'[137] The nationalist hoped that 'the Philippines were ready to become part of a confederation of Asian states.'[138] However, when he produced a draft of the Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines in 1898, he chartered a realistic course and clearly defined the territory of the nation.

> The Republic of the Philippines is the union of all Filipinos residing within the territory comprised of the Islands of Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao, the Jolo Archipelago and other adjacent islands found within the region formerly known by the name of Islas Filipinas.[139]

The territory was based on the one of Spain and included in Mindanao and Sulu Archipelago. The draft further mentioned:

---

[135] Purposes of the *Liga Filipina*: 1. To unite the whole Archipelago into a compact, vigorous, and homogenous body; 2. Mutual protection in every case of trouble and need; 3. Defense against every violence and injustice; 4. Development of education, agriculture, and commerce; 5. Study and implementation of reforms. See in Jose Rizal, *Jose Rizal's Political and Historical Writing*, Manila: National Historical Institute, 2007, p. 309.
[136] Cesar Adib Majul, *Apolinario Mabini Revolutionary*, Manila: Vertex Press, 1964, p. 204.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Ibid.
[139] The government of the Philippines website: http://malacanang.gov.ph/8128-the-constitutional-program-of-the-philippine-republic/ (Accessed on 1 Sept. 2016.)

The Marianas Islands, the Carolinas, and other territories which were subject to the

Spanish government in the Oceania region, will become an integral part of the

Philippine Republic, if they voluntarily take up the cause of the Filipinos to secure

independence.[140]

This view was the same as Andres Bonifacio in this period who formed the secret

society, 'Katipunan' for the purpose of achieving independence from Spain and led to

the Philippine Revolution. Bonifacio wished to gain independence for the Philippines

archipelago and had much stronger consciousness of Filipino, not of Malay.[141] While

Rizal and Mabini wished to co-operate with other Malays in the Pacific, Bonifacio and

Emilio Aguinaldo, the first president of the nation, did not consider to do so.

The frame of the nation has been perceived since then, but it was not until in the

1930s that the proposal of the Malay based nation came up. Wenceslao Vinzons, a later

politician and leader of guerrillas against Japanese army, argued for a united Malay

nation. For this purpose, he formed '*Perhempoean Orang Malayoe*' which was organised

for Filipinos and students in Manila from Southern Siam, the Malay Peninsula, the

current Indonesia and Polynesia.[142] It is notable that Filipinos themselves set up the

association in solidarity with the Malays in this period, and it is interesting that the

proposal was made at quite an early stage among Southeast Asian nationalists. Then,

Wenceslao who was still a student in the University of the Philippines delivered a speech

titled 'Malayan Irredenta' in February 1932. [143] The speaker argued that 'a political

[140] Ibid.

[141] Ikehata Setsuho, *Filipin Kakumei to Katorishizumu (The Philippine Revolution and Catholicism)*, Tokyo: Keisou Shobou, 1987, pp. 111-112. As a matter of fact, Bonifacio used 'Tagalog,' not Filipino. According to Ikehata, 'Tagalog' was the same meaning as Filipino.

[142] Rommel A. Curaming, Ibid., p. 251.

[143] See the full text on Ismail Hussein, *Antara Dunia Melayu dengan Dunia Kebangsaan*, Bangi: Penerbit UKM, 1990, Lampiran 1, pp. 47-52. He titled 'Malaysian Irredenta.' (p. 47), but it would seem that the correct title was 'Malayan Irredenta.' Associate Professor, Augusto V. de Viana, Department of History, Faculty of Arts and Letters, University of Santo Tomas informed me on 26 July, 2017.

outlook that was confined to national boundaries circumscribed the struggle against colonial yoke.'[144] It is noteworthy here that Filipinos themselves considered the unified or integrated territory of the Malay Archipelago as a political unit. The student strongly asserted the formation of a 'Republic of Malaysia.' He did not use the word 'Malay World' or *Alam Melayu*,[145] but his 'Malaysia' was synonymous with the term. He mentioned that the origin of 'Malaysia' was from Srivijaya and Majapahit, and said that Srivijaya ranged from Formosa (Taiwan) to Ceylon (Sri Lanka), and south Java and the Maluku.[146] Furthermore, he argued for the following scope for Malaysia: 'A unified Malaysia extending from the northern extremity of the Malay Peninsula to the shores of New Guinea, from Madagascar to the Philippines and to the remotest islands of Polynesia.'[147] His vision was to form a single nation 'redeemed Malaysia … beyond ... territorial boundaries,' but it follows that the national territory of 'Malaysia' was quite large area. He wished to establish the nation by giving 'birth to a new nationalism' for Malaysia. This nation was for him to make salvation of Filipinos' prosperity.[148] Unfortunately, the political leader was killed by the Japanese army in 1942. His goal was not achieved, but Diosdado Macapagal, the ninth president of the Philippines inherited this vision.

While Manuel Quezon and Claro Recto had a dream of unifying the Malay people before the Second World War,[149] Macapagal managed seemingly to do so in the 1960s under MAPHILINDO (the loose confederation of Malaya, the Philippines and Indonesia). Macapagal proposed the formation of 'a Confederation of Greater Malaysia' including the Philippines, Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, Brunei, and Sabah in July 1962.[150] He did not include Indonesia for the first time, but the President of the Philippines referred to

---

[144] Ibid., p. 47.
[145] The term 'Malay World' will be discussed in the next chapter.
[146] Ibid., p. 50.
[147] Ibid., p. 51.
[148] Ibid., pp. 51-52.
[149] Rommel, ibid., p. 252 and Diosdado Macapagal, *The Philippines Turns East*, Quezon City: Mac Publishing House, 1966, p. 43.
[150] *The Straits Times*, 28 July, 1962, p. 1.

the inclusion of Indonesia by March 1963.[151] He said that 'the establishment of MAPHILINDO will remove the barriers that have been built artificially to divide the peoples of the Malay race' and he also looked forward to the rebirth of a region as the house of free Malay peoples.[152] Macapagal emphasised that MAPHILINDO was 'a voluntary association' of three independent nations and was not a single super-state.[153] As a matter of fact, it was too late to dissolve three countries with strong nationalisms and form a single super-state by the time. After the Philippines and Indonesia gained independence, it was impossible to establish a Malay super-state. Instead, the loose confederation was the best way to pursue the Vinzons' dream. However, if the three countries combined into one nation, disruption similar to that of Yugoslavia would inevitably occur. There also might have been a serious political conflict between Tunku Abdul Rahman and Sukarno.

MAPHILINDO was a legacy of Rizal and Vinzons' dreams. The predecessors wished to have a single Malay nation but unfortunately MAPHILINDO was not a nation, but 'a new region.' The president, who joined Vinzons' association before the Second World War, found it almost impossible to establish a new nation that combined all the Malay races.  As such, he attempted to unite the region 'based on natural and ... permanent and indestructible affinities'[154] by forming the regional organization to reflect the predecessors' dreams. Macapagal might have wished that the name of the organisation and the region would have been 'Malaysia' following Vinzons' proposal. As discussed above, since the nineteenth century Filipinos have dreamt of their own polity based on the Malay race, this term was quite natural to apply to the whole area for Filipinos. However, as the Federation of Malaya re-named its own territory as 'Malaysia' in 1963. Filipinos had no choice but to term the region and the organization as

[151] Justus M. van der Kroef, 'Maphilindo: Illusion or Reality?,' *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 5 Sept., 1963, p. 641.
[152] Diosdado Macapagal, 'Maphilindo,' 21 Aug. 1963, in *The Philippines Turn East*, p. 39.
[153] Ibid., p. 40 and p. 42.
[154] Ibid., p. 57.

MAPHILINDO as a last resort. Macapagal and other Filipino politicians must have felt uncomfortable for the new country's name, the Federation of Malaysia, because only a small part of the archipelago was termed 'Malaysia,' in spite of the fact that the original meaning was the appellation of the whole Malay Archipelago.[155] Unfortunately, the region and the organization disappeared in a few months due to little interest shown by Sukarno and the Tunku.[156]

**Evolving regional consciousness**

The Philippines was historically an isolated area, and this has had a significant impact on the formation of the 'Filipino' identity. The small communities, or *barangays*, spread throughout the archipelago prior to the arrival of Spain. Unfortunately, these communities were not centralised; an empire in the area was inexistent before the arrival of Spain. Consequently, the Philippines hardly possess any myths, historical relics, or ancient documents. Filipinos cannot share any historical past. This was the reason for their isolation from the Malay World.

Christianity was the major religion in the northern area of the Philippines after the Spanish empire propagated it, and this caused Filipinos to remain isolated from the Malay World. In the Malay Archipelago, the northern Philippines was, and remains to be, exceptionally dominated by Christians, while major parts of the Archipelago were Islamised. The southern parts of the Philippines, i.e. Mindanao, Sulu Archipelago and their adjacent islands, were predominated by Islam prior to the invasion of the Spaniards. The Islamised areas had close trading relations with other Muslim-dominated islands

---

[155] Usha Mahajani, an Indian political science scholar, mentioned Vinzons' idea as 'Malaya Irredenta' in the time of period of Sabah Claim dispute with Malaysia. She might have used the actual title of Vinzons' speech 'Malaysia Irredenta' purposely. See in her article, 'The Development of Philippine Asianism,' *Asian Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (1965).
[156] For details on MAPHILINDO, see the chapter 5.

such as Borneo, Java and Sulawesi.[157] Through these relations, Muslims in the south shared an Islamic culture and history each other. Meanwhile, the Christians in the north were not close to the Muslims because of the policy of cracking down on Muslims by Spain. This policy later arose a deep hatred towards the Christians by the southern Muslims. Due to a series of long term tragedies, the Northern Philippines became minor, and was isolated from the Malay World. This religious isolation tormented the nineteenth century nationalists.

Subsequently, the nationalists sought to find their identity, the Malay race. This is the reason Rizal researched the history of Java and Sumatra, and at the same time studied the Malay language. It is noteworthy that his documents referred to the two terms: Malay and Filipino Malay, or simply, Malay. He acknowledged two different two identities. It would seem that the reason why he sought to establish the Malay identity was because he may have sought to unify the Malay World that was divided by the colonial powers.

However, the Philippine Revolution made it impossible to unify the Malay World, since the nationalists attempted to regain independence within the Spanish colonial territory after the death of Rizal. The nationalists, Bonafacio and Aguinaldo, did not pursue the Malay identity as a national fundamental element. This is probably due to three reasons. First of all, they had to fight against three colonial regimes, namely, Spain/the U.S., the British and the Dutch, in order to unify and collaborate, hence become liberated from the powers. In particular, the British power was the strongest in the world at this period of time. As the Filipinos spent a great deal of energy and time to remove the Spaniards from the islands with the help of the U.S. forces, it was physically difficult to engage in wars with other colonial powers at the same time. Second, it was difficult for Christian Filipinos to have contact and relations with intellectuals or nationalists in other areas of the Malay Archipelago. This was due to the non-emergence of nationalists

---

[157] Najeeb M. Saleeby, *The History of Sulu*, Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1963, p. 21.

at the time. Filipino nationalism emerged and developed for the first time in Southeast Asia, so that in this sense the nationalists were also in isolation. Finally, the last reason they nationalists did not pursue to unify the Malay World was due to the difficulty of communication between Filipinos and the people in other areas of the Archipelago. Most of Christian Filipino intellectuals in the nineteenth century had learnt the Spanish language, and English at a later period (Rizal was an exceptional multi-European language speaker); they were unable to speak the Malay language, which was a *lingua franca* throughout the Malay Archipelago. This was partly because of the historical background, and the fact that the Northern Philippines had no historical empires. Thus, even if the above two factors were clear, Christian Filipino nationalists/intellectuals would have faced communication problems. In order to overcome this issue in the future, Rizal and other nationalists may have studied the language. This point cannot be overlooked. These factors led to a struggle by the nationalists for independence within the territory of the Spanish empire, during, and after, the Philippine Revolution.

From a broad perspective, the Philippine Revolution led the nationalists to give up attempting to unify the Malay World, and to choose their own path to independence. As previously mentioned, a politician had a dream to establish 'the Republic of Malaysia' in the 1930s, but this never developed in the political mainstream in the Philippines. The territory of the Philippines, which was basic compared to that of the Spain and the US, was self-evident among the nationalists at the time. Consequently, the territory was stipulated in the 1935 Constitution. This meant that for Filipinos, the Malay World was a forgotten region until the short-lived confederation, MAPHILINDO, was formed in 1963. Alternatively, Filipinos looked at the region of Asia.

Although the Japanese military government formed its coined region, the Great East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere in the 1940s, Filipinos never welcomed[158] the Japanese like the Thai government, and nominally used the Japanese-created term. After the war they also followed the Western-coined regional concept. The European and American powers, and later Filipino politicians, seldom used the regional terms, 'the Malay Archipelago,' 'Indian Archipelago,' 'Malaysia' or 'Indonesia,' after the war,[159] and instead relied on the terms 'Asia,' 'the Far East' and 'South East Asia.' The Philippine foreign policy between the 1946 independence and 1950 was directed towards Europe and the U.S., since the new country was greatly influenced by these regions. Russell Fifield observed that even after independence, 'it was difficult to adjust to the concept of Asian neighbours.'[160] Interestingly enough, the fifth President of the Philippines, Manuel Roxas, perceived that the island country belonged to a part of the Western world in international politics.[161]

However, it was Elpidio Quirino, the next President, who proactively developed to deepen diplomatic relations with neighbours in Asia with the expansion of communism surrounding the country. He stated that 'In the light of political developments in Southeast Asia, and the turbulent conditions in our immediate vicinity, the Philippines should further strengthen its position.'[162] As Quirino expressed the term 'Southeast Asia' in his 1949 speech, he had perceived that his country belonged to the region. When President of Indonesia, Sukarno, paid an official visit to Manila in 1951, Quirino mentioned that his visit was 'a historic moment in the life of the peoples of Southeast

[158] José P. Laurel, *War Memoirs: Written in Yokohama and Sugamo Prisons*, Manila: José P. Laurel Memorial Foundation, 1962, pp. 60-61.

[159] The terms, 'Malaysia' and 'Indonesia' will be discussed in the next chapter.

[160] Russell H. Fifield, *The Diplomacy of Southeast Asia: 1945-1958*, Archon Books, 1968, p. 84.

[161] 'Remarks of His Excellency Manuel Roxas President-elect of the Philippines At the Overseas Writers' Club,' May 16, 1946. Roxas also emphasised on developing relations with neighbouring countries. The government of the Philippines website: http://www.gov.ph/1946/05/16/remarks-of-president-elect-roxas-at-the-overseas-writers-club/ (Accessed on 1 Sept. 2016)

[162] 'State-of-the-Nation Message of President Quirino to the Joint Session of the Congress of the Philippines' Jan. 24, 1949. The government of the Philippines website: http://www.gov.ph/1949/01/24/state-of-the-nation-message-of-president-quirino-to-the-joint-session-of-the-congress-of-the-philippines/ (Accessed on 1 Sept. 2016)

Asia,' but Quirino did not place emphasis on their racial ties.[163] When Quirino visited Jakarta in 1952, he mentioned that the two countries had 'the consciousness of a common racial origin', and had been under Srivijaya and Majapahit,[164] but he focused more on the diplomatic relations in Southeast Asia, than on the racial ties, and also recognised that the two countries belonged to the members of Southeast Asia. In order to prevent the threat of communism in Asia, the Filipino leader took the initiative to hold the Baguio Conference in 1950, and sought to establish regional cooperation on security, but failed to form a regional organization which the Philippines wished. The Philippine government joined SEATO in 1954, [165] which the U.S. organised, and this further strengthened its security. Therefore, the Filipinos' regional consciousness based on the Malay race had not been formulated. With the world order imposed by Europe and the U.S., the Philippines strengthened its regional consciousness of Southeast Asia in terms of security[166] starting from the 1940s. This consciousness among Filipinos was developed to establish ASEAN in 1967.

**Conclusion**

As is well known, Thailand was never colonised politically. However, in terms of foreign policy and regional awareness in the nineteenth and twentieth century, it adhered to the regional concepts designed by the West. The Thai elites began creating a Southeast Asian regional consciousness after the Second World War. Unlike Siam, Burma, Cambodia and Vietnam were colonised by the British and the French. Thus, the borders of Siam were drawn not by its people, but through colonial force and request. The kings

---

[163] 'Extemporaneous Welcome Address of President Quirino to President and Madame Sukarno,' Jan. 28, 1951. The government of the Philippines website:
http://www.gov.ph/1951/01/28/extemporaneous-welcome-address-of-president-quirino-to-president-and-madame-sukarno/
(Accessed on 1 Sept. 2016)
[164] Carlos R. Lazo, *Quirino selected speeches*, Manila: Orient Publishing, 1953, p. 302 and p. 304.
[165] The conference and SEATO will be discussed in the chapter 5.
[166] See the details in Usha Mahajani, 'The Development of Philippine Asianism,' *Asian Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (1965).

of Siam, who were at the centre of political power, struggled to maintain independence by using their diplomatic skills.

Regional awareness and consciousness were the result of interaction with Westerners. At the end of Rama III's reign in 1850, a U.S. mission was sent to Bangkok using the term 'Southeast Asia.' The royal court most likely noticed the regional term used and this was one of the earliest recorded uses of the term in the country.

King Mongkut, who spoke English and promoted Western civilisation, had a regional consciousness through contact with the British and the U.S. Although it seems that he learnt the terms such as 'Indian Archipelago' and 'South-East Asia' through English books and newspapers, his documents show that he used 'East Asia' and simply 'Asia.' Thus, the king had a broad regional consciousness. His successor, King Chulalongkorn, travelled to Asian and European countries a few times, and had a solid understanding of international politics. He often discussed with European officers and read English newspapers and books, as well as learnt regional terms surrounding Siam. His brother, Prince Damrong, also occasionally used the term 'East' in his documents. Thus, the royal family shared similar perspectives on the region.

After Siam was accepted as a single independent country and became a member of the League of Nations, the Siamese had been aware of other regional concepts such as 'Far East' and 'Malaysia.' Up to the time, the kings had an awareness of only 'East' and 'East Asia,' but Siam's delegates, mainly princes, followed the concepts coined by the West. Interestingly enough, the son of King Chulalongkorn, King Vajiravudh, the first king who studied overseas, seemed to know regional concepts quite well, but he seldom used 'Asia,' and consistently used 'East' or 'Far East' when he indicated the Asian region and East Asia. It can be said that he might have tried to avoid using the term 'Asia' that Europeans had long used as a discriminatory term.

During the Second World War, Siam's elites, who governed after the 1932 Revolution, were forced to follow the Japanese regional concept, 'Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity' to survive in a turbulent era and sustain Thailand's independence. The regional concept was almost synonymous with the Far East created by the West, but the Siamese remained the sense of regional consciousness that Thailand belonged to. The formation and operation of SEAC during the war led to change Thai people's regional consciousness. Some Siamese were aware of the term 'South East Asia,' but Thai people quickly followed the regional concept after the term became an international political word. For that reason, Thai elites, as we will discuss in later chapter, sought to co-operate with surrounding small countries.

To conclude, Thai people always followed the regional concepts coined by the West before and after the World War. Their consciousness was only over a broad region prior to the Second World War. The Siamese had no consciousness and recognition of the region of the present-day mainland Southeast Asia with the maritime one until the end of the world war.

The Philippines is a unique country in that nationalists attempted to embrace Malay identity and merge it into their national consciousness. Some Filipino nationalists also perceived a 'region' in which Malay race lived as their national frame. This was due to the development of Christianity, a religion to which the majority of Filipino subscribe to.

With the development of nationalism, Filipino nationalists sought to establish their own identity. At the early stage they attempted to pursue the two identities, namely both Malay and Filipino identities. For example, Jose Rizal first embraced a consciousness of the Malay race and traced it back to its origins in European works. For him the most important requirement to be a Malay was the Malay language. Nevertheless, the Christian islanders had no knowledge to understand it, because the Philippines had no centralised and powerful polities in the past before the arrival of Spaniard and further because they

were isolated regionally, except for the people in the parts of the southern islands. On the other hand, the Muslims in the south, who had already come to believe in Islam before the arrival, had shared Islam with the present-day Indonesia and Malaysia through trading. Thus, they had knowledge to speak the Malay language as a *lingua franca*. In this respect, the Christians and Muslims had a gap in their Malay race consciousness. Rizal and other nationalists, who learnt the 'regional' terms, 'the Malay Archipelago' and 'Malaysia,' felt from the 'Malay world' because of the lack of the language knowledge.

On the other hand, Rizal also pursued the creation of a Filipino consciousness. His expression, 'Malay Filipino,' is evidence of this. It can be said that he had a 'Double Identity.' This double identity was taken over by nationalists after his death, such as Bonifacio and Mabini. Mabini, who prepared a constitutional draft in 1898, had a Malay consciousness and wished to unify the area that the Malays lived into a single political entity. However, the draft took a realistic stance that the national borders were delimited within the Spanish territory. This stance was inherited during independence after the Second World War. Further, Emilio Aguinaldo, the first President of the Philippines, sought to gain independence within the Spanish/American territory. Subsequently, the nationalists insisted on their territory for their new independence country. This request became their main stream up to the time when the Philippines achieved independence after the Second World War. Thus, it can be said that the Philippine Revolution caused them to focus on only the colonial territory and to abandon the unification of the Malays' dwelling areas. However, some nationalists did not give up the establishment of the country based on the Malay race. Although Manuel Quezon and Claro Recto shared the same dream, Wesceslao Vinzons seriously considered the formation of a new country called 'Malaysia' to include all the Malays in the entire archipelago. He was killed by Japanese invaders during the World War, and his political idea was aborted.

By gaining independence, newly-emerged states such as the Philippines and Indonesia were divided with borders. At the same time Europeans and Americans seldom used the regional terms based on the Malay race. This resulted in the Filipinos 'losing' a sense of consciousness of the region. As the Europeans introduced the new regional concept, South East Asia, the Philippines also followed the concept.

The President, Magapacal, formed MAPHILINDO in 1963, but the loose confederation was brought to an end after a few months. By the time it was impossible to form any polities based on the Malay race. The Filipinos have seldom felt racial consciousness and began making consciousness of 'Southeast Asians' based not on any races.

# CHAPTER 4: EMERGENCE OF A REGIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS
# IN MALAYA/MALAYSIA AND INDONESIA

## Introduction

The section on Malaysia is divided into three parts. First of all, we will discuss the concept of the regional term the 'Malay Archipelago' as used among Europeans, in particular the British, with some discussions on what constitutes a Malay, which is still a controversial and complicated issue among many scholars. The following section examines the origins and concept of the term 'Malaysia,' which has been the chosen name for the country since 1963. Although Wang Gungwu pointed out that this term has been in use since the nineteenth century,[1] the pervasiveness of this term among Europeans and Malay intellectuals is, as of now, still unknown and has not been discussed sufficiently. The last part of the chapter analyses the consciousness and sense of belonging of the Malay intellectuals with the region between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The section on Indonesia, focuses on how Europeans named the archipelago, which is located in the south-eastern area of the Asian Continent. It also discusses how the locals of the islands perceived the area surrounding them. With the development of nationalism in the 1920s, the regional consciousness of key nationalists before the Second World War, namely Sukarno and Mohammad Hatta, will be discussed. In particular, Sukarno's construct of the region will be examined.

---

[1] Wang Gungwu, *Community and Nation: Essays on Southeast Asia and the Chinese*, Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books (Asia), 1981, p. 210.

**Malaya/Malaysia**

**Historical background**

Malaysia is a unique federated country consisting of the states in the Malay Peninsula (West Malaysia), as well as parts of Borneo (East Malaysia). The West Malaysian borders with Thailand are at the north side of the peninsula, and on Sumatra island of Indonesia at the south. Singapore is adjacent to Johor, which is located south of the peninsula. On the other hand, Sabah in East Malaysia shares borders with the Philippines and Indonesia. Sarawak is adjacent to the long border with Indonesia, and at the same time encompasses the country of Brunei.

The kingdom of Melaka was established by Parameswara, a Hindu-Buddhist prince in Melaka during the early fifteenth century. The first king decided to locate there because of a good harbour accessible in all seasons, and the location is at the narrowest part of the Straits, where shipping was most concentrated. He hired '*orang laut*' (sea people) as a seaborne police force to protect the kingdom, and created trading and warehouse facilities and administrative systems on the land. It attracted traders to engage in business there. As a result, the kingdom became among the greatest Asian harbours. At the time Islam was the major religion among traders. So the kings converted to Islam for their business. After the second half of the fifteenth century, the great kingdom became an Islamic centre for scholarships and for spreading the religion elsewhere.[2]

However, the kingdom of Melaka fell to the Portuguese in 1511 because of its strategy to dominate Asian trade. The Portuguese first sent an emissary to the then king, Sultan Mahmud Syah, for amicable agreement. But the Sultan rejected. Thus, the

---

[2] M. C. Ricklefs et al., *A New History of Southeast Asia*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 110-112.

European power sent 1,200 soldiers under Afonso de Albuquerque with seventeen or eighteen military ships to the kingdom. The ships attached with cannons, but the kingdom was well defended. Nevertheless, the kingdom had internal conflicts and this caused it to finally be sacrificed to the Portuguese.[3] Thereafter, with the assistance of '*orang laut*', the Sultan escaped to Sumatra island and passed away there. His son took over the title of Sultan, and then married the sister of the Pahang ruler. The new Sultan moved to the upper reaches of the Johor River, and established there the kingdom of Johor.[4]

By the end of the sixteenth century, the Dutch and the British came to enter the spice trade. In the circumstances, the Dutch combated with the Portuguese in Melaka. With the assistance of logistic support, the construction of trenches and batteries and so forth by Johor, the Dutch captured the old entrepôt from the Portuguese.[5]

Consequently, the British sphere expanded to the Malay Peninsula in the nineteenth century. While it has gained a foothold in Penang, and Singapore by 1820, the conclusion of the Anglo-Dutch Treaty in 1824 firmly established the British sphere in the Peninsula. According to the treaty, Java and Sumatra remained the preserve of the Dutch, while Melaka became a British possession in exchange of Bengkulen on Sumatra's east coast. In short, the Straits of Melaka had a 'border' between the British and the Dutch. The agreement standed as 'one of the key events in the shaping of modern Malaysia.'[6]

The nineteenth century also witnessed the formation of a plural society in the peninsula. The Chinese began to come to mining areas in the peninsula by the first half of the century, and the number of Chinese increased towards the twentieth century.

---

[3] M. C. Ricklefs et al., *ibid.*, p. 128.
[4] Barbara Watson Andaya and Leonard Y. Andaya, *A History of Malaysia*, London: Palgrave, 2001 (Second edition), p. 59.
[5] Ibid., p. 72.
[6] Ibid., p. 125.

When the first census was officially made in 1891, about half of the total population of Perak, Selangor and Sungai Ujung (Negeri Sembilan), and 79% of the population of Kuala Lumpur were Chinese.[7] Their activities greatly impacted its local economy. On the other hand, Indians came to work in the peninsula since the 1870s. The number of Indians increased after the British legalised Indian migration to the Straits Settlement in 1872, and to the Protected States in 1884. Most of the migrants, who came from Tamil areas, laboured for coffee plantations, public projects, and road and rail construction.[8] However, most of the three groups, i.e., Malays, Chinese and Indians, separately lived in the society: Malays lived in coasts and villages; Chinese in areas surrounding mining and towns; and Indians in rubber plantations. It was quite advantageous for the British to divide each of the ethnic societies, because it would not help to unify them against the colonial regime.[9]

In East Malaysia, Sarawak and North Borneo were governed by the British. James Brook assisted to suppress uprisings by Malay chiefs for a raja muda, and afterwards induced the Brunei Sultan to grant him as a fief some areas. Awarded the title of raja of Sarawak, Brook established a capital in Kuching in 1841.[10] The Brook's reign continued by the Second World War.

In North Borneo, Alfred Dent established a North Borneo company and leased the land of North Borneo from *Temenggong* of Brunei and Sultan of Sulu in 1878. The British government granted an official Royal charter to the company in 1881. The area of North Borneo with Sarawak and Brunei became a protectorate of the British in 1888.[11] The protectorate continued by 1963, except for the period of Japanese occupation.

[7] Ibid, p. 178.
[8] Ibid., p. 181.
[9] Setsuho Ikehata (ed.), *Tounan ajiashi II (history of Southeast Asia II)*, Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1999, pp. 268-270.
[10] Barbara Watson Andaya and Leonard Y. Andaya, *ibid*., pp. 128-129.
[11] *Ibid*., pp. 188-190.

With the return of the British after the Second World War, the British introduced the Malayan Union in 1946. However, a Malay nationalist by the name of Dato Onn Jafaar and others were strongly against it. It led the group to establish the United Malay National Organisation (UMNO) in the same year. Other political parties such as the Malayan Indian Congress (MIC) and non-communist based Malayan Chinese Association (MCA) were also formed in 1946 and 1949 respectively.[12] The three organisations represented each ethnic group, and the political parties began seeking together to gain independence in the 1950s. After municipal elections in 1952, UMNO and MCA won, but a non-communal party, the Independence of Malaya Party (IMP), formed by Dato Onn Jaafar after he left from UMNO, failed to win the seats. UMNO and MCA formalised their alliance during the next year. With the MIC joining in 1954, the three communal parties gained the majority at the national elections in 1955.[13] Finally, this led to achieve independence.

The Federation of Malaya gained independence in 1957, but it was far from emergence of a Malayan national consciousness, beyond racial identities, of which cultures and languages are different.

The Federation of Malaysia was born in 1963. Needless to say, the new nation was formed with Sabah (North Borneo), Sarawak, and Singapore. The creation of Malaysia caused a problem with Indonesia, which campaigned to destroy the new country called '*Konfrontasi,*'[14] and with the Philippines, which claimed territory over Sabah. The two countries broke off diplomatic relations with Malaysia. In 1965, Singapore departed partly because of personal antagonism between Tunku Abdul

---

[12] MIC was formed in August 1946. MCA has transformed into a political party in 1951. At the early stage, the purpose of the association was to help Chinese in the social and welfare field.

[13] M. C. Ricklefs et al., *A New History of Southeast Asia*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, p. 331.

[14] For detail on Konfrontasi, see J.A.C. Mackie, Konfrontasi: The Indonesia-Malaysia Dispute 1963-1966, London: Oxford University Press, 1974 and Greg Poulgrain, The genesis of Konfrontasi: Malaysia, Brunei and Indonesia, 1945-1965, Petaling Jaya: Strategic Information and Research Development Centre, 2014.

Rahman and the then Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew[15], and partly because of racial frictions.[16] While UMNO made communal approaches, the Singapore ruling party, People's Action Party (PAP), put forward to non-communal approaches. Lee stressed on 'Malaysian Malaysia' since May 1965 by setting up the Malaysian Solidarity Convention. The Malays party UMNO's leaders distrusted the PAP and Lee, and in the end, Singapore was forced to leave from Malaysia. The Malays in Malaysia kept their own identity and preserved their culture in the communal society.

The next sections discuss how the Malays developed their regional awareness in a plural society.

**The term 'Malay Archipelago' and the Malays**

Who are the Malays? The Constitution of the Federation of Malaysia stipulates in article 160: '"Malay" means a person who professes the religion of Islam, habitually speaks the Malay language, and conforms to Malay customs.'[17] In the context of a nation-state, it further stipulated that Malay 'was before Merdeka Day born in the Federation or in Singapore or born of parents one of whom was born in the Federation or in Singapore, or is on that day domiciled in the Federation or in Singapore.'[18] Although the framers of the 1957 Constitution formulated this definition to make the Malay identity clear in the multiracial country, historically speaking, the concept of the Malays is a complicated issue among many scholars. Barnard's *Contesting Malayness: Malay Identity Across Boundaries* is considered to be the best book on this subject,

---

[15] Albert Lau, A moment of anguish: Singapore in Malaysia and the politics of disengagement, Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 2003, p. 292.
[16] See details on the racial point in R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, *Politics and Government in Malaysia*, Singapore: Federal Publications, 1978, pp. 71-73.
[17] Legal Research Board (ed.), *Federal Constitution (as at 25th April 2006)*, Petaling Jaya: International Law Book Services, 2006, p. 198. For 'Malay customs' in the Constitution, Anthony Milner has a little discussion in his work. See Anthony Milner, *The Malays*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, p. 4
[18] Ibid.

where twelve prominent scholars discussed the concept. However, in the end they could not reach any consensus on the subject. The editors concluded that 'Melayu,' 'Malay,' and 'Maleis' 'remain elusive' and furthermore that Malayness is 'one of the most challenging and confusing terms in the world of Southeast Asia.'[19] Anthony Milner also argues that 'speaking Malay definitely does not imply in itself that a person identifies as a "Malay."' He mentioned that Malays who have Javanese background and speak the Malay language in the Peninsula called themselves 'Malay.'[20]

Nevertheless, from the discussions in the book, it can at least be confirmed that the term 'Malay' was used to refer to a specific race in the nineteenth century. Thus, it can be said that the Malay Peninsula and Malay Archipelago was named based on this racial concept. Here, it is important to highlight how Europeans perceived these two geographical terms in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Pointing out the discussion by Leonard Andaya, Reid said that apparently the term '*Melayu*' applied to a place in Sumatra or the Straits of Melaka.[21] It is said that Ptolemy, an Egyptian geographer, was the first to use this term in the second century. It was then not termed for people, but for the west coast of the Malay Peninsula.[22] Reid suggested that *Sejarah Melayu* mentioned *Melayu* as being the name of a small river in Sumatra,[23] and though the term was used as a place/region/nation before the nineteenth century, it was Thomas Stamford Raffles who transformed the term into the name of a race when he published *Sejarah Melayu* in 1821, titling it *Malay Annals* in English.[24] Reid argued that Raffles titled his book 'as if to show it was the story of a people,'[25] although

---

[19] Timothy P. Barnard (ed.), *Contesting Malayness: Malay Identity Across Boundaries*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2004, p. xiii.
[20] Anthony Milner, *The Malays*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, p. 3.
[21] Anthony Reid, 'Understanding Melayu (Malay) as a Source of Diverse Modern Identities,' in ibid., p. 3. See details on origins of *Melayu* in Leonard Andaya, 'The Search for the "Origins" of Melayu,' in ibid., pp. 56-75.
[22] Ibid., pp. 3-4. For Ptolemy's study on his geography, see G. E. Gerini, *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia (Further India and Indo-Malay Archipelago)*, New Delhi: Devendra Jain for Oriental Books, 1974 (Originally published in 1909).
[23] Timothy P. Barnard (ed.), ibid., p. 4.
[24] This Malay Annals was translated by John Leyden. Raffles wrote the introduction. See details in John Leyden, *Sejarah Melayu: The Malay Annals*, Kuala Lumpur: Silverfish Books, 2012.
[25] Ibid., p. 11.

*Sejarah Melayu* just narrated the story of a ruler. Raffles wrote before its publication that he regarded *Melayu* as a race in Asia:

> I cannot but consider the Malayu nation as one people, speaking one language, though spread over so wide a space, and preserving their character and customs, in all the maritime states lying between the Sulu Seas, and the southern Ocean, and bounded longitudinally by Sumatra and the western side of Papua or New Guinea.[26]

Although this article has not used 'Malay Archipelago' only using simply 'Archipelago' and 'eastern Archipelago,' it is obvious from the above sentences that the author regarded the archipelago as a single unit of the Malays. If Reid's argument is correct, in that Raffles renamed *Melayu* as the name for an entire race, it follows that travellers and scholars after this period described the Malay Archipelago as the region that the Malays inhabited. As Anthony Milner pointed out, Europeans had employed the term 'Malay' in a loose manner and also 'the idea of "Malay" began to be formulated more precisely by Europeans.[27]

Conceivably, the person who defined the 'Malay Archipelago' at quite an earlier stage was a British historian and linguist, William Marsden.[28] His book, *A Grammar of the Malayan Language*, clearly shows that the Archipelago was the area that the 'Malayu language' was spoken, i.e. the Malayan peninsula, Sumatra, Java, Borneo, Celebes, Moluccas, and the Philippines.[29] Marsden mentioned that he read Raffles'

---

[26] Thomas Raffles, 'On the Malayu Nation, with a translation of its Maritime Institutions,' *Asiatick Researches*, Vol. 12 (1816), p. 103.

[27] Anthony Milner, *The Malays*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, p. 119.

[28] See his own autobiography in William Marsden, *A Brief Memoir of the life and writings of the late William Marsden*, London: J. L. Cox and Sons, 1838.

[29] William Marsden, *A Grammar of the Malayan Language*, London: Cox and Baylis, 1812, p. i.

article in 1816,[30] so he most likely defined it based on Raffles' statement, i.e. the Malayu nation as one people.

John Crawfurd did not use the term 'Malay Archipelago' in his book, *The History of the Indian Archipelago*,[31] and had consistently employed the term 'Indian Archipelago,' in which the definition is thought to be the same as the 'Malay Archipelago.' His descriptive dictionary published in 1856 did not list the term 'Malay Archipelago.' Instead, the author created a heading titled 'Archipelago,' in which he briefly mentioned the Malay and Philippine Archipelagos.[32] This shows that the scope of the archipelago is the same as the current maritime Southeast Asia. This dictionary also included a heading titled 'Malay,' where the term is defined as 'a people of the brown complexioned race, with lank hair'[33] with a Malay language speaker. The heading explains that the Malays inhabited the area from Sumatra to New Guinea and from the Malay Peninsula to Timor. It is not clear whether the author avoided using the term 'Malay Archipelago' or preferred to use the 'Indian Archipelago,' but the word 'Archipelago' in the heading was based on his definition of the Malays.

The bestseller, *Malay Archipelago*, a book that is well known even to this day, clearly describes the region of interest in this study. The author Alfred Wallace zoologically defined the archipelago to include the Malay Peninsula as far as Tenasserim, and the Nicobar Islands on the west, the Philippines in the north, and the Solomon Islands beyond New Guinea in the east, and extending for more than 4,000 miles in length from east to west and is about 1,300 miles in breadth from north to south.[34] He divided it further into five groups: The Indo-Malay islands (Malay

---

[30] Ibid., p. v. While Raffles's article is published in 1816, the publication year by Marsden is in 1812. I could not find the reason for this inconsistency, but I will follow Marsden's statement.

[31] John Crawfurd, History of the Indian Archipelago containing an account of the manners, arts, languages, religions, institutions, and commerce of its inhabitants, Vol. I-III, Edinburgh: Archibald Constable and Co., 1820.

[32] John Crawfurd, A Descriptive Dictionary of the Islands and Adjacent countries, London: Bradbury and Evans, 1856, p. 13.

[33] Ibid., p. 249.

[34] Alfred Russel Wallace, Malay Archipelago: The land of the orang-utan, and the bird of paradise, A narrative of travel, with studies of man and nature, London: Macmillan and co., 1869, pp. 3-4.

Peninsula, Singapore, Borneo, Java, and Sumatra), the Timor group (Timor, Flores, Sumbawa, and Lombok), Celebes, the Maluku groups, and the Papuan group.[35] In an academic conference in 1863 he also mentioned, 'The Malay - or I should prefer to name it, the Indo-Australian – Archipelago' within the rough scope of 'all the islands between south-eastern Asia and Australia.'[36] This book focused on geography, nature, and zoology in the unknown world specifically targeting European readers, attracting many readers as well as winning positive and favourable reviews from numerous newspapers.[37] The title of his book popularised the term among Europeans. In 1865, his paper proposed zoologically and racially to divide the archipelago into two areas, i.e. the Indo-Malay and Austro-Malay region [38] with the description that the Malays occupied the entire archipelago[39] without a specific definition of the Malays. Wallace mentioned Crawfurd's dissertation, i.e. the *Dissertation on the Affinities of the Malayan Languages* (1852), [40] to justify why naturalists grouped the archipelago and termed it based on the Malay language, which prevailed over the area.

Although Isabella Bird, an English traveller, who visited Singapore and the Malay Peninsula in the 1880s, did not define any regional term specifically, she defined Malay as including 'Borneo, Sumatra, Celebes, Bali, and other islands of the Malay Archipelago.'[41] She also explains that the Malays who spoke the Malay language and professed Islam inhabited the Malay Peninsula, and almost all the coasts of Borneo and Sumatra. The English traveller understood the Malay Archipelago as an area where the

---

[35] Ibid., pp. x-xi.
[36] Alfred Russell Wallace, 'On the Physical Geography of the Malay Archipelago,' *The Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London*, Vol. 33 (1863), p. 218.
[37] For reviews, see *The London Standard*, 26 March 1869, p. 3, *The Examiner*, 3 April 1869, p. 7, and *Morning Post*, 12 November 1869, p. 1. *Morning Post* advertised this book with a brief extract taken from a review of *the Guardian*.
[38] Alfred Russell Wallace, 'On the Varieties of Man in the Malay Archipelago,' *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, Vol. 3 (1865), p. 211.
[39] Ibid., p. 205.
[40] Ibid., p. 214. For Crawfurd's dissertation, John Crawford, *A Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language with preliminary dissertation*, London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1852.
[41] Isabella Bird, The Golden Chersonese: A 19th century Englishwoman's Travels in Singapore and the Malay Peninsula, Singapore: Monsoon Books, 2010, p. 115.

Malays dwelt.[42] As she wrote not as an academic professional but as a traveller, it can be said that general readers would understand the use of the regional term well.

In the twentieth century, R. O. Winstedt, the former administrator of British Malaya and scholar on the subject of Malays, mentioned the term 'Malay Archipelago' once in his book published in 1923,[43] but it would seem that he followed the concept coined in the previous century. After the end of the Second World War, he wrote that the term 'Malay' applied to 'almost all the inhabitants of the Malay archipelago, Formosa, and the Philippines and some of the tribes of Indo-China.'[44] This passage means that his 'Malay archipelago' was the archipelagic area excluding Taiwan and the Philippines. It follows that his definition of 'Malay archipelago' was narrower than Wallece's.

The British in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had reached a consensus in regard to the scope of the 'Malay Archipelago' as the home-islands of Malays. However, while the term was racially and zoologically used, it did not become a political term. The Malays themselves recognised this term, as will be discussed later; but before that, we are going to analyse another Western-coined term of 'Malaysia.'

## The term 'Malaysia' as a region

Malaysia is currently used as the name of a Southeast Asian country. The Federation of Malaysia was formed in 1963 by merging Sabah (formerly North Borneo), Sarawak, and Singapore together with the Federation of Malaya, which achieved independence in 1957. Although Singapore separated from Malaysia in 1965, the two

---

[42] Ibid., p. 31.
[43] R. O. Winstedt (ed.), Malaya: The Straits Settlements and the Federated and Unfederated Malay States, London: Constable and Co., 1923, p. 140.
[44] R. O. Winstedt, *The Malays: A Cultural History*, Singapore: Kelly and Walsh, 1947, p. 4.

parts (West and East Malaysia), divided by the South China Sea, remain a single country. The country's name seems to have emerged in the sudden announcement of the country's first Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman in 1961. When he announced a plan to include the four territories, i.e. Brunei, North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore, in the Foreign Correspondents' Association of South-East Asia in Singapore, it would seem that the Tunku did not mention the word 'Malaysia' in his speech. According to John Drysdale, the Tunku spoke the possibility of a merger with all the above territories to reporters, 'departing from his text.'[45] *The Straits Times* reported this news with a title 'Big "Unity" Plan.'[46] In the article two days later the newspaper titled 'Mighty "Malaysia"'[47] on the front page. Thus, probably the Singaporean newspaper started to use the term 'Malaysia' for the united country. However, the term was not suddenly coined or emerged at the time. The term 'Malaysia' had already been coined in as early as the nineteenth century, but the definition of this term is not the same as the one used up to the Second World War.

The regional term *Malaisie* was first used in public by a French explorer. Jules Dumont d'Urville, who sailed the Pacific between 1826 and 1829, labelled the following four areas in the Pacific, in his presentation to a geological association in 1832, as Polynesia, Micronesia, Melanesia, and Malaysia. His conception of *Malaisie* referred to 'Western Oceania, [encompassing] all the islands commonly known as the East Indies.'[48] It comprised of the Philippines and Indonesia excluding New Guinea. However, the map that he came up with seemed to have excluded the Malay Peninsula in his conception. He divided Malaysia into two areas on the basis of language: the Sunda Islands and the Moluccas, in which the Malay language was spoken, and the

---

[45] John Drysdale, *Singapore Struggle for Success*, Singapore: Times Books Insternational, 1984, p. 260.
[46] *The Straits Times*, 28 May 1961, p. 1.
[47] Ibid., 29 May 1961, p. 1.
[48] Jules-Sébastien-César Dumont D'Urville, (translated by Isabel Ollivier, Antoine de Biran and Geoffrey Clark), 'On the Islands of the Great Ocean,' *The Journal of Pacific History*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (2003), p. 165.

Philippines, in which Tagalog was spoken. Though officially he first used the term *Malaisie* in French, the term had actually been long used before. He said in the presentation 'I shall leave the name of Malaysia to this area, since it has already been used by some authors, and I think was first given by Mr Lessen.'[49]

Apparently this conception was exported to Britain after a few years. The earlier recorded use of the term 'Malaysia' in English was in a travelogue, *The Claims of Japan and Malaysia Upon Christendom,* published in 1839,[50] which recorded voyages to China, Japan, and what is today Indonesia. The authors of the travelogue did not provide us the definition of the term 'Malaysia' at length, which was actually used in the title only, but, judging from the contents, it would seem that the term indicated the whole archipelago of the present maritime Southeast Asia. At the same time, the two volume-book used a few regional terms such as the 'Indian Archipelago,' which saw the most frequent use in the book, followed by the 'Malayan Archipelago,' and the 'Eastern Archipelago.' The book attached a map entitled 'Eastern Islands or Malay Archipelago,' but since the two regional terms are mentioned with an 'or' it would seem that there was no clear distinction between them. In the example of the above-mentioned three terms, all three of them were used interchangeably and were almost synonymous to each other. There was no consistency in the use of the regional terms, so it varied from writer to writer. However, it can be said here that the definition of the term might have been based on the French explorer's writings. Also, the term 'Malaysia' in this period was used for most of the archipelago.

Since then, the term 'Malaysia' has continued to be used for a few decades to indicate the entire archipelago. Published for school teachers in Australia in 1863, the

---

[49] The translators of 'On the Islands of the Great Ocean' point out that Mr. Lessen was Rene-Primavere Lessen or Pierre-Adolphe Lessen. Ibid. p. 165.
[50] Charles William King and G. Tradescant Lay, The Claims of Japan and Malaysia Upon Christendom exhibited in notes of voyages made in 1837, from Canton, in the ship Morrison and brig Himmaleh, under direction of the owners, New York: French, 1839. The first advertisement for this book was placed in The London Standard on 27 March 1839.

book, *The Geography and History of Oceania abridged, or a concise account of Australasia, Malaysia, Polynesia, and Antarctica*, clearly defined the scope of 'Malaysia.' The author explained as follows:

> Malaysia, or the Indian Archipelago
>
> This division takes its name from the Malays, who are the principal inhabitants, and includes the archipelago immediately adjoining the south-eastern coast of Asia, generally known as the East India Is. It lies between lat. 12° 40' S. and 20° N., and long. 95° and 134° E., and consists of minor clusters and chains, intersected by straits and channels. [51]

The author illustrated the details with the islands of Sumatra, Java, Borneo, Celebes, Molucca, and the Philippines. Nevertheless, it would seem that the Malay Peninsula was not included in his regional concept.

Another example that sought to define the term was a travelogue, *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago*, published in 1869 by an American naturalist, Albert Bickmore. The author roughly explained the scope of the term as follows: 'They *(the Malays)* have spread over all Malaysia, that is, the great archipelago between Asia, Australia, and New Guinea.'[52] The travelogue calls Malaysia the area that the Malays inhabited, which is to say that the term was synonymous with the definitions of the 'Indian/Malay Archipelago.' With the publication of the travelogue, a British newspaper, *The Examiner*, reviewed the definition of 'Malaysia' in a more concrete manner where it covered Sumatra, Java, Celebes, Timur, Ceram, Buru, Gilolo, and other

---

[51] Alexander Ireland, The Geography and History of Oceania abridged, or a concise account of Australasia, Malaysia, Polynesia, and Antarctica, Tasmania: W. Fletcher, 1863, p. 2.
[52] Albert S. Bickmore, *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1991, p. 20.

smaller islands.[53] Since it is clear that the term 'Malaysia' had the same meaning as the 'Malay/Indian Archipelago,' it can also be said here that the term and definition was imported from the French geographical definition to the English language and has been used since then.

The term 'Malaysia' was hardly used among English writers in the 1870s after Wallace's book, *Malay Archipelago*, was published. If Wallace had entitled his book 'Malaysia,' the term 'Malaysia' could have been popularised right then to describe the area because, as mentioned before, many newspaper readers were attracted to the book. Subsequently, the regional word appeared at a slower pace since the 1880s and in most cases it was described to have the same meaning as *Malay Archipelago*, as previously conceptualised.

However, in the 1890s the meaning slightly and gradually shifted to being narrowed down to only the Malay Peninsula. The British writers used the term in two ways: to refer to only the Malay Peninsula or to refer to the entire archipelago including the Malay Peninsula.

Now, we highlight a couple of small articles in which this term was used. For the former case, in 1890, the *Morning Post* reported the investments in the Straits Settlements using the term 'Malaysia.' In this context, this article focused only on the Malay Peninsula, not the archipelago.[54] *Huddersfield Chronicle*, a newspaper in Huddersfield, England, reported in 1892 that two Englishmen were killed and beheaded in the Malay Peninsula in March, though the exact location was not described. This short article appeared in the 'Malaysia' section under foreign news.[55] Other evidence is also shown in the *Glasgow Herald* in 1892. The newspaper made brief reviews for

---

[53] *The Examiner*, 30 Jan. 1869, p. 5.
[54] *Morning Post*, 23 July 1890, p. 2.
[55] *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 11 May 1892, p. 3.

Christmas gifts, in which it picked out an American romance novel, *Mistress Brancian,* by Jules Verne. The review of the novel gave a brief overview of the story: 'We are taken on a voyage from a Californian port across the North Pacific, and, after wonderful experiences in *Malaysia and the Indian Archipelago*, are landed at Adelaide...'[56] This clearly indicates that the newspaper recognised the difference between the two regional terms and so it follows that the former term referred only to the Malay Peninsula. In another newspaper, *The London Standard*, the writer of an article entitled 'Rubber Industry' wrote that 'for reasons of space, no account is taken of the forests of Madagascar, Assam, Borneo, North Australia, the Dutch East Indies, and Malaysia.'[57] Interestingly enough, this definition of 'Malaysia' excluded Borneo and the Dutch East Indies and is confined to the Malay Peninsula.

The latter case where the term indicates the entire archipelago is shown in some books published in this period. Interestingly enough, Alfred Wallace, the author of *Malay Archipelago*, started to use the term 'Malaysia' in his other book, which he published in 1883. He defined that 'Malaysia' included the islands of the Malay Archipelago from Sumatra to the Philippines and Moluccas and that formed the home of the true Malay race.[58] This means that he interchangeably used the term 'Malaysia' with the 'Malay Archipelago.' Even in the book, the two terms were intermingled. Though the author published another book, the *Geographical distribution of animal*, in 1876, this book never used the term 'Malaysia.' He seems to have first used this term in the 1880s. Guillemard, who edited Wallace's *Australasia* in 1894, exactly followed Wallace's definition of the term 'Malaysia.'[59] Baden-Powell's book, *In Savage Isles and Settled Lands: Malaysia, Australasia, and Polynesia 1888-1891*, mentioned the

---

[56] *Glasgow Herald*, 3 Nov. 1892, p. 9.

[57] *London Standard*, 29 Jan. 1897, p. 8.

[58] Alfred R. Wallace, *Australasia*, London: Edward Standard, 1883 (Third edition), p. 12.

[59] F. H. H. Guillemard and M.A. Cantab, Australasia Vol. 2: Malaysia and the Pacific Archipelagoes: Edited and greatly extended from Dr. A. R. Wallace's 'Australasia,' London: Edward Stanford, 1894. p. 2.

term of 'Malaysia' in the sub-title. Unfortunately, the author never explained the concept of the term, but given the title and the fact that he travelled to Java, Johor, Sarawak, the Straits Settlement and Sumatra, the term associated the archipelago with the Malay Peninsula.[60] The term 'Malaysia' had two meanings in British newspapers and books in this period of time.

On the other hand, the term is found in English newspapers issued in Singapore. An article at quite an early stage gave readers the clear definition in 1851:

> Malaysia may be considered under five divisions, namely: -1, The Philippine Islands, of which Suzm and Mindanao are the principal; 2, The Moluccas, the principal of which are Gillolo, Ceram, and Amboyna; 3, Celebes; 4, Borneo, the largest island in the world, except Australia and Greenland; 5, The Sunda Islands, the principal of which are Timor, Java, Banca, and Sumatra.[61]

This clear definition was made very early in the newspaper, but it is worthwhile to note that this definition did not cover the Malay Peninsula. According to a search on NewspaperSG,[62] the term was not used for over twenty years since then. In passing, the 1880s saw that the usage of the term revived in local newspapers. One writer wrote that 'the word "Malaysia" is by no means new ... It will likewise be found in many other publications.'[63] This would seem to have indicated the above books by Wallace and so on. Conceivably, the published books influenced the usage of this term in the newspapers.

---

[60] Baden-Powell, B.F.S., In Savage Isles and Settled Lands: Malaysia, Australasia, and Polynesia 1888-1891, London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1892, pp. 210-242.
[61] *The Straits Times*, 9 Sept. 1851, p. 6. The article titled 'Commercial Relations with the Oriental World.' The writer stipulates in this article that Papua or New Guinea is under Australasia.
[62] http://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/newspapers/Default.aspx (Accessed on Aug. 2015.)
[63] The Straits Times Weekly Issue, 11 Jan. 1893, p. 7.

Nevertheless, the definition of the term, as used in local newspapers after the 1880s, was generally different from its definition in the 1850s. While a particular writer stated that the term 'Malaysia' included 'the peninsula as well as the islands as far East as the Philippines,'[64] some reporters often used the term to indicate the area within the confine of the Malay Peninsula. An article that reported about a gold mine in Pahang in 1886 also used the term. This article stated that 'principal sources of gold in Malaysia, which made Malacca so famous nearly 400 years ago.'[65] Here, we can see that the article was referring not to the entire archipelago, but only to the Peninsula. There are also other examples to show that the term was limited only to the Peninsula. In an editorial published by *The Straits Times* in 1890 entitled 'The Sub-Divisions of Malaysia,'[66] although it described at length the states of the Peninsula such as Selangor and Pahang, it did not use the term 'Malaysia' to refer to the archipelago at all. Clearer evidence can be found in the title of an article entitled 'The Federation of Malaysia', which was published in 1895 and which talked about 'a plan for the federation of all the native States under British protection in the Malay Peninsula.'[67] This article only discussed the states colonised by the British in the Peninsula, while using the term 'Malaysia.' Nevertheless, it indicated not the entire archipelago, but limited it to some areas that combined to form the British states.

During the first half of the twentieth century the newspapers in Singapore reported much news on 'Malaysia Mission' of Methodist, which we will discuss later. This increased the frequency of the term in the newspapers. Though the writers basically used the term as a synonym with 'Malay Archipelago,' it was used variedly. While it indicated only the Peninsula, what is characteristic of the definition in the period was

---

[64] Ibid, 9 Sept. 1889, p. 7.
[65] Ibid, 17 June 1886, p. 10.
[66] The Straits Times Weekly Issue, 3 June 1890, p. 7.
[67] The Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser (1884-1942), 2 Oct. 1895, p. 2.

that the term was used more flexibly. For example, some writers used 'Dutch Malaysia' and 'British Malaysia' adding the country names.[68] Other cases show that the term applied to the whole of present Southeast Asia. When the U.S. government decided to transfer from Jakarta to Singapore in 1927, the news article mentioned that the territory of the government agency covered British Malaya, the Dutch East Indies, French Indo-China and Siam.[69] Also, a news reported the Malaysian Comfort Mission, which the members were 'from many parts of Malaysia, including Malaya, the Philippine islands, Indo-China, Thailand and Burma.'[70] There were the different usages of the term in the period, despite the fact that writers had consensus to basically indicate the Malay Archipelago. The usages would have been confusing to the readers.

On the other hand, articles in newspapers in Britain in the first half of the twentieth century covered in two ways the geographical scope of the term 'Malaysia' as in the previous period, though it would seem that the latter was widely accepted. As the case to limit to the Malay Peninsula, one article clarified: 'the Empire, i.e. of Great Britain and Ireland, Canada, the West Indies, Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, Newfoundland, Mauritius, South Africa: possibly later on, Cyprus, Ceylon, India, Hong-Kong, and *Malaysia* into one equally taxed, equally responsible unity.'[71] In this context the meaning of 'Malaysia' was separated from the entire archipelago and confined to only the Malay Peninsula, as the Empire referred to all the British colonised areas. Other articles also described in the same way: '(the writer) knows intimately Malaysia and the East Indian islands, Ceylon and Farther India, and Mid-China;'[72] 'The Westerners for long have been interested in stories of the people of Sarawak, Borneo,

---

[68] *The Straits Times*, 10 Feb. 1902, p. 4 and 14 June 1906, p. 12.
[69] Ibid., 4 Nov. 1927, p. 9.
[70] Ibid., 29 April 1940, p. 10.
[71] *Edinburgh Evening News*, 1 May 1902, p. 2. Italics added.
[72] *Aberdeen Journal*, 14 April 1919, p. 2.

and Malaysia generally;'[73] 'the tin belt which runs from Burma through Malaysia to the Dutch East Indian Islands.'[74] Another article said later that year: 'the gulf and its ports and possible air base would immediately be at the disposal of Japan, and would constitute a direct and formidable menace to Singapore, Malaysia, the Dutch East Indies, and even Burma.'[75] Some of articles were used separately to distinguish between the British and Dutch colonies. Put another way, the term 'Malaysia' referred to the Malay Peninsula under the British colonies, while the Dutch colonies were indicated as *the Dutch East Indies* in most cases.

The term 'Malaysia' was 'officially' used to apply to the archipelago in a global organization and among scholars. The Health Committee document of 1925 under the League of Nations also described 'Malaysia' as a regional term. When the committee mentioned reports on mortality from specified causes and reports on the prevalence of specified diseases in the East, the reports divided the region into four areas: India, Indo-Siamese area, China and Malaysian area.[76] The use of the term 'Malaysia' in the official document in the global organization means that the term was already officially accepted as a sub-region of Asia. In addition, judging from the four regional areas of Asia, the organization categorised 'Malaysia' as the area in combination with the current Federation of Malaysia and Indonesia. Likewise, R. O. Winstedt, who extensively researched the Malay culture, used the term in his book.[77] Although he gave no definition for the term, apparently the conception was almost synonymous with the current maritime Southeast Asia as the League of Nations indicated. We cannot ignore Rupert Emerson's work: *Malaysia: A Study in Direct and Indirect Rule*. The book stated

---

[73] *Western Morning News*, 18 March 1922, p. 4.
[74] Ibid., 21 Nov. 1927, p. 7.
[75] *Dundee Courier*, 1 March 1941, p. 2.
[76] The League of Nations, *Health Committee: Fifth Session*, C.647.M.236.1925.III., pp. 58-59.
[77] R. O. Winstedt (ed.), *Malaya: The Straits Settlements and The Federated and Unfederated Malay States,* London: Constable and Co., 1923, p. 70, p. 108 and p. 224.

that it embraced the British Malaya (the Malay Peninsula) and the Netherland Indies as a single regional term without limiting it to only the Malay Peninsula.[78]

However, as Emerson said, the term 'Malaysia' was 'a somewhat unfamiliar term,'[79] between the 1920s and 1940s. This was due partly to the fact that other regional terms became more familiar. While the political term 'Malaya,' the English hybrid word,[80] had often been used since the beginning of the nineteenth century and had become common to indicate the Malay Peninsula by the twentieth century, the other term 'British Malaya' had also begun to appear in English newspapers since the end of the nineteenth century.[81] With the expansion of the British colonies in Asia and reports in the newspapers on this issue, these terms frequently became more popular in the period. Thus, there were the four terms used to refer to the Malay Peninsula in the first half of the twentieth century: Malaysia, Malaya, British Malaya, and the Malay Peninsula. Malaysia, not a strong enough term to hold up against the 'competition,' was thus phased out of use little by little.

What needs to be pointed out is 'Malaysia Mission' of Methodist, which often reported in Singaporean newspapers after the turn of the twentieth century. For this reason, the term 'Malaysia' seemed to be quite popular among newspaper readers. Nevertheless, unlike the diverse usages in the newspapers, the definition of 'Malaysia' was used with the synonym of the Malay Archipelago until 1905 when the Philippines Mission became an independent mission. The first bishop of the mission, James Thoburn, said in his 1892 book: Malaysia 'is the region inhabited by the Malay race and its many branches, and includes the Malay Peninsula, together with the larger half

---

[78] Rupert Emerson, *Malaysia: A Study in Direct and Indirect Rules*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1964. The original publication year was in 1937.
[79] Ibid., p. 9.
[80] R. O. Winstedt (ed.), ibid., p. 1.
[81] British and Australian newspapers begun to use the term 'British Malaya' since 1884. Refer to http://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/ ;
For Australian, see http://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/?q= (Both the website were accessed on 24 July 2016).

of the islands of the Eastern Archipelago.'[82] The book often mentioned the *Malay Archipelago* by Alfred Wallace so that it can be said that the mission modelled Wallace's concept. Although Mary Isham who was engaged in this mission had a much larger definition, which included Indo-China, the bishops, John Denyes and William Oldham, who work for the missionary, shared the same geographic scope with Bishop Thoburn.[83]

However, it would seem that the reason why it titled 'Malaysia' was due partly to the meaning beyond any races to conduct the missionary works. As Thoburn defined the region of 'Malaysia' based on the Malay race, the term in this sense had the same concept with Malay Archipelago. If the term was for the race, the mission could have titled as 'Malay Archipelago Mission' as 'Malay Archipelago' mainly included the meanings of cultural, linguistic, and ethnographic elements. Thoburn said in the same book that the region of Malaysia 'has neither natural nor political boundaries to separate it from adjacent countries.'[84] As David Scott argued, the Mission intended to work without any imperial borders.[85] The Mission, which had activities mainly in Singapore, wished to conduct its works for Chinese and the Malays beyond any races. In this sense, 'Malaysia' became a neutral term for the mission. In this respect, there was a major distinction between 'Malaysia' and the 'Malay Archipelago.'

With the independence of Indonesia and the Philippines, the race-based regional term, i.e. 'Malay Archipelago,' dropped out of use amongst the Europeans after the Second World War, and its other alternative term 'Indian Archipelago' also died.

---

[82] Bishop J. M. Thoburn, *India and Malaysia*, Cincinnati: Cranston and Curts, 1892, p. 483.
[83] Mary Isham, *Valorous Ventures: A Record of Sixty and Six Years of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church*, Boston: Woman's Foreign Missionary Society Methodist Episcopal Church Publication Office, 1936, p. 336. John Russell Denyes, *The Malaysia Mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, New York: Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Open Door Emergency Commission, 1905, p. 5. Bishop Wm. F. Oldham, *Malaysia: Nature's Wonderland*, Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham, 1907, p. 7.
[84] Thoburn, ibid., p. 483.
[85] David W. Scott, 'The Geographic Imagination and the Expansion of Methodist Missions in Southeast Asia,' *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, Vol. 38, No. 3, July 2014, p. 131.

Nevertheless, the term 'Malaysia' has survived.[86] Joseph Fernando pointed out that the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO) wished to name the new independent country as 'Malaysia.'[87] Some UMNO members also preferred to use a new name for the country '*Langkasuka*,' which was a kingdom located in the northern Malay Peninsula in the fifth century, but this name was rejected by the UMNO Supreme Council.[88] In this time, there was a slight hope that the regional term 'Malaysia' would become the country's name. Unfortunately, the Reid Commission that produced a draft of the Constitution for the new country, declined the adoption of the name because 'it was outside their terms of reference.'[89] The term 'Malaysia' was finally adopted as a country name when the Federation of Malaya and the parts of Borneo island were formed as a single country in 1963. While the flexible and neutral name was settled as the nation name in the end, the new nation Malaysia was 'framed as a Malay nation-state in legal, constitutional terms' with the political dominance of the Malays.[90] Subsequently, the country started to use 'Malaysian' for its nationals.[91]

### Regional consciousness among the locals

Malay language speakers had their own regional terms of Asia: *di bawah angin* (below the wind) and *di atas angin* (above the wind). Williams Marsden observed that they seldom used the term '*Melayu*' to apply to themselves, and instead employed the term '*orang de-bawah angin*' -- the people below the wind. After his analysis of more

---

[86] Brian Harrison used 'the Malaysian archipelago' to name the insular Southeast Asia in his work. Refer to *South-East Asia: a short history*, London: Macmillan, 1954, p. ix.
[87] Dr. Joseph M. Fernando, 'Malayan Nationalism and the Dilemma of National Identity,' *Indian Historical Studies*, Vol. IV, Issue 1 (Oct. 2007), p. 9.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Ibid., p. 10.
[90] Tan Tai Yong, Creating "Greater Malaysia": Decolonization and the politics of merger, ISEAS: Singapore, 2008, p. 192.
[91] Presumably, Fay-Cooper, an American anthropologist, was the first scholar to use 'Malaysian,' though he mentione that this meaning was synonymous with 'Malayan' to 'distinguish non-Mongoloids from the rest of the southern Mongoloids.' See Fay-Cooper Cole, *The Peoples of Malaysia*, Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1945, p. vi.

than four pages, the author concluded that '*de-bawah angin'* signified 'the East', while '*de-atas angin*' 'the West.' At the same time, he regarded these terms as regional units. However, he was unsure whether '*de-bawah angin'* included Pegu, Siam, Cambodia, Cochin-China, and China, or whether it was limited to 'the Malayan and east-insular countries only.'[92] Anthony Reid also determined '*di bawah angin'* as a regional unit because it was predicated based on 'the seasonal monsoons, which carried shipping across the Indian Ocean,'[93] but the reference to the scope of the concept was not made.

Since Southeast Asian people traded using sailing vessels throughout the seas, they had a sense of space based on the currents of the seasonal monsoon. The locals were conscious of the two spaces, but it would have existed as a vague spatial concept, and would not be delimited like the contemporary boundaries are nowadays. As is clear from the *Mandala* system by Wolters,[94] the sphere of influence of kingdoms in Southeast Asia was based on the circles of kings and networks, and not on borders. In a similar vein, this sphere concept applies to their spatial consciousness. The then concept would seem likely that it was simply 'on the other side' and 'on this side,' not like the strict manner of the contemporary concept such as Myanmar under Southeast Asia and Bangladesh under South Asia. Therefore, it would be difficult to identify a definition only from '*di atas angin*' and '*di bawah angin*.'

However, their spatial consciousness gradually changed, as Michael Laffan implied,[95] by the introduction of steamers that navigated without monsoons. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, which provided shorter journeys between the North Atlantic and North Indian Oceans, caused sailing vessels to disappear from pilgrimage

---

[92] William Marsden, *A Dictionary and Grammar of the Malayan Language, Volume Two*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1984, pp. ix-xiii. The first publication was in 1812.
[93] Anthony Reid, Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450-1680, Volume One: The Lands below the Winds, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988, p. 6.
[94] O. W. Wolters, History, *Culture, and Region in Southeast Asian perspectives*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 1999.
[95] Michael Francis Laffan, Islamic Nationhood and Colonial Indonesia: The umma below the winds, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003, p. 49.

routes to Mecca, which by the end of the nineteenth century transformed into steamers propelled using machines. A series of advancements in ship technology physically connected Muslim pilgrims from Southeast Asia to the holy city of Mecca. Steamers can travel anywhere and at any time, without relying on the wind. Due primarily to this fact, the two spatial terms, '*di bawah angin*' and '*di atas angin*,' dropped out of use by the twentieth century. Among a Muslim's duties, a pilgrimage to Mecca was much facilitated with the emergence of steamers in the nineteenth century. Thus, thousands of people could visit for prayers, and many *ulama*s and religious students from Southeast Asia had the opportunity to dwell in Mecca and in Cairo, Egypt, since in that century the regional concept of Arabs was accepted.

The term *Jawa*, which is well known among Arabic speakers, signified the people of the maritime Southeast Asia in Arabic, and this was a regional term in a sense. Many intellectuals of the Archipelago visited Mecca and other Arabic cities during the nineteenth century and learnt the term through the Arabic language.[96] Nevertheless, once grouped together under a unitary region, despite the fact that they come from different birthplaces, they were still conscious of their similarities.[97] This led them to an awareness of the 'Jawi region' on earth. They became aware of their own region in Arabia, and not in their kingdoms in the Archipelago. Arabs used *Jawi*, derived from *Jawa*, to indicate individuals and products from the islands in the adjective form. The reason for this was to distinguish them from India and China.[98] While Arabs did not include religious elements in the words, *Jawa* and *Jawi* in Arabic, the 'Jawi people' were known for their Muslim identity and incorporated Islamic meanings into the word *Jawi*.[99]

---

[96] Ibid., p. 13.
[97] Amin Sweeney, *A Full Hearing: Orality and Literacy in the Malay World*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987, p. 57.
[98] Michael Francis Laffan, ibid., p. 13.
[99] Adrian Vickers, '"Malay Identity": Modernity, Invented Tradition, and Forms of Knowledge,' in Timothy P. Barnard, ibid., p. 51, and Amin Sweeney, ibid., p. 54 and p. 59.

On the other hand, Snouk Hurgronje, a Dutch scholar of Asian cultures and languages who had interacted with the 'Jawi people' in Mecca in the nineteenth century, said that, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, *Jawa* or *Jawi* would cover the region of Siam and Malacca to New Guinea within a distinct geographical boundary.[100] As Wolters argued, Southeast Asian people had no geographic border concepts because the circle of kings and the sphere to the people, not to the lands, were the most important factor in governance. It might be that 'Jawi people' themselves had no geographic boundaries in drawn lines, as Snouk put it. The people of the Archipelago had become aware of a new regional concept that was more concrete, which grouped together all Malay speakers beyond the kingdoms scattered throughout the archipelago, sharing the 'Jawa region' among the intellectuals. From experiencing the *Jawi* community in Mecca and Cairo, their regional awareness developed from a concept that was quite vague regionally, such as '*di bawah Angin*,' which was based on the monsoons only. Laffan referred to their concept as 'Jawi ecumene.'[101] At the same time, with the expansion of the colonial powers, i.e. the British and Dutch, in the archipelago in the nineteenth century, the Malay-based regional consciousness was recognised among local intellectuals in the twentieth century.

On the other hand, intellectuals in the Malay Peninsula, which was colonised by the British, have learnt a regional term in English. It was R. O. Winstedt who greatly influenced the local intellectuals in the Malay Peninsula with his discussions on the Malay culture and language, as well as the associated British regional concepts. In his youth, he worked in Perak and Negeri Sembilan, and at the same time, researched and published many well-known books on Malay literature, history, and arts. Among the

---

[100] Snouk Hurgronje, Mekka in the latter part of the 19th century: Daily life, Customs and Learning, the Moslims of the East-Indian-Archipelago, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970, p. 215.
[101] Michael Francis Laffan, ibid., p. 65.

publications include not only a Malay language grammar book, but also six Malay-English dictionaries, all of which are the culmination of his life works on the Malay culture.[102] His works also include two textbooks on history and geography for Malay teachers. The books were the best references at that time for creating regional awareness. Published in 1918, *Ilmu Alam Melayu* illustrated the Malay world as a whole. It is worthy to note that this specialist in Malay studies regarded the Malay world as a single region based on the race with borders. He divided the region into four areas: the Malay Peninsula, Borneo under the British, the islands under the Dutch, and the Philippines under the U.S.[103] While the book also used other regional terms such as *Gugusan Pulau-Pulau Melayu* (Malay Archipelago) and *Pulau Pulau Melayu* (Malay islands), these signified a group of large and small islands between Asia and Australia, with Malay inhabitants, and were synonymous with *Alam Melayu* (Malay World). As discussed in the previous section, the term 'Malaysia' was not used at all in this book for teachers. Instead, the author employed only the two terms above. Although he was aware of and used the term 'Malaysia' in his English book *Malaya* in 1923, the Malay book avoided using the term 'Malaysia.' Another book, *Kitab Tawarikh Melayu*, which was written in romanised Malay in 1925, did not explain the history of the entire archipelago, but rather focused on the one referring to the Malay Peninsula until the British colonised it.[104] This book describes the history of the delimited area of the British colony, i.e. the Malay Peninsula, separated from the Sumatra and Java islands that had historical relations for several centuries. The author might have intended to narrow the region of the Malay world. According to Anthony Milner, the term *Alam Melayu* itself was never expressed in classical Malay literature. He pointed out that the term was only used

[102] E. C. G. Barrett, 'Obituary: Sir Richard Winstedt,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, University of London, Vol. 30, No. 1, Fiftieth Anniversary Volume (1967), pp. 272-275.

[103] R. O. Winstedt, *Ilmu Alam Melayu: iaitu Sa-buah Kitab Pemimpin bagi segala Guru-Guru Melayu*, Singapore: The Methodist Publishing House, 1918.

[104] R. O. Winstedt, *Kitab Tawarikh Melayu*, Singapore: Fraser and Neave Limited, Printers, 1925.

during the early twentieth century.[105] If this were true, it was Winstedt who would have been the first to coin the term in Malay.

A Malay literary scholar, Zainal Abidin bin Ahmad, known by many as Za'ba, translated Winstedt's *Malaya* into the Malay language, and published it in *Majallah Guru* in the twelve issues between 1925 and 1926.[106] The translated articles hardly referred to any regional terms, but as the original book in English mentioned not only the terms such as 'Malay Archipelago', but also 'Malaysia,' the Malay intellectual would have understood the terms from the original book. His other article in subsequent years shows that Za'ba did mention the term 'Malaysia.'[107] It was clear then that he had known the term as a region before the Second World War.

Although his works did not refer to the scope of the Malay World,[108] the two articles in 1940 and 1941 hint about it.[109] According to the articles, it would seem that his definition of Malay literature was the works written in the Malay language, by 'Malay' writers. While the 1941 article introduced several works in Sumatra and Java islands as 'Dutch East Indies Malay,' he did not list the works of the Philippines at all. As he did not explain this, it follows that his Malay World covered only the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, Java, and the surrounding small islands, broadly speaking, current Indonesia.

As for the definition of the Malay World, a nationalist teacher by the name of Abdul Hadi [110] confirms this in his work *Sejarah Alam Melayu*.[111] The three-volume

---

[105] A.C. Milner, *Kerajaan: Malay Political Culture on the Eve of Colonial Rule*, Tuczon: The University of Arizona Press, 1982, p. 118.

[106] *Majallah Guru* was originally written in Arabic alphabet writing, *Jawi* text, but he re-published the articles in romanised Malay in 1961. I referred to the romanised text. See *Sejarah Ringkas Tanah Melayu*, Singapura: Pustaka Melayu, 1961.

[107] Zainal Abidin bin Ahmad, 'Recent Malay Literature,' *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Feb. 1941), p. 2 and p. 9.

[108] Refer to the list of all his works in Abdullah Hussain and Khalid M. Hussain, *Pendeta Za'Ba dalam Kenangan*, Kula Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 2000, pp. 303-311.

[109] Zainal Abidin bin Ahmad, 'Modern Development of Malay Literature,' *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Jan. 1940), and 'Recent Malay Literature,' *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Feb. 1941), pp. 1-20.

[110] *Ensiklopedia Sejarah dan Kebudayaan Melayu*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Vol. 1, 1999, pp. 31-32.

[111] Abdul Hadi bin Haji Hasan, *Sejarah 'Alam Melayu, Penggal I-III*, Singapore: Malaya Publishing House, 1949. The original publication year of *Penggal I* is 1925 and the first publication of *Penggal II* and *III* are in 1926 and 1929 respectively.

book describe the history of the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, and the Jawa islands only. Although the terms *Pulau-Pulau Hindia Timor* (East Indies islands), *Pulau-Pulau Melayu* (Hindia-Timor) and *Hindia Timor* were often used, the Philippines was not covered at all, in contrast to Winstedt's book. With the death of Abdul Hadi, Buyong bin Adil continued to publish the other two volumes after the Second World War.[112] The new author added the Cocos and Christmas islands as part of the Malay World, but also excluded the Philippines. Khoo Kay Kim mentioned that the author 'focused on the existence of a Malay World and its glorious past.'[113] Simply speaking, there is the possibility that both Hadi and Buyong did not regard the Philippines as their own world.

Malay intellectuals have already had a sense of the Malay World prior to the Second World War. The magazine in *Jawi* text, *Seruan Azhar*, which was published for Malay students in Cairo in 1925, is evidence. The front cover of the magazine portrays a map of Southeast Asia with some *Jawi* text which read: '*Alam Persatuan Bangsa Kita Yang Dikasihi*.'[114] The editor, Mahmud Junus, mentioned in the first issue that '[a]ll our people … whether in Java, or in Sumatra, or in Borneo, or the Malay Peninsula, must unite and share a common purpose and agreement to strive for advancement, and seek the best ways of doing this.'[115] In the 1927 issue, the editor also wrote that 'we recognise Indonesia and the Peninsula as one community.'[116] It shows that at least the magazine had a lesser affinity with Filipinos, partly because Filipinos are devoted to Christianity. Muslims who were born in the Malay Peninsula and the archipelago and studied in Cairo had a strong brotherhood with each other. They had a sense of spatial

---

[112] Buyong bin Adil, *Sejarah 'Alam Melayu, Penggal IV*, Singapore: Malaya Publishing House, 1948. Penggal V was published in 1952.
[113] Khoo Kay Kim, 'Local Historians and the Writing of Malaysian History in the Twentieth Century,' in Anthony Reid and David Marr (eds.), *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books (Asia), 1979, p. 305.
[114] *Seruan Azhar*, Vol. 1, 1925.
[115] *Seruan Azhar*, Vol. 1, 1925. This quote is from William Roff, 'Indonesian and Malay students in Cairo in the 1920's,' *Indonesia*, No. 9 (Apr. 1970), p. 77.
[116] Quoted from William Roff, ibid., p. 73.

consciousness based on Islam. This sense was shared with Malay intellectuals in the peninsula.

While British scholars defined the concept of the Malay Archipelago and Malay World to include the Philippines, the Malay intellectuals excluded the Philippines from their Malay-based region. Soda argued that, in the late 1930s, the territorial identity of Malay aristocrats and their supporters shifted from Malay states to Malaya, or *Tanah Melayu*.[117] If this argument is correct, their Malay Peninsula-centric view reflected their Malay World consciousness: they regarded it only to include Sumatra and Jawa islands, which had historical ties with the Peninsula. As the Philippines had little relations by way of relations prior to the twentieth century, the Malays had little affinity with the people.

With the development of nationalism in the Malay Peninsula, nationalists in early stages started out a movement that aimed to transform the spatial concept of the Malay World into the concept of a single nation-state. It was the *Melayu Raya* (Greater *Melayu*/Pan-Malay) which was combined with the archipelago. This concept was based on a spatial concept that the locals in the Peninsula were aware of. Moreover, the application of the concept to a nation-state signifies that nationalists had consciousness of the Peninsula being a part of the Malay archipelago. It was Ibrahim Yaacob[118] who was the first person to make a proposal to seek to transform the spatial concept into a nation-state.

As nationalists were aware of having a common culture, customs, language, religion and race with Indonesians, they believed that the Peninsula was not separable from the archipelago. For the purpose of combining with Indonesia, Ibrahim Yaacob

---

[117] Naoki Soda, 'The Malay World in Textbooks: The Transmission of Colonial Knowledge in British Malaya,' *Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 2, (Sept. 2001), p. 229.

[118] For his detail activities, refer to Cheah Boon Kheng, 'The Japanese Occupation of Malaya, 1941-45: Ibrahim Yaacob and the Struggle for Indonesia Raya,' *Indonesia*, No. 28 (Oct., 1979), pp. 84-120.

with other nationalists formed the first national political party, *Kesatuan Melayu Muda* (KMM), or Young Malay Union, in 1938. He mentioned in a later year that: The aim of *Melayu Raya* was the same as *Indonesia Raya*, which is the aspiration of the Malay nationalist movement to revive the heritage of Sri Vijaya, which was a common unity of the *bangsa*.[119]

While the political party was suppressed and forced to dissolve on June, 1942, under the occupation of the Japanese to the Peninsula, a Japanese officer offered a government post to him to soothe his anger. The nationalist leader accepted the appointment as an advisor of Malay affairs.[120] Although he co-operated with the Japanese military government, he did not give up on his dream. On 7 September, 1944 the then Japanese Prime Minister, Koiso Kuniaki, announced a statement in the House of Peers that the Japanese empire approved to grant independence to the East Indies in order to ensure their permanent welfare.[121] Thereafter, two officers in the Malayan Military Administration decided to help the concept of *Indonesia Raya* and unofficially informed Ibrahim, who later on formed *Kesatuan Rakyat Indonesia Semenanjung* (KRIS) (the Union of Peninsula Indonesians in English).[122] He requested to Sukarno, the Indonesian leader, that Malaya should be included in the nation of Indonesia.[123] Immediately before the end of the Second World War, Ibrahim met Sukarno and Hatta in Taiping, Perak after they discussed in Vietnam with the Japanese military for Indonesian independence. According to Ibrahim, Sukarno mentioned 'Let us form one single Motherland for all the sons of Indonesia', and Ibrahim replied 'We, the Malays in Malaya, are with loyalty in full support of the idea of a single Motherland, with

---

[119] Ibrahim Yaacob, *Nusa dan Bangsa Melayu*, Jakarta: N. V. Alma'ariff, 1951, p. 65.
[120] Cheah Boon Kheng, *ibid.*, pp. 104-105.
[121] *The minutes of the 85th plenary session of the House of Peers (No. 1)*, on 7 Sept., 1944, pp. 4-5. From http://teikokugikai-i.ndl.go.jp/cgi-bin/TEIKOKU/swt_logout.cgi?SESSION=5671 (accessed on 3 July, 2017).
[122] Cheah Boon Kheng, *ibid.*, pp. 110-112.
[123] Muhammad Yamin, *Naskah-persiapan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945*, Vol. 1, Jajasan Prapantja, 1959, pp. 205-206.

Malaya as a part of Free Indonesia.'[124] However, Indonesia declared its independence on 17 August, 1945, within the territory of the Netherland East Indies, excluding Malaya. Ibrahim's strong desire that Malaya should be a part of Indonesia was unattainable. Unhappy Ibrahim flew to Jakarta and never moved back to the Malay Peninsula. The reason that Indonesia did not include the Malay Peninsula into its territory remains unclear.

Immediately after the end of the Second World War, the *Partai Kebangsaan Melayu Malaya* (PKMM) (or the Malay Nationalist Party (MNP)) was formed on 17 October, 1945 by Malay left members. From the Malay language name of the party, it implied that 'there were "Malay" parties in numerous places, and that this party happened to be the specifically "Malaya"-based on.' [125] The party adopted eight programmes as its objectives, including the aim to unite the *bangsa Melayu* (Malay race) and plant *kebangsaan* in the hearts of the Malays with the aim of uniting Malaya in a large family, that is, the *Republik Indonesia Raya*.[126] The President of the party, Dr. Buruhannudin Al-Helmy, also announced the party's four decisions in his speech on the first anniversary of the Indonesian independence on 17 August, 1946:

1. Malaya was to become part of Indonesia.

2. The red and white flag to be the flag of Malaya.

3. The 2.5 million people in Malaya to help one another.

4. The people of Indonesia and Malaya to unite and have one religion.[127]

---

[124] Cheah Boon, *ibid.*, pp. 113-114 and James Ongkili, *Nation-Building in Malaysia 1946-1974*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1985, p. 22. According to Cheah, it would seem that Hatta rejected the idea of *Indonesia Raya* at that time.
[125] Anthony Milner, *The Malays*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, p. 148.
[126] Ariffin Omar, *Bangsa Melayu: Malay concepts of democracy and community 1945-1950*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1993, p. 38. This is the first programme out of the eight.
[127] CO 537/1582, p. 150. Burhanuddin also mentioned in his speech that the UMNO rejected the No. 1 and 2 of the proposal above through the discussion with the UMNO. Dato Onn wished to have the Indonesian flag with a yellow crescent and a *kris* imposed on it.

Burhanuddin also mentioned in an interview with a British officer that when asked whether the Philippines would come into the *Melayu Raya*, Burhanuddin replied that 'whether they were Malays, they would join because of the ties of blood, culture and tradition.' He prospected that 'the greater Malay state would be born within the next ten years.'[128] As Ariffin Omar mentioned, Buruhanudin regarded Malays as a 'broad Malayo-Polynesian ethno-linguistic group' including Javanese, Madagascans and others, and claimed that the arrival of foreign traders to the Malay archipelago caused the unity of the *Melayu* to disintegrate and destruct.[129] That is the main reason he insisted that the entire archipelago should be in a single state.

*Melayu Raya*, which was proposed by Ibrahim Yaacob and Burhannudin, was probably based on a concept of '*merantau*.' This concept helped to create a spatial consciousness, at least among the local intellectuals. *Meratau* is a mobility tradition which moved around the archipelago and is 'a process that is strongly connected to cultural and kinship values.'[130] People to go to *merantau* were for the purpose of not only acquiring knowledge, experience and education, but also increasing their social status in their society.[131] The most famous case is Minangkabau, but other locals in the Malay Peninsula and the archipelago generally had the same system.[132] Through the *merantau* system, '[h]ome and the feeling of belonging are imaginatively constructed through movement.'[133] Khazin Mohd. Tamrin also pointed out that *merantau* was the

---

[128] CO 537/1582, p. 167.
[129] Ariffin Omar, ibid., p. 41.
[130] Noel B. Salazar, 'The (Im)mobility of Merantau as a sociocultural practice in Indonesia,' in Natasă Gregorič Bon and Jaka Repič (eds.), *Moving places: Relations, return and belonging*, New York: Berghahn, 2016, p. 24. The stem word of *merantau* is '*rantau*.' According to Noel, *Rantau* refers to the (often adventurous) geographical, social and moral realm of journeying outside the ethnic 'homeland.' See *ibid*., p. 38, n4.
[131] *Ibid*., p. 25.
[132] Noel B. Salazar mentions this in his article.
[133] *Ibid*., p. 36.

essential tradition in the Malay culture.[134] Khazin and Noel do not mention exactly the extent they moved around, but probably visited only the areas where Islam was devoted, or areas with cultural similarity. It might be excluded from the current mainland Southeast Asia, where mainly Buddhism was practiced. Thus, they moved around within 'Malay World' or 'Malay cultural sphere' - without exact borders - and this concept helped to lead to *Melayu Raya*/*Indonesia Raya*. This is the reason the conservative party UMNO also shared the idea of PKMM/MNP, namely *Melayu Raya*.[135]

However, PKMM/MNP has quickly lost popularity, and UMNO by Dato Onn has grown its strength.[136] In later years UMNO, together with the Malayan Chinese Association (MCA) and Malayan Indian Congress (MIC), gained independence of the Federation of Malaya and UMNO did not accept the concept of *Melayu Raya*, but the idea was not yet removed by Burhannudhin. After the announcement of the formation of the Federation of Malaysia in 1961 by Tunku Abdul Rahman, Dr. Burhannudin al-Helmy, the president of *Persatuan Islam Se-Malaya* (Pan-Malayan Islamic Organisation) (PAS), proposed in the parliament that the concept of *Melayu Raya* should be adopted and include the Peninsula, Singapore, Brunei, North Borneo, Sarawak, Indonesia and the Philippines.[137] In the conflict with Indonesia the idea was realised as MAPHILINDO in 1963, which was a loose confederation of the three countries, i.e., Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines, but was short-lived, and the concept of *Melayu Raya* was dead.

---

[134] Khazin Mohd. Tamrin, 'Tradisi Merantau: Perluanya diberi perhatian dalam kajian dan penulisan sejarah Malaysia,' in Badriyah Haji Salleh and Tan Liok Ee (eds.), *Alam Persejarahan: Dari pelbagai perspektif*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan bahasa dan pustaka, 1996.
[135] John Funston, 'Malaysia and Thailand's Southern Conflict: Reconciling Security and Ethnicity,' *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Southern Thailand: Anatomy of an Insurgency (Aug. 2010), p. 238. According to him, Dato Onn excluded the southern Thailand from the concept of *Melayu Raya*.
[136] CO537/1581, p. 231.
[137] Federation of Malaya, *Parliamentary Debates, Dewan Rakyat*, Jil. III, Bahagian I, Oktober 1961 hingga Januari 1962, 'Malaysia, 16 Oktober 1961,' cols. 1631-1639.

After the Second World War, Malay politicians came to obtain a Southeast Asian consciousness. They originally had a spatial consciousness of the 'Malay World,' but had no other choice from a point of view of national security to perceive the region. The Federation of Malaya, even before and after independence, faced a serious armed threat by local communists, and was under the Emergency at the time of independence. Geographically, Malaya/Malaysia is adjacent to the borders of Siam/Thailand, so that made it possible for communists to come into the Peninsula through Thailand from China or Vietnam. For this reason, it was inevitable for the two governments to have close relations in a way to combine the maritime and the mainland. Thus, Malay political leaders have come to accept the regional concept of Southeast Asia combining the maritime part with the mainland. This is the reason the Tunku together with Tan Cheng Lock proposed a 'Southeast Asian Union'[138] in 1954.

Here we observe a regional view of Tan Cheng Lock, one of the representatives of Chinese in Malaya and the founder of the MCA. The Malacca-born public figure was appointed several key positions of the Straits Settlements such as the president of the Straits Chinese British Association (SCBA), and the Legislative Council of the Straits Settlements, before the Second World War. In the 1920s, he already had an idea for independence of Malaya. He said in his speech in the Legislative as early as 1926: 'Our ultimate political goal should be a united self-governing British Malaya, with a Federal Government and Parliament for the whole of it.'[139] He wished to gain independence only within the Malay Peninsula under the British, unlike the Malays, who wished to unite with Indonesia and the Philippines in the Malay World.

---

[138] Refer to the Chapter five.
[139] *Proceedings of Straits Settlement Legislative Council,* 1 Nov. 1926. Quoted from K. G. Tregonning, 'Tan Cheng Lock: A Malayan Nationalist,' *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Mar., 1979), p. 31.

Although he was an unofficial member of the Straits Settlements Executive Council before the global war, he exiled to India during the war. At the end of the war he returned to Malaya and gave a speech on the Malayan Union in 1946. His speech mentioned that 'the influence which Chinese merchants still have in the East Indies, Malaya and South East Asia generally ...'[140] At this time, as discussed in Chapter two, the term 'South East Asia' was becoming popular, which combined the mainland with the maritime area, but his usage was only for the current mainland area. It would seem that he had no perception of a region that unified the two areas. Three years after this speech he perceived that the Malay Archipelago is the greatest region of the largest islands.[141] He did not consider the archipelago as a part of Southeast Asia. It is likely from the speech texts that even after the end of the global war, Tan Cheng Lock had no regional consciousness of Southeast Asia. It would seem that his regional awareness of Southeast Asia was born after 1950. It was not until 1954 that his proposal with the Tunku was made for the formation of 'South East Asian Union.'

Afterwards, with news on the South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO), which formed in 1954, the term 'Southeast Asia' was becoming familiar through media in the Peninsula. However, the term translated into Malay language was not fixed by the 1970s. The term 'Southeast Asia' is an English word so that the Malay language needed to translate it. Thus, Malay writers translated the English term. For example, Abdul Rahim Haji Darus used the translated term as '*Tenggara Asia*' in his book in 1954 and 1955. Although the scope of the term was the same as that of present-day Southeast Asia, '*Tenggara Asia*' was then revised to '*Asia Tenggara*' in the 5th edition, except the title of the attached maps in the book remained '*Tenggara Asia*.'[142] While

---

[140] CO 1030/310, 'Views of Chinese in Malacca on the Malayan Union Constitution together with the speeches at the dinners,' 14 October 1946, p. 17.

[141] CO717/205, 'Address by Tan Cheng Lock at Taping and Ipoh on 10th April 1949 on The Chinese in Malaya,' p. 10.

[142] Ab. Rahim Hj. Darus, *Ilmu Alam Tenggara Asia*, Jabatan Persuratan, Kesatuan Persakutuan Guru2 Melayu Semennanjong, 1954 (Second edition). The publication year of the 5th edition is unknown.

Ibrahim Yaacob knew the English regional term and consistently used '*Asia Tenggara*' in his book,[143] Za'ba also employed the term '*Tenggara Asia*' in his book in 1961.[144] The Malay newspaper *Berita Harian,* used the two terms: '*Tenggara Asia*' and '*Asia Tenggara*' since the 1950s, and '*Tenggara Asia*' gradually disappeared in the 1970s.[145] When the Malay language employed the regional concept, there was confusion over the translation. It would seem that Malay writers did not notice the unfixed terms. The term was almost standardised since the formation of ASEAN in 1967.

**Indonesia**

**Historical background**

Indonesia lies between the Indian and Pacific Oceans, and between the mainland of Asia and Australia. Being the largest country in Southeast Asia, at 1.9 million square kilometres, it stretches 5,100 kilometres from east to west, and 1,900 kilometres from north to south. It consists of 13,700 islands of various sizes, and 200-350 various ethnic groups reside within it.[146]

Before the territory of Indonesia was colonised, numerous kingdoms and empires emerged and declined. The two mysterious empires among them, i.e., Srivijaya and Majapahit, were major empires and later had an influence on Indonesian nationalists in the twentieth century in terms of the concept of the Indonesian territory.

---

[143] Ibrahim Yaacob, *Nusa dan Bangsa Melayu*, N. V. Alma Arif: Djakarta, 1951.
[144] Za'ba, *Sejarah Ringkas Tanah Melayu*, Singapura: Pustaka Melayu, 1961, p. 4.
[145] See at http://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/newspapers/default.aspx (accessed on 7 July 2016).
[146] Refer to Yoneo Ishii (eds.) *Encyclopedia of South-East Asia*, Heibonsha: Tokyo, 1999 (New edition), p. 437 and p. 439.

Srivijaya appeared as a trading polity in a historical record in the late seventh century. The centre was in Palembang, Sumatra, and seems to have influenced the Malay Peninsula. The Buddhism kings sent tribute missions to China from the century on. However, after shifting the centre to Jambi with the invasion of the South Indian Chola dynasty, the power seems to have been on the wane. Although it still survived by the fourteenth century, the centre of the Malay world shifted to the kingdom of Melaka, and Srivijaya disappeared.[147]

Majapahit was established in East Java in 1293, after the last king of the Singahari dynasty, Kertarajasa, was killed. His son-in-low Vijaya later set up the empire, allying the Mongols against Singahari's enemies. The period governed by Hayam Wuruk with his minister Gajah Mada in the fourteenth century was the gloriest time. During this period, the polity covered most of the archipelago, which attracted the twentieth-century Indonesian nationalists for Indonesian territory, and it became the greatest ever in maritime Southeast Asia. However, due to the spread of Islam and civil wars in the early fifteenth century, the power of Majapahit declined. The power slowly shrunk years by years and disappeared by the early sixteenth century. It was the last Hindu kingdom.[148]

The Dutch first appeared in Banten in 1596, and founded the *Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie* (VOC) (English: United East India Company) to monopolise the spice trade in 1602. Based in Batavia for their business in 1619, they dominated the spice trade in Molukka.[149] Although the VOC went bankrupt because of high military and administrative costs in 1800,[150] its territorial claims were handed over to the

[147] M. C. Ricklefs et al., *A New History of Southeast Asia*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 29-30 and pp. 61-62.
[148] M. C. Ricklefs et al.,ibid., pp.63-66 and pp. 112-113, and D. R. SarDesai, *Southeast Asia: Past and present*, Boulder: Westview, 1994, pp. 52-54.
[149] For details, refer to D.G.E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia,* London: The Macmillan Press, 1968, pp. 277-374.
[150] M. C. Ricklefs et al.,ibid., p. 189.

Netherlands government.[151] At the time of its bankruptcy, Ambon was not controlled by the VOC, and the British had already taken Padang and other islands. Furthermore, the British conquered Java Island from 1811 to 1816. After the island was 'returned' to the Dutch, the two colonial powers decided to sign a treaty to provide for 'a stable, peaceful relationship between them' in the region.[152]

The year of 1824 was a watershed year in terms of territories of colonisers in the region. The Dutch and the British signed the Anglo-Dutch Treaty. According to the treaty, Java and Sumatra remained the preserve of the Dutch, while Melaka became a British possession in exchange for Bengkulen on Sumatra's east coast. In short, the Straits of Melaka had a 'border' between the British and the Dutch.[153] Afterwards, the Netherlands fought several wars with the locals including Padri War, Bali War and Aceh War to set their territories. It was in the twentieth century that the Netherlands conquered the territories of the Dutch Indies.

With the emergence of nationalism, Indonesian nationalists since the 1920s claimed a national territory based on the Dutch territory for independence, and their national sentiment as their homeland was born based on this territory. During the Second World War, the Japanese military government controlled the entire Southeast Asia as the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere. During the end of the war, the Japanese decided to grant independence based on the territory of the previous Dutch colony 'in the hope of frustrating the re-establishment of a European colonial state.'[154] Immediately after the war, Sukarno and Hatta declared their independence of the Republic of Indonesia on 17 August, 1945. However, the Netherlands attempted to restore their colonial position. The two sides reached the Linggajati Agreement in 1946,

---

[151] Ibid., p. 186.
[152] D. R. SarDesai, *ibid.*, p. 87.
[153] D. G. E. Hall, *ibid.*, p. 509.
[154] M. C. Ricklefs et al., *ibid.*, p. 306.

which the Netherlands recognized authority in Java, Madura and Sumatra, and created a federation. Nevertheless, bitter and severe struggles with the colonial power occurred for more than four years, such as the 'police actions' by the Netherlands in 1947 and 1948. With the help of the United Nations and with suspend of aid by the U.S., the Netherlands finally recognised Indonesia as an independent country based on the former colonial territory, except for Papua.[155] In the 1950s, Sukarno mentioned that Indonesian's freedom would not be complete without West Irian, and launched anti-Netherlands campaign. The Indonesian government used forces to seize West Irian. Through mediation of the U.S., the area was handed over to Indonesia in 1963.[156]

**Labelling the archipelago**

The eighteenth century witnessed the emergence of various regional names. Some of the terms were found in Sir Joseph Banks' travelogue, which was a record of the first great voyage undertaken by James Cook from 1768 to 1771. Sir Joseph Banks gave three terms to the area, namely 'the eastern islands,' 'the East Indies' and 'the Eastern Isles.'[157] On the other hand, William Marsden, a British civil officer with the East India Company in Sumatra, also employed some terms in his 1783 book, *The History of Sumatra,* to refer to this archipelago, such as 'the Eastern Archipelago' and 'the Indian Archipelago.'[158] Both of them, however, had an unclear and vague scope vis-à-vis their

---

[155] For details, M. C. Ricklefs et al., *ibid.*, pp. 338-345.
[156] D.R. SarDesai, *Southeast Asia: Past and present*, Boulder: Westview, 1994, pp. 242-243.
[157] Sir Joseph D. Hooker (ed.), Journal of the right Hon. Sir Joseph Banks: During captain Cook's first voyage in H. M. S. Endeavour in 1768-71 to Terra del Fuego, Otahite, New Zealand, Australia, the Dutch East Indies, etc., London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896, p. 388, p. 389, p. 404, and p. 410 for 'the eastern islands,' p. 136, p. 255, p. 271, p. 278 and more for 'the East Indies,' and p. 401 for 'the Eastern Isles.'
[158] William Marsden, The History of Sumatra, containing an account of the Government, Laws, Customs, and Manners of the Native inhabitants, with a description of the Natural Productions, and a relation of the Ancient Political State of that Island, London: Thomas Payne and Son, 1784 (the Second Edition), p. iii and p. 3.

perspective on the region. By the early years of the nineteenth century, the proper term for the area was still not fixed. In later years however, William Marsden presented his definition of the area labelled as the East-Indies in another book:

> [T]he East-Indies, including the southern part of the (Malayan) peninsula, together with the islands of Sumatra, Java, Borneo, Celebes, and innumerable others, as far to the eastward as the Moluccas, .... to the southward, as the island of Timor, and to the northward, as the Philippines: forming collectively the Malayan archipelago.[159]

When the book was published, the regional political situation was unstable. Sumatra and Java islands were still under control of the British Empire by 1824. When the Dutch signed the Treaty of London, they ceded Malacca to Britain and recognised Singapore as a territory of Britain. In exchange, the British agreed not to enter areas south of Singapore.[160] Despite this development, Marsden considered the archipelago to be a single unit.

Although the scope of the 'East-Indies' was defined, English writers used a variety of terms. The usage of terms for the area varied from one writer to another prior to the Second World War. Marsden referred to these islands as 'the Indian Archipelago' and 'the Indian islands' in 1783, but later also called them the 'East-Indies' and the 'Malayan Archipelago.'[161] Sir Stamford Raffles, a British civil servant, used several different terms to refer to the islands in his book, namely 'the Eastern Islands,' 'the East-Indies,' 'the Asiatic Isles,' 'the Malayan Archipelago' 'the Malayan islands,' and

---

[159] William Marden, A Grammar of the Malayan Language with an introduction and paraxis, London, 1812, p. i.
[160] D. R. SarDesai, ibid., p. 87.
[161] William Marsden, *The History of Sumatra*, p. iii for 'the Indian Archipelago,' p. 4 for 'Indian islands' and *A Grammar of the Malayan Language with an introduction and paraxis*, London, 1812, p. i.

'the Eastern Archipelago.'[162] George Earl also posited a few terms, such as 'the Indian Archipelago,' 'the East-Indian Archipelago,' 'Eastern Archipelago,' 'Eastern islands,' 'the Indian Islands,' and so on.[163] It is clear that the appellation for the archipelago was not uniform in English during the period. Furthermore, the Dutch-coined terms were brought into English. For example, 'the Indies,' 'the East Indies,' *Insulinde*' (the islands of the Indies), or 'the Netherlands East Indies.'[164] Writers were able to use their favourite terms. The usage of different terms depended on the writers themselves.

A new term for the archipelago was created at the middle of the nineteenth century. George Windsor Earl, a British navigator, suggested that the people of the Indian Archipelago and Malayan Archipelago would become 'Indu-nesians' and 'Malayunesians' respectively. [165] In spite of his creation, Earl preferred to use 'Malayunesians.' James Logan, a friend of Earl's, revised 'Indu-nesians' to 'Indonesia' as a 'purely geographical term,' and decided to use this. He also explained in his article that the new term was merely a synonym for the Indian Archipelago.[166] Furthermore, he clearly defined the geographic scope as a region and divided the region of 'Indonesia' into four areas:

1. Western Indonesia, Sumatra, the Malay Peninsula, Borneo, Java, and the intermediate islands; 2. North Eastern Indonesia, Formosa *(currently called Taiwan)* to the Solo Archipelago and Mindanao, all including the Philippine and

---

[162] Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, *The History of Java, Vol I*, London: John Murray, 1817. p. xxxiv, p. 86, p. 229, p. 258, p. 329, p. 418 and p. 419 for 'the Eastern Islands,' p. xix and xxii for 'the East-Indies,' p. 1 for 'the Asiatic Isles,' p. 2, p. 106, p. 211 and p. 217 for 'the Malayan Archipelago,' p. 1, p. 212 and p. 232 for 'Malayan islands,' and p. xvi and p. 257 for 'Eastern Archipelago.'
[163] G. W. Earl, The Eastern Seas or Voyages and Adventures in the Indian Archipelago in 1832-33-34 comprising a tour of the islands of Java -visits to Borneo, the Malay Peninsula, Siam etc.; also an account of the present state of Singapore with observations on the commercial resources of the archipelago, London: W.H. Allen and Co., 1837. p. 445 for 'the East-Indian Archipelago,' p. 2, p. 70, p. 90, p. 183, p. 351 and 391 for 'Eastern India,' p. 43 for 'Eastern Archipelago,' p. 346 for 'Eastern islands,' p. 417 for 'the Indian Islands.'
[164] R. E. Elson, *The Idea of Indonesia: A History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 1.
[165] G. Windsor Earl, 'On the Leading Characteristics of the Papuan, Australian, and Malayu-Polynesian Nations: Chapter III, The Malayu-Polynesians,' *The Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. IV, 1850, p. 71n.
[166] J. R. Logan, 'The ethnology of the Indian Archipelago,' *The Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. IV, 1850, p. 254n.

Bisayan islands; 3. South Eastern Indonesia, from the East Coast of Borneo to the New Guineas, including the western Papua islands, and the Keh and Aru Archipelago; 4. Southern Indonesia, the great southern chain between Java and New Guinea or from Bali to the Timor Laut group.[167]

Thus, it follows that the geographical definition of 'Indonesia' was the same as the one of 'Malaysia,' which was discussed in the previous section. It would seem that Earl had noticed this because his article mentioned that the French were using 'Oceania' and 'Malasia,' not 'Malaysia,' to designate the Indian Archipelago. He also pointed out that James Cowles Prichard, a British ethnologist, had employed the term in his book, *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*, and argued that among the British, only he used the term 'Malasia.'[168] Subsequently N. B. Nannys, an English linguist, mentioned in 1880 the definition of 'Indonesia,' abiding by Logan's scope.[169] It was still used among the British in the period.

On the other hand, the Dutch colonial government referred officially to its own territory as '*Nederlandsch Indië*' (Netherlands India in English), but according to Russell Jones, other terms also varied from one Dutch scholar to another, the term 'Indonesia' being one of them.[170] It shows that the English-coined term 'Indonesia' was imported into Dutch vocabulary by then. H. Kern, a Dutch ethnographer, remarked on the different scope of British interpretation in 1899: the terrain of the Malay race would be divided into Indonesia, New Guinea, Melanesia, Polynesia, Micronesia, the Philippines, New Zealand, Madagascar, the Melaka peninsula, and the interior of

---

[167] Ibid., p. 278n. The Italic is mine.
[168] G. Windsor Earl, *ibid*., p. 71n. James Cowles Prichard's book should be the two volumes' book, *Researches into physical history of mankind*, which published as the first edition in 1813.
[169] N. B. Dennys, 'A Contribution to Malayan Bibliography,' *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, June 1880, pp. 69-71.
[170] Russell Jones, 'Earl, Logan and "Indonesia,"' *Archipel*, Vol. 6, 1973, p. 97.

Formosa. This definition separated the New Guinea, the Philippines, the Melaka peninsula (currently called Malay Peninsula) from the region of 'Indonesia,' and provided for the Dutch colonial sovereignty.[171] Although the definition was based on the area which the Malay race dwelt on, the scholar did not use the term 'Malaysia,' which was frequently used for the Malay area by the British, and more importantly, narrowed down the scope of 'Indonesia' into the territory only the Dutch controlled. The narrow definition has been applied since then. Thus, this usage of the term 'Indonesia' transformed a large area that included the Philippines to a more limited area, while the meaning of 'Malaysia' has remained largely intact. Unfortunately, the term 'Indonesia' was hardly used, but Indonesian nationalists accepted the term but the 1910s and gradually began using it.[172]

While the meaning of the term 'Indonesia' was re-defined by the Dutch, the term had been 'given strong political connotation' by local nationalists and since 1918, 'came to symbolise the ideals of Indonesian nationalism'. [173] This time the meaning transformed from 'the region' into 'the nation,' and 'Indonesian' nationalists had set up the scope of their 'nation.'

With the development of nationalism, the term was officially employed by a student organization in the Netherlands. The student association, *Indische Vereeniging* (Indies' Association) was established in 1908, but the students changed its name to *Perhimpunan Indonesia* (Indonesian Association) in 1923. According to Ali Sastroamijoyo, who was the Prime Minister in the 1950s, the association 'gave a political and constitutional meaning to the term Indonesia' and the student attempted to

---

[171] R. E. Elson, ibid., p. 3.
[172] Ibid., p. 28.
[173] Akira Nagazumi, 'The word "Indonesia": The growth of its political connotation,' *Indonesian Circle*, No. 17, (Nov. 1978), p. 28.

make the term popular 'at every possible occasion.'[174] For example, the chairperson of the association, Mohammad Hatta, who became the Vice President of Indonesia after independence, adopted the term to define the future nation at the International Democratic Congress for Peace in Bierville, France in 1926.[175] The members promoted the term not only at the international level, but also within the Netherlands Indies. Although the term 'Indonesia' was prohibited to be used in public in 1922 and 1923, the nationalists felt it best described an integrated nation. This 'fastened on this name and loaded it with political connotations until it, too, became a spearhead of national identity.'[176]

Consequently, the nationalists adopted the term for their own political party, namely the *Partai Nasional Indonesia* (Indonesian National Party), which was formed in 1927. Following this, the Second Indonesian Youth Congress proclaimed and stipulated '*Tanah Air Indonesia, Bangsa Indonesia, Bahasa Indonesia*' (Indonesia as their nation, as their people, and as their national language) as *Sumpah Pemuda* (the Youth Pledge) in the following year[177] and at the same time adopted *Indonesia Raya* as the national anthem. The nationalists made great efforts to gain independence based on the territory of the Dutch colonial government.

On the other hand, the locals had once their own 'regional' terms. As previously mentioned, the Malay speakers in the archipelago labelled a region as '*di bawah angin*' and '*di atas angin*' based on the monsoon, but the terms almost disappeared by the nineteenth century. Other vernacular terms such as *Tanah Air* and *Tanah Tumpah*

---

[174] Ali Sastroamijoyo, Milestones on my journey: The memoirs of Ali Sastroamijoyo, Indonesian patriot and political leader, St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1979, pp. 27-28.
[175] Russell Jones, ibid., p. 110.
[176] Sukarno, *An autobiography as told to Cindy Adams*, Hong Kong: Gunung Agung, 1966, p. 63.
[177] Akira Nagazumi, ibid., p. 32.

*Darah* were also popularly used before the Second World War for the archipelago,[178] but its meaning as encompassing the entire region has all but vanished.

*Nusantara* was the ancient term that the locals used in their memory for centuries. *Nusantara* was a combined Sanskrit word which *Nusa* denotes 'islands' and *antara* meant 'between.' It is believed that the first usage of the term was written on a copperplate inscription dated 1305.[179] The term was used in Javanese texts in the Kingdoms of Singhasai and Majapahit, *Pararaton*, in *Sejarah Melayu* and the Bangka documents, *Surat Beriluminasi Raja Nusantara*. According to Hans-Dieter Evers, the term disappeared from written documents by the twentieth century.[180]

In the 1920s, some nationalists in the Dutch colony sought to name the nation *Nusantara*. Suwardi Suryaningrat, the founder of Taman Siswa schools and well-known as Ki Hadjar Dewantara preferred at first to use the term '*Indonesië*' to refer to what is now Indonesia. However, he later changed his mind and began to use *Nusantara*,[181] labelling the current territory based on the boundaries of the Dutch colonial government as such. Douwes Dekker, the founder of one of the earlier political parties, *Indische Partij*, also considered the term for the nation's name for a while, but in the end, it proved to be unacceptable. According to R. E. Elson's observation, it was probably because the term connoted 'Java-centricity,' namely the union of the archipelago around the Java.'[182] The young Sukarno also used in his speech in the period that 'our proud ground was once called *Nusantara*'[183] but he did not seriously consider it to be the new nation's name, though he recalled later that 'From the ninth century … we were

---

[178] Singgih Tri Sulistiyono, 'Ocean territory border concept of Indonesia: A Historical perspective,' the paper in the 22nd IAHA conference, 2 July 2012, p. 10.
[179] Jan B. Avé, '"Indonesia,' 'Insulinde' and 'Nusantara': Dotting the *I*'s and crossing the *T*", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Deel 145, 2de/3de Afl. (1989), p. 230.
[180] Hans-Dieter Evers, 'Nusantara: History of a Concept,' *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 89 (Part 1), no. 310, (June 2016), pp. 4-5.
[181] Jan B. Avé, ibid., p. 231.
[182] R. E. Elson, ibid., p. 30.
[183] Sukarno, *An Autobiography as told to Cindy Adams,* Hong Kong: Gunung Agung, 1965, p. 43.

the Sriwidjaya Empire, through the fourteenth … we were the Madjapahit Empire,' but all our islands were slowly subjugated by Holland.[184]

Directly before the end of the Second World War, Muhammad Yamin, among the most vocal members of *Badan Penyelidik Kemerdekaan Indonesia* (BPKI) (in English: the Investigating Committee for the Preparation of Indonesia's Independence), clearly defined the term by using the concept of a national border territory. He argued that *Nusantara* covers Sumatra, Java-Madura, the Lesser Sundas, Borneo, Celebes, Maluku-Ambon, the Malay Peninsula, Timor and Papua.[185] This interpretation was primarily based on the unity of the archipelago under the Majapahit empire. This concept was referred to as *Indonesia Raya*. After debating in several BKPI meetings the argument on the territory, the inclusion of the area of *Nusantara* was accepted by 39 votes out of 66. Yamin's national conception of Indonesia was also supported by Sukarno. Sukarno had a dream to embrace the Philippines and Malaya, but as for the former country he mentioned that 'the Philippines is now independent, so we must respect the sovereignty of the Philippines nation. We need no longer talk of a Pan-Indonesia.'[186] As for Malaya, Yamin and Sukarno had no doubt that the Malays in Malaya wished to join Indonesia. Sukarno mentioned 'I am convinced that the people of Malaya feel as they are Indonesians, belonging to Indonesia and as one of us,'[187] commenting on the necessity of control of the Straits of Melaka to become a stronger nation.

It was inevitable for Indonesian nationalists to cover Malaya into Indonesia because of the concept of *serumpun* (blood brotherhood).[188] In this respect, Indonesian general, Nasution, also referred to the concept of '*Naluri Rumpun Melayu*' (Malay

---

[184] Ibid., p. 32.
[185] Muhammad Yamin, *Naskah-persiapan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945*, Vol 1, Jajasan Prapantja, 1959, p. 135.
[186] Quoted in J.A.C. Mackie, *Konfrontasi: The Indonesia-Malaysia dispute 1963-1966*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1974, p. 22.
[187] Quoted in *ibid.*
[188] This translation follows Joseph Chin Yong Liow, *The politics of Indonesia-Malaysia relations: One kin, two nations*, London: Routledge, 2005, p. 26. Firdaus Haji Abdullah translated as 'people of the same racial or ethnic stock.' See his article, 'The *Rumpun* concept in Malaysia-Indonesia relations,' *The Indonesian Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1993, p. 139.

family or stock instinct), explaining an affiliation among the peoples of *Nusantara*.[189] According to Firdaus Haji Abdullah, the two peoples, i.e., Malays and Indonesians, have a feeling of basic similarity such as the perception of ancient glory, inter-migration of people within the Malay world, common struggle against colonialism, linguistic and ethnic similarities, and so forth.[190] This sense contributed to the concept of *Indonesia Rara*/*Melayu Raya*. However, Indonesia did not merge with the Malay Peninsula. Mackie points out that at the time of independence immediately after the Second World War, Indonesian leaders had enough problems in fighting the Dutch, and no desire to add the British as their adversaries[191], as a reason to exclude Malaya from Indonesia. The territory of Indonesia was laid out based on the one of the Dutch Indies.[192]

Indonesian nationalists neither applied the ancient term *Nusantara*, nor the regional term 'Malaysia,' which was synonymous with 'Indonesia' and 'the Malay Archipelago' in the nineteenth century as their country name. They would have learnt, however, that the terms were frequently used in Europe. While the nationalists in the Philippines and the Malay Peninsula sought to establish their identities on the basis of the Malay race, Indonesian nationalists, whether the groups that studied overseas or not, seldom pursued Malay identity as being their primary national identity. The intellectuals of Indonesia had a Malay consciousness, but it did not translate to become their national identity. The prominent nationalists, Douwes Drekker, Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo and Suwardi Suryaningra believed that 'older, constant, and even deep solidarities were no longer necessary or even relevant in the formation of this modern moral community.'[193] Drekker also argued that 'it is not racial unity, not unity

---

[189] Dr. A.H. Nasution, *Sekitar Perang Kemerdekaan Indonesia, Vol. 1: Proklamasi*, Bandung: Disjara dan Penerbit Angkasa, 1977, p. 52. The author also explained the early history of Nusantara in the Chapter 2 in his book. See *ibid.,* pp. 25-29.

[190] Firdaus Haji Abdullah, ibid., p. 140. According to him, the expression of *serumpun* between the two people can be traced back to the year 1906.

[191] Mackie, ibid., p. 22.

[192] East Timor under the Portuguese was annexed to Indonesia in 1975.

[193] R. E. Elson, ibid., p. 16.

of interests, not unity of language, which form the state, but it is legal unity which governs the expansion of the state,'[194] and sought 'to bind his Indies together on the basis of a secular equality in humanity that was blind to national, racial, religious, intellectual or cultural differences.'[195] The racial factor was not included in the five important factors contributing to the growth of Indonesian nationalism, as suggested by George Kahin.[196]

It is worthy to mention the usage of the terms *Indonesia Raya* and *Melayu Raya.* According to Cheah Boon Kheng, *Indonesia Raya* and *Melayu Raya* were used both terms interexchangeably.[197] It is true that the geographical concept of the two terms are similar, but they are different in terms of seeking their identities. Indonesian nationalists always used the term *Indonesia Raya*, not *Melayu Raya*. This is because 'Indonesians are not ethnic Malays.'[198] As discussed previously, Indonesian nationalists pursued a new national identity without a base of Malay or other ethnic sentiments. This became a driving force to attempt to gain independence. That is the reason Indonesians always used *Indonesia Raya*. On the other hand, as discussed in the preceding section, Malay nationalists identified themselves as *Melayu* and regarded the Malayo-Polynesian ethno-linguistic group as *Melayu* in Burhannudhin's argument, and later limited this to Malays in the Peninsula. That is the reason Malay nationalists seldom used the term *Indonesia Raya*. Thus, while the two terms can be inter-exchanged in terms of the territorial concepts, they are unable to do so in terms of identifying themselves.[199]

Most of the regional terms produced and used by the West disappeared after the Second World War, and Indonesian people also 'lost' regional names to indicate the

---

[194] Ibid.
[195] Ibid., p. 18.
[196] George McTurnan Kahin, *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959, pp. 37-41.
[197] Cheah Boon Kheng, 'The Japanese occupation of Malaya, 1941-45: Ibrahim Yaacob and the struggle for Indonesia Raya,' *Indonesia*, No. 28 (Oct., 1979), p. 85, n1.
[198] Joseph Chin Yong Liow, ibid., p. 160.
[199] Anthony Milner mentioned this, but does not discuss in his work. See Anthony Milner, *The Malays*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, p. 150.

entirety of the archipelago, including the Philippines. With the global order by the West and the mushroom of new independent countries, Indonesia's foreign policy, or more apt, Sukarno's foreign policy, maintained its own focus.

**Pursuing to construct a region**

This section presents the contrasting views of two Indonesian nationalists—Sukarno the first President and Mohammad Hatta the first Vice-President—vis-à-vis their construction of the region. Sukarno was a major leader in the entire period before independence all the way up to his downfall as the President in 1967. Although Hatta resigned from his position in 1956, he also led the country to independence as a prominent nationalist alongside Sukarno. Both of the nationalists had contrasting personalities and policies, but in terms of their perception of the region, it was shared before and after the Second World War.

With the emergence and development of nationalism, Indonesians sought to free themselves from the Dutch colonial regime. Their coherent political themes, namely the elimination of colonialism and building a peaceful and equal society led them to struggle for independence. In particular, the existence of colonial regimes in the whole of Asia prompted nationalists to have a greater sense of regional consciousness.

Sukarno's early articles repeatedly criticised the colonialism that spread throughout Asia. One of his major articles published in 1926 titled 'Nationalism, Islam, and Marxism' observed that the root cause of colonialism was the lack of resources in the West, which forced Europe to colonise and exploit Asian countries. He complained

that 'the fortunes of Asia have gone to their countries.'[200] His later article titled 'Indonesianism and Pan-Asianism' also endeavoured to unify Asians under Pan-Asianism in order to defeat colonialism together.[201] With the consciousness that Indonesia is a part of Asia, he argued that the Indonesian nationalism was inspired from other Asian countries and all nationalist movements in Asia were connected and influenced each other. Further, he argued that colonial regimes could sustain themselves even if the Indonesians defeated the Dutch because other colonial countries could take over. For this reason, emphasis was placed on subversion of not only the Dutch but also all colonial regimes. He concluded that Asians must be close to each other in order to 'become an Asian community having one spirit and one soul.'[202] This was his eternal political belief even after independence. The Indonesian leader categorised countries as belonging to either the group of colonial countries or the colonised countries. Therefore, his regional consciousness was biased towards the West and the East, namely Europe and Asia, given his colonial experiences. This consciousness remained even after gaining independence.

After the end of the Second World War, the Dutch returned to its old colonial territory, though it was driven away by the Japanese before. With its restoration, Indonesians fiercely resisted against the Dutch. In September 1945, British forces first landed on Java on behalf of Allied forces, and after a few days Dutch forces also arrived. Indonesian forces had fought against the colonial powers and in some areas such as Surabaya there was severe fighting. However, with 'considerable pressure' from the British,[203] the Dutch and the Republic of Indonesia, which was not officially recognised yet, signed the Linggadjati agreement in March 1947. The agreement recognised the

---

[200] Sukarno, 'Nationalism, Islam, and Marxism,' *Under the Banner of Revolution*, Vol. 1, Jakarta: Panitya Penerbit, 1965, pp. 1-2.
[201] Sukarno, 'Indonesianism and Pan-Asianism,' ibid., pp. 67-71.
[202] Ibid., p. 69.
[203] D. G. E. Hall, ibid., p. 853.

sovereignty of the republic over Java, Madura and Sumatra and formed a federation with the Dutch territory called the United States of Indonesia, which lasted only between 1949 and 1950. However, within a few months after the agreement, the Dutch government accused the republic of violating it. It sent troops to occupy key cities in Java and Sumatra, along with the arrest of key politicians such as Sukarno and Hatta. The situation caused some small scale clashes, which shocked the world and was criticised by members of the United Nations, in particular Asian countries. Seizing the Indonesian key nationalists caused the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru to hold the Asian Conference on Indonesia in New Delhi at the beginning of 1949. The meeting rejected the use of Dutch airplanes and ships within sovereign territories of Pakistan, India, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia and so on. With much pressure from Asian countries and the United States, the Dutch finally agreed to transfer sovereignty to Indonesia in the same year. The conference drew Indonesian nationalists closer together and solidified their relations with Asian nations, who together determined to eliminate the colonial regimes from the world. Sukarno looked back at the Bandung Conference saying that, 'Never before in the history of mankind has such a solidarity of Asian and African peoples been shown for the rescue of a fellow Asian nation in danger.'[204]

Subsequently, the Indonesian government pursued more steps to increase solidarity among Asian countries. The result was the Asian-African Conference in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955. Before the conference, Ali Sastroamidjojo, the then prime minister of Indonesia, proposed the idea in the Colombo Conference in the previous year. The prime minister persuaded the four members, namely India, Ceylon, Pakistan,

[204] George McTurnan Kahin, *The Asian-African Conference: Bandung, Indonesia, April 1955*, Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1956, p. 47.

and Burma, to convene the Asia-Africa Conference to solidify relations between regional countries and appeal to eliminate colonialism.[205]

The Asia-Africa Conference was held in April 1955. This meeting was 'the first intercontinental conference of coloured peoples in the history of mankind.'[206] His long speech in the opening of the conference summed up his thought. He argued that even if many countries gained independence, 'colonialism is not yet dead ... Wherever, whenever, and however it appears,' and colonialism must be eradicated from the face of the earth.'[207] Further, he emphasised that Asian and African countries had to raise their voice on world affairs, and concluded that 'Asia and Africa can prosper only when they are united.'[208] This successful conference gave him 'the opportunity to appear as the great unifier' in the Third World.[209]

The conference developed into the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) in the 1960s. It can be said that Sukarno laid his strategic foundation beyond the region of Asia in order to form a large bloc in international politics. Although he had fully recognised Asia as a single geographical unit since before the global war, he hardly considered the smaller region to define his regional consciousness and remained focused on larger regional consciousness. As we will discuss later, while some Southeast Asian leaders sought to form closer regional co-operation in the 1950s, Sukarno was never interested in a small regional co-operation. As Anthony Reid argued, this conference 'was not much of a step towards the solidarity of the Southeast Asian region.'[210]

Immediately after the end of the Bandung Conference in 1955, Indonesia held its first general elections for the parliament.  None of the political parties gained a majority

---

[205] See on the process for the conference on chapter 4.
[206] Ibid., p. 39.
[207] Ibid., p. 44.
[208] Ibid., p. 50.
[209] J. D. Legge, *Sukarno: A political Biography*, Singapore: Archipelago Press, 2003 (Third edition), p. 292.
[210] Anthony Reid, 'The Bandung Conference and Southeast Asian Regionalism,' in See Seng Tan and Amitav Acharya (eds.), *Bandung Revisited: The legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, Singapore: NUS Press, 2008, p. 19.

and thus in this period, coalitions were formed. All the coalition cabinets were short-lived. Hence, domestic politics was always in a state of instability. Though Sukarno decided to introduce the concept of 'Guided Democracy' in 1959 in order to secure the political situation, it caused the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI) to expand their influence and power. This had a great impact on Sukarno's foreign policy. To stabilise domestic politics, the President forged closer relations with Communist China, while the relations with India soured, taking a downward turn since independence.[211] Sukarno sought to focus on a new bloc based on the Asia-Africa group. Subsequently, the concept of the New Emerging Forces (NEFO) and the Old Established Forces (OLDEFO) was made. He said that 'Western countries belong in general to the old established order' and 'the newly-independent countries of Asia and Africa belong essentially to the new emerging forces.'[212] Nevertheless, the core members of NEFO were dominated by communist and pro-communist countries such as Indonesia, Cambodia, North Korea, North Vietnam, and China.[213] While the concept bore fruit with the holding of the Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEFO) in November 1963—which was joined by about fifty countries—there was not much outcome beyond that. Sukarno attempted to establish his own 'region' or bloc, distinguishing between colonial and colonised countries. The Indonesian leader also tried to deny regional concepts coined by the West, and to increase regional consciousness among colonised countries.

Interestingly enough, however, regional terms were not found in his articles before the Second World War. Thus, it is not clear to what extent he understood such regional terms. Nevertheless, he would have recognised the term 'the Great East Asia'

---

[211] See the strained relationship between the two countries in the chapter 17 in Ide Anak Agung Gde Agung, *Twenty years Indonesian foreign policy: 1945-1965*, The Hague: Mouton and Co, 1973.
[212] Department of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia, *New forces build a new world*, 1965 (?), p. 17.
[213] Donald E. Weatherbee, *Ideology in Indonesia: Sukarno's Indonesian Revolution*, Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, 1966, p. 70.

(*Asia Timor Raya* in Indonesia) at least after occupation by Japanese. It was because the term was frequently used in the local mass media such as radio and newspapers to propagate Japanese activities. During the war, it is also not clear whether he had known of the term 'South East Asia' because the news propagated by the South-East Asian Command (SEAC) in 1943 was not broadcasted in Indonesia due to the Japanese controlled media. [214] Notwithstanding that, Sukarno might have been aware of the term, as can be surmised from his famous speech, 'The Birth of *Pancha Sila*,' in June 1945. Talking about a geography, he mentioned that 'in South Asia the land of India is a single unity.' Further, in defining the region, he said that it was 'bordered by the extensive Indian Ocean and the Himalaya Mountains.' [215] This suggests that he was aware that Indonesia belonged not to South Asia, but to another region, which might be South East Asia. This was a sharp contrast with the book of an famous Indonesian writer, Armijn Pane, which described Indonesia as being one of the South Asian countries. [216]

Sukarno had used the term 'South East Asia' at least since the country's independence. The President sometimes used the term in his anniversary speeches for the country's independence. For the first time, the term *Asia Tenggara* (South East Asia) was found on 17 August 1947, though no definitions of the term were made at all.[217] As the term has gained currency in English, it is highly possible that the political leader understood the term, but not Indonesians in general. In a speech in 1953, he also mentioned that 'In the entire South East Asia, even through West Asia, Indonesia is the country where most efforts were made to run democracy!'[218] This passage shows that

---

[214] For example, see *Sinar Matahari*, 26 Aug., 1943, p. 2. It reported on the Quebec conference, but did not refer to the establishment of SEAC.

[215] Herbert Feith and Lance Castles (eds.), *Indonesian Political Thinking: 1945-1965*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970, p. 42. The term, 'South Asia' in English, has been found in British newspapers since the 1820s, according to the British Newspaper Archive. The earliest use is on the *Birmingham Gazette* in 8 Oct. 1827, p. 2.

[216] Armijn Pane, 'Sekitar permulaan tarich masehi,' in *Indonesia: Madjalah kebudajaan*, Djanuari-Februari, 1951, pp. 5-36. He defined the current mainland Southeast Asia as South-East Asia.

[217] Dari Proklamasi sampai Gesuri: Terbitan berisi pidato proklamasi diutjapkan oleh P.J.M. Presiden Republik Indonesia pada tiap tanggal 17 Agustus sedjak tahun 1945 sampai 1963, Jajasan Prapantja, 1963, p. 27.

[218] Ibid., p. 222.

he recognised that Indonesia belonged to South East Asia. The term, *Asia Tenggara*, was used six times in his independence anniversary speeches by 1958. Interestingly enough, the 1958 speech complained that many countries regarded him as 'the sick man of South-East Asia.'[219] Thus, the political leaders and the Indonesia audience did have an awareness of the region through the speeches, though the definition might have been in vague.

Although Sukarno was cognizant of the term South East Asia, he was not interested in 'regional co-operation' with neighbouring countries and did not attempt to deepen this regional consciousness through co-operation. His indifference was apparent when a proposal for a 'Federation of the Free Peoples of Southern Asia' by Ho Chi Minh was made on 17 November 1945. The Vietnamese nationalist proposed to set up the federation with India, Burma, Malaya and all the subject peoples of Asia to liberate themselves from colonial regimes. After receiving the proposal, the Vice President of Indonesia, Mohammad Hatta, handed the letter to the then Prime Minister, Sutan Sjahrir. He rejected the proposal because 'if we ally ourselves with Ho Chi Minh, we will weaken ourselves and delay independence.'[220] The reason is reasonable, considering that the Asian countries were devastated immediately after the World War and the Indonesian forces still fought with the Allied forces. However, another reason is that Sukarno and other leaders were not interested in small regional co-operation.

Another case shows that the President was indifferent towards regional co-operation. The President of the Philippines, Elpidio Quirino convened the Baguio Conference in May 1950 in order to 'discuss cultural, political and economic problems common to the participating nations' and to 'form a Pacific union.'[221] Sukarno sent

---

[219] Ibid., p. 382.
[220] Hanna Papanek, 'Note on Soedjatmoko's recollections of a historical moment: Sjahrir's reaction to Ho Chi Minh's 1945 call for a free peoples federation,' *Indonesia*, No. 49 (1990), p. 144.
[221] The Singapore Free Press, 9 May 1950, p. 8.

Ahmad Subarjo, the former Minister of Foreign Affairs as a delegate, and instructed him to 'thwart the Philippines in their hope of arranging such a permanent body of cooperation.' It was because Indonesia was against the establishment of a regional body during the Cold War.[222] Sukarno was cautious of forming a new military group with the participants, but discussions were held on social, economic and cultural issues only, and no military issues were discussed, nor was a regional organization formed either.

On the other hand, Mohammad Hatta, who was born in Bukittinggi, Padang, Sumatra, had had some regional consciousness since the Second World War. After studying Dutch in his hometown and Jakarta, he departed to Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Having started to study economics in 1922, he earned a doctorate after ten years.[223] During his studies overseas, he had easier access to newspapers and other media than in Indonesia, which meant that his stay in Europe impacted his regional perspectives. One of his earlier writings show us that he recognised the term 'South East Asia' in 1930. When he gave a long speech to students of Indology in Utrecht, he mentioned what is now Indonesia as 'the Netherlands in South-East Asia.'[224] Although this phrase was quoted from the Dutch language, which a professor wrote on his article in the previous year, Hatta's speech shows that he knew of the term from the Dutch article by then.

The magazine, *Daulat Ra'jat*, which was created as a nationalist-propagated media in September 1931 and was edited by Sutan Sjahrir and Hatta since 1932,[225] shows that writers used a few regional terms. The issue on 20 April 1932 mentioned that Indonesia is located next to '*Selatan-Timoernya Asia*' (South-East Asia in

---

[222] Ide Anak Agung Gde Agung, ibid., p. 195.

[223] George McT. Kahin, 'In Memoriam: Mohammad Hatta, (1902-1980),' *Indonesia*, No. 30 (Oct. 1980), pp. 113-114.

[224] English translation was quoted from Mohammad Hatta, *Portrait of a Patriot: selected writings by Mohammad Hatta*, The Hague: Mounton Publishers, 1972, p. 119. For Indonesian language, it is available in Mohammad Hatta, *Kumpulan Karangan*, Djakarta: Penerbitan dan Balai Buku Indonesia, 1953, p. 38.

[225] For details, see in J. D. Legge, 'Daulat Ra'jat and the ideas of the Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia,' *Indonesia*, No. 32 (Oct., 1981), pp.151-168.

English).[226] The writer—though it is unclear who wrote this article—recognised the term and at the same time defined it as what is currently known as mainland Southeast Asia. Reference to 'Asia' was also quite widespread. For example, the article titled 'Politik pendjadjahan di Asia' (Colonial politics in Asia) focused on the political situation in India, Indonesia and the Philippines, but no other regional terms were used. As the nationalists always received international news and observed the political situation in other parts of Asia, in particular China and India, the Indonesian writers often used the term 'Asia,' not other regional terms. Interestingly enough, the magazine did not use the terms 'Malay Archipelago' and 'Indian Archipelago.' The Indonesian nationalists seldom used the regional terms because they determined to seek independence and regarded the area of the 'Malay Archipelago' not as a region, but as their own country. Indonesian nationalism led them to abandon the two regional terms in the period prior to World War II when the area was occupied by Japanese.

During Japanese occupation, Hatta often used the term '*Asia Timur Raya*' (Greater East Asia). In a 1943 radio speech replying to the Japanese Prime Minister, Hideki Tojo, Hatta often used the term 'the Great East Asia' as espoused by the Japanese.[227] Even in a 1944 speech regarding future independence, Hatta repeatedly mentioned the term,[228] but presumably he was forced to use it under the Japanese military regime. It was because he co-operated with the Japanese Military government 'to reduce the impact of the oppressive policies of the Japanese on the Indonesian people.'[229] The nationalist referred to 'East Asia and South' (*Asia Timur dan Selatan*) as areas to be subjugated by the Japanese immediately after they landed in Kota Bahru,

---

[226] 'Keadaan Pacific,' *Daulat Ra'jat*, 20 Apr. 1932, p. 6.
[227] I. Wangsa Widjaja and Meutia F. Swasono (eds.), *Mohammad Hatta Kumpulan Pidato: Dari tahun 1942 s.d. 1949*, Jakarta: Yayasan Idayu, 1981, pp. 33- 36.
[228] Ibid., pp. 54-58.
[229] Mohammad Hatta, *Mohammad Hatta: Indonesian patriot Memoir*, Singapore: Gunung Agung, 1981, p. 210.

Malaya in early December 1941.[230] With the Japanese having invaded the whole of the Dutch Indies, Hatta's writings had employed the term "Greater East Asia" more frequently as it was created by the Japanese government. At the same time the term 'Indonesia' was continuously used to refer to the area delineating their homeland.

Immediately after the independence of the Republic of Indonesia, Hatta, who became the Vice President, proposed to create an economic region in a conference in 1946. He said:

> To set the world's economic structure, it is necessary to create a united economy for some neighbouring countries. For example, East Asia and Australia can be united under one integrated economy. Either through their geographic factor, or through their economic structure, this area could become one 'together prosperity.'[231]

It is notable that Hatta made the proposal in terms of that economic region. This is because in the aftermath of the world war, the Vice President did not seek to collaborate economically with other Southeast Asian countries, but rather attempted to form a new region with East Asia and Australia. He did not even mention the term South East Asia (*Asia Tenggara*) in his speech. However, not much attention was paid to this at all. Even as the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs later, the proposal was not seriously mooted partly because Indonesian foreign policy was mostly handled by President Sukarno and partly because Hatta's cabinet had 'no attempt to act out hero roles on the international stage.'[232]

---

[230] Mohammad Hatta, *Kumpulan Karangan*, Djakarta: Penerbitan dan Balai Buku Indonesia, 1953, p. 142.

[231] Mohammad Hatta, *Beberapa Pokok Pikiran*, Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia, 1992, p. 16. The translation is mine. The original text is written in Indonesia.

[232] Herbert Feith, *The Decline of Constitutional Democracy in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962, p. 87.

Hatta did not only use the term 'South East Asia,' but also promoted regional co-operation in his famous 1953 article published in *Foreign Affairs*. He mentioned the six objectives in Indonesian foreign policy and one of them was to place 'special emphasis on initiating good relations with neighbouring countries, the majority of which have in the past occupied a position similar to Indonesia.'[233] Nevertheless, he did neither propose a neighbouring co-operation in the region of Southeast Asia nor mention the regional term.

Hatta might have avoided using the term 'South East Asia' in his period as Vice-President. He referred to the term when he gave a speech in Tokyo in 1957 immediately after his resignation.[234] At the time, the then Prime Minister of Japan, Nobusuke Kishi proposed to set up 'the South East Asian Development Fund'[235] to give a financial aid to countries in the region and Hatta might have had no choice but to use the term. Nevertheless, as he was not a government officer, it was not necessary to mention the plan of the Fund. This would not be an accident to use the term at the time. The Indonesian Government pursued an active and independent foreign policy. Therefore, it can be said that using the regional term, which developed from the Western-coined military coalition—namely SEAC in 1943—would have had a negative impact on Indonesian politicians.

On the other hand, Indonesian bureaucrats understood the term and used it in their daily work. The Ministry of the Foreign Affairs of Indonesia for example refers to it in its organisation chart. Officers in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for example set up a

---

[233] Mohammad Hatta, 'Indonesia's Foreign Policy,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 31, No. 3, Apr. 1953, p. 441.

[234] Hatta resigned from his position on 1 Dec., 1956 without any reasons. George Kahin observed that the reason was due to the fact Hatta was not able to 'prevail against the powerful marriage of convenience between Sukarno and the army.' See 'In Memoriam: Mohammad Hatta (1902-1980),' *Indonesia*, No. 30 (Oct. 1980), p. 116.

[235] This plan derailed because of protests from the United States. See in details to Jeong Kyong-Ah, 'Kishi naikaku no "Tounan Ajia kaihatsu kikin" kousou to ajia shokoku no hannou' ('"The Southeast-Asian Development Fund" of the Kishi Cabinet and the Reaction of Asian Countries'), *Research Bulletin of Faculty of Education and Welfare Science*, Oita University, Vol. 27, No. 1, 2005, pp. 17-32 and Nobushuke Kishi, *Kishi Nobusuke Kaikoroku (Memoir of Nobusuke Kishi)*, Tokyo: Kouzai-do Shuppan, 1983, pp. 319-322.

division focusing on the region since independence. According to the pre-1950 organisation chart of the Ministry, the Minister controlled a Secretary-General which had seven departments. One of the departments was called the 'Department of Politics,' which was broken down into eight divisions. Further, one of the divisions, which was called the Second Division, covered the two areas: East Asia and South East Asia. While the former section handled with Japan, China and Korea, the latter section focused on the Philippines, Indo-China, Siam, Burma, and Malaya.[236]

However, in early 1950 the ministry's structure was reorganised and the Secretary-General had only three departments. One of the departments, the 'Overseas Directorate,' governed the Asia Department, which is composed of the China, Central Asia and South East Asia Sections. On the other hand, the Central Asia Department embraced India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Ceylon, and Nepal, and the South East Asia Section included Indo-China, Siam, Burma, Macao, Singapore, Malaya and other British areas. Interestingly enough, the Philippines was excluded from the South East Asian region, and was set up as the Section of the Philippines under the Department of the Pacific.[237]

Furthermore, the Ministry was again re-organised at the end of 1950, with the Philippines being removed from the Pacific Department. It is not sure whether the country was covered in the Section of South East Asia or the Pacific.[238] Be that as it may, though the definition of the region was not fixed yet at the early stage of the Ministry, the official document shows that officers of the Ministry had recognised the regional frame and might have had much regional consciousness. At the same time, it is clear that the Minister of the Foreign Affairs in the period such as Achmad Subarjo

---

[236] Departemen Luar Negeri Panitya Penulisan Sedjarah, Republik Indonesia, *Dua Puluh Lima Tahun: Departmen Luar Negeri 1945-1970*, Jajasan Kesedjahteraan Karyawan Depl, 1971, Lampian II.
[237] Ibid., Lampian III.
[238] Ibid., Lampian V.

and Sutan Sjahrir,[239] both of whom were educated in the Netherlands in their early lives, understood the regional term.

Lastly, we have to focus on Dr. Subandrio, who worked as a bureaucrat in the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs since independence and who later became a politician. He was born as a child of aristocrats in East Java in 1912 and graduated from a medical college in Jakarta in 1942. Practicing as a surgeon in Semarang, at almost the same time, he joined a nationalist movement. The doctor was close to Sutan Sjahrir and was later appointed as the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Information in 1946. Joining Sjahrir's political party, *Partai Sosialis* (Socialist Party), he was appointed as ambassador to the United Kingdom. He worked at the embassy in London by 1954 and subsequently was chosen as the ambassador to the Soviet Union. In 1957 Sukarno recalled him to Jakarta as Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Subandrio was appointed as the Minister of the Foreign Affairs in 1957.[240] He helped Sukarno to develop his radical foreign policy until 1966, but was arrested and imprisoned for twenty-nine years until 1995, and died in 2004.

During his ambassadorship to the United Kingdom, he sometimes focused on Southeast Asia in his speeches. On 17 August 1949 he delivered a speech titled 'A New Approach to South East Asia' with the request of the president of Oxford Majlis Asian Society. He framed South East Asia as a single regional unit and mooted a proposal of cooperation between South East Asian countries to seek solutions not only in international problems but also in 'national difficulties and the development of the country as a whole.'[241] Furthermore, he explained that regional co-operation and their concerted action led all the countries to 'reduce the danger of losing the freedom and

---

[239] Sjahrir referred to '*Asia Tenggara*' in his pamphlet, *Our Struggle* written in October, 1945. See Sutan Sjahrir, Benedict Anderson (tra.), *Our Struggle*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 1968, p. 443.
[240] Michael van Langenberg, 'Dr. Subandrio - An Assessment,' *The Australian Quarterly*, Vo. 38, No. 4 (Dec. 1966), pp. 67-70.
[241] Subandrio, Indonesia on the march: the collected speeches of H. E. Dr. Subandrio delivered while Ambassador of the Republic of Indonesia to the Court of St. James 1950-1954, Volume I Jakarta: Penerbit Djambatan, 1959, p. 10.

democratic principles that have been achieved, because of lack of wisdom' and possibly to prevent war from outside powers.[242] Scholars of Southeast Asia have not paid much attention to this speech, but it is noteworthy that Subandrio was the first Indonesian to have proposed regional co-operation.

However, based on the speech's texts, his regional definition seems to be slightly different from the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs. For example, he referred to countries such as India, Pakistan, and Ceylon in the speech titled 'Trial of Communism and Western Democracy in South East Asia' in 1950.[243] In the following year his speech shows that he mentioned the same countries as being part of the Southeast Asian region.[244] Thus, in this respect he had different regional view from the Ministry.

Although Subandrio proposed the regional co-operation in his ambassadorship in London, he did not refer to it at all during the period of his Minister of Foreign Affairs. His 1958 speech emphasised that 'only by working together collectively with the states of Asia and Africa can we make a constructive contribution to the building of a new world, which must be different from the old balance existing before the Second World War.'[245] In annual meeting of the Colombo Plan in 1959 he did not make a proposal to co-operate among Southeast Asian countries, but admitted that they needed to achieve and 'build up stability in the region of South and South-East Asia.'[246] Though the Tunku, the Prime Minister of Malaya and Garcia, the President of the Philippines mooted out the idea of regional co-operation by this time and Subandrio also came up the same idea in 1949, the Indonesian government rejected it. The government pursued to co-operate with more number of countries in Asia and Africa.

---

[242] Ibid.
[243] Ibid., p. 25.
[244] Ibid., p. 66.
[245] Subandrio, 'International Relations in the Present Era,' *Indonesia on the march*: *A Collection of Addresses by Dr. Subandrio, Foreign Minister of the Republic of Indonesia, Volume II*, Jakarta: Department of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia, 1963, p. 101.
[246] 'International Responsibility for Stability,' ibid., p. 113.

Indonesian foreign policy turned towards a 'militant policy of struggle and confrontation against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.'[247] By dissolving the Assembly in July 1959, Sukarno changed the political system from a parliamentary to a presidential system of government and also kept his dominance on foreign policy.[248]

By turning radical Indonesia's foreign policy, the government attempted to categorise the two groups: the New Emerging Forces and the Old Established Forces. Subandrio said that 'in our diplomacy we struggle for the practice of international relations based not upon power but upon justice, for the sake of our own growth.'[249] That was why the government grouped into the two forces to struggle 'toward a new world based upon justice.'[250] Sukarno and Subandrio attempted to transform the international politics which the West had held real power and build up a new world by grouping the existing nations in the world beyond any regions. As a result the Indonesia government also withdrew from the United Nations in 1965. In the end, Sukarno lost his position after the 30 September coup in 1965, which it is said that the PKI members attempted to hold power. The new government under the President Suharto pursued and sought regional co-operation to stabilise the whole region by joining ASEAN.

## Conclusion

The archipelago was labelled a 'regional unit' based on race. Thomas Raffles transformed the meaning of '*Melayu*' from that of a place to that of a race, and the term

---

[247] Frederick P. Bunnell, 'Guided Democracy Foreign Policy: 1960-1965 President Sukarno Moves from Non-Alignment to Confrontation,' *Indonesia*, No. 2 (Oct., 1966), p. 37.
[248] Ibid., p. 38.
[249] Subandrio, 'International Relations in the Present Era,' *Indonesia on the march*: *A Collection of Addresses by Dr. Subandrio, Foreign Minister of the Republic of Indonesia, Volume II*, Jakarta: Department of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia, 1963, p. 272.
[250] Ibid.

'Malay Archipelago' was derived from that meaning and indicated the area that Malays inhibited. While he did not define the scope of the archipelago that they lived in, William Marsden's definition included the Philippines. Although John Crawford consistently used the term 'Indian Archipelago,' and not 'Malay Archipelago,' his definition was almost the same as the Marsden's definition. The best seller, *Malay Archipelago*, by Wallace also inherited the definition. In the period up to the Second World War, the term 'Malay Archipelago' was often used in English newspapers. At least in English-speaking countries, the area, located in the southeastern of the Asian Continent, was known as a single unit.

On the other hand, the term 'Malaysia,' which is currently used as a country name and also based on the Malay race, had been originally employed for the entire archipelago since the 1830s. The term included the Philippines and also was synonymous with the Malay Archipelago and Indian Archipelago. None the less, since the publication of the best-selling book on the Malay Archipelago by Wallace, the term 'Malaysia' was not often used. Since the 1890s, some writers also began using the term in relation to the Malay Peninsula only. Thus, between the end of the nineteenth century and the prior to the Second World War, the term referred to two possible places, either the entire archipelago or only the Malay Peninsula.

The section also shows that prior to the World War, there emerged a few terms that indicated the Malay Peninsula. In addition to 'Malaysia,' British writers also used 'Malaya,' 'British Malaya,' and also 'Malay Peninsula' to refer to the area. The four terms for the Malay Peninsula were often used among Europeans.

On the other hand, the locals in the peninsula had a sense of regional consciousness based on nature and religion. Originally they used the local terms '*di bawah/atas angin,*' but with the development of steamers produced by Europeans, the regional terms disappeared. The local intellectuals, in particular among Hajis and

students in Arabia, also had a sense of regional consciousness based on Islam, referring to the archipelago as 'Jawa' or 'Jawi.' However, other regional terms soon replaced it.

This chapter shows that R. O. Winstedt created the term *Alam Melayu* (Malay world) as well. Translated *Gugusan Pulau-Pulau Melayu* (Malay Archipelago) and *Pulau Pulau Melayu* (Malay islands) by Za'ba, local intellectuals preferred to use '*Alam Melayu.*' However, Winstedt's scope of the term was not exactly adopted by the locals, which is to say that the scope became based on the area that Muslims lived in. Consequently, it left out the Philippines.

With the development of nationalism in the Malay Peninsula a concept of *Melayu Raya* was born. The idea intended Malaya to become a part of Indonesia, which is similar culturally and linguistically. Their historical perceptions and the migration system *merantau* helped to make spatial consciousness among the Malays. However, little attention was paid to the concept after the independence of Indonesia.

On the other hand, once the term 'South East Asia' was popularised in the 1940s, Malay intellectuals shifted their regional consciousness from the 'Malay World.' Although the translated term of 'South East Asia' was not fixed by the 1960s, their regional consciousness that they belong to the region in the south-east part of the Asian continent has penetrated into the local intellectuals via English and its associated translations.

The archipelagic area, now called 'Indonesia,' had been labelled with several names by Europeans since the eighteenth century such as 'the Eastern Islands,' 'the Asiatic Isles,' 'Malay Archipelago,' 'Indian Archipelago,' and others. With the colonisation of the entire area by the Dutch, Europeans began using other terms like 'the Indies,' 'the East Indies,' 'Insulinde' (the islands of the Indies), and 'the Netherlands East Indies.' Despite the fact that there were many terms used to label the area, a British writer, James Logan, also coined the term 'Indonesia' in 1850. He

defined the large area that consisted of the present-day Indonesia, Taiwan and the Philippines. In this sense, the term 'Indonesia' was synonymous with the regional term 'Malaysia.' However, at the end of the nineteenth century the definition was only limited to the Dutch colonial area. Although this term was not used in Europe by the 1910s, local intellectuals and nationalists under the Dutch colonial area incorporated the term into their national movement.

As mentioned in the section on Malaysia, local Malay speakers had their own regional terms, but the people in the archipelago had their original term, '*Nusantara*' which had been in use since the fourteenth century. With the development of nationalism, this term was also considered to be used for their nationalism movement as *Indonesia Raya*, but it was later abandoned. Indonesian nationalists pursued independence based not on their Malay racial identity, but on a new identity that did not attach special importance to their traditional elements. For this reason they employed 'Indonesia' as their country not 'Malaysia' or other term.

The last section revealed that Sukarno himself had little interest in regional consciousness before the Second World War, and was more passionate for political co-operation with countries in a large region of Asia in order to eliminate colonialism, which was his political motto. He was not keen on co-operating with immediate neighbouring countries within a small region because of his ambition to be a representative of the Third World, though he recognised the regional frame 'South East Asia.' Even at the end of his government the president attempted to form his own bloc, NEFO.

Hatta and Subandrio pursued regional co-operation immediately after the end of the World War. While Hatta proposed to create an economic region, Subandrio sought regional co-operation within Southeast Asia. Hatta noticed the regional term 'South East Asia,' but he seldom used the term in his speech and writings by his resignation in

1956. On the other hand, Subandrio did not propose in public to form regional co-operation after his assumption of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. He pursued Sukarno's extreme policy and at the same time created regional trouble and disorder. The resignation of Hatta and the loyalty of Subandrio to Sukarno were missed opportunities to solidify regional co-operation, but the downfall of Sukarno created regional co-operation in Southeast Asia, shifting Indonesia's foreign policy.

## CHAPTER 5: EARLY REGIONAL CO-OPERATION

## AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

### Introduction

Students of international relations have been the main group driving the discussion of regional political co-operation in Southeast Asia between the end of the Second World War and the eve of the formation of ASEAN. However, this chapter discusses economic and cultural regional co-operation, as well as inter-state relations within the region. Most historians also focus on their studies on the Asia-African Conference, other Asian conferences, SEATO, and ASA, but these students have paid little attention to proposals of regional co-operation by indigenous political leaders and to social and cultural regional co-operation in this period.

Therefore, this chapter examines how proposals for regional co-operation were made and how regional organisations emerged in the period starting immediately after Second World War right up to the formation of the ASEAN. This chapter comprises four main sections. The first section focuses on the period between 1945 and 1955. The Asia-Africa Conference, also known as the Bandung Conference, was held at the end of this period. It was the turning point that divided countries in the region into two main camps with regard to regional cooperation. The second section discusses Malaya's proposal for regional co-operation at the end of the 1950s, as well as the formation and dissolution of the ASA after the formation of MAPHILINDO. The third section analyses regional organisations involved in social and cultural cooperation, which have received little attention in most scholarly sources. The last section attempts to define the terms 'regional organisation' and 'regional cooperation' in relation to the formation of SEATO in 1954.

**Early regional co-operation in Asia from 1945 to 1955**

At the end of January 1945, during the Second World War, General Aung San of Burma stressed the necessity for Burma's co-operation with neighbouring countries in the area of defence: 'Burma must be strong in her defence, and will need the helping hand of one or more of her neighbours, at least—an entente between Burma, Indo-China, Thailand, Malaya, the Philippines, the East Indies, Yunnan, and Eastern India, on this side of the Brahmaputra.'[1] The Burmese leader also stated his plan to call for an 'Asiatic Freedom Conference' in October 1945 for the purpose of forming 'a united campaign to secure freedom' from external powers. He proposed the inclusion of Burma, Ceylon (present-day Sri Lanka), India, Indo-China, Malaya, the Philippines, and Thailand.[2] In addition, Aung San stated his desire to form the 'Asiatic federation in the not very, very remote future' in the presence of Sarat Bose, the elder brother of Subhas Chandra Bose and a member of the Indian National Congress.[3] Noting that Burma must strive to come up with solutions to mutual problems with India and South East Asia,[4] the Burmese leader suggested the immediate formation of a South-East Asia Economic Union. For this union, his potential members would comprise Burma, Indochina, Indonesia, Malaya, and Thailand.[5] Interestingly enough, although he recognised the Philippines as one of the Asian countries to be included in his plans for regional co-operation, the country was excluded from his conception of Southeast Asia. Unfortunately, after his assassination by a political enemy, the proposal failed to come to fruition. This, nevertheless, was one of the earliest indigenous proposals for regional co-operation.

---

[1] 'Document II: Defence of Burma January 30, 1945', Josef Silverstein (ed.), *The Political Legacy of Aung San*, Ithaca: Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University, 1972, p. 16.

[2] *The Straits Times*, 1 Nov. 1945, p. 1.

[3] Josef Silverstein (ed.), *The political legacy of Aung San: Compiled by and with an Introductory Essay by Josef Silverstein*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972, p. 86.

[4] Ibid., p. 90.

[5] *The Straits Times*, 19 April 1947, p. 4.

A proposal for regional co-operation was also put forward by the then President of Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh, in 1945, in which he sent a letter to the President of Indonesia, Sukarno, to propose the formation of 'a Preparatory Commission with the ultimate purpose of creating a Federation of the Free Peoples of Southern Asia,' that aimed to fight for freedom and liberation from colonial powers.[6] President Ho Chi Minh had plans to extend invitations to India, Burma, and Malaya to become members of the commission. However, Indonesia did not respond to this proposal, mainly because it thought that it would become weaker, and its independence delayed, if it allied with Ho Chi Minh.[7]

Another proposal was later put forward by the then Prime Minister of Thailand, Thamrong Nawasawat, who announced in July 1947 that Thailand and France planned to form a Pan Southeast Asian Union for the joint development of irrigation, fisheries, communication, and other industries. The union would initially include the region of Indochina i.e. Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, and would later include Borneo, Burma, India, and Indonesia as well. However, the Thai people opposed this union with France, and consequently the organisation was not formed.[8]

Although the proposals mentioned above did not come to fruition, India succeeded in taking initiatives towards forging regional co-operation. The first such initiative was the Asian Relations Conference held in New Delhi in 1947. The conference, which comprised twenty-six countries, aimed to pave the way towards co-operation among Asian countries, particularly among Southeast Asian countries. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Prime Minister of India, called for co-operation among Asian countries, and proposed the formation of a permanent Asian regional organisation. As Werner Levi pointed out, the conference reached the apex of their solidarity at the time, but began to

---

[6] Hanna Papanek, 'Note on Soedjatmoko's Recollection of a Historical Moment: Sjahrir's Reaction to Ho Chi Minh's 1945 Call for a Free Peoples Federation,' *Indonesia*, No. 49 (1990), p. 142.
[7] Ibid., p. 144.
[8] Army Vandenbosch and Richard A. Butwell, *Southeast Asia among the World Powers*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1957, pp. 250-251.

decline after the independence of many Asian countries with the gradual withdrawal of Western colonial powers.[9] Moreover, a common distrust towards the two major Asian countries, i.e. India and China, held by other smaller countries arose during this time.[10] Delegates from Southeast Asian countries were reluctant to be controlled by the two largest powers in the Asian region, and Nehru's proposal was thus not supported.[11] On the contrary, the delegates from Southeast Asian countries, i.e. Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam, built close and meaningful relations in New Delhi, India. Interestingly enough, one of the Indonesian delegates wrote:

> I had endless talks and debates, especially with the delegations of Burma, Thailand, Vietnam, the Philippines, and Malaya. We felt we had much in common. We were from the same stock, and certainly once belonged to the same Malay race. We debated, talked, and planned a Southeast Asian Association closely co-operating first in culture and economic matters. Later, there could perhaps be a more closely knit political co-operation. Some of us even dreamt of a Greater Southeast Asia federation.[12]

Though this regional co-operation was not forged immediately, it is worth noting that the conference provided a venue for the Southeast Asian delegates to meet and communicate with each other, since most of the indigenous political leaders whose countries were under colonial powers were not able to meet each other. The leaders who met here became key government figures later.

---

[9] Werner Levi, *Free India in Asia*, Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1952, p. 39.
[10] Sisir Gupta, *India and Regional Integration in Asia*, London: Asia Publishing House, 1964, p. 36.
[11] Nicholas Tarling (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia: Volume Four, From World War II to the present*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 268.
[12] Abu Hanifah, *Tales of a Revolution*, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1972, p. 235.

At around the same time, independent of the conference, the communist leader of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV), Pham Ngoc Thanh, and the then Prime Minister of Siam, Pridi Banomyong, discussed the necessity of forming a regional organisation in June 1946.[13] Unofficial representatives from Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaya, Thailand, and Vietnam participated in a conference that resulted in the formation of the Vietminh-sponsored South East Asia League in Bangkok in September 1947. The motives to form a regional co-operation with neighbours stemmed from 'genuine sympathy for the nationalist aspirations of neighbouring peoples' after the Thai government's territorial claims in Indochina from France was rejected.[14] As a matter of fact, the French government had proposed to establish a Pan Southeast Asia Union to the Thai government, which comprised France, Thailand, and its neighbours. However, this scheme was shelved because of Thailand's objection that an independent Cambodia and Laos should join the Union,[15] though Pridi was the first to be interested in this Union.[16] In the unofficial conference, six goals were laid out in relation to the formation of the League: the promotion and development of good understanding among the member states; the realisation of their aspirations for full nationhood and the raising of their economic, social, and cultural standards; the promotion of universal peace and respect for human rights; the promotion of study, research, and exchange of information in Southeast Asia; the publication of matters of cultural, social, economic, and scientific interests relating to the region; and the establishment of a Southeast Asia Federation.[17] However, the conference was not officially recognised by Southeast Asian governments, partly because of the participation of unauthorised representatives from Burma,

[13] Christopher E. Goscha, *Thailand and the Southeast Asian Networks of the Vietnamese Revolution 1885-1954*, Richmond: Curzon, 1999, p. 256.

[14] Bruce Reynolds, 'Thailand and the Southeast Asia League,' *International Conference on Thai Studies August 22-24, 1984*, Bangkok, Relations between Thailand and other countries, Vol. 3, p. 14.

[15] William Hendrson, 'The Development of Regionalism in Southeast Asia,' *International Organisation*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Nov., 1955), p. 469.

[16] *The Bangkok Post*, 7 July 1947, p. 1 and p. 8.

[17] Ibid., 15 Aug. 1947, p. 1.

Indonesia, and Malaya. The resignation of Pridi also resulted in the League's unsuccessful formation.

Since the Asian Relations Conference in 1947, indigenous Asian conferences had been held nearly every year until 1955. In January 1949, Nehru called for an Asian Conference to discuss the situation in Indonesia, in which at that time, the Dutch had conquered the main cities of Indonesia as part of its military campaign, in addition to capturing key Indonesian nationalists. Although the conference in 1949 was unofficial, fifteen Asian countries including Burma and the Philippine—with Thailand as an observer—participated in it. From the conference, a resolution to call for the release of the Indonesian political leaders and the withdrawal of the Dutch troops was passed. After this resolution, the United Nations Security Council ordered an end to the aggression in Indonesia and the restoration of the Indonesian government.

The Dutch finally adhered to this order. It can thus be seen that the conference had a great impact on international politics, played an important role in bringing about a peaceful settlement of this issue, and at the same time, reflected an Asian voice in international politics. Interestingly enough, according to Sisir Gupta, during this conference, Carlos Romulo of the Philippines urged for the establishment of a small permanent secretariat base in New Delhi or Manila that could evolve into a permanent organisation for Asian states,[18] but his suggestion was not adopted.

Subsequent to this, the President of the Philippines, Elpidio Quirino, the President of the Republic of China, Chiang Kai Shek, and the President of South Korea, Syngman Rhee, intended to form an Asian Union in 1950. For the purpose of countering communist attacks, Quirino called for a conference in Baguio, the Philippines, to discuss a military pact and the formation of an anti-communism alliance. However, Burma, India, and Indonesia, among other countries, opposed the agenda to discuss the aforementioned

---

[18] Sisir Gupta, ibid., pp. 40-41.

issues when they were invited. Thus, the conference was limited to general economic and social issues. Although the participating countries i.e. Australia, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Thailand passed a resolution, the conference was considered to have ended in failure. As Russell Fifield pointed out, the reasons for this failure were the rivalry between India and the Philippines for regional leadership and the differences among the countries of the region in their attitudes towards the menace of Communist aggression.[19] In the issue of communism, India and Indonesia were neutralists, but other countries were opposed to it.

However, this conference significantly contributed to a sense of regional consciousness of Southeast Asia for two reasons. Firstly, the Asian regional conferences in the 1940s were held mainly in India, but this conference was the first meeting to be conducted within the region of Southeast Asia. Secondly, while many delegates from Middle Eastern countries were invited to the Asian Relations Conference in 1947, the Philippine government mainly focused on inviting the countries within the regions of Southeast Asia and the Pacific to the Baguio Conference because 'we can complement one another relying on our common historic origin and traditional sympathy with each other, as well as on our geographic propinquity.'[20] In forging an international collaboration, the President of the Philippines chose to focus more on his immediate neighbouring countries within the Southeast Asian region as opposed to the whole of Asia.

Another important Asian conference during this period that aimed to forge regional co-operation was the Colombo Conference convened by the Prime Minister of Ceylon, John Kotelawala, in 1954, in collaboration with the Prime Ministers of Burma, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan. Unlike the 1949 Asian Conference, this informal conference

[19] Russell D. Fifield, 'Philippine Foreign Policy,' *Far Eastern Survey*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (21 Feb., 1951), p. 35.
[20] Government of the Philippines website: http://www.gov.ph/1950/05/26/address-of-president-quirino-at-the-opening-session-of-the-baguio-conference-of-1950-may-26-1950/ (Accessed on Aug. 2015).

was not called to discuss any specific issues. The Prime Minister of Ceylon merely wished to exchange ideas in an informal manner on matters of common interest with neighbouring countries. He believed that this would be an effective way to forge deeper relationships with neighbouring countries. His original intention was to arrange a meeting with only Burma, India, and Pakistan due to the fact that they are Ceylon's closest neighbours and have many things in common. However, Kotelawala realised that Indonesia also belonged to the same cultural region and had also 'shaken off the shackles of colonialism at about the same time.' In view of this, an invitation was sent to Indonesia as well.

According to Kotelawala, there was no intention to promote Pan-Asianism behind this conference. [21] It seems that he possessed a sense of regionalism pertaining to Southeast Asia, since this conference was officially called 'the Colombo Conference of the South-East Asian Prime Ministers.' He also proposed an economic co-operation within Southeast Asia in his opening speech. The agenda of the conference was mainly to discuss issues pertaining to Indochina. At around the same time, the Geneva Conference was also held to seek peaceful solutions to the same issues in Indochina; hence the resolutions that were passed in the Colombo Conference greatly influenced the views of the Great Powers in the Geneva Conference as well. In addition to the resolutions pertaining to the issues in Indochina, the participants of the Colombo Conference also agreed to considerations for economic co-operation and mutual aid between participating governments, as well as to hold a conference comprising Asian and African countries.[22] As the Prime Minister of Ceylon noted, the five participating countries came to know one another and one another's minds better than before,' and they drew the attention of the rest of Asia 'to the possibilities of united actions.'[23]

---

[21] Sir John Kotelawala, *An Asian Prime Minister's Story*, London: George G. Harrap and Co. Ltd., 1956, pp. 117-118.
[22] *Keesing's Contemporary Archives*, Vol. 9, 1952-54, p. 13577.
[23] Sir John Kotelawala, ibid., p. 125.

The then Prime Minister of Indonesia, Ali Sastroamidjajo, had previously expressed a strong desire to hold an Asia-Africa conference during his attendance of the Colombo Conference. In view of the dire circumstances in Indochina at that time, he believed that his proposed Asia-Africa Conference would lead to a removal of tension among the countries. The Colombo Powers, which is what the participants of the Colombo Conference were known as, with the exception of Pakistan, held sceptical views on whether such a conference would be able to become a reality. Nevertheless, Indonesia took bold initiatives, and the country subsequently hosted the Bogor Conference with the other four Colombo Powers to discuss the possibility of the Asia-Africa Conference at the end of December 1954.[24]

The Bogor Conference mainly aimed to discuss whom the Colombo Powers would invite. They initially planned to invite only the Asia-Africa group within the U.N., but Nehru proposed extending an invitation to the People's Republic of China as well due to the fact that its representative seat in the U.N. was not yet recognised at the time. This was one of the main points that reflected upon whether or not Asian solidarity could be successfully forged, because China, which was the most populous country, could not be ignored in the international arena. After several discussions, they finally agreed to invite China along with twenty-three other countries. The Joint Communiqué of the Colombo Powers stressed 'to promote goodwill and co-operation among the nations of Asia and Africa,'[25] and, although this is less known, the communiqué also mentioned that the five countries 'considered setting up a committee to discuss economic questions of common interests to the countries.'[26] They also made attempts to forge economic co-operation among themselves.

---

[24] For details, see Ali Sastroamijajo, *Milestones on my Journey: The Memoirs of Ali Sastroamijojo, Indonesia Patriot and Political Leader*, St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1979, pp. 273-284.
[25] G. H. Jensen, *Afro-Asia and Non-Alignment*, London: Faber and Faber, 1966, p. 415.
[26] Ibid., pp. 417-418.

Sponsored by the Colombo Powers, the Asia-Africa Conference was held in Bandung in April 1955. The twenty-nine participating countries were not only from East and South Asia, but were also from West and Central Asia. Participating countries from Southeast Asia were Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, the Philippines, Thailand, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the State of Vietnam. Since Malaya did not yet achieve independence at the time, it was not officially invited, but nationalist parties from Malaya and Sarawak attended as observers.[27]

It is worth mentioning that this was the first time that all independent countries in Southeast Asia participated in a single conference initiated by the indigenous governments themselves. Since the Asian Relations Conference held in 1947 was an unofficial conference, most of the delegates from Southeast Asia, particularly Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam were not authorised representatives of their respective governments.

It is generally said that the Bandung Conference was successful because the twenty-nine countries, irrespective of their different ideologies, shared similar views on common problems, reached agreements on various issues, and declared their support for the promotion of world peace and co-operation, which was later called 'the spirit of Bandung.' As George Kahin pointed out, another significant point about this conference was that China, which was internationally isolated before, participated and directly engaged in discussions with non-communist countries. It helped to 'allay apprehensions of possible aggressive moves Communist China,' and to also relieve international tensions. The Prime Minister of Ceylon, who was 'an avowed and inveterate opponent of Communism,'[28] made this statement later: 'I felt when I came back home that I was not taking an undue risk in prophesying that there would be no war.'[29]

---

[27] Ibid., p. 187.
[28] Sir John Kotelawala, ibid., p. 123.
[29] Ibid., p. 184.

In the context of the spirit of regionalism in Southeast Asia, this conference was also significantly important. This was because of the fact that with the success of the conference, Southeast Asian countries were divided into two groups in their views regarding 'regionalism.' As mentioned above, the final communiqué declared the following:

> The Asia-Africa Conference declares its conviction that friendly cooperation, in accordance with these principles, would effectively contribute to the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security, while cooperation in the economic, social, and cultural fields would help bring about common prosperity and well-being for all.[30]

This clause declared two points: the former being the co-operation in international peace and security, and the latter being the co-operation in the economic, social, and cultural fields. Looking at the situation of 'regional co-operation' in the 1960s, it can be said that the former was more in line with Indonesia and Burma's interests, while the latter was more in line with Malaya, Thailand, and the Philippines' aspirations.

Indonesia has had a strong desire to eradicate imperialism and colonialism since before its independence because of bitter colonial experiences and fierce battles with the Dutch for independence. At the time of the conference, as the West Irian dispute with the Dutch was not yet settled, Sukarno emphasised in his opening speech of the Asia-Africa Conference that 'colonialism is not dead yet' and 'is an evil thing…must be eradicated from the earth.'[31] The final communiqué also said that all the participants agreed in declaring that 'colonialism…is an evil which should speedily be brought to an end,'[32],

[30] Carlos Romulo, *The Meaning of Bandung*, The University of North Carolina Press, 1956, p. 102.
[31] George McTurnan Kahin, *The Asian-African Conference: Bandung, Indonesia April 1955*, Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1956, p. 44.
[32] Ibid., p. 81.

incorporating the same expression from Sukarno. Indonesia prioritised the abortion of colonialism and imperialism in its efforts to promote the creation of a peaceful world. Sukarno noted in this speech at the United Nations General Assembly in 1960:

> Almost without exception, imperialism and colonialism in one of their many manifestations, are at the root of the tension (and) of the conflict. Imperialism and colonialism and the continued forcible division of nations ... is at the root of almost all international and threatening evil in this world of ours. Until those evils of a hated past are ended, there can be no rest or peace in this world … [i]n order to make peace, we must remove the causes of tension and conflict.[33]

It was important for Sukarno to co-operate with countries in the third world for the purpose of ending colonialism. As such, he was more concerned with efforts to develop co-operation among third world countries and thus, as Anthony Reid pointed out, he was less keen on regional co-operation within Southeast Asia. Co-operation among third world countries was his concept of 'regional co-operation.'[34] In this context, Indonesia established its position with the leaders of the third world—India, Egypt, and Yugoslavia—to express opinions of the Asia-Africa group after the successful conference.

On the other hand, the latter group of countries mentioned earlier had been seeking co-operation among Southeast Asian countries in economic and cultural fields since the late 1950s. The first such co-operation was known as the South East Asian Friendship and Economic Treaty (SEAFET), proposed by Malaya.

---

[33] *United Nations General Assembly fifteenth session Official Records: 880ᵗʰ Plenary Meeting*, p. 281 and p. 283.
[34] Anthony Reid, 'The Bandung Conference and Southeast Asian Regionalism,' in See Seng Taul and Amitav Acharya (eds.), *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, Singapore: NUS Press, 2008, p. 23.

**Regional social and cultural co-operation**

Although many scholars have focused on the origins and development of regional organisations within the context of international politics, the regional, social, and cultural organisations before the formation of ASEAN have not been sufficiently discussed. The Southeast Asian Games (SEA Games) and the South East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation (SEAMEO), which were established in 1959 and 1965, respectively, were created for the purpose of promoting regional co-operation through sports and educational activities. Before discussing ASEAN in the next chapter, the focus here should be on these regional social and cultural organisations because they were also instrumental in enhancing regional identity.

The creation of the South East Asia Peninsular Games (SEAP Games) was an initiative by Luang Sukhum Nayapradit, the then Vice President of the National Olympic Committee of Thailand, in late 1957. Although he was interested in organising major athletic sports games such as the Asian Games and the Olympic Games, when it came to organising international games, he had a more particular desire that was more limited in its regional scope, e.g. games that involved only the 'South East Asia Peninsular,' or what is currently known as mainland Southeast Asia. Before submitting his proposal to the Olympic Committee of Thailand, he first attempted to convey his ideas to Cambodia and Vietnam through the coach of the Amateur Athletic Association of Thailand, who visited the countries in a private capacity in February 1958. Having received their support, the Vice President of the Committee submitted his proposal to the Olympic Committee. The Olympic Committee approved it in principle, and preparations to set up an organisation to oversee the South East Asia Peninsular Games were made in December of that year.

When the third Asian Games was held in Tokyo in May 1958, Nayapradit called for a meeting of sports organisations from Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Malaya, and Vietnam to discuss his proposal, which was subsequently fully approved. The meeting decided on a new name for the games i.e. the South East Asia Peninsular Games (SEAP Games). Bangkok was the first city to host the games in 1959, and it was then held every two years. Nayapradit explained that the purposes of the new games were to enhance the standard of regional athletes in competing in the Asian Games and Olympics, and 'to promote closer friendship among the neighbouring countries.' He also stated his hope that the regional games 'would stir up interest in sport' in the six participating countries, seeing that they were 'hopeless' in the Olympic Games and could only win a small number of medals in the Asian Games. He perceived the games as 'a sort of a family Olympics,' [35] which could have indicated his intention of developing regional consciousness.

The SEAP Games was limited to only mainland Southeast Asia at early stage. Nayapradit stated that the reason for this was because 'the people in this region have similarity in climate and in physical appearance.'[36] Thailand did not invite Singapore to this regional competition. An anonymous Thai sports official gave two reasons for this: firstly, Singapore did not belong to the 'Peninsula mainland,' and secondly, Thailand had inadequate facilities to hold a big sports event.[37] However, Singapore expressed a strong desire to participate in the Games. The Singapore Olympic and Sports Council sent a team to Bangkok to discuss the matter at the end of July 1959. Although the contents of the discussions with the Thai officials were not reported, Thailand finally gave its approval and sent an invitation to Singapore for the inaugural regional games in December 1959.[38] There is no clear indication as to why Singapore, which was still a

[35] *The Singapore Free Press*, 4 June 1958, p. 15.
[36] SEA Games Federation, *SEAP and SEA Games History: 50th Anniversary of SEA Games*, 8th December 2009, Vientiane, p. 15.
[37] *The Straits Times*, 26 Aug. 1958, p. 14.
[38] Ibid., 28 July 1959, p. 15 and 1 Aug. 1959, p. 13.

British colony, desired to join the games, but the island-nation was incorporated into the area of 'the South East Asia Peninsular,' or mainland Southeast Asia, under the definition of the SEAP Games Federation.

Although Singapore was accepted into the games and thus the scope of SEAP expanded, the purpose of organising the SEAP Games did not change at all, which was actually to promote cordial relations between neighbouring countries in the region. In mainland Southeast Asia, severe conflicts and hatred had existed for centuries, such as the one between Thailand and Burma, and Cambodia and Vietnam. Thus, it was hoped that sports could promote peace and co-operation between all sovereign states in the region. Nayapradit did mention in a report by the Organising Committee for the First SEAP Games that 'the Rules of the SEAP Games Federation will serve to bind us together in closer harmony and friendship, thus strengthening and perpetuating cordial relations that have happily existed between us for centuries.'[39] The SEAP Games has, to some extent, contributed to the development of regional consciousness in mainland Southeast Asia later in the 1960s and the 1970s.

Some members of the SEAP Games Federation proposed enlarging its membership in the 1960s, but the other members did not easily accept this. Thailand and Singapore proposed extending membership to Brunei, Indonesia, and the Philippines in 1967 and 1969 respectively.[40] Malaysia also made a proposal to expand the membership in 1971, but this failed because the other members wished to keep the games within the 'SEAP family' only. The Malaysian Sports Minister, Hamzah Abu Samah, proposed adding new member states again in October 1975, but the delegates from Burma, Cambodia, and Laos opposed the proposal because it 'would mean heavier financial strains on countries who were finding it difficult to compete, let alone the organiser of the event.'[41] However,

---

[39] SEA Games Federation, ibid., p. 14.
[40] *Berita Harian*, 27 June 1967, p. 7 and *The Straits Times*, 7 Dec. 1969, p. 10.
[41] *The Straits Times*, 10 Oct. 1975, p. 31.

the meeting held to discuss this matter in Bangkok in December of the same year finally

came to a conclusion that new members could be accepted to participate. Since Malaysia

was the host for the 1977 Games that was held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia insisted that

it would not organise the games without the participation of the three new members:

Brunei, Indonesia, and the Philippines. The other founding members finally bent to

Malaysia's strong will.[42]

With the admission of the new members, the name of the SEAP Games was

changed to its current name, the Southeast Asian Games (SEA Games), in 1977. It took

almost ten years to expand the games' membership since the proposal was initially made.

Without Malaysia's efforts, the games' membership would not have been expanded.

There are other regional organisations that are not well discussed in the context of

regionalism in Southeast Asia, such as SEAMEO. This is presumably because the

organisation is limited to co-operation in the area of education, which is not at all related

to national and regional security and political issues in Southeast Asia that caused

controversial matters during the Cold War. However, political leaders in each country of

the region acknowledge education to be the most important factor in national

development. Thus, a regional organisation was set up to lay the foundation of

development in the education field.

The idea of establishing SEAMEO originated from an informal meeting between

Southeast Asian countries and the U.S. government. At the time when the UNESCO

Conference of Ministers of Education and Ministers Responsible for Economic Planning

was held in Bangkok in 1965, the Ministers of Education of Laos, Malaysia, Singapore,

Thailand, South Vietnam, and the Philippines held an informal dialogue with Eugene

Black, the Special Advisor to the U.S. President, following the desire of the U.S.

---

[42] Ibid., 13 Dec. 1975, p. 31.

President, Lyndon Johnson, to promote social and educational development through a regional co-operation.[43]

The informal meeting is regarded as the first SEAMEO conference. With encouragement in the form of financial support from the U.S. government, and the offer to provide temporary secretariat staffs by the Thai government, the ministers agreed to set up the regional organisation in the area of education. This meeting should have been considered a landmark in the development of regionalism in Southeast Asia, but it has instead been given little attention.

Apparently, the first conference saw many proposals being put forward, though it was an informal dialogue. The Minister of Education of Malaysia, Khir Johari, made one of these proposals. His proposal was to set up an education research centre to standardise tests, and to develop a curriculum and teaching techniques in Kuala Lumpur. The Minister intended that the centre would serve not only Malaysia, but also other Southeast Asian countries.[44]

Following this meeting, an interim Secretariat was formed in the Ministry of Education of Thailand. The Secretariat drew up educational project proposals and submitted them during the second SEAMEO conference, which was held in Manila in November 1966. The Manila Conference also approved the acceptance of Indonesia as a new member. It is worth noting that most Southeast Asian countries joined this organisation before the establishment of ASEAN.[45] The conference also approved a draft charter of the organisation, and made the decision to formalise the creation of the permanent secretariat located in Bangkok.

The third conference in Singapore in 1968 approved the establishment of the permanent Secretariat in Bangkok, as well as the regional centres. A permanent Director

---

[43] Bonifacio S. Salamanca, *The Innotech Story*, Quezon City: SEAMEO-Innotech, 1989, pp. 18-19.
[44] *The Straits Times*, 22 Nov. 1965, p. 7.
[45] Cambodia (1971), Brunei (1984), Vietnam (1992), and Myanmar (1998) joined in respective year.

for the Secretariat was also appointed in this meeting. [46]Another significant event was the signing of the SEAMEO charter, which was drafted in the previous conference, by the member states. As the Minister of Education of Singapore, Ong Pang Boon pointed out regarding the charter, 'this one is the first one that has achieved concrete results.'[47]

SEAMEO is a regional organisation that cannot be ignored in the context of regionalism in Southeast Asia. This is due to two factors: the rapid establishment of SEAMEO's internal structures, and the aggressive pursuit of various activities since its inception. As previously mentioned, the establishment and appointment of the Secretariat took place in 1968, and the organisation charter was approved and signed by the member countries in the same year. The establishment of SEAMEO's Secretariat took much less time compared to ASEAN, which actually took nine years after its inception in 1967 to decide on establishing its Secretariat in Jakarta. The ASEAN Charter was signed and entered into force only forty years after the creation of the organisation.

In regard to the second factor mentioned above, SEAMEO has been active since its inception in 1965. The most significant thing was that the SEAMEO Conference, the highest level of meeting in the organisation, has been held annually and hosted by the member countries on a rotational basis. By holding ministerial meetings each year, the member countries could co-operate more closely in the education field. In addition, the regional co-operation network and the seven regional centres under SEAMEO were established in the early stages of the organisation's formation.[48] Since the formation of the organisation, various education projects have also been proactively pursued.

---

[46] Bonifacio S. Salamanca, ibid., p. 22 and SEAMEO, *Resource Book on SEAMEO*, Bangkok, 1981 (Revised edition), pp. 25-26.
[47] *The Straits Times*, 8 Feb. 1968, p. 21.
[48] The network and regional centres are as below: Tropical Medicine and Public Health Network (1966). The central office is in Bangkok; Regional Centre for Tropical Medicine (1967) in Thailand; Regional Centre for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (1966) in the Philippines; Regional Centre for Public Health, Hospital Administration, Environmental and Occupational Health (1967) in the Philippines; Regional Centre for Microbiology, Parasitology and Entomology (1967) in Malaysia; Regional Centre for Education in Science and Mathematics (1967) in Malaysia; Regional English Language Centre (1968) in Singapore; Regional Centre for Tropical Biology (1968) in Indonesia. From the SEAMEO website:
http://www.seameo.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=98&Itemid=519 (accessed on 8 Aug., 2015)

An example of this is the Regional English Language Centre in Singapore, which serves to improve language skills for English as a second language in the region, besides providing English intensive courses and training for teachers. Through the centre, the member countries would no longer be required to send people to the West for English training. Each regional centre also produced annual reports, which have shown tangible results through collaboration with member countries.

SEAMEO can be considered a success in the early stages of the history of regional co-operation in Southeast Asia. As little attention was given to this organisation, it can be said that it was a 'silent success.' This silent success was a result of politicians and educators alike recognising the importance of education in the region. All Southeast Asian countries suffered from battered economies after the Second World War. Economic development thus became the primary issue; the national development for all newly independent countries in the long term prioritised promoting modern education to all citizens. Sharing common educational problems was inevitable, so countries in the region sought to find solutions and work together to settle these problems through the regional organisation. All the member countries also sought to obtain mutual benefits through co-operation in the field of education. Thus, the organisation led to more success than ASEAN, as Koh pointed out.[49] When the U.S. conducted the informal meeting, the participants might have thought that an educational collaboration within the region would not achieve success in light of the failure of ASA and MAPHILINDO. The U.S. initiated SEAMEO, but the regional members created most projects run by the organisation. It can therefore be said that the maturing of regional consciousness has led to international collaborations within the region and the emergence of ASA and MAPHILINDO by the mid-1960s.

---

[49] T. T. B. Koh, 'International Collaboration concerning Southeast Asia,' *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 390, A New American Posture toward Asia (Jul., 1970), p. 22.

## SEATO as a regional organisation?

In regard to regional co-operation and regional organisations from 1945 to 1967, the South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) has been discussed in detail. However, this dissertation does not consider SEATO as a regional organisation because of the two factors discussed below. SEATO was simply a military group or alliance in which the Western countries mainly participated to stop the expansion of communism in Southeast Asia, as the then Indian Ambassador to the United Nations, Krishna Menon, made a criticism with the following words in 1954: 'The Charter provides for a regional organisation, however, it is not a regional organisation but...a modern version of a protectorate. It is an organisation of certain imperial Powers, and some others, who may have an interest in joining together to protect a territory which they say is in danger.'[50]

The first factor as to why SEATO is not considered a regional organisation is that most of its members are outsiders of the Southeast Asian region. As is well known, SEATO was established in Manila in 1954 at the initiative of the U.S., with the co-operation of Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines. Meanwhile, only two of the participating countries were actually from the region (Thailand and the Philippines), most of the other member states were former colonial nations. All members had grave concerns over the spread of communism in the entire region, particularly from Indochina. The treaty signed in Manila stipulated the 'Treaty Area', which involved protecting 'the general area of South-East Asia,'[51] with three countries named in the protocol of the treaty: Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.[52] As mentioned in Chapter 1, no consensus has been reached regarding the definition of the Southeast Asian region among scholars and politicians in this period, thus it seems that

---

[50] *Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Vol. 9, 1952-1954*, Keesing's Publications: London, p. 13 and p. 763.
[51] Leszek Buszynski, *SEATO: The failure of an alliance strategy*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1983, p. 229. See Article VIII of the treaty in the Appendix.
[52] Ibid., p. 231.

this broad definition was used instead. However, this definition and the name of the organisation did not indicate that all members belonged to the region. In other words, although the name of the organisation contained 'South East Asia,' it is clear that this term referred only to the geographical area designated by all members of SEATO within and outside the region for the purpose of defence. Unlike ASA and MAPHILINDO, the organisation was not formed for the purpose of promoting co-operation between the countries of the region.

The second factor as to why SEATO is not considered a regional organisation is that it hardly involved regional co-operation between the countries in the region. As Michael Leifer argued, a regional co-operation is formed on a multilateral basis (over three countries) with several other additional conditions, 'however intimate, between states, which share a common geographic location.'[53] As the member states from within the region were Thailand and the Philippines only, this criterion was not fulfilled. In this respect, SEATO was not a regional organisation. However, some members might have recognised Pakistan as one of the Southeast Asian countries. The Muslim country still retained its eastern territory (present-day Bangladesh that gained independence in 1972), located west of Burma, during the formation of SEATO. Apart from the issue as to whether or not this territory was part of the region, even granting the assumption that Pakistan was included in the region and that the three countries forged multilateral co-operation within this organisation, SEATO would still not be considered a regional organisation. Certainly this would mean that the conditions that Leifer laid out would be met, but this military organisation would still not function without the Major Powers, in particular the United States, as the main purpose of SEATO was to prevent the communists from expanding in the region during the Cold War. The countries belonging

---

[53] Michael Leifer, 'Problems and prospects of regional cooperation in Asia: The political dimension,' *The Indonesian Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 3, 4 (1976: Special Issue), p. 92.

to the region did, however, predominantly run this organisation. In other words, a regional organisation is defined as an organisation in which at least three nations within a region take initiatives towards establishing it and predominantly run it themselves.

Although SEATO is far from a regional organisation, what exactly is a 'region' as used in the term 'regional organisation'? Basically, a regional organisation cannot be formed without a region. As the prominent historian Nicholas Tarling defined, a region is 'like a nation, a region is an "imagined community."'[54] When local politicians in a country have a regional consciousness and they share this perception of the region with neighbouring countries, a region emerges. '[t]here are no "natural" regions but they are constructed, deconstructed and reconstructed, internationally or non-internationally, in the process of global transformation, by collective human action and identity formation.'[55] These elements contribute to the creation of a region, but there is one other indispensable prerequisite for the establishment of a region: a regional organisation, which is formed based on the 'regularity and intensity of interactions'[56] among local politicians in the region. This contributes to the formation of a regional frame and the creation of an 'imagined region' and to gain their region for themselves. Through any regionally related activities in a regional organisation, the formation of the region emerges as a common vision. As such, it is clear that the most important element in the creation of a region is the formation of a regional organisation.

As we saw in this chapter, many proposals towards regional co-operation and the establishment of a regional organisation that were made between the 1940s and 1960s hardly materialised, but some of them did result in the establishment of regional organisations. Among them, ASA laid the foundation for the formation of future regional

---

[54] Nicholas Tarling, *Regionalism in Southeast Asia: To foster the political will*, London: Routledge, 2006, p. 6.
[55] Quoted from ibid., p. 12. Original article is in Michael and Söderbaum, 'Key Issues in New Regionalism: Comparisons from Asia, Africa and the Middle East,' in Hettne, Björn et al., *Comparing Regionalism: Implications for Global Development*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
[56] William R. Thompson, 'The Regional Subsystem: A Conceptual Explication and a Propositional Inventory,' *International Studies Quarterly*, Vo. 17, No. 1 (Mar., 1973), p. 101.

organisations. Based on this first indigenous organisation, ASEAN was thus born in 1967. As will be discussed in the next chapter, ASEAN created a much more definite image and a common regional consciousness of Southeast Asia through its regional activities.

## From indigenous proposals to crystallisation

While Indonesia became a leading power in Asia after the Asia-Africa Conference, in which it sought co-operation with other Asian and African countries, some of the other Southeast Asian countries also took initiatives to forge regional co-operation. Leaders from the Malay Peninsula, a geographical location that strategically connects the mainland and maritime Southeast Asia, proposed a new regional co-operation.

Tunku Abdul Rahman, president of the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO), and Tan Cheng Lock, president of the Malayan Chinese Association (MCA), jointly suggested on November 1954 that a South East Asia Union should be formed for the purpose of defence. The suggested members included Burma, Indo-China, Indonesia, Malaya, the Philippines, and Siam, with the hope of obtaining aid from the United States. Singapore was not included in this plan, but several indigenous leaders agreed with the idea, under specific conditions. Lee Yong Min, Secretary of the Singapore Labour Party, welcomed the idea, but casted doubt on how Malaya could become a member of the union, since Malaya was not yet independent at the time. Thio Chan Bee, a Singapore Legislative Council member, also offered his support for economic co-operation, partly because 'South-East Asia territories are closely linked' to each other, but he suggested that the first step for such co-operation should be a confederation of the Federation of Malaya, Singapore, Borneo, Sarawak, and Brunei. Tan Cheng Lock stated that the

formation of the aforementioned union depended on the outcome of discussions with the Thai government in the end, [57] but the proposal failed.

The Tunku subsequently proposed another framework for regional co-operation. During an official visit to Ceylon in early 1958, he suggested to the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Solomon Bandaranaike, that there should be closer co-operation and understanding between smaller Southeast Asian countries, because 'South-East Asian countries are inclined to dance to the tune of bigger nations.'[58] He also stated that these nations should not 'concern themselves unduly with world and Afro-Asian politics when politics in South-East Asia itself are in the melting pot.'[59] Thus, in order to discuss and sort out common problems with each other, the Tunku proposed holding a conference for regional leaders in Kuala Lumpur, while stating that he did not wish to take the lead. He said that 'I do not want to take the lead because I consider myself a young brother among South-East Asian leaders.'[60] He apparently had Sukarno/Indonesia in mind when making this statement. Since Malaya had just gained independence at that time, the Tunku did not wish to take initiatives towards regional co-operation, so as not to be made a regional leader. More interestingly, the Tunku made his proposal for regional co-operation in Ceylon, despite having made official visits to South Vietnam and Thailand immediately before visiting the island. Apparently, the Tunku regarded Ceylon as part of Southeast Asia at the time. After proposing for a Southeast Asian conference to come up with a charter for economic development, which was mooted during the 14th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), the Malayan government included Ceylon, India, and Pakistan (but excluded Burma) on the invitation list.[61] This might be seen as the regional demarcation of ECAFE, and Ceylon's inclusion

---

[57] *The Straits Times*, 11 Nov. 1954, p. 1 and *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 Nov. 1954, p. 3. The reactions of Singapore are found in *The Singapore Free Press*, 13 Nov. 1954, p. 7. *The Straits Times* criticised the plan of the Alliance. See the editorial of *The Straits Times*, 13 Nov. 1954, p. 6.
[58] *The Straits Times*, 9 Feb. 1958, p. 1.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid., 22 April 1958, p. 5.

in it was perhaps due to the island's geographic location, whereby the Tunku might have felt that it shared geographical proximity with Malaya. The cultural similarity and the presence of Malays in Ceylon might have also been another factor that prompted the Tunku to consider the island as one of the regional members. This Malay population is attributable to the numerous immigrants who migrated into Ceylon during the British colonial era.

The Tunku made an official visit to the Philippines at the invitation of President Carlos Garcia in January 1959. In the joint communiqué issued on the last day of his visit by the two Heads of government, they agreed on the need for forging closer cultural ties and collaboration among the countries of Southeast Asia to discuss and solve common problems.[62] Immediately before the issuance of the communiqué, the Tunku also stated that Malaya might call for a meeting of leaders from Southeast Asian countries as the first step towards the realisation of Malaya's proposal for an economic and cultural alliance.[63] The Prime Minister of Malaya emphasised forging economic co-operation between the Southeast Asian countries because 'the only way to combat the infiltration by the Communists' was 'to ensure that the conditions in South-east Asia are very much better than they are today.'[64]

As a matter of fact, Garcia proposed the formation of an anti-communist alliance among member countries, but he pointed out that this would antagonise many other Asian countries if it were formed.[65] The Tunku would have wanted both neutral and pro-Western nations to join his regional framework. However, when the idea was disclosed to Garcia, he thought that the South East Asian Friendship and Economic Treaty (SEAFET) was 'too broad and grandiose.' Garcia preferred to associate with the pro-

---

[62] Federation of Malaysia, *Malaya/Philippine Relations: 31st August, 1957 to 15th September, 1963*, Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Cetak Kerajaan, 1963, p. 1.
[63] *The Straits Times*, 7 Jan. 1959, p. 1.
[64] Ibid., 5 Jan. 1959, p. 1.
[65] *Manila Times*, 3 Jan., 1959, p. 1.

Western nations in the region.[66] The two Heads of government also held different ideas regarding regional co-operation. Tunku's idea of regional co-operation was only in the economic and cultural fields, but Garcia sought co-operation in more areas, including politics and security. As the Tunku believed that regional co-operation could help defend against communist expansion by increasing the living standards in the region, he attempted to persuade the President during the meeting. After the conclusion of the official visit, the two governments discussed the implementation of the joint communiqué, and the Malayan government subsequently submitted its draft proposal to the Philippines.

At the same time, Thailand was also keen on setting up a regional association. According to Bernard Gordon, a working paper on a regional co-operation made by the Foreign Ministry of Thailand was sent to other Southeast Asian countries, and was widely circulated. Thailand wanted to call the association the 'Southeast Asia Community Organisation (SEACOR).'[67]

On 28 October 1959, the Tunku sent a letter to Garcia, in which he stated that he had already sent his proposal to Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. This reflected his concept/definition of the countries that comprised the Southeast Asian region. While the objectives of the newly proposed regional organisation were to promote closer relations between the countries of the region and to find solutions to common problems in economic, social, cultural, and scientific fields, more interestingly, the Tunku desired to develop a sense of regional consciousness through the organisation. He explained in his letter his motivation behind such a desire:

---

[66] Bernard Gordon, *The Dimensions of Conflict in Southeast Asia*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966, p. 166.
[67] Ibid., p. 167.

For historical reasons, the cultural and economic development of most countries of South East Asia has been principally influenced in the present century by the relations, which they have had with other countries outside South East Asia. As a consequence, the growth of any sense of South East Asian consciousness, or of a common heritage in the great cultural achievements and possibilities of this part of Asia has been arrested. [68]

The Tunku suggested that the first quarter of 1960, specifically around February or March, might be appropriate for a meeting of regional leaders.[69] However, only the Philippines and Thailand favoured his idea to set up a new regional association. Other invitees rejected it, including the largest and most populous country in the region, Indonesia. President Sukarno replied to the Tunku in a letter dated 31 December 1959, giving a somewhat positive opinion by stating that 'it is good, in fact necessary,' but also adding at the same time that 'a new association …will only raise doubts and … become a stumbling block to our desire to cooperate.' Instead, he suggested that Southeast Asian countries should concentrate on bilateral arrangements. In regard to regional co-operation, he stated that as and when it was needed, he 'can foresee possibilities within the Afro-Asian context.'[70] Laos gave no reaction, while Burma, Cambodia, and Vietnam finally objected to the establishment of the association,[71] though the three core members, i.e. Malaya, Thailand, and the Philippines, preferred Burma and Indonesia to join on the basis of their neutralist political stands in international politics. When the Tunku expressed the idea of forging regional co-operation in Ceylon in 1958, it seemed that his

---

[68] *Malaya/Philippine relations*, p. 16.
[69] Ibid., p. 17.
[70] The quote is from Bernard K. Gordon, *The Dimensions of Conflict in Southeast Asia*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966, p. 171n.
[71] Nicholas Tarling, *Southeast Asian regionalism: New Zealand Perspectives*, ISEAS: Singapore, 2011, p. 12 and Yamakage Susumu, *ASEAN: symbol kara system e (ASEAN: From symbol to system)*, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1991, pp. 35-36.

concept of Southeast Asia included the island nation, but a formal invitation to be part of this new association was never sent.

When the sixteenth session of the ECAFE was held in Bangkok in March 1960, in which the agenda focused on regional co-operation in Asia, the Philippine delegate formally proposed the formation of the South East Asia Economic Bloc. The Minister of Commerce of the Philippines who was also the Chief delegate, Dr. Perfecto Laguio, stated that the Philippines, Thailand, Malaya, and South Vietnam would join it, while Indonesia could become its founding member.[72] However, Malaya negatively responded that '[t]he Philippines' proposal is too limited in its scope. It lacks the social aspects of our proposal...Malaya's proposal is neater, more modest, and more workable.'[73]

At the end of July 1960, the Tunku announced that the three countries (Malaya, the Philippines, and Thailand) agreed to form their own Secretariats to handle preparatory work towards the establishment of the Association of South East Asia States (ASAS). This announcement was made after the three countries engaged in discussions on the topic for months. The Tunku said that there had been general agreement that the proposed co-operation between the countries should be established 'on a practical and informal basis.' He also added that ASAS would involve no formal treaty.[74] In this announcement, the name SEAFET was dropped and changed to ASAS, and this was partly because SEAFET sounded like SEATO.[75]

After two weeks, Indonesia rejected the idea of joining ASAS, and emphasised that it would only agree to bilateral treaties with other countries based on mutual co-operation.[76] The three countries discussed the regional co-operation for a few months, and finally a meeting was held in Kuala Lumpur in February 1961 between the Tunku,

---

[72] *The Straits Times*, 11 March 1960, p. 3.
[73] Ibid., 23 March 1960, p. 15.
[74] Ibid., 28 July 1960, p. 1.
[75] Lalita Prasad Signh, *The Politics of Economic Cooperation in Asia: A Study of Asian International Organisations*, Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1966, p. 216.
[76] *The Singapore Free Press*, 11 Aug. 1960, p. 2.

the Thai Foreign Minister, Thanat Khoman, and the Philippine Foreign Minister, Felixberto Serrano. It was in this meeting that the three countries decided to go ahead to form ASAS.[77]

The Association of South East Asia (ASA) was finally established in July 1961. The name of the organisation was changed again to reflect the word 'hope' in the Malay language. It involved many conferences among Foreign Ministers, and committees and projects until September 1963,[78] when the Federation of Malaysia was formed. At this time, Malaysia broke off diplomatic relations with Indonesia and the Philippines. After restoring relations with the Philippines, a standing committee was held again in Bangkok in March 1966. Afterwards, a Joint Working Committee was also held, but the conference of Foreign Ministers at the end of August 1967 became the last meeting for ASA. Since the Association of South East Asia Nations (ASEAN) was established at the beginning of the month, the three countries agreed in principle to transfer ASA programmes and projects to ASEAN in order to avoid duplication of activities.[79] After the conference, the Tunku stated that '[w]e have not quite suspended ASA. We are carrying on with it until the time is ripe for ASA to back out for ASEAN to go ahead.'[80] Before the conference, Khoman also mentioned that '[t]he dissolution of ASA depends on the work remaining for the organisation to do. If there is no more work, it would fade away and stop.'[81] No announcement was made to dissolve ASA, and the organisation gradually faded.

The first regional organisation in Southeast Asia, ASA, thus ceased with the formation of ASEAN, but it is worth noting that it was the indigenous leadership that created the organisation. Although many political leaders in Asia proposed regional co-

[77] *The Straits Times*, 14 Feb. 1961, p. 1.
[78] See ASA's activities on J. L. Vellut, 'The Asian Policy of the Philippines 1954-61,' Working Paper No. 6, Department of International Relations, The Australian National University, 1965, pp. 62-63.
[79] *Foreign Affairs Malaysia*, Vol. 1, No. 6 (Sept. 1967), pp. 60-61.
[80] *The Straits Times*, 30 Aug. 1967, p. 13.
[81] Ibid., 27 Aug. 1967, p. 5.

operation and organisations after the Second World War, as previously mentioned, all of these indigenous proposals never came to fruition. Thus, it is important to discuss here the background of ASEAN and the factors behind its successful formation. These factors can be divided into domestic and international factors.

The major domestic factor that encouraged regional co-operation in this period was the fact that each country had not achieved economic independence due to economic stagnation, despite their political independence from the colonial powers except for Thailand. For this reason, all Southeast Asian countries were given financial aid from the major powers to develop their economies. Despite this fact, Southeast Asian countries did not wish to depend unduly on these major powers. Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, said later that:

> We want to be free, we do not want to be under the influence of anyone, large or small. We do not want to depend on the outside world, we want to depend on each and everyone of us ... We do not want to be dictated from Europe, or from America, or from Moscow, or from Peking, or from anywhere else.[82]

Another additional factor contributing to the economic stagnation in the Southeast Asian countries was the revolts from local communist forces. Therefore, the three countries agreed that the best way to develop their economies and gain economic independence was to discuss common problems and find solutions with the developing countries neighbouring them. This was Tunku's opinion, and Thailand and the Philippines also accepted this opinion.

---

[82] *Collected interviews of Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman*, Vol. 1, Bangkok: Department of Information, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1967, p. 50.

The ASA's successful formation is also attributable to two international factors. The first factor was the regional organisations that were formed in the 1950s in Europe such as the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the European Economic Community (EEC), the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC or Euratom), and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), which provided the inspiration for ASA's formation. The second factor relates to the Cold War. The Cold War had impact on the entirety of Southeast Asia, especially with the Indochina region becoming the ideological battleground between the communism and capitalism. [83] In 1954, Thailand and the Philippines joined SEATO for the purpose of protecting their sovereignty from being threatened by the communist camp, but in view of the SEATO alliance becoming dysfunctional, the two countries became distrustful of the alliance, especially after the Laos crisis from the late 1950s to the early 1960s. In the aftermath of this, the two countries desired to create a regional organisation for economic co-operation with their immediate neighbours, a move which finally resulted in the signing of the Bangkok Resolution on regional economic co-operation during the 16th ECAFE assembly in 1960, and this became the impetus for the formation of ASA. The Bangkok Resolution aimed to promote regional co-operation, especially in Southeast Asia.[84]

ASA is significant not only for being the first indigenous regional organisation formed by indigenous leaders. As Gordon argued, the most important element was that 'the concept of regionalism has a remarkably strong appeal to the indigenous elites in Southeast Asia.'[85] In other words, the three member countries took leadership via ASA to re-define and further develop the concept of Southeast Asia. As discussed in Chapter 1, 'Southeast Asia' as a region has been defined differently by scholars and politicians'.

---

[83] See Pham Hong Tung, 'The Cold War and Vietnam 1945-54,' pp. 153-171, in Albert Lau (ed.), *Southeast Asia and the Cold War*, London: Routledge, 2012.

[84] Latila Prasad Singh, *The Politics of Economic Cooperation in Asia: A study of Asian international organisations*, Columbia: University of Missouri Press, pp. 149-154.

[85] Bernard Gordon, *Toward Disengagement in Asia: A strategy for American foreign policy*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969, p. 108.

The concept of Southeast Asia was originally a Western concept, and the indigenous political leaders were aware of its rough geographical scope based on the Western concept. However, ASA sought to re-define the geographical scope of the region from the indigenous point of view. This resulted in the various efforts of its member countries, but most significantly the Malayan leaders, who were the ones who proactively pursued this aim. They approached the countries within the region to join the organisation, and in so doing appealed to them to define their own region. Although most of ASA's objectives and projects were subsequently transferred to ASEAN, it still remains an important organisation in terms of regional identity, because ASEAN would not have been able to define the region without ASA.

Another significant entity in Southeast Asia that was aimed at developing regional co-operation and helped mature regional identity existed at around the same time, and this was MAPHILINDO. This was not an official regional organisation, but it was a significant entity involved in ASA's transition to becoming ASEAN. By analysing the background of this entity, its significance can be seen. Nationalists in the Philippines and Indonesia had wished to create a confederation of the Malay race since the nineteenth century. As discussed in Chapter 2, Jose Rizal and other Filipino nationalists envisaged a union of the Malay stock. In the 1930s, the Young Philippines, a nationalist student organisation under Wenceslao Q. Vinzons, set a goal to form 'Republic of Malaysia' and used the slogan 'Malayan Irredenta.' Manuel Quezon also had a dream of forming a federation that included Burma, Thailand, and Indochina, of which its people were considered as related to the Malays culturally.[86] For the Philippines the closest thing to a 'Malay Union,' which Rizal and Vinzons suggested, was MAPHILINDO.[87] Indonesian

---

[86] Arnold C. Brackman, *Southeast Asia's Second Front: The power struggle in the Malay Archipelago*, New York: F.A. Praeger, 1966, p. 179.

[87] Interview through e-mail with Associate Professor, Augusto V. de Viana, Department of History, Faculty of Arts and Letters, University of Santo Tomas on 26 July, 2017. For more details, Augusto V. de Viana, 'The dream of Malayan unity: President Diosdado Macapagal and the Maphilindo,' *Jurnal Sejarah*, Vol. 23, Bil. 1 (Jun 2015), pp. 42-76.

nationalists also harboured a similar dream in the 1920s. Later in 1959, Mohammed Yamin, the Minister of Special Affairs of Indonesia, stated that it was desirable to establish a non-political Austronesian confederation comprising Indonesia, Malaya, and the Philippines, on the basis of its people originating from a single stock of identical culture.[88]

The President of the Philippines, Diosdado Macapagal, proposed the formation of MAPHILINDO during the time of the Indonesian Confrontation against Malaysia. The proposal was an embodiment of the idea of establishing a confederation of nations of Malay origin, and it was discussed during a conference involving the Foreign Ministers of the three nations in June 1963. They agreed, in a joint communiqué, that they would accept the idea as a means of bringing together the three countries into closer association.[89]

However, the framework of MAPHILINDO was not well defined. The heads of the three nations signed the Manila Accord on 31 July 1963, during the summit conference, which defined MAPHILINDO as 'the grouping of the three nations of Malay origin working together in close harmony, but without surrendering any portion of their sovereignty.'[90] Although Gordon wrote that it was 'a loose consultative grouping of Indonesia, Malaya, and the Philippines,'[91] Mackie argued that it was 'much less than a confederation, and hardly even an alliance.'[92] As it was an 'association for the Malay race,' it was criticised as an anti-Chinese association, especially by Singapore.[93] In spite of the fact that the entity involved the Malay stock, Tun Razak, the Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia, stated that it was possible for any country to join, because '[t]he

---

[88] *The Singapore Free Press*, 22 Oct. 1959, p. 10.
[89] Joint Communique of the conference of Foreign Ministers of the Federation of Malaya, the Republic of Indonesia, and the Republic of the Philippines held at Manila from June 7 to 11, 1963. See *Malaya/Philippine Relations*, p. 26 (Appendix VII).
[90] Ibid., p. 32 (Appendix X).
[91] Bernard K. Gordon, 'Problems of regional cooperation in Southeast Asia,' *World Politics*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (Jan., 1964), p. 222.
[92] J. A. C. Mackie, *Konfrontasi: The Indonesia-Malaysia Dispute 1963-1966*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1974, p. 167.
[93] *The Straits Times*, 6 July 1964, p. 1.

idea is purely based on friendship for the benefit of all the people.'[94] During the Foreign Ministers' conference, Malaysia did consider the option of extending membership to other countries. In response to this, the Head of Cambodia, Norodom Sihanouk, expressed the desire to join MAPHILINDO at a later time.[95]

Through the Accord, the three nations agreed that they would attempt to co-operate in matters of security and economic, social, and cultural development, as well as set up a national secretariat and hold conferences for the Heads and Foreign Ministers of the three governments at least once a year.[96] In short, this organisation was set up for the purpose of comprehensive co-operation. The summit conference that was held at the end of July 1963 endorsed the Accord. As a matter of fact, Kuala Lumpur perceived that Indonesia had accepted the formation of Malaysia from its agreement to form MAPHILINDO, but Jakarta and Manila saw MAPHILINDO as an entity that would hinder the formation of Malaysia. Thus, when the Prime Minister of Malaya declared the formation of the Federation of Malaysia on 16 September 1963, the Accord was disregarded, and so were the plans for the yet unformed association, though no country officially declared its dissolution. MAPHILINDO was short-lived during the transitional period between the births of ASA and ASEAN, but the entity made three important contributions in the development of the concept of regionalism.

The first of these was that MAPHILINDO provided the opportunity to seek a peaceful resolution of mutual conflicts through a series of discussions. As Macapagal noted, the summit was 'in fact the first exercise in *mushawarah* or brotherly consultation by the three MAPHILINDO countries.' [97] This referred to how the three nations attempted to find solutions through the 'MAPHILINDO spirit' after the formation of

---

[94] Ibid., 17 June 1963, p. 1.
[95] Ibid., 12 Jan. 1964, p. 1.
[96] *Malaya/Philippine Relations*, p. 33 (Appendix X).
[97] Closing statement of President Macapagal at http://www.gov.ph/1963/08/05/closing-statement-of-president-macapagal-at-the-summit-conference-in-manila-august-5-1963/ (Accessed on 22 Aug., 2015).

Malaysia, when it broke off diplomatic relations with Indonesia and the Philippines. The intensified Confrontation, in which Indonesia engaged in armed conflicts in Sarawak and other areas in Malaysia, also resulted in attempts to meditate and peacefully settle this dispute by other Southeast Asian countries such as Thailand and Cambodia. It can be said in a sense that this conflict offered an opportunity to regionally co-operate.

The second contribution was, as Macapagal pointed out, the fact that MAPHILINDO brought together the leaders of the three nations for the first time in history to discuss common problems together.[98] The MAPHILINDO summit between the leaders of the three Southeast Asian nations was evidence that countries of the region had sought solutions together over the urgent issue involving the formation of Malaysia. ASA had only involved conferences between Foreign Ministers, but it never involved any summit. After the summit of MAPHILINDO, a summit of Southeast Asian countries would not be held again until 1976 during the ASEAN meeting in Bali.

Lastly, MAPHILINDO contributed to strengthening Indonesia's commitment to the Southeast Asian region. While Indonesia had by then focused on global politics as one of the core members of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), as well as one of the unifiers of the third world after the Asia-Africa Conference in 1955, Sukarno was inclined towards regional politics after the formation of Malaysia, thus breaking away from Indonesia's previous trend in international politics. After he failed to stop the formation of Malaysia, the President of Indonesia sought to form 'a new South-East Asian union.' Coincidentally, this proposed union was similar to the one that Ho Chi Minh proposed to Sukarno in 1945. While the Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, Salvador Lopez, stated that MAPHILINDO was not a closed association, but rather an expanding association of like-minded nations,[99] Malaysia had negative views regarding

---

[98] Addressing by President Macapagal at http://www.gov.ph/1963/07/30/address-of-president-macapagal-at-the-opening-ceremonies-of-the-summit-conference-july-30-1963/ (Accessed on 22 Aug., 2015).
[99] *The Straits Times*, 12 Sept. 1963, p. 2.

the formation of this union. The Malaysian Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, Khir Johari, stated his personal view in November 1963, that the proposal for the formation of a new South-East Asia confederation was a 'stunt to deviate attention from the immediate problems facing Malaysia' regarding its conflicts with Indonesia and the Philippines. He saw no point in this move, as MAPHILINDO left ample room for the inclusion of other States.[100] The Singaporean Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew, was at the same time accused of trying to isolate Malaysia from its immediate neighbours in the region by letting Burma, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand join together. Lee also expressed his view that Sukarno decided on this new attempt because he realised that the four month old confrontation had failed to stop the formation of Malaysia.[101]

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, perceived that MAPHILINDO's objective was the same as that of ASA, except for the former's ethnic similarity, i.e. being an entity of nations of the Malay stock. He also mentioned that Thailand could not be part of MAPHILINDO, because it was an entity based on the Malay stock, and complained that the concept of the entity should be expanded.[102] The Thai Consul General to Singapore suggested that the confederating states of MAPHILINDO should change its name so that other Southeast Asian countries could join 'without feeling inferior.'[103] After exhausting all its efforts to stop the formation of Malaysia, Indonesia attempted to find another solution by approaching other countries in the region. As such, it is evident that Indonesia has by then begun to concentrate on regional politics.

The conceptions of ASA and MAPHILINDO, as Gordon argued, were fundamentally different,[104] though the Malaysian government regarded that the two

---

[100] Ibid., 18 Nov. 1963, p. 8.
[101] Ibid., 13 Jan. 1964, p. 16.
[102] *Berita Harian*, 4 Jan. 1966, p. 3.
[103] *The Straits Times,* 2 Jan. 1964, p. 6.
[104] Bernard Gordon, 'Regionalism and Instability in Southeast Asia,' *Orbis*, Vol. 10, No. 2, (Summer 1966), p. 452.

organisations 'would not affect' their activities with each other.[105] ASA's aim was to enhance the living standards in each country and to counter the infiltration of communism among the people through economic co-operation. In contrast, the Malay-based MAPHILINDO aimed to collaborate not only in economic and cultural fields, but also in political and security fields, that is, overall co-operation.

MAPHILINDO subsequently died off naturally, and while its members attempted to expand its membership, other countries in the region were not very keen to join because of its Malay identity. Indonesia then attempted to create a new regional union, but other countries might have thought of the risk that the large country had taken initiative of. After the 930 Incident that led to Sukarno's downfall, Indonesia and Malaysia resumed diplomatic relations. In regard to the regional associations, neither ASA nor MAPHILINDO survived. MAPHILINDO's founding members, together with Thailand and Singapore, would go on to establish a new regional association: ASEAN.


**Conclusion**

Various proposals for regional co-operation in Southeast Asia were made between the end of the world war and 1967, but most of them failed to take off. At the early stage, proposals from political leaders in Burma, Vietnam, and Thailand were made but in vain. While the neighbouring major country, India, took initiatives for regional co-operation in the late 1940s, the Philippines sought to regionally co-operate for anti-communism efforts and held the Baguio Conference in 1950. The conference was an epoch-making event, as it was the first time one of the Southeast Asian countries has ever held a meeting for regional co-operation. But in contrast to its intention, the conference promoted co-operation in the economic field only.

---

[105] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Malaysia, *Malaysia in brief*, Kuala Lumpur: Department of Information, 1963, p. 103.

Subsequently, after the conferences in Colombo and Bogor, the Bandung conference was held in 1955, which was initiated by Indonesia. This conference drew leaders from two large regions, i.e. Asia and Africa, and attracted much global attention, successfully propelling Sukarno as the leader of the Third World. On the contrary, it did not lead to solidarity among the countries of the small region, Southeast Asia.

After the successful conference, two approaches for regional co-operation in Southeast Asia were taken: the first being the 'hard approach group' that focused mainly on international politics for global peace, security, and elimination of colonialism. This group, represented by Indonesia, approached not only the Asian region, but also the Third World, but little attention was paid to neighbouring Southeast Asian countries. On the other hand, the 'soft approach group' aimed for economic and cultural co-operation. To this end, the group placed emphasis on co-operation with border countries, so that the group countries would cultivate a regional sense of awareness and consciousness. The two approaches remained until the formation of ASEAN in 1967.

As per the hard approach and political regional co-operation, SEATO is a good example to illustrate this point. This military organisation was formed by the U.S. for the purpose of defence against communists in Southeast Asia, but most of its members originated from outside Southeast Asia, and among its members, only Thailand and the Philippines belonged to the region. SEATO is regarded as a regional organisation not because it was formed by regional countries, but because the members, in particular the Western countries, targeted the region that would defend against communists. The name of the organisation also gave rise to some misunderstanding. On the other hand, the organisation became a troublesome group because it created hatred and political differences in the region. SEATO never advocated for regional consciousness, let alone forged any strong unity between the regional countries.

Regional co-operation in economic, social, and cultural fields started to emerge in the late 1950s. Initially, the SEA Games consisted of members mainly from the mainland of Southeast Asia. Burma, Cambodia, and Vietnam, which objected to political and economic regional co-operation, joined the sports organisation much later. This helped to inculcate regional consciousness under the title of Southeast Asia. SEAMEO for the educational field, formed in 1965, had six members initially. Through this initiative, a secretariat was set up and a charter was adopted at quite an early stage before the formation of ASEAN. Most of the Southeast Asian countries had, by 1968, joined this regional organisation, and shared regional consciousness through SEAMEO regular conferences. Although the two regional organisations hardly attracted the public, they successfully contributed to building regional awareness among members.

A proposal of economic co-operation was put forward in the late 1950s. The Tunku made this pioneering proposal in 1958. In the following year, the Tunku suggested calling this proposal SEAFET and brought it to the Philippines, and went on to discuss the formation of a regional organisation. The Tunku put forward a proposal for political co-operation in 1954, but failed. This time he considered stopping the communist expansion by enhancing the living standard of each country through economic co-operation. At the same time, he intended to instill regional consciousness. The SEAFET proposal was carried out under the name of ASA in 1961. Although the members were made up of only three countries, the body already had a regional concept of the present-day Southeast Asia. Initially, the name of SEAFET included 'Economic,' but the name of the new organisation, ASA, left out this 'Economic' aspect. ASA originally aimed for economic and cultural co-operation, but it was also possible to opt for political co-operation, so the term 'Economic' was dropped. Although the organisation was short-lived, it was significant in that it was the indigenous leaders that formed it and the regional concept spread out to include regional leaders.

During the closing of ASA, the three countries, i.e. Malaysia, the Philippines, and Indonesia, formed MAPHILINDO. This was to increase comprehensive co-operation including security. This move was significant for the fact that it provided an opportunity to seek a peaceful solution. Also, as a result, a summit was held for the first time. Most importantly, in the regional co-operation of Southeast Asia, MAPHILINDO showed the path for regional co-operation to Indonesia, which was not keen on the region. The organisation was more short-lived due to the conflicts between its members, but it finally paved the way for the formation of ASEAN.

# CHAPTER 6: ASEAN AND THE MATURATION
# OF REGIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

## Introduction

There is a variety of research on ASEAN encompassing its international relations, economy, politics and others. Many scholars research on history of ASEAN, but most of them focus on the history of inter-ASEAN countries and the development of the regional organisation. Although the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), which is one of the three pillars of the ASEAN Community, was already formed at the end of 2015, little attention has been paid to the origins of 'ASEAN identity.' This chapter discusses the period between the formation of ASEAN and the Summit in 1976, which was in a sense the time of declaration to set a goal to pursue and create the identity.

This chapter is divided into four sections. Although ASEAN was nominally set up for economic and cultural co-operation, political co-operation between the members was inevitable due to the Vietnam War. After a discussion of this, the next section will discuss the concept of ZOPFAN, which was targeted to neutralise the entire region of Southeast Asia, not only of ASEAN region. ASEAN itself has decided to focus on the scope of the Southeast Asian region. The third section examines how some countries which were keen on joining ASEAN had been excluded by the ASEAN countries at early stage. The last one analyses how members pursued greater awareness and consciousness of the 'ASEAN region,' which led to the formation of an 'ASEAN identity' and 'ASEAN Community' in the future.

**Early steps to political co-operation**

The end of the conflict between Indonesia and Malaysia in 1966 led to a revival of regional activities. Although ASA became dormant in 1963 because of Indonesia's Confrontation (*Konfrontasi*) against Malaysia and the Philippines' claim on Sabah, the end of the Confrontation after the fall of Sukarno and the installation of the new president of the Philippines, Ferdinand Marcos, who 'soft-peddled the Sabah claim'[1] contributed towards a resurgence in regional activities. The relations between Malaysia and Indonesia normalised through the mediation of the Foreign Minister of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, in 1966.[2] Tun Razak, the Deputy of Prime Minister of Malaysia and the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, Adam Malik were the representatives of both the countries and the key figures to end the Confrontation.[3] When Thanat Khoman met Adam Malik for the first time, he sought 'the possibility of Indonesia joining an enlarged organisation which would replace the outdated ASA.'[4]

Indonesia also had no intention to join ASA because Indonesia accused ASA of being a colonial tool and an extension of SEATO. In addition, 'Indonesia was too proud to become a junior member of an association in which it would be the largest and most populous state.'[5] Instead of joining, Indonesia was an active mover in creating a new regional organisation for the purpose of removing distrust among the Southeast Asian countries and raising its credibility as the largest country in the region. The Indonesian Foreign Minister produced a draft of a South East Asian Association for Regional Co-operation (SEAARC) and presented it to Burma,

[1] Roger Irvine, 'The Formative Years of ASEAN: 1967-1975,' in Alison Broinowski, *Understanding ASEAN*, London: Macmillan Press, 1982, p. 10.

[2] Marvin C. Ott, 'Mediation as a Method of Conflict Resolution: Two Cases,' *International Organization*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (autumn, 1972), pp. 609-610. This article favourably appraised Thanat Khoman's mediatory role during *Konfrontasi*. Roger Irvine, *ibid.* J. Norman Parmer, 'Malaysia: Changing a Little to Keep Pace,' *Asian Survey*, Vol. 7, No. 2, A Survey of Asia in 1966: Part II (Feb., 1967), p. 131. See the conclusion of the discussion (Bangkok peace pact), *The Straits Times*, 30 May 1966, p. 1 and 2 June 1966, p. 1.

[3] As Adam Malik was the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, Malaysian counterpart should have been the same position. However, the Tunku, the Prime Minister also held the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs between 1960 and 1970. Properly speaking, the same position should negotiate each other, but the negotiator of Malaysia passed to Tun Razak, because the Tunku was the head of the government.

[4] Quote from M. Rajendran, *ASEAN's Foreign Relations: The shift to collective action*, Kuala Lumpur: Arenabuku, 1985, p. 16.

[5] Dewi Fortuna Anwar, *Indonesia in ASEAN: Foreign Policy and Regionalism*, Singapore: ISEAS, 1995, p. 50.

Cambodia, the Philippines and Thailand. Though Burma and Cambodia stated that they would not oppose it, they did not intend to join.[6] The Philippines and Thailand favoured joining, and the latter held discussions with Indonesia to revise the draft. The revised draft was sent to Malaysia through the Thai Foreign Minister. The obstacle in the formation of this new organisation was Malaysia's response. In June 1966, the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Tun Dr. Ismail, urged for the expansion of membership in 'a regional association embracing Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam.'[7]

The Tunku as the founder of ASA insisted on enlarging the regional organisation, and hesitated to the creation of a new regional organisation, being wary and afraid that President Sukarno might return to take power. The Tunku expected in 1963 that 'more countries would join in and add strength to it (ASA) … because through it strong ties of friendship would be formed and with it peace and stability in this region.'[8] He insisted later that 'I would not like to see us sacrifice ASA … to create a wider regional association, which I am convinced in the present circumstances has little chance of success.'[9] However, for the purpose of expanding its membership, Malaysia accepted the formation of a new regional organisation under a new name: the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)[10], which was established in Bangkok on 8 August 1967. Malaysia decided to join the new regional organisation because of Thailand's persuasive urging, Malaysia's continuous commitments towards regional relations, and the awareness by Foreign Ministry officials that Indonesia's membership in ASEAN would be beneficial in tying

---

[6] *Ibid*., pp. 51-52.
[7] 'Tun Ismail's speech to Foreign Correspondents,' *Foreign Affairs Malaysia*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1966, pp. 1-2.
[8] *The Straits Times*, 26 Aug. 1963, p. 9.
[9] Quoted from Bernard K. Gordon, *Toward Disengagement in Asia: A Strategy for American Foreign Policy*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969, p. 117.
[10] This is the original spelling. Since the 1970s the organisation started to use 'the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.'

Malaysia to the region as a whole.[11] What is important here is that as Indonesia joined the organisation, Burma and Cambodia, non-ASEAN countries in the early period, appreciated the spirit of regional co-operation. Although the two non-ASEAN countries opposed ASA at the time of the formation, they did not clearly object to ASEAN.

It is said that the term 'ASEAN' was originally coined by Adam Malik, the Indonesian Foreign Minister, as he proposed the name of the new regional organisation, the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), on the eve of its formation, and the other four members accepted it. Dewi Fortuna pointed out that the term ASEAN was invented by an American political scientist, Russell Fifield, who proposed the formation of 'ASEAN' as early as 1963 in his book, *Southeast Asia in United States Policy*. However, according to her, the Indonesian Foreign Minister had not read this book before and denied borrowing the acronym from the book.[12] There is no clear evidence as to whether the name of the regional organisation was created by Indonesia. Initially Malik proposed a new organisation name, SEAARC, but Thanat Khoman objected to the name because it sounded as 'shark.'[13]

In spite of it being a regional organisation, ASEAN was not able to cover the entire Southeast Asia at its inception. This was partly because North Vietnam, a communist-dominated country, was not invited to join, and other states in the region also refused to join. Most scholars agree that this was partly because all the members i.e., Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, had anti-communist stances in their foreign policies. In other words, this new organisation was regarded as a group of anti-communist nations seeking to defend themselves. One of

---

[11] Russell H. Fifield, *National and Regional Interests in ASEAN: Competition and Co-operation in International Politics*, Singapore: ISEAS, 1979, p. 9.

[12] Dewi Fortuna Anwar, *ibid*., pp. 54-55. Russell Fifield proposed the name to establish a collective security pact by non-communist countries in Southeast Asia. It was not for economic and cultural regional co-operation. See in details in his book, *Southeast Asia in United States Policy*, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1963, pp. 426-429.

[13] Dewi Fortuna Anwar, *ibid*., p. 51.

the priorities of ASEAN was to thwart the expansion of communism in Southeast Asia.[14] The permanent secretary of the Foreign Ministry of Malaysia, Ghazalie Shafie said in 1965 in the context of China's communist threat that Southeast Asian countries would 'create a common will not merely to survive but to triumph over imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism … South East Asia must unite, will have no choice but to unite, in the face of the massive threat confronting us and perhaps continuing to confront us for several decades.'[15] Southeast Asian countries have, as mentioned in the Introduction, different languages, religions, government regimes, among others. The five member states had almost nothing in common except for the fact that they were once colonised, although Thailand had retained its own independence. In this context, it almost seemed that the anti-communist stance among the five countries were the only thing that they shared and that could serve to solidify their unity. Thus, concerns with regards to national security led the members to create ASEAN. Adam Malik believed that 'in most cases the original motivation towards regional cooperation has been essentially political in nature'[16] and explained their motivation to form ASEAN in such words:

> It was the fact that there was a convergence in the political outlook of the five prospective member-nations, both with regard to national priority objectives as on the question of how best to secure these objectives in the emergent strategic configuration of East Asia, which provided the main stimulus to join together in ASEAN.[17]

---

[14] Interview through e-mail with Mr. Marciano R. de Borja, Consul General, Consulate General of the Philippines in Guam, the United States on 9 Aug. 2017. Thomas Daniel, analyst of Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) Malaysia also agreed this when interviewed through e-mail on 7 Aug. 2017.

[15] Ghazalie Shafie, *Malaysia: International Relations*, Kuala Lumpur: Creative Enterprise, 1982, p. 88.

[16] Adam Malik, 'Regional Cooperation in International Politics,' in Centre for Strategic and International Studies, *Regionalism in Southeast Asia*, Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 1975, pp. 157-158.

[17] Ibid., p. 161.

Thanat Khoman of Thailand also placed emphasis on the four political rationales of ASEAN, i.e., power vacuum with the withdrawal of the colonial powers, ineffective SEATO, strengthening the member countries' positions and protecting themselves against the rivalries of big powers.[18] In other words, due to the shifting trends in international politics during the second half of the 1960s, the leaders of the countries felt an urgent necessity to regionally unite together, especially by including the largest nation in the region, Indonesia. Although Thailand was not keen on joining MAPHILINDO in 1963 because of a confederation of the Malay stock,[19] it was not concerned with this factor because Thailand was more worried with being isolated in the region rather than being fearful of its majority of Malay neighbours.[20]

If the founding members disclosed that the association was formed for political co-operation, this would create antipathy from non-members within and outside the region. To avoid such a scenario, the founding members decided to create the regional association on the basis of economic and cultural co-operation.[21] However, forging economic co-operation was not easy task because the economic structure in each member country had their own vulnerabilities and, as Rajendran pointed out, 'the existing political differences, the effect of mutual suspicions among some of the members and the different levels of economic and industrial development ... were important factors working against concentration on regional economic problems.'[22] In addition, as Adam Malik said, 'differences in levels of development are to be regarded as a major impediment towards regional cooperation among developing countries.'[23]

---

[18] Thanat Khoman, 'Forward to *The ASEAN Reader,* ASEAN: Conception an Evolution,' in Ooi Kee Beng et al., *The 3rd ASEAN Reader*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2015, p. xiv.
[19] See the Chapter 5.
[20] Interview through e-mail with Marciano R. de Borja, Consul General, Consulate General of the Philippines in Guam, the United States on 9 August, 2017.
[21] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat, 1986 (Second edition), p. 23 and see the ASEAN Secretariat website: http://asean.org/the-asean-declaration-bangkok-declaration-bangkok-8-august-1967/ (Accessed on 3 Feb. 2016)
[22] M. Rajendran, *ASEAN's Foreign Relations: The shift to collective action*, Kuala Lumpur: Arenabuku, 1985, p. 22.
[23] Adam Malik, ibid., p. 164.

As a number of scholars stated, the progress made in forging economic co-operation was quite slow and visible results from regional economic co-operation was hardly achieved in the early stage. The Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew revealed in his opening speech in the 1972 ASEAN Ministerial Meeting that:

In the first year, August 1967 to August 1968, there were 102 recommendations. None were implemented. In the second year, August 1968 to December 1969, of 161 recommendations, 10 were implemented, i.e. 6.2%. In the third year, December 1969 to March 1971, of 207 recommendations, 22 were implemented - 10.6%. In the fourth year, March 1971 to April 1972, of 215 recommendations, 48 were implemented - 22.3%.[24]

Rajendran argued that the five members in the period between 1967 and 1974 did not genuinely commit to the purposes of regional economic co-operation because ASEAN did not set up a Secretariat, and then criticised that 'the economic goals set by the Association represented merely the icing on the "ASEAN cake."'[25] If the member nations had been serious about economic and cultural co-operation within the regional association from the beginning, the economic ministers and ministers of culture-related portfolios of each member country should have held meetings. However, the regional meetings were held by the ministers of foreign affairs, in which the focus was mainly on foreign policies. The economic ministers' meetings only began in 1975. On the other hand, the ASEAN Committee on Culture and Information (COCI) was established in 1978 to promote co-operation in culture and arts, but the

[24] *Statements by the ASEAN heads of governments at ASEAN Ministerial meetings, 1968-1985*, ASEAN Secretariat: Jakarta, 1986, p. 23 and the National Archives of Singapore website:
http://www.nas.gov.sg/archivesonline/speeches/record-details/7316c3ac-115d-11e3-83d5-0050568939ad, p. 1. (Accessed on 3 Feb. 2016)
[25] M. Rajendran, ibid., p. 22.

first meeting of ASEAN Ministers Responsible for Culture and Arts (AMCA) was held only in 2003. It took thirty-six years for such a ministers' meeting to be convened.[26]

Although economic co-operation was minimal, the premier of Singapore stressed that 'perhaps the most valuable achievement of ASEAN since its inception was the understanding and goodwill created at the various ASEAN meetings which had helped to lubricate relationships which could otherwise have generated friction.'[27] His statement is true because indigenous leaders in the region seldom had any direct communications under their colonised regimes. At the end of the Second World War, these nations gained independence and had just begun to establish contact with each other, although some of them had already been communicating with each other before the war. Their independence allowed them to freely and frequently communicate with neighbouring countries. The ASEAN framework provided them with a platform to regularly communicate and interact with each other on economic issues. At the same time, the member nations began discussing political issues related to the ASEAN framework since the beginning of the formation.

As ASEAN was formed for regional economic and cultural co-operation, political issues were not discussed on the official agenda of the formal ministers' meetings. In informal meetings, however, political issues were frequently discussed. Susumu Yamakage has analysed, between 1967 and 1972 the five countries had held political discussions in informal meetings, which involved meetings held outside the ASEAN framework.[28] He stated that these informal meetings originated from a meeting held on 6 August 1966. The meeting was convened the day after the third

---

[26]The ASEAN Secretariat website: http://culture360.asef.org/organisation/asean-coci/ and
http://www.asean.org/?static_post=asean-ministers-of-culture-and-arts-hold-inaugural-meeting-kuala-lumpur-14-october-2003-2
(Accessed on 3 Feb. 2016.)
[27] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986,* p. 53. For the original speech text at *Statements by the ASEAN heads of governments at ASEAN Ministerial meetings, 1968-1985*, ASEAN Secretariat: Jakarta, 1986, p. 24.
[28] Susumu Yamakage, *ASEAN. Shimbol kara Systemu e (ASEAN: from symbol to system),* Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku shuppankai, 1991, p. 127 and p. 136.  The author argued that informal meetings have been regulated since 1972 inside ASEAN.

formal meeting of ASA foreign ministers, and Tun Razak of Malaysia, Narciso Ramos of the Philippines, and Thanat Khoman of Thailand participated. The three ministers announced a joint declaration known as the 'Bangkok Peace Appeal.'[29] As ASA was formed for the purpose of economic co-operation, this political communiqué was unusual and out of place. The ministers were fully aware of this, and so the communiqué stated that the three Foreign Ministers of ASA 'availed themselves of the occasion to consult together on matters of common interest outside the framework of ASA.'[30] In response to Dr. Mahathir Mohamad's questions, Tun Razak emphasised in parliament in the same month that 'We are forcing no-one nor is it made under the auspices of ASA which is an association for co-operation endeavours in the cultural, economic and social fields. The move since it is political was made outside the framework of ASA.'[31] Informal meetings of Foreign Ministers were also adopted within ASEAN. After the formation of ASEAN, an informal meeting was held on 7 August 1968 in Jakarta[32] after the Second formal Foreign Ministers' meeting. In this unofficial meeting, regional security issues were discussed. These included Vietnam peace talks in Paris, American presence in the region, British military withdrawal from the region, and the failure of some states to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.[33]

The anti-communist countries had no choice but to hold discussions towards political co-operation because the U.S. government had shifted its policy on Indochina in the first half of 1968 and the issue of military withdrawal from the region arose.

---

[29] See the details in *Foreign Affairs Malaysia*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1966, pp. 12-13. The ministers expressed the following unanimous opinions:
1. The present conflict constitutes a grave threat to the peace and stability of South East Asia.
2. Such threat to peace is a major obstacle to the sound and steady economic development of the region and the resulting political instability prevents the full enjoyment of the economic progress achieved by joint regional undertakings.
3. South East Asian and other Asian countries cannot delegate to others their primary responsibilities for the maintenance of peace, security and stability in their own region, nor can they abdicate to outside Powers (less interested in the welfare of Asia) the fundamental duty of safeguarding regional peace and of seeking a peaceful solution to any conflict within the region.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid., p. 14.
[32] Yamakage argued that the first informal meeting was on the eve of the formation of ASEAN.
[33] *The Canberra Times*, 9 Aug. 1968, p. 6 and *The Straits Times*, 9 Aug. 1968, p. 7.

With the withdrawal plan from the East of Suez by the British government, ASEAN leaders were forced to take measures to prevent a power vacuum in the region. It was the informal meetings after the official ASEAN meetings that served as platforms to discuss political issues. As Yamakage puts it, at the early stages by 1971 the informal meetings were held outside of the framework of ASEAN, and it so happened that those participating in them were ASEAN Foreign Ministers.[34] It is unclear what was being discussed in these informal meetings because they did not issue any communiqués. The meetings were held seven times by 1972. Thereafter it became a regular meeting.

Whether formal or informal meetings were held, from the perspective of regional consciousness in Southeast Asia, ASEAN members more frequently communicated with each other after 1967, and unity within the association grew stronger. As Yamakage also argued, 'ASEAN had played a significant role to almost forcibly connect the diplomatic channels among the members.'[35] Similar to how relations between Malaysia and the Philippines improved and then was suspended in 1968, ASEAN members had also to overcome difficulties in holding regional discussions.

The ASEAN countries had slowly enhanced solidarity through regular meetings, but Southeast Asia at that time was divided into two areas: the ASEAN group and the non-ASEAN group, i.e. Burma, Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. Nevertheless, the ASEAN group always intended to unify the entire Southeast Asia. The Bangkok Declaration in 1967 stated that 'the Association is open for participation to all States in the South-East Asian Region'[36] and also declared that one of its aims was:

---

[34] Yamakage Susumu, ibid., p. 142.
[35] Ibid.
[36] *ASEAN Document Series 1967-1986*, p. 24.

To accelerate the economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region through joint endeavours in the spirit of equality and partnership in order to *strengthen the foundation for a prosperous and peaceful community of South-East Asian Nations.*[37]

From this, we can see that the founders of ASEAN had intended to build up a community of Southeast Asian states in the future. Tun Razak, the Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia said on 11 November 1967 that 'we hope that our neighbours such as Burma, Cambodia, Laos and others will join ASEAN in the near future so that all countries in this Southeast Asian region can excel together towards a glorious era of development, modernity and civilization.'[38] He expected to develop the region together with non-members through ASEAN. More interestingly, Adam Malik, the Indonesian Foreign Minister, re-emphasised that ASEAN 'should not remain merely a mechanism for governmental co-operation but must gradually become a symbol of a community of the peoples in this region.'[39] While no member countries had the intention to create a regional community during the ASA era, ASEAN members, or at least Indonesia and Malaysia, saw the regional association as a catalyst to unify the whole region. The member countries had the intention to form a single community during the inception of the organisation. Since its inception, ASEAN has been a regional organisation not just for ASEAN members, but for the entire Southeast Asia. However, the political uncertainty and instability of the region, in particular due to the Vietnam War, did not allow it to expand its membership.

---

[37] Ibid., p. 23. Italic is added.
[38] Translated from 'Ucapan Timbalan Perdana Menteri Sewaktu merasmikan persidangan pelajar-pelajar Islam Tenggara Asia yang dianjurkan oleh persatuan kebangsaan pelajar-pelajar Islam di Malaysia,' in Arkib Negara Malaysia, *Ucapan-Ucapan Tun Haji Abdul Razak bin Hussein 1967 (Jilid II)*, Kuala Lumpur, 1995, p. 165.
[39] *The Straits Times*, 23 Oct. 1968, p. 10.

On the other hand, the Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew argued regarding the scope of Southeast Asia in 1968:

I have always thought it was a grave mistake to classify Vietnam as Southeast Asian. By its history, ethnic affinities and cultural patterns, Vietnam is East Asian, not Southeast Asian. And there are profound differences between these two groups. [40]

Nevertheless, at the very least Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand had shared a common definition of the region that included Vietnam, because South Vietnam was invited as an official guest to the annual Foreign Minister meetings in 1969 and 1971.[41]

Although the scope of Southeast Asia was self-defined among ASEAN leaders, it was through the 1971 Kuala Lumpur Declaration describing the Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN) that regional leaders 'officially' demarcated the region of Southeast Asia. This declaration resulted from discussions of political issues in informal meetings. Therefore, it is a vital declaration in developing regional consciousness in the future.

**ZOPFAN for the entire region**

International politics in Southeast Asia before and after the formation of ASEAN experienced drastic changes. First, the British government announced in

---

[40] 'Trends and Tendencies in Southeast Asia,' speech by Lee Kuan Yew at the Gabriel Silver Memorial Lecture, Columbia University, New York, U.S.A. (12 Dec. 1968),' in *The Papers of Lee Kuan Yew: Speeches, Interviews and Dialogues, Vol. 4 (1967-1968)*, Singapore: Gale Asia, 2012, p. 476.

[41] Joint Communique of the Third ASEAN Ministerial meeting, Cameron Highlands, Malaysia, 16-17 Dec. 1969, in *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 51 and Joint Communique of the Fourth ASEAN Ministerial meeting, Manila, 12-13 March 1971, p. 52. Laos in 1969 and Cambodia in 1971 were also invited as an official guest. ASEAN invited the two countries to the annual meeting in 1973 as well.

1967 and 1968 its plan to withdraw its forces from the east of Suez. Second, after the Tet Offensive by North Vietnam at the end of January 1968, the U.S. President, Johnson called for peace talks with Ho Chi Minh, the President of Vietnam. The first of these peace talks commenced in Paris on May 1968. After Richard Nixon was installed as the new U.S. President in January 1969, he announced the Nixon Doctrine in Guam in July of that year, which decided on the withdrawal of its forces from Vietnam. As the U.S. government restarted negotiations with North Vietnam to end the war, American policies towards Asia shifted. Further, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union stated the need to create a system of collective security in Asia in 1969. Under these international circumstances, ASEAN countries believed that they should agree on collective security policies. Among the countries, Malaysia was quick to perceive the current international trends, and Tun Dr. Ismail proposed a neutralisation plan for Southeast Asia.[42]

Neutralism originally emerged in Europe, especially among the smaller nations, at the beginning of the nineteenth century as an option to protect national sovereignty against incursion by the major powers. By the mid-twentieth century, the concept had well pervaded into Asia. As Peter Lyon puts it, neutralism was almost ubiquitous in Southeast Asia in one form or another,[43] with its official adoption by Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar in the 1960s. The government of Malaya was in a position to choose a neutral policy when the country achieved independence from the British in 1957, but found it inexpedient to do so. Its neutral foreign policy came to the fore only in 1970 when the concept of ZOPFAN was officially proposed to ASEAN by the second Prime Minister, Tun Razak. However, the cornerstone of the neutral policy had been

---

[42] Bilveer Singh, *ZOPFAN and the New Security Order in the Asia-Pacific Region*, Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, 1992, p. 26. See his statement in Federation of Malaysia, *Perbahatahan Parlimen, Dewan Ra'ayat yang Kedua, Penggal Keempat, Penyata Rasmi, Jilid IV, No. 18*, 23 Jan. 1968, col. 3614.
[43] Peter Lyon, *War and Peace in South-East Asia*, London: Oxford University Press, 1969, p. 161.

laid out earlier, and its origins can be traced back to the period of the first Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman.[44]

Extreme anti-communists nations might not be able to propose a neutral policy. In the case of Malaysia, the political leaders had an anti-communist stance, but their stance was quite soft. It can be said that their stance was neutral, i.e. neither pro-communist nor strictly anti-communist. When the Malayan Communist Party (MCP) unleashed its reign of terror in 1948, the British government at that time declared a state of emergency in Malaya. This remained in force till 1960, even after the country gained independence in 1957. Militant members of the MCP killed thousands of local civilians during the Emergency, thus arousing considerable public animosity against them. Nevertheless, the Tunku had a liberal stance on communism as an ideology and his stance was evident even in the early years of his political career. As the Chief Minister of Malaya before independence, the Tunku held a meeting with Chin Peng, the head of the MCP in Baling, Kedah in December 1955, during which he stated his stance on communism. The purpose of this meeting was to persuade the communists to renounce violence and to disarm. The Tunku declared that the MCP would not be accepted 'as lawful and legitimate after the damage they *(MCP)* have done to the people and the country.'[45] When Chin Peng argued that the Communist Party of Australia was functioning legally, the Tunku retorted that '[t]he communists were not pressing armed struggle in Australia'[46] and further said: 'We don't mind … the communist ideology, so far as you don't preach violence. In our country, quite a lot of people are communist theorists dedicated to communist ideology but they didn't carry

---

[44] See in details in Ito Mitsuomi, 'The path to Malaysia's neutral foreign policy in the Tunku era,' *Sarjana*, forthcoming.
[45] Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj, *Looking Back: Monday Musings and Memoirs*, Pustaka Antara: Kuala Lumpur, 1977, p. 13.
[46] Chin Peng, *My Side of History*, Media Master: Singapore, 2003, p. 380.

out any violence, so we allowed them.'[47] As this statement was from a recollection by Chin Peng, one might be tempted to treat it with some reservation, but the Tunku himself had reiterated it in later years:

I am not anti-communist *per se*. I am only against those Communist countries who try through subversive and militant means to export the ideology to our country. In this way I am anti-communist. I am not anti-communist if they keep their ideology within their borders.[48]

This clearly shows that while the Tunku strongly opposed the use of militant means to overturn the government, he was essentially not against communism. On the contrary, the Tunku mentioned that 'If perchance … we find that some particular method of the Communists can be adopted for the good of our Nation and State, we shall not hesitate to adopt that method.'[49] If he were truly anti-communist and a hardliner against communism, he would not have said this.

Other senior government officials who influenced Malaya's foreign policies also had similar liberal views on communism as the Tunku. During the period of his ambassadorship to the United Nations and the United States, Tun Dr. Ismail also expressed similar views in public, stating that Malaya 'is the only country in the world today which is involved in a shooting war with adherents of communism.' However, it was essentially 'militant communism' and 'communist terrorism'[50] that he was against. In this respect, Tun Dr. Ismail's position on communism was clear when he

---

[47] C.C. Chin and Karl Hack (eds.), *Dialogues with Chin Peng: New Light on the Malayan Communist Party*, Singapore University Press: Singapore, 2004, pp. 175-176.

[48] Abdullah Ahmad, *Tengku Abdul Rahman and Malaysia's Foreign Policy 1963-1970*, Berita Publishing: Kuala Lumpur, 1985, p. 5 and his same comment in Kua Kia Soong (ed.), *K. Das and the Tunku Tapes*, SIRD: Petaling Jaya, 2002, pp. 99-101.

[49] Memorial Tunku Abdul Rahman P/U. 236, *The Presidential Address by Tunku at the 15th General Assembly of UMNO*, 23 Aug. 1962.

[50] Tawfik Ismail and Ooi Kee Beng (eds.), *Malaya's First Year at the United Nations: As Reflected in Dr Ismail's Reports Home to Tunku Abdul Rahman*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2009, pp. 106-107.

reiterated in parliament a year later: 'We are not against communism as ideology, although we ourselves believe in democracy. But we are against its militant form and those countries practicing it, and through subversive and militant means try to export this ideology to other countries.'[51] Interestingly enough, his view of communism and his differentiating between ideology and militancy echoed the Tunku's stance in 1955.

The Tunku was one who was liberal towards communism, although his speeches and statements were often erroneously referred to as 'anti-communist' in the media. Tun Dr. Ismail also had a tolerant and understanding attitude towards communism, accepting communism as a dogma. Although the political leaders often used the phrase 'anti-communism' in public, it would be more appropriate and correct to say that their stance was not 'anti-communist,' but actually 'anti-militant communist' or more simply 'anti-terrorist.'

The Malaya/Malaysian government had adopted a pro-Western foreign policy from the beginning of its independence, but it had to do so because of three main reasons: first, the MCP was still carrying out terrorist activities when Malaya achieved independence, and the state of emergency that was declared in 1948 still remained in force; second, the small Malayan defence forces were not in a position to defend the new nation adequately when independence was granted in 1957; third, the government's decision in limiting funds for national defence meant that its armed forces could not be expanded.

Malaysia had no diplomatic relations with communist countries by the mid-sixties because the country had to deal with domestic communist guerrillas at the outset of independence, and it was threatened by the pro-communist government of Indonesia during the *Konfrontasi* era, which had links with China, a major communist

---

[51] Federation of Malaysia, *Parliamentary Debates, Dewan Ra'ayat (House of Representatives) Official Report, Third session of the second parliament of Malaysia,* Vol. III, No. I, 20 June 1966, col. 865.

country. However, the government gradually steered towards a middle course after 1967. It formed diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia in 1967 and then with the Soviet Union. This was followed by Romania and Bulgaria in Eastern Europe.[52]

In July 1967 and again in January 1968 the British government had announced the withdrawal of its armed forces from Malaysia and Singapore by the end of 1971.[53] Subsequently, Malaysia held discussions with the other four countries in the Five-Power Defence Conference between 1968 and 1971 and signed the Five-Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) to replace the Anglo-Malayan Defence Agreement (AMDA). Should the deal fail to go through, Tun Dr. Ismail proposed in the *Dewan Rakyat* (Lower House) on 23 January 1968 that the concept of regional neutrality be vigorously pursued as an alternative. He emphasised that the entire Southeast Asian region should pursue a policy of neutrality guaranteed by the three powers, *viz.* the United States, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China.

The key figures in the government reacted favourably to the proposal. The Tunku, the Prime Minister, commented: 'This is something which is worth giving thought to,'[54] adding that the government would try to discuss with the countries in and outside the region, including the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia with which it had diplomatic relations by 1968. Moreover, he remarked that 'we might persuade them to agree to peaceful co-existence, agree to non-aggression pacts and at the same time agree to the neutralisation of certain zones, in particular, South East Asia.'[55] Tun

---

[52] Official documents have not mentioned the relations with the all above communist countries. See *The Straits Times*, 6 May 1967, p. 1 for Yugoslavia, *The Straits Times*, 24 Dec. 1967, p. 16 for the Soviet Union, *Berita Harian*, 3 January 1969, p. 5 and *The Straits Times*, 3 January 1969, p. 11 for Bulgaria. The establishment of diplomatic relations with Romania is not reported in local newspapers, but Dr. Mahathir mentioned when he visited the country. See the Office of the Prime Minister of Malaysia website: http://www.pmo.gov.my/ucapan/?m=p&p=mahathir&id=45 (accessed on 3 Dec. 2016) The embassy of Romania in Malaysia also mentioned the date of the establishment (22 March, 1969). See its website: http://kualalumpur.mae.ro/node/221 (accessed on 3 Dec. 2016).
[53] *House of Commons Debates*, 27 July 1967, vol. 751, col. 1102 at
http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1967/jul/27/defence and *House of Commons Debates*, 16 Jan. 1968, vol. 756, col. 1581 at
http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1968/jan/16/public-expenditure. (Accessed on 5 Feb. 2015.)
[54] Federation of Malaysia, *Perbahatahan Parlimen, Dewan Ra'ayat yang Kedua, Penggal Keempat, Penyata Rasmi, Jilid IV, No. 18*, 27 Jan. 1968, col. 4307.
[55] Ibid., col. 4308.

Razak, the then Deputy Prime Minister, also praised the proposal as a possibility to endorse the neutralisation policy for the region's long term objectives.[56] To achieve the goal of neutralisation, Tun Razak tried to persuade the Soviet Union to guarantee the independence and neutrality of the countries in the region when he visited Russia in May 1968. The communist country responded by only agreeing to adhere to the principle of co-existence.[57] It is worth noting that both the Tunku and Tun Razak accepted the idea of neutralisation and, interestingly enough, the latter started to work towards the neutralisation of the region immediately after the proposal was made.

Unfortunately, a bitter ethnic riot occurred in May 1969, and the Tunku was not able to keep his position and finally resigned in September 1970. The new Prime Minister, Tun Razak, appointed Tun Dr. Ismail, who proposed the neutralisation plan, as the Deputy Prime Minister. This appointment showed that the new government was at the helm of the regional neutralisation plan.

The policy towards the neutralisation of Southeast Asia characterised his administration. Originally this plan was suggested as an alternative in case of the failure of the FPDA, but the Malaysian government also focused on implementing this plan as its foreign policy because it believed that the security of the entire Southeast Asian region was directly linked to its own national security. Before allowing the big powers outside the region and non-ASEAN countries in the region to accept it, Malaysia needed to persuade the ASEAN countries, but the four ASEAN countries did not express their support immediately. This was mainly because of the failure of Laos and Cambodian to neutralise in the 1960s, in which the ASEAN leaders knew that a neutral policy would not necessarily bring peace and security.

---

[56] Ibid., cols. 4333-4334.
[57] *The Straits Times*, 27 May 1968, p. 1.

Fortunately, Tun Razak obtained support for the neutralisation plan from Thailand and Indonesia when he officially visited both countries.[58] During the United Nations General Assembly in October 1971, the Prime Minister of Malaysia presented the plan.[59] After addressing in the assembly, he met ASEAN foreign ministers in New York, in which they decided to meet in Kuala Lumpur on 25 November 1971. More importantly, the New York meeting endorsed the plan to work towards a neutral Southeast Asia.[60] In passing, this meeting also discussed matters regarding subsequent discussions that were to be held in Kuala Lumpur regarding the Asian summit. This was proposed by Marcos immediately after the U.S. President, Nixon announced his visit to China.[61]

The Kuala Lumpur Declaration of 1971 made during the special ASEAN Foreign Ministers' meeting was the first declaration that expressed political co-operation among ASEAN countries, in spite of the fact that ASEAN was established for economic and cultural co-operation. In this respect, the meeting was special and exceptional for ASEAN. The Declaration was, as Yamakage pointed out, to neutralise the whole region of Southeast Asia, not merely the ASEAN region.[62] After the long preamble, only two clauses were written as the body-text. The second clause declared that 'South East Asian countries should make concerted efforts to broaden the areas of cooperation which would contribute to their strength, solidarity and closer relationship.'[63] Tun Razak believed that regional co-operation would engender conditions of stability in the region and a sense of solidarity and cohesion among

---

[58] *Berita Harian,* 17 Dec. 1970, p. 3 and *The Straits Times,* 24 Dec. 1970, p. 12.
[59] *The United Nations General Assembly, Twenty-Sixth Session Official Records*, 1848th Plenary Meeting, 1 Oct. 1971, p. 4 at the Official Document System of the United Nations: http://documents.un.org (Accessed on Feb. 2015).
[60] *The Straits Times*, 18 Oct. 1971, p. 30.
[61] Ibid., 4 Oct. 1971, p. 1.
[62] Yamakage Susumu, ibid., p. 161.
[63] *ASEAN Document Series 1967-1986*, Second Edition, Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat, 1986, p. 30.

South-East Asian countries.'[64] And, through close co-operating among the region's countries, a regional community would be born. He said in the Malaysian parliament that '[f]or us in Malaysia our vision for the future is that of a Community of South-East-Asia.'[65] In short, the Declaration expressed the desire and hope of ASEAN leaders to create a regional community in the future. The joint statement after the Kuala Lumpur meeting also stated that the Foreign Ministers and the Special Envoy agreed that 'they would bring the contents of their Declaration to the attention of the other countries of Southeast Asia and would encourage them to associate themselves with the aspirations and objectives expressed in the Declaration.'[66] Tun Razak explained this plan to President Nixon in New York in October 1971, but apparently the ASEAN countries did not inform the other Southeast Asian countries about the plan at that time except for South Vietnam and Laos.[67] The ASEAN countries had since then attempted to get approvals from not only the major powers but also non-ASEAN countries for the plan. However, it took time for the non-ASEAN countries in Southeast Asia to accept the plan.

In the context of regional consciousness in Southeast Asia, the significance of the Declaration is that 'ASEAN country members came to bear in mind to keep stable and friendly relationships among Southeast Asian countries.'[68] Although the five countries originally grouped together to co-operation against communism, they did not create an ASEAN bloc, but attempted to neutralise the whole Southeast Asian region including its communist countries instead. The ASEAN members focused on how to stabilise the entire region and develop the region's economy regardless of

---

[64] *The United Nations General Assembly, Twenty-Sixth Session Official Records*, 1848th Plenary Meeting, 1 Oct. 1971, p. 4 at the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org) (Accessed on February 2015).
[65] Federation of Malaysia, *Penyata Rasmi, Dewan Ra'ayat, Parlimen Ketiga, Penggal Parlimen Pertama,* Jil. 1, Bil. 31, 26 Julai, 1971, col. 3718.
[66] The ASEAN Secretariat website: http://www.asean.org/?static_post=joint-press-statement-special-asean-foreign-ministers-meeting-to-issue-the-declaration-of-zone-of-peace-freedom-and-neutrality-kuala-lumpur-25-26-november-1971 (Accessed on 1 Feb. 2016).
[67] For South Vietnam, see *New Nation*, 17 Nov. 1971, p. 1. For Laos, see in *Foreign Affairs Malaysia*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Dec. 1971), p. 90.
[68] Yamakage Susumu, ibid., p. 165.

ideology. In the same manner the Declaration was the document that expressed the region's readiness for co-existence and a sharing of prosperity within the regional unit.

ZOPFAN also bore significance for the countries of Indochina: they had begun to see a link between regional security and their own national security, and came to realise that regional co-operation was important after the end of the Vietnam War. Vietnam and Laos criticised the neutralisation plan in 1975 and 1976, and Laos proposed the 'Zone of Peace, Genuine Independence' as an alternative to ZOPFAN in the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) meeting in 1975. Regardless of what the proposed alternatives were, the countries of Indochina had begun realizing the importance of creating a security zone in co-operation with the entire region.

Under these circumstances the ASEAN countries made great efforts to reach out to non-ASEAN countries, in particular the countries of Indochina. Among the ASEAN members, Indonesia played a significant role in doing so, such as holding a conference in Cambodia in 1970 and participating in the International Commission for Control and Supervision (ICCS) which functioned to oversee the ceasefire process in South Vietnam in January 1973. Other ASEAN members also attempted to reach out to these countries in the first half of the 1970s. As mentioned previously, some of these countries were invited to the annual ASEAN Foreign Ministers meetings. In addition, the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in 1973 agreed to set up the Coordinating Committee for the Reconstruction and Rehabilitation of Indochina States,[69] which was to assist the war-devastated countries of Indochina in rehabilitation and redevelopment.

ZOPFAN contributed to the development of the Southeast Asian region and to the creation of a much stronger regional consciousness. In this regard, it was also important that the five countries defined the scope of the region to which the

---

[69] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 55.

neutralisation process could be applied, thus demarcating the region of Southeast Asia. At the same time, this demarcation excluded some countries from the region. The next section discusses the countries left out from the framework of the Southeast Asian region.

**Excluding countries from Southeast Asia**

This section examines the regional perspectives of the Southeast Asian region held by the governments of Ceylon (later renamed as Sri Lanka) and Pakistan/Bangladesh. If the region of Southeast Asia is roughly defined as the geographic space situated between the east of India, the south of China and the north of Australia, these three countries should be included in Southeast Asia. Examining these regional perspectives here is important because, as we saw in chapter one, some scholars prior to the 1960s regarded these three territories as being part of Southeast Asia. We will now examine how these governments perceived the region as a whole, and also the perceptions of ASEAN leaders as to whether these countries belonged to the region of Southeast Asia.

Sri Lanka is situated in the Indian Ocean off the south-eastern tip of India. The island country has a plural society comprising immigrants mainly from India. After being colonised by the Portuguese and Dutch, it became a British colony in 1815. The country gained peaceful independence in 1948, but severe ethnic conflicts have continued since.[70] Although the major ethnic groups in the island are the Sinhalese and Sri Lankan Tamils, Malays also reside there as one of the smaller minorities, and adhere to Islam. The name of the country, Ceylon, was changed to its current name, Sri Lanka, in 1972. Its foreign policies by the mid-1950s actively helped to unite

---

[70] See the history of Sri Lanka, Nira Wickramasinghe, *Sri Lanka in the Modern Age: A History*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Asian countries. The island nation, under the then Prime Minister's initiative, hosted the Colombo Conference in 1954, inviting Burma, India, Indonesia and Pakistan to participate. This conference subsequently led to the Asia Africa Conference in 1955.

The issue as to whether the island country belonged to the region of Southeast Asia became controversial among scholars in the 1950s, as we saw in chapter one. According to the then Prime Minister of Ceylon, Sir John Kotewalawa, when Queen Elizabeth II visited the island in April 1954 and broadcast a special speech, she remarked that Colombo was 'in the heart of South-East Asia.'[71] It is probable that Kotewalawa did not perceive anything wrong with this phrase. When the Colombo Conference was held in 1954, the Prime Minister called the conference 'The South-East Asian Prime Ministers' Conference.'[72] He believed that the five participating countries were part of the region. In fact, his perception that the region of Southeast Asia included these five countries was reasonable, because the South-East Asian Command (SEAC) that was set up in 1943 during the Second World War was set up in the island country, and its headquarters established there as well. It was thus that Kotewalawa perceived Ceylon as being part of the region.

After the formation of ASA on 31 July 1961, one of the ministers of Ceylon stated his private views that 'if the scope of the organisation is enlarged to take in a wider area, there is no reason why we should not come in too.'[73] Apparently the minister recognised that the island nation was not in Southeast Asia. Immediately after that, there were sources that stated that 'the geographical extent of South-East Asia was not defined when ASA was set up'[74] and suggested that Ceylon could become a member. Ceylon expected to join the organisation, but the Tunku opined after a year that India and Ceylon were not considered as potential members of ASA

---

[71] Sir John Kotewalawa, ibid., p. 112.
[72] Ibid., p. 120.
[73] *The Straits Times*, 8 Sept. 1961, p. 5.
[74] Ibid, 9 Sept. 1961, p. 11.

because they were not in the region.[75] The Tunku had a clear definition regarding the scope of Southeast Asia.

However, the Tunku later changed his mind. He became keen on bringing Ceylon into the new regional organisation: ASEAN. He said before the formation of ASEAN that he would support any form of wider organisation for regional co-operation and subsequently stated that 'Ceylon should be in with us.'[76] With the establishment of ASEAN, the Tunku stated again regarding admitting Ceylon: 'If Ceylon desires to join ASEAN, although geographically she is not in South-east Asia, Malaysia will support her entry,' adding that the question of Ceylon joining ASEAN had not arisen since Ceylon had not formally applied to be a member.[77] The Philippine government regarded the island country as a 'highly qualified partner' and expressed approval for admitting the island country after discussions with Indonesia.[78] The Indonesian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Adam Malik, also said immediately after the formation: 'geographically India was not included in Southeast Asia. ASEAN … was confined to countries located in Southeast Asia. However … Ceylon was in Southeast Asia.'[79] In other words, ASEAN countries had no consensus as to where Ceylon belonged.

Despite the fact that the island country was invited to be an ASEAN member, the government of Ceylon hesitated to join. The Ceylonese Prime Minister reasoned that he was not sure whether ASEAN was aligned to SEATO, which the opposition parties in Ceylon were strongly against. As the island nation pursued a non-alignment foreign policy, he said that joining the organisation depended on whether 'ASEAN is

---

[75] Ibid., 31 July 1962, p. 11.
[76] Ibid., 23 April 1967, p. 1.
[77] Ibid., 30 Sept. 1967, p. 1.
[78] Ibid., 8 Oct. 1967, p. 3.
[79] Quoted in Kripa Sridharan, *The ASEAN Region in India's Foreign Policy*, Aldershot: Datrmouth, 1996, p. 50.

against any particular bloc.'[80] When discussing with the Tunku on joining ASEAN in October 1967, the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Dudley Senanayake stated that Ceylon was considering participation, but joining the regional organisation was not an urgent matter.

According to S. R. Nathan, Canagaratnam Gunasingham, Sri Lanka's former High Commissioner to Singapore, said that the then Prime Minister of Ceylon had come under pressure not only from the leftists within his country, but also from India, China and the Soviet Union, although the island country had hoped of 'breaking away from its moorings in South Asia and becoming a trading nation with links to South East and East Asian nations as well as to all littoral Asia.'[81] Ceylon is located at the south of India in the Indian Ocean and is in close proximity to the largest country of South Asia, India, but if Ceylon joined ASEAN, it would in a sense 'become a Southeast Asian country.' ASEAN leaders took a favourable view of the island country and extended a warm welcome to Ceylon to join the regional organisation. This was probably because in spite of its geographical size, the Ceylonese government played a significant role in international politics, such as hosting the Colombo Conference in 1954.

However, ASEAN countries never invited Ceylon to the ministerial meetings, although Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam were invited as guests. It can therefore be said that ASEAN members did not actually consider Ceylon a Southeast Asian country. After fourteen years had passed since the formation of ASEAN, the then Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, Ramasinghe Premadasa, submitted an application to join ASEAN to the Standing Committee in May 1981, but the application was turned down in the following year.

[80] *The Straits Times*, 9 Oct. 1967, p. 1 and *Berita Harian*, 10 Oct. 1967, p. 4.
[81] S. R. Nathan, *An Unexpected Journey: Path to the Presidency*, Singapore: EDM Books, 2011, p. 351. See also Rodolfo C. Severino, *Southeast Asia in Search of an ASEAN Community: Insights from the former ASEAN Secretary-General*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2006, pp. 45-47.

Bangladesh is geographically surrounded by India in three directions, and the southeastern part of the country is adjoining Burma. It literally lies between South Asia and Southeast Asia. Bangladesh has a complicated history. It was called East Pakistan under the sovereignty of Pakistan prior to 1971, after which it gained independence. When India and Pakistan gained independence from the British in 1947, the region of Bengal was divided into the West and East along the lines of religion, namely Hinduism and Islam. While West Bengal, which was predominantly Hindu, was incorporated as a territory of India, the Muslim-dominated East Bengal was brought into Pakistan that year. East Bengal was a region independently governed by a major Pakistani political party, the Muslim League, between 1947 and 1954. Just like other countries in Asia, nationalism in Bengal emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century and thereafter developed significantly. However, when elections were held in 1946, the majority of Bengali Muslims in East Bengal voted for the Muslim League to create a separate homeland for Muslims. The voters felt more secure and comfortable with Muhammad Ali Jinnah, who became the founder of Pakistan.[82] In 1955 it was established as one of the states of Pakistan and was renamed East Pakistan. In spite of the fact that both West and East Pakistan were part of the same country, there was a distance of 2,000 km between Islamabad, the capital of Pakistan in the West, and Dhaka, the main city in the East.

Since Pakistan consisted of two geographically divided territories, the government at that time faced problems with defending its territories. Thus, Pakistan joined the Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO), which was formed in 1955 with Iran, Iraq, Turkey and the United Kingdom in the interest of its western territory, and it also signed a treaty with SEATO that was established in 1954 in the interest of its

---

[82] For details, see in Zillur R. Khan, 'Islam and Bengali Nationalism,' *Asian Survey*, Vol. 25, No. 8 (Aug. 1985), pp. 834-851 and Hasan Zaheer, *The Separation of East Pakistan: The Rise and Realization of Bengali Muslim Nationalism*, Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 3-107.

eastern territory. However, the foreign policies of Pakistan were influenced by West Pakistani elites who dominated the civil service and military, and they basically tried to strengthen relations with the Middle Eastern countries because of their feelings of affinity to Islam.[83] Pakistan in the West and the East shared a common religion, but due to their different cultures and languages, East Pakistan, which is in closer proximity to Southeast Asia, was given less importance.

It is probable that East Pakistan's foreign policies were more oriented towards Asia during the premiership of Mohammad Ali Bogra (1953-1955), a Bengali politician. This can be seen from his participation in notable conferences from Colombo to Bandung. It is possible that he attempted to draw closer to countries of both South and Southeast Asia through participating in these conferences. We do not know whether he had a regional awareness oriented towards Southeast Asia just like most of East Pakistan, but we know that Pakistan's foreign policies were highly valued by the U.S. thereafter.

In 1971, East Pakistan achieved independence from Pakistan, and was renamed Bangladesh. When Ghaffar Baba, the Malaysian Minister of National and Rural Development visited the country, the new country's leaders expressed their desire to join ASEAN because they regarded Bangladesh as one of the countries of Southeast Asia. An article commented: 'Whether Bangladesh is part of South-East Asia geographically is beside the point. But its desire to join ASEAN and its claim to be one of the South-East Asian countries should be given the widest interpretation.'[84] This indicated that people did not feel that Bangladesh did not belong to Southeast Asia. Although Bangladesh did not apply for membership in ASEAN, the Malaysian Deputy Prime Minister, Tun Dr. Ismail, stated after two months that 'We do not

---

[83] K. B. Sayeed, 'Southeast Asia in Pakistan's Foreign Policy,' *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (Summer, 1968), pp. 230-232.
[84] *New Nation*, 24 March 1972, p. 6.

consider Bangladesh as part of the area we regard as South-East Asia.'[85] Even though the country is adjacent to Burma, Bangladesh was excluded from the region.

While Malaysia urged Ceylon to join the new regional organisation of ASEAN even before its formation, Pakistan, which possessed a territory adjacent to Burma, was not invited to join despite the fact that East Pakistan was much closer to Southeast Asia. This was probably due to the fact that ASEAN countries wanted to keep away from the conflicts between Pakistan and India, in which both countries was engaged in a war against each other in 1965.

As a matter of fact, before the Second World War, the British did not recognise the region of East Bengal as a part of Southeast Asia, and neither did the indigenous leaders of Southeast Asia. The people of East Bengal/East Pakistan also hardly possessed any regional awareness towards Southeast Asia. Most of the Muslim-dominated areas are surrounded by Hindu-dominated areas, and its south-eastern border is also contiguous with that of a Buddhist country. As such, it can be said that East Bengal is somewhat an isolated Muslim region. The present-day nations of Sri Lanka, Pakistan and Bangladesh were part of British India. This might be one of the reasons as to why the people had no regional awareness of Southeast Asia. In short, the Bengali Muslims, despite being mostly attracted to the political ideals of Jinnah, felt more secure and comfortable to be part of West Pakistan, which is closer to Mecca in the Middle East. Moreover, another reason for the lack of a regional awareness towards Southeast Asia in East Bengal was that Burma, which is adjacent to the region, separated from British India and became British Burma in April 1937. With the formation of British Burma which had a Buddhist majority, a 'wall' was created in the south-eastern side of the region in the minds of the Bengali Muslims. With their different religions and the formation of a Buddhist-majority British Burma,

---

[85] *The Straits Times*, 26 May 1972, p. 29.

the Bengali Muslims did not look to Southeast Asia for a shared regional consciousness.[86]

Further, it would also be essential to discuss the regional geography of Taiwan and Papua New Guinea in order to better understand the demarcation of Southeast Asia.

Taiwan, located to the north of the Philippines and formed the Republic of China after the Second World War, was keen on joining the regional organisations of Southeast Asia. The Republic of China first showed its desire to take part in ASA as early as 1962.[87] It is unknown whether it submitted an application to join at this time, but Taiwan attempted to join ASA again in 1966. Immediately after this news was reported, the Tunku opposed the admission of Taiwan because the island nation had no diplomatic relations with Malaysia, besides being outside the region of Southeast Asia.[88] His stand did not change even after the formation of ASEAN. There is no evidence that Taiwan expressed its desire to join ASEAN, or if ASEAN invited Taiwan to join. Taiwan is geographically close to Southeast Asia, which is approximately 250 km away from the Philippines and as mentioned in the chapter three it was included in the Malay Archipelago in the nineteenth century, but it was embroiled in political disputes with mainland China, of which the countries of Southeast Asia wanted to distance themselves from these disputes. Taiwan lost its representative seat in the United Nations in 1971. After President Nixon of the U.S. visited Beijing in 1972, the detente led to the cutting off of ties between ASEAN countries and Taiwan, and the establishment of official relations between the People's Republic of China and ASEAN countries such as Malaysia in 1974, and Thailand and the Philippines in 1975. Relations between Southeast Asian countries and Taiwan

---

[86] According to Thomas Daniel, analyst of ISIS Malaysia, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka were considered too far geographically from Southeast Asia. Interview through e-mail with him on 7 August, 2017.
[87] Estrella D. Solidum, *Towards a Southeast Asian Community*, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1974, p. 44.
[88] *Berita Harian*, 16 March 1966, p. 1, ibid., 17 March 1966, p. 1, and *The Straits Times*, 17 March 1966, p. 9.

were almost cut off during this period, and Taiwan has become isolated diplomatically since then.[89] In light of this complicated issue, Southeast Asian leaders held to a tacit understanding that Taiwan was outside the region, and it was not allowed to join the regional organisation so as not to give rise to diplomatic problems for each member country.

Papua New Guinea had not gained independence at the time of the formation of ASEAN. It was placed under the International Trusteeship System and ruled by Australia until it became independent in 1975. Thus, ASEAN members did not consider including the country as a member state in spite of the fact that the country is contiguous with Indonesia, sharing a 760 kilometre border. When the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, Adam Malik proposed the formation of a South Pacific sub-regional group, he viewed the geographical location of Indonesia as belonging to the Indian Ocean, South-East Asia and the South Pacific. When asked regarding the possibility of Papua New Guinea joining ASEAN, he answered that 'at the beginning I was for the proposition to have an independent Papua New Guinea enter ASEAN.' However, '[i]t has been told to me that the other members of ASEAN might not think Papua New Guinea as properly belonging to the East Asian area,' but rather the South Pacific region. This led the minister to surmise that Papua New Guinea was part of the latter region.[90] The Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, Carlos Romulo said in later years that he was not averse to ASEAN admitting Papua New Guinea.[91] Although the country had shown its strong desire to join the regional organisation since the 1980s, the Foreign Minister of Singapore, Suppiah Dhanabalan pointed out in 1987 that ASEAN had not really thought about admitting a single country that belonged to two

---

[89] Lee Lai To, 'Taiwan and Southeast Asia: Realpolitik Par Excellence?,' *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Dec. 1985), p. 209.

[90] *The Canberra Times*, 10 Nov. 1973, p. 9. Thomas Daniel, analyst of ISIS Malaysia, also pointed out that Papua New Guinea is geographically too far and too Australasian -Indonesia's rule over West Papua notwithstanding. Interview through e-mail with him on 7 August, 2017.

[91] *The Straits Times*, 15 June 1982, p. 16.

regional groups, and Papua New Guinea had been a member of the South Pacific Forum since 1971.[92]

ASEAN leaders had defined the scope of Southeast Asia by the middle of the 1970s. According to S. R. Nathan, the westernmost border of the region 'did not extend to the west beyond Burma.'[93] The eastern and southern borders of the region did not extend beyond the Indonesian borders, and the northernmost side was the northern border of the Philippines. For this reason, even if countries such as Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Taiwan and Papua New Guinea declared that they belonged to Southeast Asia, they were not able to join Southeast Asian regional organisations or incorporate themselves into the region, as ASEAN countries decided on the scope of the region. In other words, ASEAN 'was already creating a political need for a clearer delineation of the boundaries of Southeast Asia to distinguish insiders from outsiders.'[94] Subsequently, based on its own definition of the region, ASEAN has attempted to build co-operation not only within ASEAN but also with non-ASEAN countries, and the organisation directed its efforts towards establishing a regional community.

**Towards an ASEAN Region and Community**

With the establishment of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) on 31 December 2015, the term 'ASEAN Community' was often used by the mass media. After the adoption of Vision 2020 during the ASEAN summit in Malaysia in 1997, in which the member countries stated that they 'envision the entire Southeast Asia to be, by 2020, an ASEAN community conscious of its ties of history, aware of its cultural

---

[92] *The Canberra Times*, 10 April 1987, p. 4.
[93] S. R. Nathan, ibid., p. 350.
[94] Chin Kin Wah, 'ASEAN: The Long Road to "One Southeast Asia",' *Asian Journal of Political Science,* Vol. 5, No. 1 (June 1997), p. 5.

heritage and bound by a common regional identity,'[95] ASEAN members declared the establishment of an ASEAN Community 'comprising three pillars, namely political and security cooperation, economic cooperation, and socio-cultural cooperation'[96] in the Bali Concord II in 2003. Thereafter, the regional organisation has produced the ASEAN Charter and adopted the Roadmap for an ASEAN Community (2009-2015). Although it seems that the ASEAN Secretariat itself has declared that the term 'ASEAN Community' was first used in Vision 2020, this term actually originates from the Declaration of ASEAN Concord in Bali, Indonesia in 1976.

The term 'ASEAN Community' did not emerge suddenly in 1976, but was coined after the term 'ASEAN region' became widely used. One of the earliest usage of the term 'ASEAN region' in the early stages was in 1968 by the then Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tun Razak.[97] It seems that he had never used this term officially since then. Perusing declarations, joint communiqués, statements of Foreign Ministers and other related documents of ASEAN, the term 'ASEAN region' has been used frequently since 1971. President Marcos of the Philippines used this term three times in his opening speech at the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in 1971. While the terms 'ASEAN countries' and 'ASEAN governments' were used only once respectively, the term 'ASEAN region' was used more emphatically than other terms, in which it is often found in official ASEAN documents. With his use of the term, it became more popular in *The Straits Times* in Singapore,[98] as writers started using the term more. ASEAN documents such as the joint communiqués and speech texts in 1972 and 1973 did not use the term 'ASEAN region,' but President Suharto of Indonesia, mentioned

---

[95] The ASEAN Secretariat website: http://www.asean.org/?static_post=asean-vision-2020 (Accessed on 2 Feb. 2016.)
[96] The ASEAN Secretariat website: http://www.asean.org/?static_post=declaration-of-asean-concord-ii-bali-concord-ii-2 (Accessed on 2 Feb. 2016.)
[97] *The Straits Times*, 10 Aug. 1968, p. 1.
[98] 1968: twice, 1969: twice, 1970: three times, 1971: 16, 1972: 39, 1973:31, 1974: 39, 1975: 37, 1976: 157, 1977: 317. Source at NewspaperSG of National Library Board Singapore:
http://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/newspapers/Digitised/Searchresults.aspx?q=%22ASEAN+region%22&lang= (Accessed on 1 Feb. 2016)

the term twice in his opening speech in the seventh ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in Jakarta in 1974. The communiqué issued from it also employed the term 'ASEAN region' and, more interestingly, described 'ASEAN as one region.'[99] This indicates that the political leaders had by then at least reached a consensus that ASEAN was a sub-region within Southeast Asia.

As discussed above, ASEAN members aimed to include all Southeast Asian countries within the organisation since the early stages of its establishment. To this end, it was necessary to use a new regional term besides 'Southeast Asia' in order to include all the countries within the region and to enhance regional consciousness. Southeast Asia, having a variety of cultures from each country, differs from Europe that has a generally common and similar culture in terms of religion and languages. The term 'Europe,' which was said to coin by Greece, has been widely used around the region since then because the word 'Europe' has similar spellings and pronunciations in the different European languages. Thus, in the case of Europe, it was not difficult to create regional consciousness and a common identity, subsequently laying the foundation for a European community.

On the other hand, the term 'Southeast Asia,' which was coined by the West, had to be translated from English into local languages. Thus, unlike Europe, no common regional term exists because of translations into different languages. This was a major obstacle to the creation of a shared regional consciousness. When the indigenous political leaders wished to refer to the entire region, they used the term 'Southeast Asia' in their respective languages. Unlike 'ASEAN,' the term 'Southeast Asia' has different expressions in different languages, such as *Asia Tenggara* in Indonesian and Malay, *Timog-silangang Asya* in Tagalog and เอเชียตะวันออกเฉียงใต้

---

[99] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 56.

(Ae chia ta wan org chiang tai) in Thai. These different expressions in each country have not been helpful in creating awareness for a common regional identity among the common people. Thus, the regional leaders came up with 'ASEAN' as a name to refer to the region. By widely using the untranslatable term ASEAN, the political leaders have attempted to define the region and create a shared regional identity. This was how a regional name became transformed from being a name of Western origin to being a regional term of indigenous origin. This was also, so to speak, one of the process of the de-colonization of the regional name. That was why indigenous politicians in the Southeast Asian region actively used the term 'ASEAN region.'

While a couple of regional organisations were set up before ASEAN, the names of these organisations could not be fully used to refer to the region. For example, the term 'ASA region' was sometimes used in *The Straits Times*,[100] but politicians hardly used the term. This was so because ASA consisted of only three countries and was suspended for three years after its formation. There were a few instances when local newspapers used the term 'SEAMEO region,' which refers to the regional educational organisation formed in 1966. Despite the fact that most Southeast Asian countries participated in the beginning, little attention was paid to this organisation. Thus, the term 'SEAMEO region' was a non-impacted term and got never popular. Furthermore, a few articles in the newspapers used the term 'SEATO region,' but this term was somewhat inappropriate because the SEATO members were not neighbouring countries and, as discussed in the previous chapter, SEATO was not a regional organisation per se.[101]

---

[100] For example, *The Straits Times*, 23 Nov. 1962, p. 6, ibid., 27 May 1967 p. 5 and ibid., 1 Feb. 1967, p. 10.
[101] For 'SEAMEO region,' see *New Nation*, 20 Feb. 1973, p. 5, *The Straits Times*, 30 June 1973, p. 8. For 'SEATO region,' see *The Straits Times*, 28 March 1961, p. 3 and *Singapore Herald*, 17 Dec. 1970, p. 11.

ASEAN is the acronym for the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and it contains the regional name 'Southeast Asia.'[102]  It is also a convenient term to use as an acronym in newspapers, magazines and any other media because it is easily pronounced and allows the saving of space on paper through the usage of an acronym. Another importance of using this term is that it can be used in local newspapers in various languages. As ASEAN is an acronym, it cannot be translated into local languages. For example, a book entitled *ASEAN: Dalam Berita, Harapan dan Kenyataan 1967-1977*,[103] which collected ASEAN related articles in Indonesia, shows that all local newspapers here have neither employed the translated official name, *Perhimpunan Bangsa-bangsa Asia Tenggara* (the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), nor PBAT/PBBAT, the acronym from the translation. Indonesians have a tendency to abbreviate long names, whether it is an indigenous term in their own language or a translated term, such as PBB (*Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa*: the United Nations in English) and AS (*Amerika Syarikat*: the United States of America in English), but for the term ASEAN, Indonesia has remained using the English acronym. It might be presumed that writers first used the Indonesian language acronym PBAT/PBBAT or *Perhimpunan Bangsa-bangsa Asia Tenggara*, but since then instead of it, 'ASEAN' has consistently been used. In other cases, *Berita Harian* and other Malay newspapers in Singapore also applied the English acronym since 1967. The translated name, *Persatuan Negara-negara Asia Tenggara* was used only at the time of the formation of the regional organisation. It was written as '*Persatuan Negara2*

---

[102] As mentioned in the chapter 1, the term 'Southeast Asia' in ASEAN official documents used 'South-East Asia' in 1967, but thereafter, the terms 'South East Asia' and 'Southeast Asia,' was used. The case in point is 'The ASEAN Foreign Ministers Meeting to assess the agreement on ending the war and restoring peace in Vietnam and to consider its implication for Southeast Asia, Kuala Lumpur, 15 Feb. 1973' in *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 115. However, the term 'Southeast Asia' has been consistently used as the current version since 1976 (Declaration of ASEAN Concord and Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia).
[103] Centre for Strategic and International Studies, *ASEAN: Dalam Berita, Harapan dan Kenyataan 1967-1977*, Jakarta: Yayasan Proklamasi, 1978.

*Asia Tenggara* (ASEAN).'[104] It is worth pointing out here that the Indonesian and Malay newspapers used the English acronym and not an acronym from their language, even though the name of the regional organisation was indeed translated. Local newspapers in the Philippines and Thailand have also applied the English acronym (Thai newspapers use the term ASEAN as อาเซียน in Thai characters, but pronunciation is the same as English.), in spite of the fact that they had translated the term: *Samahan ng mga Bansa sa Timog-silangang Asya* in Tagalog and สมาคม ประชาชาติแห่งเอเชียตะวันออกเฉียงใต้ (sa ma kom pra cha chard hang ae chia ta wan org chiang tai) in Thai. Likewise, as the political leaders of ASEAN members often used the acronym in speeches and writings, newspapers also followed suit. This has led to the popularization of the term ASEAN in the mass media.

The term 'ASEAN' itself is the name of the regional organisation. President Suharto of Indonesia stated that 'ASEAN ... is a genuine grouping which does not serve the interest nor execute the policy of whatever outside power. It is an organisation of our own, by ourselves and for ourselves,'[105] None the less, the political leaders of the five founding countries possibly intended to rename the Southeast Asian region 'ASEAN' for the purpose of strengthening regional solidarity. As currently the ten countries within Southeast Asia are members, ASEAN may now be perceived as a region in its own right. Donald Emmerson pointed out that ASEAN is not the regional name and 'Southeast Asia the region and ASEAN the organisation are not the same thing.'[106] However, after President Marcos officially started using the term 'ASEAN region' in 1973, the term 'ASEAN' has somewhat become the regional name. As the Bangkok Declaration in 1967 stated, the regional organisation

---

[104] *Berita Harian*, 9 Aug. 1967, p. 1.
[105] *Statements by the ASEAN heads of governments at ASEAN ministerial meetings 1968-1985*, Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat, 1986, p. 29.
[106] Donald M. Emmerson, 'Challenging ASEAN: A "Topological" View,' *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (2007), p. 426.

attempted to lay the foundation 'for a prosperous and peaceful community of South-East Asian Nations'[107] and was 'open for participation to all States in the South-East Asian Region.' [108] During the early years of ASEAN the regional organisation consisted of the five founding countries only, and as such the term 'ASEAN region' could not apply to the entire region of Southeast Asia. While ASEAN was passive in terms of building a regional community during the early stages, ASEAN countries had intended since its formation that all Southeast Asian countries join the regional organisation.

Another important thing at this time was that ASEAN leaders had intended to create a regional identity. President Marcos of the Philippines stressed in the Manila ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in 1971 the purpose of ASEAN to bring about an awakening towards a common identity and community of interests.[109] Further, in a statement by ASEAN foreign ministers on 15 February 1973 that assessed the agreement on ending the war and restoring peace in Vietnam while considering its implications for Southeast Asia, it was stated:

> The meeting acknowledged that all nations should follow a policy of peace and friendship with all countries irrespective of their political ideology on the basis of mutual respect of each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity … The sense of identity and regional cohesion engendered through ASEAN cooperation and the development of national and regional resilience could be the foundation on which Southeast Asian countries could assume this responsibility. [110]

---

[107] Ibid., p. 23.
[108] 'The ASEAN Declaration (Bangkok Declaration), Bangkok, 8 August 1967,' in *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 24.
[109] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986,* p. 52.
[110] Ibid., p. 115.

In short, they felt that co-operation among ASEAN countries was inevitable to create an identity.

At the same time, the ASEAN member countries themselves pursued to set up 'ASEAN region' as a single region. For the purpose that the region of Southeast Asia become identical to the region of ASEAN, they also considered to expand its membership and attempted to urge for co-operation with non-ASEAN countries of Southeast Asia. In this sense, it is important that ASEAN countries attempted to open the Southeast Asian summits in 1973 and 1975 including non-ASEAN countries. President Marcos of the Philippines proposed an Asian Forum in 1972 that would include all Southeast Asian countries. The proposal was incorporated into the agreement of the ASEAN informal meeting in 1973 as such: 'the desirability of convening a conference of All South-East Asian nations to serve as an Asian forum at an appropriate time in the future.'[111] Nevertheless, some ASEAN countries insisted that China and Japan should be included in the Forum,[112] and in the end, the Asian Forum never materialised. Although other similar meetings were proposed by the Prime Minister of Thailand, Kukrit Pramj after the fall of Saigon to communists in 1975 and it was not crystalised, either.[113]

The 1973 informal meeting also discussed the expansion of ASEAN membership, and the agreement expressed the desirability 'to expand the membership of ASEAN at the opportune time to cover all the countries in Southeast Asia.' [114] They agreed that they would like the Non-ASEAN members of Southeast Asia to join the ASEAN region after 'establishing and furthering contacts and promoting

---

[111] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 115.
[112] *The Straits Times*, 17 Feb. 1973, p. 14.
[113] Centre for Strategic and International Studies, ibid., p. 320. The daily Indonesian newspaper, *Harian Merdeka* reported on 24 July 1975.
[114] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 115.

interlocking relationships amongst the countries.'[115] This shows that the ASEAN countries wished to expand the ASEAN region by expanding the membership and that the member states made all effort to strengthen the relations with the non-ASEAN members irrespective of ideologies.

On February 1976, the first ASEAN summit was held in Bali, Indonesia. It was said that the summit was urgently held in light of communist victories in Cambodia on 17 April, South Vietnam on 30 April and Laos on 2 December, 1975. Carlos Romulo, the Foreign Secretary of the Philippines denied that the summit was held solely because of the Indochina situation.[116] The summit finally decided to 'expand ASEAN cooperation in the economic, social, cultural and political fields.'[117] The heads of the ASEAN member countries issued three documents: the Joint Press Communiqué, Declaration of ASEAN Concord (Bali Concord), and Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC). The Bali summit was significant in that it issued these documents and, as Michael Leifer pointed out, it served to confirm the member states' regional identity.[118] These documents, in particular the Bali Concord and TAC, were significant in confirming this regional identity.

The Declaration of ASEAN Concord in 1976 used the term 'ASEAN Community' twice, in which the term was never used before, and this was thus its first official usage. The clause 8 states: 'Member states shall vigorously develop an awareness of regional identity and exert all efforts to create a strong ASEAN community ...'[119] Further, the Concord also mentioned that one of ASEAN's aims was to provide 'support for the active involvement of all sectors and levels of the ASEAN

---

[115] Ibid.
[116] *The Straits Times,* 17 May 1975, p. 1
[117] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 32.
[118] Michael Leifer, *ASEAN and the Security of South-East Asia*, London: Routledge, 1989, p. 66.
[119] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 32.

communities.'[120] In the same light, this Concord said that ASEAN's aim was to encourage scholars, writers, artists and mass media to play active roles 'in fostering a sense of regional identity and fellowship.'[121]

The significance of the Bali Concord was that it officially declared political co-operation among the member states. The Concord re-affirmed the economic and cultural co-operation among member states, and also emphasised regional stability:

> The stability of each member state and of the ASEAN region is an essential contribution to international peace and security. Each member state resolves to eliminate threats posed by subversion to its stability, thus strengthening national and ASEAN resilience.[122]

Moreover, it is significant that this clause referred to 'ASEAN resilience,' which is used for the first time in an official document here. This new phrase was derived from the phrase 'national resilience' that President Suharto of Indonesia had started to use since 1972. 'National resilience' means 'the ability of a country to make the social and economic changes necessary for progress, and to meet all external threats while preserving the country's essential national resilience.'[123] From the term 'national resilience,' he went on to coin the term 'regional resilience.' According to the President, this means 'the ability of member countries to settle jointly their common problems and look after their future and well-being together,' further stating that 'if each country develops its own "national resilience," gradually a "regional resilience" will emerge.'[124] It is not sure whether his use of the word 'regional' at this time

---

[120] Ibid., p. 34.
[121] Ibid.
[122] Ibid., p. 32.
[123] Centre for Strategic and International Studies *Regionalism in Southeast Asia*, Jakarta: Yayasan Proklamasi, 1975, p. 8.
[124] Ibid.

referred to ASEAN states only or the whole Southeast Asian region in the above context. On the other hand, the phrase 'ASEAN resilience' in the Declaration expressed an intention to find and settle common problems among member states not only in economic and cultural aspects but also in the political field. The Declaration further articulated that 'Member states shall vigorously develop an awareness of regional identity and exert all efforts to create a strong ASEAN community.'[125] In this statement, the 'regional identity' means ASEAN identity, not identity of Southeast Asian region. This Declaration presented a goal for long term to form the community by creating the regional identity. It also implies that the members wished to create a single community beyond any ideologies with expansion of membership and the ASEAN region in order to stabilise in political and economic fields. This declaration was based on strong conviction of the members. The five members had ever strong suspicion and misunderstanding at the time of the formation of the regional organisation, but through a great number of meetings and discussion they have successfully overcame it and built up the relations of mutual trust. Based on their experience and confidence, the members attempted to extend the method to the Non-ASEAN countries, in particular communist countries, for the purpose of stability of the entire region.

On the other hand, the main purpose of the TAC was 'to promote perpetual peace, everlasting amity and cooperation among their peoples which would contribute to their strength, solidarity and closer relationship.'[126] More exactly, TAC was 'conceived to promote a way of promoting greater common understanding both within and beyond the bounds of ASEAN ... The essence of that common understanding was

---

[125] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 32.
[126] Ibid., p. 35.

respect for national sovereignty.'[127] This treaty was produced mainly for non-ASEAN countries in Southeast Asia, in particular for Vietnam whose long and bitter war had just ended. While this treaty pushed for the establishment of mutual trusting relations with non-ASEAN countries, ASEAN countries expected that in the future non-ASEAN countries would accept the principles of TAC, i.e. respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states, abstention from threat or use of force, peaceful settlement of international disputes, equal rights and self-determination and non-interference in the affairs of states. It was hoped that this treaty would also move them towards accepting these principles. For this reason, the treaty stated that one of its aims was to 'open for accession by other states in Southeast Asia.'[128] Tun Razak, in his final speech to ASEAN countries, clearly mentioned his expectation: 'Already then we envisaged the creation of a family of nations in Southeast Asia which would embrace the whole region to promote cultural, social and economic cooperation for the mutual benefit of all.'[129] The ASEAN members pursued to transfer the entire region of Southeast Asia into the ASEAN region by dragging the non-members.

It is said that regional organisations were modelled on the European Economic Community (EEC). Based on the Benelux Customs Union, i.e. Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, in 1948, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was established in 1952, and it subsequently developed into the EEC with six member countries in 1957. Imitating this, the five countries of Southeast Asia went on to form ASEAN. According to the former Secretary-General of ASEAN, Phan Wannamethee, 'the ASEAN Treaty of Amity and Co-operation in 1976 was inspired, as far as political co-operation was concerned, by the Luxembourg Report of 27

---

[127] Michael Leifer, ibid., p. 69.
[128] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 37.
[129] *Statements by the ASEAN heads of governments at ASEAN ministerial meetings 1968-1985*, Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat, 1986, p. 36.

October 1970.'[130] This report, called the 'Davignon Report,' was produced after the EEC Six Foreign Ministers' Meeting in 1970, mainly 'to study the best way of achieving progress in the matter of political unification, within the context of enlargement of the European Communities.' [131] The report stated that 'The Ministers are … convinced that progress here would be calculated to promote the development of the Communities and give Europeans a keener awareness of their common responsibility,' [132] and that regional political co-operation was inevitable for the purpose of establishing a community. The statements inspired ASEAN leaders to consider the formation of an ASEAN community and to expand ASEAN membership. For the purpose of expanding membership in the future, ASEAN members expressed the need to have good neighborly relations with non-ASEAN countries and to build a strong community through the TAC. The clause 12 of the TAC stated:

> The High Contracting Parties in their efforts to achieve regional prosperity and security, shall endeavor to cooperate in all fields for the promotion of regional resilience, based on the principles of self-confidence, self-resilience, mutual respect, cooperation and solidarity which will constitute the foundation for a strong and viable community of nations in Southeast Asia.[133]

The Vietnam War that destabilised the entire Southeast Asian region was the main reason that gave rise to the need for creating political and economic stability. After the end of the war, ASEAN needed to communicate and take initiatives to build mutual trust in a peaceful manner. The year 1975 witnessed significant victories by

---

[130] Phan Wannamethee, 'The Importance of the EC for South-East Asia: The ASEAN Perspective,' p. 21, in Giuseppe Schiavone, *Western Europe and South-East Asia, Co-operation or Competition,'* London: The Macmillan Press, 1989.
[131] The Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance de l'Europe (CVCE):
http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/4/22/4176efc3-c734-41e5-bb90-d34c4d17bbb5/publishable_en.pdf, p. 2. (Accessed on 1 Feb. 2016.)
[132] Ibid., p. 3.
[133] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 36.

communists, and the end of the war became the watershed for regional politics. To create mutual trust, ASEAN members had to fill the gap in relations with non-ASEAN countries, and the TAC was the document to do so. Its long-term aim was to remove hatred and suspicion, and create a regional community that would lead to the development of a regional identity.

The two documents, i.e. Bali Concord and TAC, signed by the heads of ASEAN countries were definitely the most important documents in forming an ASEAN Community that embraces the entire Southeast Asia, and also in developing regional consciousness. The documents are considered a single set and are inseparable with regards to the formation of the community. However, the level of regional consciousness was still low among the people in ASEAN at the time. Thus, Lau Teik Soon and Mr. Rukmito Hendraningrat, the retiring Indonesian Ambassador to Singapore, appealed for various ASEAN activities such as sports and academic co-operations to be held in order to further awaken regional consciousness.[134]

The regional organisation has become more active since the summit. The two factors contributed to do so. First, the ASEAN leaders felt that the 'domino theory,' which the U.S. government stirred up fear, would not be carried out. The Malaysian minister, Ghazalie Shafie shared the opinion with others, and the Tunku also believed that the domino theory would not happen.[135] Other factor was that Vietnam expressed its desire before the summit to forge regional co-operation in economic and cultural fields.[136] It is worthwhile to note in terms of its activities in earnest that ASEAN has started economic ministerial meetings since 1975 and also set up the ASEAN Secretariat in 1976.

---

[134] *New Nation*, 22 Feb. 1975, p. 6 and *The Straits Times*, 28 March 1976, p. 5.

[135] Ghazalie Shafie, 'On the Domino Theory,' in *Malaysia: International Relations*, Kuala Lumpur: Creative Enterprise, 1982, p. 236, and 'The Communist Threat in Malaysia and Southeast Asia,' *Pacific Community*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (July 1977), p. 572.

[136] J. M. van der Kroef, 'Hanoi and ASEAN: A New Confrontation in Southeast Asia?,' *Asia Quarterly*, No. 4, 1976, p. 252.

Non-ASEAN countries have joined the organisation since the 1980s, and currently all Southeast Asian countries except East Timor have become ASEAN members.[137] It was at a time when the term of the Western origin 'Southeast Asia,' almost became synonymous with the ASEAN region defined by the local leaders.

**Conclusion**

After the end of the Confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia, regional co-operation emerged in earnest among five of the Southeast Asian countries. With the fall of Sukarno and the birth of the Suharto administration, regional relationships slowly began to improve. Consequently, ASEAN was formed in 1967 for regional economic and cultural co-operation, which proceeded at quite a slow pace even in the 1970s. However, at the same time, the members have been also aware of the necessity of regional co-operation in political field.

Initially ASEAN's members consisted of only five countries, which were considered anti-communist countries, and so it did not cover all Southeast Asian countries. North Vietnam, which was the first communist country in the region, was not invited. Burma and Cambodia rejected joining the new regional organisation. Thus, it was said that the organisation had an anti-communist and regional outlook like SEATO. None the less, through both formal and informal meetings, the members strengthened the relations and solidarity not only in the economic and cultural fields, but also in the political area.

ASEAN members made a bold political declaration through ZOPFAN. Although ZOPFAN was declared by the five members in a special meeting in 1971 on

---

[137] After Brunei joined in 1984, the organisation expanded its members in the 1990s, namely Vietnam (1995), Myanmar and Laos (1997) and Cambodia (1999), and currently it has the ten country members. The East Timor, which gained independence from Indonesia in 2002, is still awaiting approval to become a part of the organisation.

Malaysia's initiative, this declaration was not for ASEAN, but for the entire Southeast Asian region including its communist countries. Non-ASEAN countries in the region criticised, but the declaration made them recognise the significance of the entire region's security and was conducive toward enhancing regional consciousness.

On the other hand, ASEAN members decided and defined the scope of the region through the organisation to chart their own path. ASEAN has become a regional organisation that demarcated the region of Southeast Asia by itself, which then decided, through their selection process, whether candidate countries such as Sri Lanka, Pakistan and Taiwan were allowed to join the region or not. In doing so the members made the definition clear for their own region, when in fact the regional scope was not even clear in the 1960s. The definition was for the purpose of keeping their regional independence and at the same time building up its regional consciousness.

ASEAN has also ambitiously sought to transform the Western coined region of 'Southeast Asia' into their own region, the 'ASEAN region.' The term 'ASEAN' was used in the media in each country without translation into their own languages and became popular among the general public. Since the 1970s, official documents issued by the regional organisation began to use the term 'the ASEAN region' as a sub-region of Southeast Asia. Spreading out the term at least in each member country helped the public to create the regional consciousness.

The declaration to pursue the creation of 'a strong ASEAN community'[138] in the 1976 first ASEAN summit was the official starting point to create an ASEAN identity in the future. The official documents issued in the summit also sought to enlarge ASEAN and open it to other countries in the region. In essence, this move by the founding countries was an attempt to establish ASEAN firmly within their own

---

[138] *ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986*, p. 32.

region without depending on major powers from the outside. This project was for the purpose of de-colonisation and regional self-reliant.

# CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

Southeast Asia as we know it today contains a diversity of cultures, languages, ethnicities, and government systems. It was the West that created and delineated the region as a single unit. The term 'Southeast Asia' was born and has been used since the 1820s and commonly referenced in British newspapers and magazines from the second half of the nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth century. It is not surprising then that the British government applied the term to the military organisation, South East Asia Command (SEAC), which was formed in 1943. The term was neither a brand new one nor an original one at the time. Although the term has long been used, the conception was not fixed nor clearly made at least by the 1960s.

Originally denoting the region located between China and India, the current region of Southeast Asia used to be regarded as consisting of two separate areas, namely 'Further India' referring to the mainland areas and the 'Indian Archipelago' or 'Malay Archipelago' for the maritime areas. These terms disappeared after the Second World War, and instead, the writers combined the two areas into a single region, employing the term 'Southeast Asia' since then.

The adjacent countries of the region such as India, China, and Japan continued with their own regional terms that had been in use since ancient times. In particular, China and Japan used the terms '*Nanyang*' and '*Nanyo*' respectively until prior to the Second World War. However, with the widespread use of the term 'Southeast Asia' in English, most countries subsequently adopted their translated terms from English. Thus, the term 'Southeast Asia' in various linguistic translations became the accepted term for the region, transcending different languages. Thus, the region of Southeast Asia is essentially a constructed framework outlined by outsiders.

Although it is easy to construct and delineate a region from the outside, a region will not be 'created' and constructed unless insiders of the region accept and agree to the concept. This thesis shows when and how local politicians and intellectuals in the four countries, i.e., Siam/Thailand, the Philippines, Malaya/Malaysia and Indonesia, were aware of a region they belong to, and that they in each country had different senses of consciousness and conceptions.

In the case of Thailand, the regional term 'Southeast Asia' was brought to its attention earlier than in other countries of the region. When a U.S. special envoy who cited 'South East Asia' requested an audience with King Rama III in 1850, it was the first time that the Thai royal officials encountered the term. Since Rama IV (King Mongkut) and his successors were knowledgeable in English, they would have been versed with some of regional terms conveyed in this foreign language, and could follow various Western concepts espoused during the colonial era.

However, the Siam court prior to the Second World War seldom used the term. King Mongkut, King Chulalongkorn, his brother, Prince Damrong and King Vajiravudh would have recognised the term 'Southeast Asia' through their reading of English newspapers published in Bangkok and Singapore and in books written in English. Nevertheless, the term did not appear in a large number of palace documents that were written in English. Instead, the palace preferred terms such as 'Asia,' 'East Asia,' the 'East,' the 'Far East' and so forth. King Mongkut and King Chulalongkorn were committed to a national transformation towards modernisation along Western lines in order to maintain its independence in the colonial era. For this reason, the Siam court followed the Western regional concept in the international politics. During the reign of King Vajiravudh, Siam conformed to Western ways of international diplomacy, including the adoption of regional terms and concepts used by Western writers under the League of Nations as an independent country. Even after the Constitutional Revolution

in 1932, following the abandonment of the absolute monarchy, the country's foreign policy and a sense of regional consciousness among the military elites remained unchanged. Further, the lack of use of the term and regional consciousness was due partly to the historical conflicts with Burma and Vietnam and due partly to the religious and linguistic differences in the archipelago.

At the beginning of the 1940s, the Thai government acceded to an alliance with Japan. Thailand was subsequently subsumed into what Japan called 'Greater East Asia' and the 'Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.' From this juncture, the Thai government put aside the regional terms used by the West, and deferred to the temporal ruler of the Asian region. To the Thai king and the military elite, maintaining national independence was of utmost importance. However, after the end of the world war, Thailand felt that it should keep in step with the ways of the victorious West. The Thai elites adopted the term 'Southeast Asia' into common use when they initiated early moves at regional co-operation, and the Thai people then came to recognise Southeast Asia as a geographical entity on the map.

In the case of the Philippines, the nationalists before the Second World War had no Southeast Asian consciousness, but Malay-stock regional consciousness. For example, Jose Rizal, who understood several languages including English and French, was presumably aware of the term 'Southeast Asia' through books or magazines published in the West, but there is no evidence for this. Instead, he and other nationalists adopted Malay consciousness and became aware of the 'regional' consciousness. It was mainly because geographically and religiously the Philippines was isolated from the Malay archipelago. Further, there was no shared history with the Malay archipelago at the time. By unifying with the Malay people in the entire archipelago, nationalists pursued liberty and liberation from the colonial powers. While Filipino identity constituted the core in pursuit of independence after the Philippines Revolution, some of the nationalists

continued to pursue the unification of Malay people and a single nation, which was converted from the Malay-stock region.

Even as a segment of the Philippine populace pursued their Malay identity, they hardly felt an affinity with the people in mainland Southeast Asia prior to the Second World War. This can be attributed to differences in culture, language, and religion. However, after the war, regional awareness of Southeast Asia gradually strengthened. The Philippine government held the Baguio conference for the purpose of countering communist attacks in 1950, but that ended in failure. Nonetheless, the conference contributed to the deepening of Southeast Asian consciousness to a certain degree, partly because it was the first meeting to be conducted in Southeast Asia and at least attempted to make co-operation with the immediate neighbouring countries. Further, a direct impact on Southeast Asian consciousness to the Philippines was the military alliance, SEATO, which was, strictly speaking, not a regional organisation, even though the alliance focused mainly on the region to counter communism terrorism. The Philippines was not active in indigenous regional co-operation within Southeast Asia before the formation of ASA in 1961. It was only with the subsequent failure of ASA and MAPHILINDO that the government began focusing on regional co-operation and, at the same time, building a regional identity within Southeast Asia.

Although many terms for Southeast Asia were coined by Westerners, such as the Malay archipelago, the Indian archipelago, Farther India, Malaysia (as a regional term) and so forth, Malays in the Malay Peninsula had their own spatial terms. Among them were '*di bawah angin*,' '*di atas angin*' and '*Jawi*.' Although there had been spatial consciousness for centuries, at least by the nineteenth century, with the acknowledgement of Western superiority in military might and technology, local intellectuals in the Peninsula took to adopting regional terms created by the British since

the beginning of the twentieth century. One of these terms was '*Alam Melayu*' (Malay World).

Originally the definition of the term was synonymous with 'Malay Archipelago' when R. O. Winstedt referred to '*Alam Melayu*' (Malay World) in his book for the first time. However, Za'ba re-defined the term that drew on strong connotations with Malays, who were devoted to Islam and spoke the Malay language. This meant that the largely Christian Philippines was excluded from this grouping, such was the regional consciousness among the locals in the twentieth century.

When nationalism emerged in the Peninsula, Malay leftists such as Ibrahim Yaacob aimed to transform the spatial concept of the Malay World into the concept of a single nation-state – *Melayu Raya*. The concept of combining with Indonesia was to revive the glorious heritage of Sri Vijaya for a common unity of the *bangsa*. For the leftists, the concept included the Philippines, which were excluded by other intellectuals. Although the president of Indonesia, Sukarno, declared the formation of Indonesia without Malaya immediately after the end of the Second World War, some nationalists still pursued the concept by the 1960s.

On the other hand, UMNO and other alliance parties pursued independence in the 1950s and they gained popularity through local elections. This moment was a watershed for Malays to change their regional consciousness from the Malay World to Southeast Asia. The parties rejected the concept of *Melayu Raya*, though nationalists such as Dato Onn accepted it at its very early stages. UMNO rejected the concept mainly because of national security. As other countries faced a serious armed threat by local communists, the Federation of Malaya also had the same internal problems. Since Malaya is geographically adjacent to the borders of Thailand, the newly independent country has come to accept the regional concept of Southeast Asia, combining both the maritime part with the mainland. This is the reason the leader of UMNO, Tunku Abdul Rahman

together with the representative of Chinese, Tan Cheng Lock proposed a 'Southeast Asian Union' in 1954. Thus, although regional consciousness among Malays had concentrated on the archipelago prior to the world war, a consciousness of Southeast Asia emerged after the war from a point of view of national security. When the Tunku proposed regional co-operation with Southeast Asian countries in 1954, the regional consciousness of Southeast Asia among the elites was sealed.

In the case of Indonesia, people also had spatial terms for centuries such as '*di bawah angin*,' '*di atas angin*' and '*Jawi*,' as the people in the Malay Peninsula were aware. Additionally, the archipelagic locals used the term '*Nusantara*.' Although the terms were their traditional spatial terms, Indonesia, was only coined by the British in the middle of the nineteenth century. While the scope of the term was wide, encompassing Taiwan, the Philippines and New Guinea in the early years, a Dutch scholar applied the term to refer only to the Dutch colonial area at the end of the nineteenth century. With the development of nationalism, local nationalists employed this regional term for their nation-state.

With the independence in 1945, the territory of Indonesia became based on the former Dutch colonial territory, but Sukarno and Munammad Yamin also pursued the inclusion of the Philippines and Malaya in a greater area called *Indonesia Raya*. *Indonesia Raya* was based on the traditional and spatial concept of *Nusantara*. However, the nationalists gave up on merging them into Indonesia because the former was already independent and the latter was to avoid fighting against other colonial power, the British. Thus, in this period between the 1920s and independence (1945), local politicians saw Indonesia as a space between a region and a nation because the area was still colonised and has not achieved independence.

Indonesian nationalists, who studied in the Netherlands and other European countries such as Mohammad Hatta and Sutan Sjahrir, were aware of the regional term

'Southeast Asia' prior to the Second World War. Sukarno also was aware of the term, but the president of Indonesia was not interested in co-operation within a small region. Further, he seldom used the term 'Southeast Asia,' and when he did, only in a negative context especially in his speeches on Independence Day.

Instead of Southeast Asia, Sukarno was keener on Pan-Asianism. Asia as a region was significant to the Indonesian independence movement because Indonesian nationalism had emerged from the harsh control of the suppressive colonial Dutch. This movement presented Indonesia with the opportunity to co-operate with other leaders of Asian countries that had been similarly under the rule of colonial powers prior to the Second World War. Sukarno's advocacy of the concept of Pan-Asianism reflected the sentiments of the time. Asian sentiments greatly impacted the foreign policy of Indonesia after its independence, and at the same time contributed to strengthening the nationalists' regional consciousness, especially Sukarno. Based on a Pan-Asian regional sentiment, Sukarno pursued cooperation with Asian countries. The culmination was the Asia-African Conference in 1955.

Afterwards, Sukarno pursued the formation of a political bloc/region with communist and communist-leaning countries following the souring of relations with India subsequent to his policy of Confrontation with Malaysia, but the attempt ended in failure with the *coup d'etat* in 1965. With the downfall of the president, the Indonesian government took a pragmatic line to shift and commit itself to closer regional cooperation. Indonesia's reaching out to Southeast Asian countries was a key step that led to the subsequent formation of ASEAN.

After the Second World War, politicians and intellectuals in the four countries which achieved or pursued independence, deepened the sense of regional consciousness through regional co-operation between the end of the Second World War and 1967, in particular co-operation in the social and cultural fields. This laid the foundation for future

political co-operation.

The term 'Southeast Asia' had become a politically-connotative reference through its association with regional organisations such as SEAC during the Second World War and SEATO in 1954. Thus, naturally, 'Southeast Asia' had taken on a political image that people could be familiar and come to terms with. In the period between the end of the war and the 1950s, various forms of political and regional co-operation were put forward by Burma, Thailand and Vietnam, but all were in vain. Such ventures faced immense hurdles partly because of the Vietnam War that stretched into the 1970s. This made the involvement of political ideology unavoidable and divided countries into groups that were pro-Communism, anti-Communism, or neutral.

On the other hand, the formation and activities of various social and cultural regional organisations gave the term 'Southeast Asia' itself further exposure, which helped to soften its image as a political grouping. The SEAP Games and the educational organisation SEAMEO helped to dilute the political connotation of Southeast Asia. Their efforts helped pave the way to awakening the sense of regional consciousness, that of Southeast Asia as a geographical and political entity. Such regional co-operation was feasible because participating countries consciously avoided inflexible ideological elements in arriving at any agreement.

Under the circumstances, Tunku Abdul Rahman, who was the president of UMNO and the later first Prime Minister of Malaya/Malaysia, emerged as a key person for regional cooperation. It would seem that the Tunku realised that political co-operation would be too difficult to materialise after his proposal of a 'South East Asian Union' ended in failure. He then aimed for economic co-operation instead five years later.

With the shift in the Tunku's approach, restraining the armed expansion of communism was de-emphasised, and the advancement of economic development became the frontline rationale for regional co-operation. This approach resulted in the

formation of ASA, the first indigenous economic regional organisation. Unfortunately, this operation was not sustained because of conflicts between Malaysia and the Philippines. Nevertheless, this attempt at co-operation showed that regional countries could work together in the economic field, separated though they were due to politics and ideology. The three-member nations, namely Malaya, the Philippines and Thailand, remained hopeful that a measure of political co-operation was not out of reach. MAPHILINDO was formed at the time ASA was dormant, but the Malay-based confederation for comprehensive co-operation too, disappeared after a few months because of irreconcilable political conflicts. While this short-lived organisation showed that political co-operation could be fraught with hazards, it was significant in that it succeeded in dragging an indifferent Indonesia into the sphere of regional co-operation within Southeast Asia. By this time political elites at least in four countries further deepened the sense of regional consciousness through cooperative relations, despite whether they were deemed a success or a failure.

Another important factor in the development of regional consciousness through co-operation immediately before the formation of ASEAN was that regional political co-operation was born in informal manner. It was the Bangkok Peace Appeal in 1966 to urge for an end to the Vietnam War that laid the path for a rekindling of serious attempts at regional political co-operation. By providing regional leaders a platform to discuss political issues in an informal setting, the leaders actively developed regional co-operation and moved forward to form ASEAN.

The formation of ASEAN was significant in terms of developing and consolidating regional consciousness. Although it was for cultural and economic co-operation, it emerged as the vital organisation to define the scope of Southeast Asia and deepen the regional consciousness through informal political co-operation.

Since an accepted definition for the entire region of Southeast Asia remained

elusive among European scholars, ASEAN stepped up to resolve the issue immediately after its formation. At the time of the formation of ASEAN, Ceylon was invited to join the grouping, but it did not join. Other surrounding countries wished to join, but they were rejected with one of the main reasons that it was located 'out of Southeast Asia.' ASEAN's own definition helped to create a definitive Southeast Asian region and ASEAN region as a sub-region, and an ASEAN Community by and for the grouping.

After self-defining, the regional organisation aimed at developing regional consciousness by using the acronym ASEAN without translating by any languages through media since the time of the formation and attempted to penetrate it into the public psyche. Moreover, ASEAN members began referring to the 'ASEAN region' as a sub-region of Southeast Asia through statements at ASEAN meetings and speeches. The project contributed to awaken and develop the consciousness of Southeast Asia and at the same time helped to foster the consciousness and identity of ASEAN as a region, not as a regional organisation.

ZOPFAN as a neutrality declaration also supported the development of Southeast Asian consciousness. The declaration resulted from a series of informal political meetings among the members. In view of the history that political co-operation always ended with failure in the region, the declaration was remarkable. Five ASEAN members finally attained success in ensuring political co-operation. At the same time the declaration is the political expression to delimit their own region, though it did not exactly define the scope.

With the end of the Vietnam War in which the Communists emerged victorious, ASEAN members felt the pragmatic need to live with communism within the region. The ASEAN summit in 1976 was the serious turning point for co-existence among ideologies which took centre stage. Among the three documents to issue after the summit, the Bali Concord was the most important because it declared the aim of forming an ASEAN

community with the proposition to enlarge the membership of ASEAN. The founding members clearly intended to expand the ASEAN region as a sub-region to the main region by embracing all the countries in Southeast Asia. Thus, through a series of their projects the founding members initiated the programme to change the Western-coined name 'Southeast Asia' to their own regional name, 'ASEAN,' sought to create a single ASEAN community and ASEAN identity eventually, and consolidated the regional concept. ASEAN itself has pursued to create its own collective identity. This did not happen in other regions around the world except Europe by the 1970s. For example, the region of East Asia, which including the world economic powers, China, Japan and Korea, has no such an organisation to create regional consciousness and its identity even now. In this respect, ASEAN is a self-generating and unprecedented region in the world.

As this study focused on the four countries, namely Siam/Thailand, the Philippines, Malaya/Malaysia and Indonesia, the prevalence of regional consciousness in other mainland Southeast Asian countries such as Burma, Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam was not discussed. The four countries – Burma that were long controlled under India, Cambodia that has glory history of the Angkor empire, Laos that is landlocked by Cambodia, China, Thailand and Vietnam, and Vietnam that was politically, economically and culturally influenced by China for centuries – each has its own perspectives. By researching it, we will know how ASEAN was developed and consolidated in a comprehensive manner.

# Selected Bibliography

**Primary Sources**

**Documents consulted in the National Archives, Kew, Britain.**

| | |
|---|---|
| CO 537/1581 | HQ Malaya Command Weekly Intelligence Summary (1946) |
| CO 537/1582 | HQ Malaya Command Weekly Intelligence Summary (1946) |
| CO 537/3759 | Malaya: conversations with Dato Onn |
| CO 717/205 | Address by Tan Cheng Lock at Taping and Ipoh on 10th April 1949 on the Chinese in Malaya |
| CO 1030/310 | Views of Chinese in Malacca on the Malayan Union Constitution together with the speeches at the dinners, 14 Oct. 1946 |
| DO 35/8913 | Ceylon: foreign policy |
| DO 196/134 | Ceylon foreign policy |
| DOC 279 | Memorandum by Sir J. Crosby on the present-day attitude of Siam towards the Western Powers, and towards Britain in particular, 1938. |
| FO 371/83622 | Indonesian relations with Indo China. Indonesian recognition of Ho Chi Minh |
| FO 371/83716 | Foreign policy of Dr Hatta and of President Sukarno |
| FO 371/92935 | Statement of Philippine foreign policy; visit of President Quirino to USA, Spain and Italy |
| FO 371/101063 | Rumours of negotiations for a peace settlement between the French and Ho Chi Minh; no likelihood of India or Indonesia being asked to mediate |
| FO 371/116933 | Discussions and meetings of the Manila Treaty |
| FO 371/136056 | Visits to foreign countries by Field Marshal Sarit and other personalities of Thailand |
| FO 422/56 | Affairs of Siam. Further Correspondence. Part XIV |
| FO 422/85 | Further Correspondence Respecting Siam and South-East Asia: Part 1 |
| FO 422/86 | Siam and South-East Asia Further Correspondence Part II |
| FO 422/87 | Siam and South-East Asia Further Correspondence Part III |

**Documents consulted in ISEAS Library, Singapore**

Tun Dr. Ismail bin Dato' Haji Abdul Rahman Papers.

**Document consulted in Memorial Tunku Abdul Rahman, Kuala Lumpur**

P/U. 236: *The Presidential Address by Tunku at the 15th General Assembly of UMNO*, 23 Aug. 1962.

## Official documents

### British

*British documents on foreign affairs: Reports and papers from the foreign office confidential print*, Part I from the mid-nineteenth century to the First World war, Series E: Asia, 1860-1914, Vol. 26, South-East Asia: China, India, Burma, Siam and Tibet, 1850-1908, University Publications of America, 1995.

*British documents on foreign affairs: Reports and papers from the foreign office confidential print*, Part I from the mid-nineteenth century to the First World war, Series E: Asia, 1860-1914, Vol. 27, South-East Asia: Siam, Malaya and Indochina, 1856-1914, University Publications of America, 1995.

*British documents on foreign affairs: Reports and papers from the foreign office confidential print*, Part I from the mid-nineteenth century to the First World war, Series E: Asia, 1860-1914, Vol. 29, South-East Asia: Sulu, Sarawak, Borneo and Brunei, 1843-1879, University Publications of America, 1995.

*British documents on foreign affairs: Reports and papers from the foreign office confidential print*, Part I from the mid-nineteenth century to the First World war, Series E: Asia, 1860-1914, Vol. 29, South-East Asia: Sulu, Sarawak, Borneo and Brunei, 1879-1905, University Publications of America, 1995.

*British documents on foreign affairs: Reports and papers from the foreign office confidential print*, Part II from the First to the Second World War, Series E: Asia, 1914-1939, Vol. 49, Siam and South-East Asia, 1914-1929, University Publications of America, 1997.

*British documents on foreign affairs: Reports and papers from the foreign office confidential print*, Part II from the First to the Second World War, Series E: Asia, 1914-1939, Vol. 50, Siam and South-East Asia, 1930-1939, University Publications of America, 1997.

*British documents on foreign affairs: Reports and papers from the foreign office confidential print*, Part IV from 1946 through 1950, Series E: Asia 1948, Vol. 6, Japan, Korea and Southeast Asia, Jan. 1948-Dec. 1948., University Publications of America, 2001.

*British documents on foreign affairs: Reports and papers from the foreign office confidential print*, Part IV from 1946 to 1950, Series E: Asia, 1949, Vol. 9, Burma, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, The Philippines and South-East Asia and the Far East (General), Jan. 1949-Dec. 1949, University Publications of America, 2003.

*British documents on foreign affairs: Reports and papers from the foreign office confidential print*, Part IV from 1946 through 1950, Series E: Asia 1950, Vol. 11, Burma, South-East Asia and the Far East, Indonesia, Nepal and the Philippines, Jan. 1950-Dec. 1950, University Publications of America, 2003.

*Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons*, 27 July 1967 (Hansard).
http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1967/jul/27/defence and

*Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons*, 16 Jan. 1968 (Hansard).
http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1968/jan/16/public-expenditure.

Stockwell, A.J., *British Documents on the End of Empire, Series B, Volume 3, Malaya, Part I, The Malayan Union Experiment 1942-1948*, London: HMSO, 1995.


**The United States**

*Department of State Bulletin*, Vol. LII, No. 1348, 26 Apr. 1965.

U.S. Congress, Senate, *Message from the President of the United States in answer to a resolution of the Senate, calling for information in relation to the mission of Mr. Balestier, Late United States Consul at Singapore, to Eastern Asia*. 32nd Congress, 1st session, Doc. 38, Washington D.C., 1852.


**Japan**

Daitoushou (Ministery of Greater East Asia Affairs), *Daitoua kaigi enzetsushu (Speech collection of the Greater East Asia Conference)*, 1943.


**The United Nations and the League of Nations**

'Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings' at the United Nations Statistics Division website: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm

The League of Nations, *Advisory committee on Traffic in Opium and Other dangerous Drugs: Minutes of the Fifth Session held at Geneva, From May 24th to June 7th, 1923*, C.418. M.184. 1923.XI.

The League of Nations, *Health Committee: Fifth Session*, C.647.M.236.1925.III.

The League of Nations, *Traffic in women and children: Work of the Bandoeng Conference*, C.516.M.357.1937.IV., Geneve, December 20th, 1937.

*The United Nations General Assembly, Twenty-Sixth Session Official Records*, 1848th Plenary Meeting, 1 Oct. 1971. (From the Official Document System of the United Nations, http://documents.un.org)

United Nations General Assembly fifteenth session Official Records: 880th Plenary Meeting.

**ASEAN**

*ASEAN Documents Series 1967-1986, 2nd Edition*, Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat, 1986.

'ASEAN VISION 2020' at the ASEAN Secretariat website: http://www.asean.org/?static_post=asean-vision-2020

'Declaration of ASEAN Concord II (Bali Concord II)' at the ASEAN Secretariat website:http://www.asean.org/?static_post=declaration-of-asean-concord-ii-bali-concord-ii-2

Speech given 'ASEAN Ministers of Culture and Arts Hold Inaugural Meeting Kuala Lumpur,' 14 Oct. 2003 at the ASEAN Secretariat website: http://www.asean.org/?static_post=asean-ministers-of-culture-and-arts-hold-inaugural-meeting-kuala-lumpur-14-october-2003-2

*Statements by the ASEAN heads of governments at ASEAN Ministerial meetings, 1968-1985*, ASEAN Secretariat: Jakarta, 1986. (all official documents are available on http://asean.org/)

**Indonesia**

*Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia*, Djakarta: Japenpa for the Department of Information.

Departemen Luar Negeri Panitya Penulisan Sedjarah, Republik Indonesia, *Dua Puluh Lima Tahun: Departmen Luar Negeri 1945-1970*, Jajasan Kesedjahteraan Karyawan Depl, 1971.

Department of Information, *Berita Repoeblik Indonesia*, 1 Dec. 1945.

Department of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia, *New forces build a new world*, 1965 (?).

**Malaya/Malaysia**

Allen, J. de V., Stockwell, A. J., and Wright, L. R., *A Collection of Treaties and other documents affecting the States of Malaysia, Vol II*, London: Oceana Publications, 1981.

'At the official dinner given in his honour by his Excellency Mr. Constantin Descalescu Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania' 16 May 1983 at the Office of the Prime Minister of Malaysia website: http://www.pmo.gov.my/ucapan/?m=p&p=mahathir&id=45

*Ensiklopedia Sejarah dan Kebudayaan Melayu*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Vol. 1, 1999.

Federation of Malaya, *ASA reports of the first meeting of foreign ministers on economic and cultural co-operation among Southeast Asian countries and statement of policy*, 1961.

Federation of Malaya, *Parliamentary Debates, Dewan Rakyat*, 1957-1963, Hansard.

Federation of Malaysia, *Parliamentary debates*, *Dewan Rakyat*, 1963-1976, Hansard.

*Foreign Affairs Malaysia,* Vol. 1-9 (1966-76).

Malaysia, *Malaya-Indonesia relations, 31st August, 1957 to 15th September, 1963,* Kuala Lumpur, 1963 (?).

Malaysia, *Malaya/Philippine Relations*: 31st August, 1957 to 15th September, 1963, Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Cetak Kerajaan, 1963.

Malaysia, *Indonesian intentions towards Malaysia*, Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Chetak Kerajaan, 1964.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Malaysia, *Malaysia in brief*, Kuala Lumpur: Department of Information, 1963.

Morais, J. Victor (ed.), *Strategy for Action: the Selected speeches of Tun Haji Abdul Razak*, Kuala Lumpur: Prime Minister's Department Malaysia, 1969.

*Ucapan-ucapan Tun Haji Abdul Razak bin Hussein*, 1960-1967, Kuala Lumpur: Arkib Negara Malaysia.

*Ucapan-ucapan Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra* 1955-1960, Kuala Lumpur: Arkib Negara Malaysia.


**The Philippines**

'Address of President Macapagal at the opening ceremonies of the Summit Conference' July 30 1963 at the government of the Philippines website: http://www.gov.ph/1963/07/30/address-of-president-macapagal-at-the-opening-ceremonies-of-the-summit-conference-july-30-1963/

Lotilla, Raphael Perpetuo M. (ed.), *The Philippine National Territory: A Collection of Related Documents*, Diliman, Quezon City: Institute of International Legal Studies, University of the Philippines Law Center and Manila: Foreign Service Institute, Department of Foreign Affairs, 1995.

'Address of President Quirino at the opening session of the Baguio Conference of 1950' at the government of the Philippines website: http://www.gov.ph/1950/05/26/address-of-president-quirino-at-the-opening-session-of-the-baguio-conference-of-1950-may-26-1950/

'Closing Statement: President Macapagal at the Summit Conference in Manila' Aug. 5 1963 at the government of the Philippines website: http://www.gov.ph/1963/08/05/closing-statement-of-president-macapagal-at-

the-summit-conference-in-manila-august-5-1963/

'Extemporaneous Welcome Address of President Quirino to President and Madame Sukarno,' Jan. 28, 1951 at the government of the Philippines website: http://www.gov.ph/1951/01/28/extemporaneous-welcome-address-of-president-quirino-to-president-and-madame-sukarno/

'Highlights of the 2010 Census-Based Population Projections' at the government of the Philippines website: https://psa.gov.ph/content/highlights-2010-census-based-population-projections

'Remarks of His Excellency Manuel Roxas President-elect of the Philippines At the Overseas Writers' Club,' May 16, 1946. Roxas also emphasized on developing relations with neighbouring countries at the government of the Philippines website: http://www.gov.ph/1946/05/16/remarks-of-president-elect-roxas-at-the-overseas-writers-club/

'State-of-the-Nation Message of President Quirino to the Joint Session of the Congress of the Philippines' Jan. 24, 1949 at the government of the Philippines website: http://www.gov.ph/1949/01/24/state-of-the-nation-message-of-president-quirino-to-the-joint-session-of-the-congress-of-the-philippines/

'The Constitutional Program of the Philippine Republic,' at the government of the Philippines website: http://malacanang.gov.ph/8128-the-constitutional-program-of-the-philippine-republic/


**Singapore**

'Address by the Prime Minister at the official opening of the fifth ASEAN Ministerial Meeting at the Shangrila Hotel,' 13 April 1972 at the website of the National Archives of Singapore. http://www.nas.gov.sg/archivesonline/speeches/record-details/7316c3ac-115d-11e3-83d5-0050568939ad


**Thailand**

*Collected interviews of Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman,* Vol. 1-3, Bangkok: Department of Information, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1967-69.

*Foreign Affairs Bulletin,* Vol. 1-12 (1962-1973).

*Foreign Affairs Bulletin,* Vol. 16 (1976).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Collected statements of Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman*, Vol. 1-4 (1965-1968).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Collected statements of Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman*, Vol. 7 (1970-72).

*Thailand: How Thailand Lost Her Territories to France*, Bangkok: Department of Publicity, 1940.

**Others**

Legal Research Board (ed.), *Federal Constitution (As at 25th April 2006)*, Petaling Jaya: International Law Book Services, 2006.

SEA Games Federation, *SEAP and SEA Games History: 50th Anniversary of SEA Games*, 8th December 2009, Vientiane.

SEAMEO, *Resource Book on SEAMEO*, Bangkok, 1981 (Revised edition).

**Internet Sources**

**Official**

Minutes of the Japanese Imperial Diet (in Japanese): http://teikokugikai-i.ndl.go.jp/

Minutes of the Japanese parliament (in Japanese): http://kokkai.ndl.go.jp/

U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian: https://history.state.gov/

ASEAN secretariat: www.aseansec.org

**Interviews**

Thomas, Daniel, Analyst, ISIS Malaysia, 7 August 2017.

de Borja, Marciano R., Consul General Consulate General of the Philippines, 9 August 2017.

de Viana, Augusto V, Associate Proffessor, Department of History, University of Santo Tomas, 26 July, 2017.

**Secondary Sources**

**Books**

Ab. Rahim Hj. Darus, *Ilmu Alam Tenggara Asia*, Jabatan Persuratan, Kesatuan Persakutuan Guru2 Melayu Semennanjong, 1954 (Second edition).

Abu Hanifah, *Tales of a Revolution*, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1972.

Abdul Hadi bin Haji Hasan, *Sejarah 'Alam Melayu, Penggal I-III*, Singapore: Malaya Publishing House, 1949.

Abdullah Ahmad, *Tengku Abdul Rahman and Malaysia's Foreign Policy 1963-1970*, Berita Publishing: Kuala Lumpur, 1985.

Abdullah Hussain and Khalid M. Hussain, *Pendeta Za'Ba dalam Kenangan*, Kula Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 2000.

Acharya, Amitav, *The quest for identity: international relations of Southeast Asia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

----------, *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia*: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2009 (second edition).

----------, *The making of Southeast Asia: international relations of a region*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.

Agoncillo, Teodoro A. and Alfonso, Oscar M., *History of the Filipino People*, Quezon City: Malaya Books, 1967.

Ali Sastroamijoyo, *Milestones on my journey: The memoirs of Ali Sastroamijoyo, Indonesian patriot and political leader*, St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1979.

Anand, R.P. (ed.), *ASEAN Identity: development and culture*, Queszon city: University of the Philippines Law Center, 1981.

Andaya, Barbara Watson and Andaya, Leonard Y., *A History of Malaysia*, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001 (Second edition).

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. Revised Edition ed.*, London: Verso, 1991.

----------, *The Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia, and the World*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1998.

Anwar, Dewi Fortuna, *Indonesia in ASEAN: Foreign Policy and Regionalism*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asia Studies, 1994.

Aung San Suu Kyi, *Freedom from Fear and other writings*, London: Penguin Books, 1991.

Armijn Pane, *Indonesia: Madjalah kebudajaan*, Djanuari-Februari, 1951.

*Asia research bulletin*, Vol. 1-6: 1971-77, Singapore: Asia Research Ltd.

Baden-Powell, B.F.S., *In Savage Isles and Settled Lands: Malaysia, Australasia, and Polynesia 1888-1891*, London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1892.

Barnard, Timothy P. (ed.), *Contesting Malayness: Malay Identity Across Boundaries*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2004.

Bastin, John and Benda, Harry J., *A History of Modern Southeast Asia: Colonialism, Nationalism, and Decolonization*, Kuala Lumpur: Federal Publications, 1968.

Bickmore, Albert S., *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Bilveer Singh, *ZOPFAN and the New Security Order in the Asia-Pacific Region*, Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, 1992.

Bird, Isabella, *The Golden Chersonese: A 19th century Englishwoman's Travels in Singapore and the Malay Peninsula*, Singapore: Monsoon Books, 2010.

Borchardt, Klaus-Dieter, *European unification: the origins and growth of the European Community*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Community, 1989.

Bowring, Sir John, *The Kingdom and People of Siam: Volume One and Two*, London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Boyce, Peter, *Malaysia and Singapore in International Diplomacy: Documents and Commentaries*, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1968.

Brackman, Arnold C., *Southeast Asia's Second Front: The power struggle in the Malay Archipelago*, New York: F.A. Praeger, 1966.

Brimmell, J.H., *Communism in South East Asia: A Political Analysis*, London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Broinowski, Alison (ed.), *Understanding ASEAN*, London: The Macmillan Press, 1982.

----------, *ASEAN into the 1990s*, London: The Macmillan Press, 1990.

Buszynski, Leszek, *SEATO: The Failure of an Alliance Strategy*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1983.

Buyong bin Adil, *Sejarah 'Alam Melayu, Penggal IV*, Singapore: Malaya Publishing House, 1948.

Cady, John Frank, *Southeast Asia: its historical development*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Callis, Helmut, *Foreign capital in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institution of Pacific Relations, 1942.

C. C. Chin and Hack, Karl (eds.), *Dialogues with Chin Peng: New Light on the Malayan Communist Party*, Singapore University Press: Singapore, 2004.

Centre for Strategic and International Studies, *ASEAN: Dalam Berita, Harapan dan Kenyataan 1967-1977*, Jakarta: Yayasan Proklamasi, 1978.

Cesar Adib Majul, *Apolinario Mabini Revolutionary*, Manila: Vertex Press, 1964.

Cheah Boon Kheng, *Malaysia: The Making of a Nation*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2002.

Chiang Hai Wang, *History of South, East and South-East Asia*, Kuala Lumpur: Federal Publications, 1976.

Chin Kin Wah and Leo Syryadinata (eds.), *Michael Leifer: Selected Works on Southeast Asia*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2005.

Chin Peng, *My Side of History*, Media Master: Singapore, 2003.

Christie, Clive J., *A Modern History of Southeast Asia: Decolonization, nationalism and separatism*, London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1996.

----------, *Ideology and Revolution in Southeast Asia 1900-1980: Political idea of the Anti-Colonial era*, Surrey: Curson Press, 2001.

Chula Chakrabongse, *Lords of Life: The Paternal Monarchy of Bangkok, 1782-1932 with the earlier and more recent history of Thailand*, New York: Taplinger Publishing, 1960.

Clifford, Hugh, *Further India: Being the story of exploration from earliest times in Burma, Malaya, Siam and Indo-China*, London: Alston Rivers, limited, 1905.

Coates, Austin, *Rizal: Philippine Nationalist and Martyr*, Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Coedès, George, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1968.

Colbert, Evelyn, *Southeast Asia in International Politics 1941-1956*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Cole, Fay-Cooper, *The Peoples of Malaysia*, Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1945.

Conference on ASEAN Students of Regional Affairs, *Regionalism in Southeast Asia*, Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 1974.

Constantino, Renato, *Neocolonial Identity and Counter-Consciousness: Essays on Cultural Decolonization*, M.E. Sharpe, 1978.

Crawfurd, John, *History of the Indian Archipelago containing an account of the manners, arts, languages, religions, institutions, and commerce of its inhabitants*, London: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 1820.

---------, *A grammar and dictionary of the Malay language: with a preliminary dissertation*, London: Elder Smith, 1852.

----------, *A Descriptive Dictionary of the Islands and Adjacent countries*, London: Bradbury and Evans, 1856.

----------, *Journal of an Embassy to the Courts of Siam and Cochin China; Exhibiting a view of the Actual State of those kingdoms,* Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Darling, Frank C., *Thailand and the United States*, Washington D.C., Public Affairs Press, 1965.

Dash, Kishore C., *Regionalism in South Asia: Negotiating cooperation, institutional structures*, London: Routledge, 2008.

Davies, Norman, *Europe: A history*, HarperPerennial, 1998.

Dent, Christopher M., *East Asian Regionalism*, London: Routledge, 2008.

Denyes, John Russell, *The Malaysia Mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, New York: Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Open Door Emergency Commission, 1905.

Deutsch, Karl W, *Nationalism and its Alternatives*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.

Dewi Fortuna Anwar, *Indonesia in ASEAN: Foreign Policy and Regionalism*, Singapore: ISEAS, 1995.

Dobby, E. H. G., *Southeast Asia*, London: University of London Press, 1950.

Drysdale, John, *Singapore Struggle for Success*, Singapore: Times Books Insternational, 1984.

Earl, G. W., *The Eastern Seas or Voyages and Adventures in the Indian Archipelago in 1832-33-34 comprising a tour of the islands of Java -visits to Borneo, the Malay Peninsula, Siam etc.; also an account of the present state of Singapore with observations on the commercial resources of the archipelago,* London: W.H. Allen and Co., 1837.

Elson, R. E., *The Idea of Indonesia: A History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Emerson, Rupert, *Representative Government in Southeast Asia*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

----------, *Malaysia: A Study in Direct and Indirect Rules*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1964.

----------, *From Empire to Nation: the rise to self-assertion of Asian and African peoples*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Emerson, Rupert, Mills, Lennox, and Thompson, Virginia, *Government and Nationalism in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institution of Pacific Relations, 1942.

Estrella D. Soldium, *Towards a Southeast Asian Community*, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1974.

Fall, Bernard B. (ed.), *Ho Chi Minh On Revolution: Selected Writings 1920-66*, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967.

Fawsett, Louise and Hurrell, Andrew (eds.), *Regionalism in World Politics: Regional Organization and International Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Feith, Herbert, *The Decline of Constitutional Democracy in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962.

Feith, Herbert and Castles, Lance (eds.), *Indonesian Political Thinking: 1945-1965*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970.

Fifield, Russell H., *Southeast Asia in United States Policy*, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1963.

----------, *The Diplomacy of Southeast Asia: 1945-1958*, Archon Books, 1968.

----------, *National and Regional Interests in ASEAN: Competition and Co-operation in International Politics*, Singapore: ISEAS, 1979.

Fisher, Charles L., *South-East Asia: A Social, Economic and Political Geography*, London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1964.

Francia, Luis H., *A history of the Philippines: From Indios Bravos to Filipinos*, New York: Overlook Press, 2010.

Frank Vincent, Jun., *The land of the white elephant: sights and scenes in South-Eastern Asia A personal narrative of travel and adventure in Farther India, embracing the countries of Burma, Siam, Cambodia, and Cochin-China (1871-2)*, New York: Harper and brothers, 1874.

Frey, Marc, Pruessen, Ronald W., and Tan Tai Yong (eds.), *The transformation of Southeast Asia: International Perspectives on Decolonization*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2003.

Funston, N.J., *Malay Politics in Malaysia: A Study of the United Malays National Organisation and Party Islam*, Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann Educational Books, 1980.

Furnivall, J. S., *Progress and welfare in Southeast Asia: A comparison of colonial policy and practice*, New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1941.

----------, *Problems of Education in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institute of Pacific relations, 1942.

----------, *Educational progress in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institute of Pacific relations, 1943.

----------, *Colonial Policy and Practice: A comparative study of Burma and Netherlands India*, New York: New York University Press, 1956.

Gare, Frederic and Matto (eds.), *India and ASEAN: The politics of India's Look East Policy*, New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 2001.

Gellner, Earnest, *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

Gerini, G. E., *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia (Further India and Indo-Malay Archipelago)*, New Delhi: Devendra Jain For Oriental Books, 1974.

Ghazali Shafie, *Malaysia: International Relations Selected Speech by M. Ghazali Shafie*, Kuala Lumpur: Creative Enterprise, 1982.

----------, *Ghazali Shafie: Malaysia, ASEAN and the New World Order*, Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 2000.

Gorcha, Christopher E., *Thailand and the Southeast Asian Networks of the Vietnamese Revolution, 1885-1954*, Surrey: Curzon Press, 1999.

Gordon, Bernard, *The Dimensions of Conflict in Southeast Asia*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

----------, *Toward Disengagement in Asia: A Strategy for American Foreign Policy*, Englewood Cliffs: Pretice-Hall, 1969.

Goscha, Christopher E., *Thailand and the Southeast Asian Networks of the Vietnamese Revolution, 1885-1954*, Richmond: Curzon Press, 1999.

Gowing, Peter Gordon, *Mandate in Moroland: The American Government of Muslim Filipinos 1899-1920*, Diliman, Quezon City: Philippine Centre for Advanced Studies, University of the Philippines System, 1977.

Green, David Michael, *The Europeans: Political identity in an emerging polity*, Boulder (Colorado): Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2007.

Guillemard, F. H. H. and Cantab, M.A., *Australasia Vol. 2: Malaysia and the Pacific Archipelagoes: edited and greatly extended from Dr. A. R. Wallace's 'Australasia,'* London: Edward Stanford, 1894.

Gupta, Sisir, *India and Regional Integration in Asia*, London: Asia Publishing House, 1964.

Hack, Karl, *Defence and Decolonisation in Southeast Asia: Britain, Malaya and Singapore 1941-1968*, Curzon Press, 2001.

Hagiwara Nobuyuki, *Malaysia Seijiron – Fukugou shakai no seijirikigaku (Malaysian politics: political powers in plural society)*, Tokyo: Koubundou, 1989.

Hall, D. G. E. (ed.), *Historians of South East Asia*, London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Hall, D. G. E., *A History of South-East Asia*, London: Macmillan Press, 1968 (Third edition).

Harris, Townsend, *The Complete journal of Townsend Harris: First American Consul General and Minister to Japan*, New York: Japan Society, 1930.

Harrison, Brian, *South-East Asia: A Short History, Third Edition*, London: Macmillan, 1967.

Hasan Zaheer, *The Separation of East Pakistan: The Rise and Realization of Bengali Muslim Nationalism*, Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Hay, D., *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1957.

Henderson, William (ed.), *Southeast Asia: Problems of United States Policy*, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1963.

Hitchcock, Michael, King, Victor T. (eds.), *Images of Malay-Indonesian Identity*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Hooker, Sir Joseph D. (ed.), *Journal of the right Hon. Sir Joseph Banks: During captain Cook's first voyage in H. M. S. Endeavour in 1768-71 to Terra del Fuego, Otahite, New Zealand, Australia, the Dutch East Indies, etc.*, London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896.

Houben, V.J.H., Maier, H.M.J. and van der Molen, W. (eds.), *Looking in odd mirrors: the Java sea*, Leiden : Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, 1992.

Hurgronje, Snouk, *Mekka in the latter part of the 19th century: Daily life, Customs and Learning, the Moslims of the East-Indian-Archipelago*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

I. Wangsa Widjaja and Meutia F. Swasono (eds.), *Mohammad Hatta Kumpulan Pidato: Dari tahun 1942 s.d. 1949*, Jakarta: Yayasan Idayu, 1981.

Ibrahim Yaacob, *Nusa dan Bangsa Melayu*, N. V. Alma Arif: Djakarta, 1951.

Ide Anak Agung Gde Agung, *Twenty years Indonesian foreign policy: 1945-1965*, The Hague: Mouton and Co, 1973.

Ikehata Setsuho, *Filipin Kakumei to Katorishizumu (The Philippine Revolution and Catholicism)*, Tokyo: Keisou Shobou, 1987.

Ikehata Setsuho (ed.), *Tounan Ajiashi II, Toushobu (History of Southeast Asia II: the maritime)*, Tokyo Yamakawashuppansha, 1999.

Indolf, Hans H., *Impediments to Regionalism in Southeast Asia: Bilateral Constraints among ASEAN Member States*, Singapore: Institution of Southeast Asian Studies, 1984.

Ireland, Alexander, *The Geography and History of Oceania abridged, or a concise account of Australasia, Malaysia, Polynesia, and Antarctica*, Tasmania: W. Fletcher, 1863.

Isham, Mary, *Valorous Ventures: A Record of Sixty and Six Years of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church*, Boston: Woman's Foreign Missionary Society Methodist Episcopal Church Publication Office, 1936.

Ishii Yoneo et. al, *Tounan ajia wo shiru jiten (Encyclopedia of South-East Asia)*, Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2001 (New edition).

Ismail Hussein, *Antara Dunia Melayu dengan Dunia Kebangsaan*, Bangi: Penerbit UKM, 1990.

Iwasaki Ikuo, *Lee Kuan Yeu –Seiyou to Ajia no hazamade (Lee Kuan Yeu: between the Western and Asia)*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996.

J. Saravanamuttu, *The Dilemma of Independence: Two Decades of Malaysia's Foreign Policy, 1957-1977*, Penang: Penerbit Universiti Sains Malaysia for School of Social Sciences, 1983.

Jeffrey, Robin (ed.), *Asia: The winning of independence*, London: Macmillan Press, 1981.

Jensen, G. H., *Afro-Asia and Non-Alignment*, London: Faber and Faber, 1966.

Jeshurun, Chandran, *Malaysian Defence Policy: A Study Parliamentary Attitudes 1963-1973*, Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Malaya, 1980.

----------, *Malaysia: Fifty Years of Diplomacy 1957-2007*, Kuala Lumpur: The Other Press, 2007.

John, Horace St., *The Indian archipelago: Its history and present state*, London: Longman, 1853.

Jones, Matthew, *Conflict and Confrotation in South East Asia 1961-1965: Britain, the United States, Indonesia and the Creation of Malaysia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Jorgensen-Dahl, Arnfinn, *Regional Organization and order in South-East Asia*, Hampshire: The Macmillan Press, 1982.

Jumsai, Manich, *King Mongkut and Sir John Bowring*, Bangkok: Chalermnit, 1970,

Kahn, Joel S. (ed.), *Southeast Asian Identities: Culture and the politics of representation in Indonesia, Malaysia*, Singapore and Thailand, Singapore: ISEAS, 1998.

Kahin, George McTurnan, *The Asian-African Conference: Bandung, Indonesia, April 1955*, Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1956.

----------, *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959.

----------, *Southeast Asia: A testament*, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.

Kahin, George (ed.), *Governments and Politics of Southeast Asia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959.

Kakizaki Ichiro, *History of Thailand: the truth of a smiling country*, Tokyo: Chuko Shinsho, 2013.

Kalyani Bandyopadhyaya, *Burma and Indonesia: Comparative political economy and foreign policy*, New Delhi: South Asian Publishers, 1983.

Kanai Lai Hazra, *History of Theravada Buddhism in South-East Asia*, Munshiram Manoharlal, 1982.

Kannikar Sartraproong, *A True Hero: King Chulalongkorn of Siam's visit to Singapore and Java in 1871*, Bangkok: Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, 2008.

*Keesing's Contemporary Archives*, Vol. 5-20: 1943-74, Keesing's Publications: London.

King, Charles William and Lay, G. Tradescant, *The Claims of Japan and Malaysia Upon Christendom exhibited in notes of voyages made in 1837, from Canton, in the ship Morrison and brig Himmaleh, under direction of the owners*, New York: French, 1839.

Kishi Nobushuke, *Kishi Nobusuke Kaikoroku (Memoir of Nobusuke Kishi)*, Tokyo: Kouzai-do Shuppan, 1983.

Kobkua Suwannathat-Pian, *Thailand's Durable Premier: Phibun through Three Decades 1932-1957*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Kotelawala, Sir John, *An Asian Prime Minister's Story*, London: George G. Harrap and Co. Ltd., 1956.

Kratoska, Paul H, Raben, Remco and Henk Schulte Nordholt (eds.), *Locating Southeast Asia: Geographies of knowledge and politics of space*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005.

Kua Kia Soong (ed.), *K. Das and The Tunku Tapes*, Petaling Jaya: Strategic Info Research Development, 2002.

Laffan, Michael Francis, *Islamic Nationhood and Colonial Indonesia: The umma below the winds*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.

Latourette, Kenneth S., *The American Record in the Far East, 1945-1951*, New York: Macmillan Company, 1952.

Lau, Albert, *A Moment of Anguish: Singapore in Malaysia and the Politics of Disengagement*, Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 2003.

Lau Teik Soon (ed.), *New Direction in the International Relations of Southeast Asia: the Great powers and Southeast Asia*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1973.

Laurel, José P., *War Memoirs: Written in Yokohama and Sugamo Prisons*, Manila: José P. Laurel Memorial Foundation, 1962.

Laurence W. Martin (ed.), *Neutralism and Nonalignment: the New States in World Affairs*, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962.

Lazo, Carlos R., *Quirino selected speeches*, Manila: Orient Publishing, 1953.

Lebra, Joyce C. (ed.), Japan's Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere in World War II: Selected Readings and Documents, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Lee Kuan Yew, *From Third World to First, The Singapore Story: 1965-2000*, Singapore: Times Media, 2000.

----------, *The Papers of Lee Kuan Yew: Speeches, Interviews and Dialogues, Vol. 4 (1967-1968)*, Singapore: Gale Asia, 2012.

Lee Soo Ann (ed.), *New Direction in the International Relations of Southeast Asia: Economic Relations*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1973.

Legge, J.D., *Sukarno: A Political Biography*, Singapore: Archipelago Press, 2003.

Leifer, Michael (ed.), *Nationalism Revolution and Evolution in South-East Asia*, Zug (Switzerland): Interdocumentation, 1970.

----------, *Asian Nationalism*, London: Routledge, 2000.

Leifer, Michael, *Dilemmas of Statehood in Southeast Asia*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1972.

----------, *The Foreign Relations of the New States*, Camberwell, Vic.: Longman Australia, 1974.

----------, *ASEAN and the Security of South-East Asia*, London: Routledge, 1989.

Leonowens, Anna Harriette, *The English governess at the Siamese court: Being recollections of six years in the royal palace at Bangkok*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Levi, Werner, *Free India in Asia*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952.

----------, *The Challenge of World Politics in South and Southeast Asia*, Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Likhit Dhiravegin, *Siam and Colonialism (1855-1909): An analysis of diplomatic relations*, Bangkok: Thai Watana Panich, 1974.

Lim Pui Huen, *Through the Eyes of the King: The Travels of King Chulalongkorn to Malaya*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2009.

Liow, Joseph Chinyong, *The Politics of Indonesia – Malaysia Relations: One kin, Two Nations*, London: Routledge Curzon, 2005.

Lyon, Peter, *War and Peace in South-East Asia*, London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Macapagal, Diosdado, *The Philippines Turns East*, Quezon City: Mac Publishing House, 1966.

Mackie, J.A.C., *Konfrontasi: The Indonesia-Malaysia Dispute 1963-1966*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Macmillan, Allistes (ed.), *Seaports of the Far East: Historical and Descriptive Commercial and Industrial Facts, Figures and Facts*, London: H. and L. Collingridge, 1923.

Malik, Adam, *In the Service of the Republic*, Singapore: Gunung Agung, 1980.

Marsden, William, *The History of Sumatra, containing an account of the Government, Laws, Customs, and Manners of the Native inhabitants, with a description of the Natural Productions, and a relation of the Ancient Political State of that Island*, London: Thomas Payne and Son, 1784 (Second edition).

----------, *A Grammar of the Malayan Language*, London: Cox and Baylis, 1812.

----------, *A Brief Memoir of the life and writings of the late William Marsden*, London: J. L. Cox and Sons, 1838.

----------, *A Dictionary and Grammar of the Malayan Language, Volume Two*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1984.

McAlister, John, T. (ed.), *Southeast Asia: the politics of national integration*, New York: Random House, 1973.

Mahajani, Usha, *Philippine Nationalism: External Challenge and Filipino Response, 1565-1946*, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1971.

Mahathir Mohamad, *Regional development and the Pacific community: Selected speeches by Dr Mahathir Mohamad, Prime Minister of Malaysia, Vol. 1*, Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications (M), 1995.

----------, *Reflections on ASEAN*, Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, 2004.

Malcolm, George A., *First Malayan Republic: The Story of the Philippines*, Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1951.

Malcom, Haward, *Travels in South-Eastern Asia, embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam, and China*, Boston: Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln, 1839.

Man Mohini Kaul, *The Philippines and Southeast Asia*, New Delhi: Radiant Publishers, 1978.

McCloud, Donald G., *Southeast Asia: Tradition and Modernity in the Contemporary World*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1995.

Means, Gordon P., *Malaysian Politics: The Second Generation*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Mende, Tibor, *South-East Asia between Two Worlds*, London: Turnstile Press, 1955.

Miller, Harry, *Prince and Premier: A Biography of Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra*, Putaling Jaya: Eastern Universities Press, 1982.

Miller, Robert Hopkins, *The United States and Vietnam 1787-1941*, Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1990.

Mills, Lennox A. (ed.), *The New World of Southeast Asia*, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1949.

Mills, Lennox A. and associates, *The New World of Southeast Asia*, Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press, 1949.

Milne, R.S. and Mauzy, Diane K., *Politics and Government in Malaysia*, Singapore: Federal Publications, 1978.

Milner, A.C., *Kerajaan: Malay Political Culture on the Eve of Colonial Rule*, Tuczon: The University of Arizona Press, 1982.

----------, The invention of politics in colonial Malaya, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

----------, *The Malays*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Moffat, Abbot Low, *Mongkut, the King of Siam*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961.

Mohamed Noordin Sopiee, *From Malayan Union to Singapore Separation: Political Unification in the Malaysia Region 1945-65 Second Edition*, Kuala Lumpur: University Malaya Press, 2005.

Mohammad Hatta, *Kumpulan Karangan*, Djakarta: Penerbitan dan Balai Buku Indonesia, 1953.

----------, *Portrait of a Patriot: selected writings by Mohammad Hatta*, The Hague: Mounton Publishers, 1972.

----------, *Mohammad Hatta: Indonesian patriot Memoir*, Singapore: Gunung Agung, 1981.

----------, *Beberapa Pokok Pikiran*, Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia, 1992.

Mojares, Resil, *Brains of the Nation: Pedro Paterno, T. H. Pardo de Tevera, Isabelo de los Reyes and the Production of Modern Knowledge*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2006.

Mondasano, Michael J. and Jory, Patrick (eds.), *Thai South and Malay North: Ethnic Interactions on a Plural Peninsula*, Singapore: NUS Press, 2008.

Mook, H. J. van, *The Stakes of Democracy in South-East Asia*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1950.

Moor, J. H., *Notices of the Indian Archipelago, and adjacent countries*, Vol. I, Singapore, 1837.

Morrison, Charles E. and Suhrke, Astri, *Strategies of Survival: The Foreign Policy Dilemmas of Smaller Asian States*, Queensland: University of Queensland, 1978.

Muhammad Yamin, *Naskah-persiapan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945*, Jajasan Prapantja, 1959.

Muhammad Yusoff Hashim, *The Malay Sultanate of Malacca: A study of various aspects of Malacca in the 15th and 16th centuries in Malaysian history*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1992.

Mustapha Hussain, *Malay Nationalism before UMNO: The Memoirs of Mustapha Hussain*, Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publications and Distributors, 2005.

Nair, Shanti, *Islam in Malaysian Foreign Policy*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 1997.

Najeeb M. Saleeby, *The History of Sulu*, Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1963.

Narine, Shaun, *Explaining ASEAN: Regionalism in Southeast Asia*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.

Nasution, A.H., *Sekitar Perang Kemerdekaan Indonesia, Vol. 1: Proklamasi*, Bandung: Disjara dan Penerbit Angkasa, 1977.

Nathan, S. R., *An Unexpected Journey: Path to the Presidency*, Singapore: EDM Books, 2011.

Nehru, Jawaharlal, *The Discovery of India*, London: Meridian Books, 1956.

----------, *Glimpses of world history*, Asia Publishing House, 1962.

Oldham, Bishop Wm. F., *Malaysia: Nature's Wonderland*, Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham, 1907.

Omar, Ariffin, *Bangsa Melayu: Malay concepts of democracy and community 1945-1950*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Ongkili, James, *Nation-Building in Malaysia 1946-1974*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Ooi Kee Beng, *The Reluctant Politician: Tun Dr. Ismail and his time*, Singapore, ISEAS, 2006.

Osborne, Milton, *Region of revolt: focus on Southeast Asia*, Rushcutters Bay, N.S.W.: Pergamon Press Australia, 1970.

Osborne, Milton, *Southeast Asia: An Introductory History*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1979.

Ott, Martin C., *The Neutralization of Southeast Asia: An Analysis of the Malaysian/ASEAN proposal*, Ohio: Ohio University, 1974.

Owen, Norman G. (ed.), *The Emergence of Modern Southeast Asia: A New History*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005.

Panikkar, K.M., *The Future of South-East Asia: An Indian View*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943.

----------, *Asia and Western Dominance: A Survey of the Vasco Da Gama Epoch of Asian History, 1498-1945*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1959.

Pariah Abd. Samad, *Tun Abdul Razak: A Phenomenon in Malaysian Politics*, Kuala Lumpur: Affluent Master, 1998.

Parsons, Jalcott, *The Social System*, New York: The Free Press, 1951.

Raffles, Sir Thomas Stamford, *The History of Java, Vol I*, London: John Murray, 1817.

Rajendran, M., *ASEAN's Foreign Relations: The shift to collective action*, Kuala Lumpur: Arenabuku, 1985.

Reid, Anthony and Marr, David (eds.), *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books (Asia), 1979.

Reid, Anthony, *Southeast Asia in the age of commerce, 1450-1680, Vol. 1: The lands below the winds*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

----------, *Charting the Shape of Early Modern Southeast Asia*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2000.

Remme, Tilman, *Britain and Regional Cooperation in South-East Asia, 1945-49*, London: Routlwdge, 1995.

Ricklefs, M. C. et al., *A New History of Southeast Asia*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Rizal, Jose, *The Philippines a Century Hence*, Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1912.

----------, *The Rizal-Bluementritt Correspondence, Part Two, 1890-1896*, Manila: Jose Rizal National Centennical Commission, 1961

----------, *Jose Rizal's Political Writings*, Manila: The National Historical Institute, 2007.

----------, *Jose Rizal's Political and Historical Writing*, Manila: National Historical Institute, 2007

Roberts, Edmund, *Embassy to the Eastern Courts of Cochin-China, Siam, and Muscat, in the U.S. Sloop-of-war Peacock, David Geisinger, Commander, during the years 1832-34*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1837.

Roff, William R., *The Origins of Malay Nationalism*, Kuala Lumpur: Penebit Universiti Malaya, 1974.

Romulo, Carlos, *The Meaning of Bandung*, The University of North Carolina Press, 1956.

Salamanca, Bonifacio S., *The Innotech Story*, Quezon City: SEAMEO-Innotech, 1989.

Sambandan, V.T., *Asian almanac: weekly abstracts of Asian affairs*, Vol.1-3: 1963-66.

----------, *Asian almanac: weekly abstracts of Asian affairs*, Vol .5: 1967.

Santaputra, Charivat, *Thai Foreign Policy 1932-1946*, Bangkok: Thammasat University, 1985.

SarDesai, D.R., *Indian Foreign Policy in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam 1947-1964*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

----------, *Southeast Asia: Past and present, Third Edition*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1994.

Severino, Rodolfo (ed.), *Framing the ASEAN charter: An ISEAS perspective*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2005.

Severino, Rodolfo C., *Southeast Asia in Search of an ASEAN Community: Insights from the former ASEAN Secretary-General*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2006.

----------, *Where in the World is the Philippines?: Debating its National Territory*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2011.

Shiraishi Takashi, *Umi no teikou – Ajia wo dou kanngaeruka (Maritime Imperial – how we think of Asia)*, Tokyo: Chukou Shinsho, 2001.

Silverstein, Josef (ed.), *The political legacy of Aung San: Compiled by and with an Introductory Essay by Josef Silverstein*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972.

Singh, Lalita Prasad, *The Politics of Economic Cooperation in Asia: A Study of Asian International Organisations*, Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1966.

Suzuki Shizuo, *Monogatari Filipin no rekishi (The history of the Philippines)*, Tokyo: Chuko Shinsho, 2013.

Smith, Anthony (ed.), *Nationalist Movements*, London: Macmillan Press, 1976.

Smith, Anthony, *Nationalism and Modernism*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 1998.

----------, *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.

Solidum, Estrella D., *Towards a Southeast Asian community*, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1974.

Solidum, Estrella D., *The politics of ASEAN: An introduction to Southeast Asian Regionalism*, Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 2003.

Sridharan, Kripa, *The ASEAN Region in India's Foreign Policy*, Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1996.

Steinberg, David Joel (ed.), *In search of Southeast Asia: A modern history*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Subandrio, *Indonesia on the march: the collected speeches of H. E. Dr. Subandrio delivered while Ambassador of the Republic of Indonesia to the Court of St. James 1950-1954*, *Volume I* Jakarta: Penerbit Djambatan, 1959.

----------, *Indonesia on the march*: *A Collection of Addresses by Dr. Subandrio, Foreign Minister of the Republic of Indonesia, Volume II*, Jakarta: Department of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia, 1963.

Sukarno, *Dari Proklamasi sampai Gesuri: Terbitan berisi pidato proklamasi diutjapkan oleh P.J.M. Presiden Republik Indonesia pada tiap tanggal 17 Agustus sedjak tahun 1945 sampai 1963*, Jajasan Prapantja, 1963.

----------, *Under the Banner of Revolution*, Vol. 1, Jakarta: Panitya Penerbit, 1965.

----------, *An autobiography as told to Cindy Adams*, Hong Kong: Gunung Agung, 1966.

Sutan Sjahrir, Anderson, Benedict (tra.), *Our Struggle*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 1968.

Sweeney, Amin, *A Full Hearing: Orality and Literacy in the Malay World*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Syed Serajul Islam, *The Politics of Islamic Identity in Southeast Asia*, Singapore: Thomson Learning, 2005.

Tan Tai Yong, *Creating "Greater Malaysia": Decolonization and the politics of merger*, ISEAS: Singapore, 2008.

Tarling, Nicholas (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia Volume One, Part Two: From c. 1500 to c. 1800*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

----------, *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia Volume Two, Part One: From c. 1800 to the 1930s*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

----------, *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia Volume Two, Part Two: From World War II to the present*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Tarling, Nicholas, *Southeast Asia: Past and Present*, Melbourne: F. W. Cheshire, 1966.

----------, *The Fall of Imperial Britain in South-East Asia*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1994.

----------, *Nations and States in Southeast Asia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

----------, *Imperialism in Southeast Asia: a fleeting, passing phase*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2001.

----------, *Southeast Asia: A Modern History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

----------, *Nationalism in Southeast Asia: 'If the people are with us'*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004.

----------, *Asia: 'If the people are with us'*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004.

----------, *Regionalism in Southeast Asia: To foster the political will*, London: Routledge, 2006.

----------, Southeast Asian regionalism: New Zealand Perspectives, ISEAS: Singapore, 2011.

Taylor, Peter J, *Political Geography: World-economy, nation-state and locality*, Essex: Longman Scientific and Technical, 1994.

Tawfik Ismail and Ooi Kee Beng (eds.), *Malaya's First Year at the United Nations: As Reflected in Dr Ismail's Reports Home to Tunku Abdul Rahman*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2009.

Thayer, Philip W. (ed.), *Southeast Asia in the Coming World*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1953.

----------, *Nationalism and progress in Free Asia*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956.

Thoburn, Bishop J. M., *India and Malaysia*, Cincinnati: Cranston and Curts, 1892.

Thompson, Virginia McLean, *Labor problems in Southeast Asia*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.

----------, *Thailand: The new Siam*, New York: Paragon Book, 1967.

Thompson, Virginia and Adloff, Richard, *Minority problems in Southeast Asia*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955.

Tibbetts, G. R., *A Study of the Arabic texts containing material on South-East Asia*,

Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979.

Tinker, Hugh, *Ballot Box and Bayonet: People and Government in Emergent Asian Countries*, London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Ton That Thien, *India and South East Asia 1947-1960: A Study of India's policy towards the South East Asian countries in the period 197-1960*, Geneve: Librarie Droz, 1963.

Tongchai Winichakul, *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994.

Kishi Toshihiko, Arano Yasunori, and Kokaze Hideo (eds.) *'Higashi Ajia' no jidaisei (Timeness of "East Asia"),* Tokyo: Keishuisha, 2005.

Tunku Abdul Rahman Haji-Putra, *Looking Back: Monday Musings and Memories*, Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Andara, 1977.

----------, *Malaysia: the Road to Independence*, Putaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, 2007.

Van der Kroef, Justus M., *Indonesia since Sukarno*, Singapore: Donald Moore for Asia Pacific Press, 1971.

Van Mook, H.J., *The stakes of Democracy in South-East Asia*, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1950.

Vandenbosch, Army and Butwell, Richard A., *Southeast Asia among the World Powers*, Lexington: University of Kentuchy Press, 1957.

----------, *The Changing face of Southeast Asia*, Lexington: University of Kentuchy Press, 1967.

Vella, Walter F., *Siam Under Rama III, 1824-1851*, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1957.

Vella, Walter F., *Chaiyo! : King Vajiravudh and the development of Thai nationalism*, Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1978.

Vincent, Jun Frank, *The land of the white elephant: sights and scenes in South-Eastern Asia: A personal narrative of travel and adventure in Farther India, embracing the countries of Burma, Siam, Cambodia, and Cochin-China (1871-2)*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1874.

W. K. Che Man, *Muslim Separatism: The Moros of Southern Philippines and the Malays of Southern Thailand*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Wang Gungwu (ed.), *Malaysia: A Survey*, London: Pall Mall Press, 1964.

Wang Gungwu, *Community and Nation: Essays on Southeast Asia and the Chinese*, Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books (Asia), 1981.

Wallace, Alfred Russel, *Australasia*, London: Edward Standard, 1883 (Third edition).

----------, *The Malay Archipelago*, Oxford: John Beaufoy Publishing, 2009.

Warner, Denis, *Reporting South-East Asia*, Sydney: Argus and Robertson, 1966.

Warshaw, Steven, *Southeast Asia emerges: A concise history of Southeast Asia from its origin to the present*, Berkeley: The Diablo Press, 1975.

Weatherbee, Donald E., *Ideology in Indonesia: Sukarno's Indonesian Revolution*, Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, 1966.

Wheatley, Paul, *The Golden Khersonese: Studies in the Historical Geography of the Malay Peninsula Before A.D. 1500*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1961.

Wilson, Dick, *The Neutralization of Southeast Asia*, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.

Winstedt, R. O. (ed.), *Malaya: The Straits Settlements and The Federated and Unfederated Malay States*, London: Constable and Co., 1923.

Winstedt, R. O., *Ilmu Alam Melayu: Iaitu Sa-buah Kitab Pemimpin bagi segala Guru-Guru Melayu*, Singapore: The Methodist Publishing House, 1918.

----------, *Kitab Tawarikh Melayu*, Fraser and Neave, Limited, Printers: Singapore, 1925.

----------, *The Malays: A Cultural History*, Singapore: Kelly and Walsh, 1947.

Wolters, O. W., *Early Indonesian Commerce: A study of the origins of Srivijaya*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967.

----------, *History, Culture, and Region in Southeast Asian perspectives*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 1999.

Woon, Walter, *The ASEAN Charter: A Commentary*, Singapore: NUS Press, 2016.

Wriggins, W. Howard, *Ceylon: Dilemmas of a New Nation*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Wyatt, David K., *Thailand: A short history*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

Yamakage Susumu, *ASEAN kara shimboru he* (*ASEAN – From Symbol to System*), Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1991.

Yano Toru, *Nanshin no Keihu (The lineage of southern expansion)*, Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha, 1975.

----------, *Tonan ajia sekai no kouzu: Seijiteki seitaishikan no tachibakara (Structures of Southeast Asian World: From view of point of political ecological history)*, Tokyo: Nihon housou kyoukai, 1984.

----------, *Reisen to Tounan ajia (The Cold War and Southeast Asia)*, Tokyo: Chuuou

kouronsha, 1985.

Yen Ching Hwang, *The overseas Chinese and the 1911 revolution: with special reference to Singapore and Malaya*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Yoneo Ishii and Yumio Sakurai (eds.), *Tounan ajiashi I Tairikubu (History of Southeast Asia Vol. I: Mainland)*, Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppansha, 1995.

U Nu, *U Nu Saturday's Son*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Unknown author, *Travels in South-Eastern Asia: compiled from the most authentic and recent sources*, London: Printed for C.J.G. and F. Rivington, 1831.

Zaide, Gregorio F., *The Republic of the Philippines (History, Government, and Civilization)*, Manila: Rex Book Store, 1963.

Zainal Abidin bin Ahmad, *Sejarah Ringkas Tanah Melayu*, Singapura: Pustaka Melayu, 1961.

## Articles

Acharya, Amitav, 'Imagined Proximities: The Making and Unmaking of Southeast Asia as a Region,' *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 27, No. 1, 1999.

Adam Malik, 'Indonesia's Foreign Policy,' Indonesian Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 1, (Oct. 1972).

Agnew, John, 'Regions on the mind does not equal regions of the mind,' *Progress in Human Geography*. Vol. 23, No. 1, 1999.

Akira Nagazumi, 'The word "Indonesia": The growth of its political connotation,' *Indonesian Circle*, No. 17, (Nov. 1978).

ASEAN Secretariat, 'ASEAN Vision 2020,' *ASEAN Economic Bulletin*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (March 1998).

Avé, Jan B., '"Indonesia,' 'Insulinde' and 'Nusantara': Dotting the *I*'s and crossing the *T*", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Deel 145, 2de/3de Afl., 1989.

Barrett, E. C. G., 'Obituary: Sir Richard Winstedt,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, University of London, Vol. 30, No. 1, Fiftieth Anniversary Volume (1967).

Briggs, Lawrence Palmer, 'The Appearance and Historical Usage of the Terms Tai, Thai, Siamese and Lao,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 69, No. 2 (Apr.- Jun., 1949).

Broek, Jan O. M., 'Diversity and Unity in Southeast Asia,' *Geographical Review*, Vol.

34, No. 2, (Apr., 1944).

Bunnell, Frederick P., 'Guided Democracy Foreign Policy: 1960-1965 President Sukarno Moves from Non-Alignment to Confrontation,' *Indonesia*, No. 2 (Oct., 1966).

Butwell, Richard, 'Malaysia and its Impact on the International Relations of Southeast Asia,' *Asian Survey*, Vol. 4, No. 7, (July 1964).

Charrier, Philip, 'ASEAN's inheritance: the regionalization of Southeast Asia, 1941-61,' *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 2001.

Cheah Boon Kheng, 'The Japanese Occupation of Malaya, 1941-45: Ibrahim Yaacob and the Struggle for Indonesia Raya,' *Indonesia*, No. 28 (Oct., 1979).

Chin Kin Wah, 'ASEAN: The Long Road to "One Southeast Asia,"' *Asian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Jun. 1997).

Christian, John L., 'Recent Literature Relating to Southeast Asia,' *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 4, (Aug. 1942).

Coates, Austin, 'The Philippines National Hero: Rizal in Sandakan,' *The Sarawak Museum Journal*, Nos. 19-20, Vol. X, 1962.

Coedès, G., 'English Correspondence of King Mongkut,' *Journal of Siam Society*, Vo. 21, No. 2, 1927-28.

Curaming, Rommel A., 'Filipinos as Malay: Historicizing an Identity,' in Maznah Mohammad and Muhd. Khairudin Aljunied (eds.), *Melayu: The Politics, Poetic and Paradoxes of Malayness*, Singapore: NUS Press, 2011.

Dennys, N. B., 'A Contribution to Malayan Bibliography,' *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, June 1880.

D'Urville, Jules-Sébastien-César Dumont, (translated by Isabel Ollivier, Antoine de Biran and Geoffrey Clark), 'On the Islands of the Great Ocean,' *The Journal of Pacific History*, Vol. 38, No. 2, 2003.

Earl, George Windsor, 'On the Leading Characteristics of the Papuan, Australian, and Malayu-Polynesian Nations: Chapter III, The Malayu-Polynesians,' *The Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. IV, 1850.

----------, 'Contributions to the physical geography of South-Eastern Asia and Australia,' *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. 6, 1852.

Emerson, Rupert, 'An Analysis of Nationalism in Southeast Asia,' *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Feb. 1946).

Emmerson, Donald, '"Southeast Asia": What's in a Name?,' *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 1984.

----------, 'Challenging ASEAN: A "Topological" View,' *Contemporary Southeast Asia*,

Vol. 29, No. 3, 2007.

Estrella, D., Solidum, 'Regional Co-operation an ASEAN: The Philippine Experience,' *Asian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 5, No. 1, (June 1997).

Evers, Hans-Dieter, 'Nusantara: History of a Concept,' *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 89 (Part 1), no. 310, (June 2016).

Fawcett, Louise, 'Exploring regional domains: a comparative history of regionalism,' *International Affairs*, Vol. 80, No. 3, (May 2004).

Fernando, Joseph M., 'The Formation of Malaysia: Shared History, Varied Images,' *Malaysia in History*, Vol. 29, 2005.

----------, 'Malayan Nationalism and the Dilemma of National Identity,' *Indian Historical Studies*, Vol. IV, Issue 1 (Oct. 2007).

Fifield, Russell, 'Philippine Foreign Policy,' *Far Eastern Survey*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (21 Feb., 1951).

----------, 'The Concept of Southeast Asia: Origins, Development, and Evaluation,' *South-East Asian Spectrum*, Vol. 4, No. 1, (Oct. 1975).

Firdaus Haji Abdullah, 'The Rumpun concept in Malaysia-Indonesia relations,' *The Indonesian Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1993.

Fitzgerald, C. P., 'Early Chinese contacts with South-East Asia' in Geoff Wade (ed.), *China and Southeast Asia: Routledge Library on Southeast Asia, Volume I: Introduction and history to the fourteenth century*, London: Routledge, 2009.

Frost, Frank, 'The origins and evolution of ASEAN,' *World Review*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Aug. 1980).

Funston, John, 'Malaysia and Thailand's Southern Conflict: Reconciling Security and Ethnicity,' *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 32, No. 2, (Aug. 2010).

Gordon, Bernard K., 'Problems of regional cooperation in Southeast Asia,' *World Politics*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (Jan., 1964).

----------, 'Regionalism and Instability in Southeast Asia,' *Orbis*, Vol. 10, No. 2, (Summer 1966).

Grajdanzev, A. J., 'Japan's Co-Prosperity Sphere,' *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (Sept., 1943).

Haas, Earnest, 'The Challenge of Regionalism,' *International Organisation*, Vol. 12, No. 4, (Autumn 1958).

Hall, Duncan H., 'Post-war government and politics of British South East Asia,' *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1947.

Heine-Geldern, Robert, 'Conceptions of State and Kingship in Southeast Asia,' *The Far*

*Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 1, (Nov. 1942),

Henderson, William, 'The Development of Regionalism in Southeast Asia,' *International Organization*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Nov. 1955).

Jack-Hilton, Colin, 'Marco Polo in South-East Asia: A preliminary essay in reconstruction,' *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, Vol. 5, 1964.

Jeong Kyong-Ah, 'Kishi naikaku no "Tounan Ajia kaihatsu kikin" kousou to ajia shokoku no hannou' ('"The Southeast-Asian Development Fund" of the Kishi Cabinet and the Reaction of Asian Countries'), *Research Bulletin of Faculty of Education and Welfare Science*, Oita University, Vol. 27, No. 1, 2005.

Jones, Russell, 'Earl, Logan and "Indonesia,"' *Archipel*, Vol. 6, 1973.

Juntanamalaga, Preecha, 'Thai or Siam?,' *A Journal of Onomastics*, Vol. 36, No. 1-2, 1988.

Kahin, George McT., 'Malaysia and Indonesia,' *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 37, No. 3, (Fall 1964).

----------, 'In Memoriam: Mohammad Hatta, (1902-1980),' *Indonesia*, No. 30 (Oct. 1980).

Khazin Mohd. Tamrin, 'Tradisi Merantau: Perluanya diberi perhatian dalam kajian dan penulisan sejarah Malaysia,' in Badriyah Haji Salleh and Tan Liok Ee (eds.), *Alam Persejarahan: Dari pelbagai perspektif*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan bahasa dan pustaka, 1996.

K. B. Sayeed, 'Southeast Asia in Pakistan's Foreign Policy,' *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (summer, 1968).

Keating, Michael, 'National and Regional Identities in Europe,' *Contemporary European History*, Vol. 16, No. 3, (2007).

Khoo Kay Kim, 'Local Historians and the Writing of Malaysian History in the Twentieth Century,' in Anthony Reid and David Marr (eds.), *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books (Asia), 1979.

Landon, Kenneth Perry, 'Nationalism in Southeastern Asia,' *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 2, (Feb. 1943).

Lau Teik Soon, 'Malaysia and the neutralization of Southeast Asia,' in Patrick Low (ed.), *Trends in Malaysia II*, Singapore: ISEAS, 1971.

----------, 'ASEAN and the Bali Summit,' *Pacific Community*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (July 1976).

Lee Lai To, 'Taiwan and Southeast Asia: Realpolitik Par Excellence?,' *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Dec. 1985).

Legge, J. D., 'Daulat Ra'jat and the ideas of the Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia,'

*Indonesia*, No. 32 (Oct., 1981).

Leifer, Michael, 'Problems and prospects of regional cooperation in Asia: The political dimension,' *The Indonesian Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 3, 4 (1976: Special Issue).

----------, 'Taiwan and South-East Asia: The Limits to Pragmatic Diplomacy,' *The China Quarterly*, No. 165, (Mar., 2001).

Liow, Joseph Chinyong, 'Tunku Abdul Rahman and Malaya's Relations with Indonesia, 1957-1960,' Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, Vol. 36, No. 1, 2005.

Logan, J. R., 'The Ethnology of Eastern Asia,' *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. 4, 1850.

----------, 'The ethnology of the Indian Archipelago,' *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. 4, 1850.

Lord, Donald C., 'Missionaries, Thai, and Diplomats,' *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Nov., 1966).

Mills, Lennox A. (ed.), 'Southeastern Asia and the Philippines,' *Annals of the American Academy of Politics and Social Science*, Vol. 226, (Mar., 1943).

Milner, Anthony, and Johnson, Deborah, 'The idea of Asia,' in John Ingleson, *Regionalism, Subregionalism and APEC*, Clayton (Victoria): Monash Asia Institute, 1997.

Miyazaki Ichisada, 'Nanyo wo touzaiyouni wakatsu konkyo nitsuite (Evidences divided the East and the West ocean in the South ocean),' *Toyoshi Kenkyu*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1942.

Moe Thuzar, 'What does it take to join ASEAN?,' *ISEAS Perspective*, No. 36, 2 June 2017.

Mohamed Noordin Sopiee, 'The advocacy of Malaysia –before 1961,' *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (1973),

Mohammad Hatta, 'Indonesia's Foreign Policy,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 31, No. 3, Apr. 1953.

Nairn, Ronald C., 'SEATO: A Critique,' *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Spring 1968).

Ott, Marvin C., 'Foreign Policy Formulation in Malaysia: The Tunku Era,' *Asian Survey*, Vol. 12, No. 13, 1972.

Papanek, Hanna, 'Note on Soedjatmoko's recollections of a Historical Moment: Sjahrir's Reactions to Ho Chi Minh's 1945 Call for a Free Peoples Federation,' *Indonesia*, No. 49, (1999).

Phan Wannamethee, 'The Importance of the EC for South-East Asia: The ASEAN Perspective,' in Schiavone, Giuseppe, *Western Europe and South-East Asia, Co-operation or Competition,'* London: The Macmillan Press, 1989.

Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, 'The Introduction of Western Culture in Siam,' *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (1926-27).

Raffles, Thomas, 'On the Malayu Nation, with a translation of its Maritime Institutions,' *Asiatick Researches*, Vol. 12, 1816.

Reid, Anthony, 'A Saucer Model of Southeast Asian Identity,' *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 27, No. 1, 1999.

Reid, Anthony, 'The Bandung Conference and Southeast Asian Regionalism,' in See Seng Tan and Amitav Acharya (eds.), *Bandung Revisited: The legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, Singapore: NUS Press, 2008.

Roff, William, 'Indonesian and Malay students in Cairo in the 1920's,' *Indonesia*, No. 9 (Apr. 1970).

Salazar, Noel B., 'The (Im)mobility of Merantau as a sociocultural practice in Indonesia,' in Natasă Gregorič Bon and Jaka Repič (eds.), *Moving places: Relations, return and belonging*, New York: Berghahn, 2016.

Salazar, Zeus A., 'The Malay World: Bahasa Melayu in the Philippines,' in Salazar, Zeus A., *The Malayan Connection: Ang Pilipinas sa Dunia Melayu*, Lunsod Quezon: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 1998.

----------, '"Malay," "Malayan" and "Malay Civilization" as cultural and anthropological categories in the Philippines,' in Salazar, Zeus A., *The Malayan Connection: Ang Pilipinas sa Dunia Melayu*, Lunsod Quezon: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 1998.

----------, 'Orang-orang India, Filipino, Melayu: Jose Rizal sebagai pejuang kebangsaan Melayu,' in Salazar, Zeus A., *The Malayan Connection: Ang Pilipinas sa Dunia Melayu*, Lunsod Quezon: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 1998.

Sani, Rustam A., 'Melayu Raya as a Malay "nation of intent,"' in Dahlan, H.M., *The nacent Malaysian society: developments, trends and problems*, Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 1976.

Sapilman, Christopher W. A. and Saaler, Sven, 'Pan-Asianism as an ideal of Asian identity and solidarity, 1850-Present,' *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus*, Vol. 9, Issue 17, No. 1, (Apr. 2011).

Savage, Victor, (trans. Komeie Taisaku), 'Kukan wo meguru mondai: tounan ajia ni okeru hiryouikiteki kyoudoutaikara shokuminchikokka henoikou' (Changing landscapes: cultural geologies and cosmic space in Southeast Asia), *Historical Geography* (Japan), Vol. 237 (January, 2008).

Seah Chee Meow, 'ASEAN and Regionalism in South-East Asia,' *South East Asian Spectrum*, Vol. 2, No. 3, (Apr. 1974).

Scott, David W., 'The Geographic Imagination and the Expansion of Methodist Missions in Southeast Asia,' *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, Vol. 38, No. 3, July 2014.

Smith, Anthony, D., 'National identity and the idea of European unity,' *International Affairs*, Vol. 68, No. 1, (Jan., 1992).

Silcock, T.H., 'Development of a Malayan Foreign Policy,' *Australian Outlook*, Vol.17, No. 1, (Apr. 1963).

Snow, Karen, 'St. Petersburg's Man in Siam: A. E. Olarovskii and Russia's Asian Mission, 1898-1905,' *Cahiers du Monde russe*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 2007).

Soda, Naoki, 'The Malay World in Textbooks: The Transmission of Colonial Knowledge in British Malaya,' *Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 2, (Sept. 2001).

Solomon, Robert, 'Boundary concepts and practices in Southeast Asia,' *World Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Oct., 1970).

Suryadinata, Leo, 'Towards an ASEAN Charter promoting an ASEAN regional identity,' in Rodolfo Severino (ed.), *Framing the ASEAN charter: An ISEAS perspective*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2005.

Tarling, Nicholas, 'From SEAFET and ASA: Precursors of ASEAN,' *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, Vol. 3 (May 2007).

Thanat Khoman, 'Which road for Southeast Asia?,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (Jul. 1964).

----------, 'Forward to *The ASEAN Reader,* ASEAN: Conception and Evolution,' in Ooi Kee Beng et al., *The 3ʳᵈ ASEAN Reader*, Singapore: ISEAS, 2015.

Tilman, Robert O., 'Malaysian Foreign Policy: The Dilemmas of a Committed Neutral,' *Public Policy*, Vol. 16 (1967).

Tregonning, K. G., 'Tan Cheng Lock: A Malayan Nationalist,' *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Mar., 1979).

Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, 'The Filipino Soul,' in Hilario, Vincente and Quirino, Eliseo (eds.), *Thinking for ourselves: A representative collection of Filipino essays*, Manila: Oriental Commercial Co. Inc., 1928.

T. T. B. Koh, 'International Collaboration concerning Southeast Asia,' *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 390, A New American Posture toward Asia (Jul., 1970).

Tunku Abdul Rahman, 'Malaysia: Key Area in Southeast Asia,' *Foreign Affairs*, (July 1965).

----------, 'The communist threat in Malaysia and Southeast Asia,' *Pacific Community*, Vol. 8, No. 4, (July 1977),

Usha Mahajani, 'The Development of Philippine Asianism,' *Asian Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1965.

Van der Kroef, Justus M., 'The Term Indonesia: Its Origin and Usage,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 71, No. 3, (Jul.-Sep., 1951).

----------, 'Maphilindo: Illusion or Reality?,' *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 5 Sept., 1963.

----------, 'Hanoi and ASEAN: A New Confrontation in Southeast Asia?,' *Asia Quarterly*, No. 4, 1976.

Van Langenberg, Michael, 'Dr. Subandrio - An Assessment,' *The Australian Quarterly*, Vo. 38, No. 4 (Dec. 1966).

Victor, Savage, (trans. Komeie Taisaku), 'Changing landscapes: cultural geologies and cosmic space in Southeast Asia,' *Historical Geography (Japan)*, Vol. 237, (January, 2008).

Wallace, Alfred Russell, 'On the Physical Geography of the Malay Archipelago,' *The Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London*, Vol. 33, 1863.

Wallace, Alfred Russell, 'On the Varieties of Man in the Malay Archipelago,' *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, Vol. 3, 1865.

Wang Gungwu, 'Nation Formation and Regionalism in Southeast Asia,' in Margaret Grant (ed.), *South Asia Pacific Crisis: National Development and the World Community*, New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1964.

Wicks, Peter, 'Malaysia's Quest for Neutralisation: A Perspective,' *Australian Quarterly*, Vol. 44, No. 3, (Sept. 1972).

Yamakage Susumu, 'Kokumintougou no tameno tiiki tougou－Tounan ajia toushobu kousaikankei no henyouto seijitougoumondai (Linkage between National and Regional Integration: The Evolution of Cooperation in Insular Southeast Asia),' *Kokusai Seiji* (*International Politics)*, No. 84, 1987.

Yen Ching-hwang, 'Tongmenghui, Sun Yat-Sen and the Chinese in Singapore and Malaya: A Revisit,' in Leo Suryadinata (ed.), *Tongmenghui, Sun Yat-Sen and the Chinese in Southeast Asia: A Revisit*, Singapore: Chinese Heritage Centre, 2006.

Yujirou Iwamoto, 'Tounan ajia ni okeru chiiki shugi' (Regionalism in Southeast Asia), in *1960 nendaini okeru chugokuto tounan* ajia (*China and Southeast Asia in the 1960s)*, Tokyo: Ajia Seikei Gakkai, 1974.

Zainal Abidin bin Ahmad, 'Modern Development of Malay Literature,' *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Jan. 1940),

----------, 'Recent Malay Literature,' *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Feb. 1941).

Zillur R. Khan, 'Islam and Bengali Nationalism,' *Asian Survey*, Vol. 25, No. 8 (Aug. 1985).


**Newspapers**

*Aberdeen Journal*, 14 April 1919.

*Bangkok Calender*, 1866.

*Bangkok Readers*

*Bells Weekly Messenger*, 7 July, 1822.

*Berita Harian*, 4 Jan. 1966, 16 March 1966, 17 March 1966, 27 June 1967, 9 Aug. 1967, 10 Oct. 1967, 3 Jan. 1969, and 17 Dec. 1970.

*Birmingham Gazette*, 8 Oct. 1827.

*Dundee Courier*, 1 March 1941.

*Edinburgh Evening News*, 1 May 1902.

*Glasgow Herald*, 3 Nov. 1892.

*Harian Merdeka,* 24 July 1975.

*Huddersfield Chronicle*, 11 May 1892.

*Inverness Courier*, 4 Nov. 1824.

*Leads Intelligencer*, 28 Oct. 1824.

*Leeds Mercury*, 4 Dec. 1873.

*Manila Times*, 28 Oct. 1928, 4 Nov. 1928, 3 Jan., 1959, and 5 Jan., 1959.

*Morning Post*, 12 Nov. 1869, 6 March, 1874, and 23 July 1890.

*New Nation*, 17 Nov. 1971, 24 March 1972, 20 Feb. 1973, and 22 Feb. 1975.

*Newcastle Courant*, 25 Sept. 1742.

*Norfolk Chronicle*, 21 June 1788.

*Northampton Mercury*, 30 Oct. 1824.

*Osaka Mainichi Shimbun* (Daily newspaper), 2 Aug. 1940.

*Royal Cornwall Gazette*, 9 Dec. 1820, and 13 July, 1822.

*Sinar Matahari*, 1 July 1943, 26 Aug. 1943, and 23 Nov. 1943.

*Singapore Herald*, 17 Dec. 1970.

*The Atlantic Telegraph*, 12 Feb., 1879.

*The Bangkok Post*, 7 July 1947, 15 Aug. 1947, 26 July 1963, 9 Aug. 1967, 28 Nov. 1974, and 29 Apr. 1979.

*The Canberra Times*, 9 Aug. 1968, 10 Nov. 1973, and 10 April 1987.

*The Examiner*, 30 Jan. 1869, 3 April 1869, and 29 Nov. 1873.

*The Indiana Progress*, 28 Sept. 1876.

*The Ipswich Journal*, 16 Nov. 1751.

*The Guardian*, 12 Aug. 1874.

*The London Standard*, 26 March 1869, and 29 Jan. 1897.

*The New York Times*, 3 April 1896, and 3 Sept. 1896.

*The Nonconformist*, 17 Dec. 1873.

*The San Antonio Express*, 23 April, 1868.

*The Singapore Free Press*, 9 May 1950, 13 Nov. 1954, 4 June 1958, 22 Oct. 1959, and 11 Aug. 1960.

*The Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser*, 16 Nov. 1849, 2 Oct. 1895, 17 Jan. 1898, and 21 Nov. 1908.

*The Straits Times*
13 Aug. 1850, 9 Sept. 1851, 12 July, 1887, 10 Feb. 1902, 14 June 1906, 3 Feb. 1908, 12 June, 1912, 6 July, 1918, 14 Jan. 1919, 4 Nov. 1927, 12 Dec. 1931, 2 Jan. 1935, 29 April 1940, 1 Nov. 1945, 19 April 1947, 11 Nov. 1954, 13 Nov. 1954, 9 Feb. 1958, 22 April 1958, 5 Jan. 1959, 7 Jan. 1959, 1 Aug. 1959, 26 Aug. 1958, 28 July 1959, 11 March 1960, 23 March 1960, 28 July 1960, 14 Feb. 1961, 28 March 1961, 28 May 1961, 29 May 1961, 8 Sep. 1961, 9 Sep. 1961, 28 July, 1962, 31 July 1962, 23 Nov. 1962, 17 June 1963, 26 Aug. 1963, 12 Sept. 1963, 18 Nov. 1963, 2 Jan. 1964, 12 Jan. 1964, 13 Jan. 1964, 6 July 1964, 22 Nov. 1965, 17 March 1966, 1 Feb. 1967, 6 May 1967, 27 May 1967, 23 April 1967, 27 Aug. 1967, 30 Aug. 1967, 30 Sep. 1967, 8 Oct. 1967, 9 Oct. 1967, 24 Dec. 1967, 8 Feb. 1968, 27 May 1968, 9 Aug. 1968, 10 Aug. 1968, 23 Oct. 1968, 3 Jan. 1969, 7 Dec. 1969, 24 Dec. 1970, 4 Oct. 1971, 18 Oct. 1971, 26 May 1972, 17 Feb. 1973, 30 June 1973, 17 May 1975, 10 Oct. 1975, 13 Dec. 1975, 28 March 1976, and 15 June 1982.

*The Straits Times Overland Journal*, 29 March 1871.

*The Straits Times Weekly Issue*, 17 June 1886, 9 Sept. 1889, 3 June 1890, and 11 Jan. 1893.

*The Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 Nov. 1954.

*Times of Indonesia*, 27 Sept. 1954.

*Weekly Sun*, 8 Oct. 1910.

*Western Morning News*, 18 March 1922, and 21 Nov. 1927.

For Australian newspapers on http://trove.nla.gov.au/
For British newspapers on http://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/
For Singapore and Malaysia newspapers on http://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/newspapers/


## Magazines

*Banteng*, 21 March 1946.

*Daulat Ra'jat*, 20 Apr. 1932.

*Far Eastern Economic Review*, 9 March 1961, 30 Nov. 1961, 18 Apr. 1963, 15 Aug. 1963, 5 Sept., 1963, and 13 Feb. 1964.

*Far Eastern Survey*, Vol. 19, No. 8 (Apr. 19, 1950).

*The Graphic*, 18 Oct. 1873, and 22 Sept. 1883.

*Seruan Azhar*, Vol. 1, 1925.


## Thesis

Stefan Matthias Hell, 'Siam and the League of Nations: Modernization, Sovereignty and Multilateral Diplomacy, 1920-1940,' Leiden University Institute for Area Studies (LIAS) Ph.D dissertation, 31st Oct. 2007.


## Proceedings

*Proceedings of the Third Congress of Prehistorians of the Far East*, Singapore: The Government Printing Office, 1940.

*Proceedings of the international symposium Southeast Asia: Global area studies for the 21st century*, Kyoto: Centre for Southeast Asian Studies Kyoto University, 1997.

*Proceedings of the Symposium on Bangsa and Umma: A comparative study of people-grouping concepts in the Islamic areas of Southeast Asia*, Section for Islamic area studies, Institute of Asian cultures, Sophia University, 2007.


**Papers**

de Viana, Augusto V., 'The Philippine view of Indonesian independence day as reporter in Philippine newspapers,' the paper in the 22nd IAHA conference, 2 Jul. 2012.

Singgih Tri Sulistiyono, 'Ocean territory border concept of Indonesia: A Historical perspective,' the paper in the 22nd IAHA conference, 2 Jul. 2012.


**Internet Sources**

Internet book archive: https://archive.org/