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.

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

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.
\(^5\) 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 Ujong (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.
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. 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. 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,’ 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.
Rahman and the then Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew, and partly because of racial frictions. 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.’ 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.’

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,

---

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.’

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.’

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. 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. Reid suggested that Sejarah Melayu mentioned Melayu as being the name of a small river in Sumatra, 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. Reid argued that Raffles titled his book ‘as if to show it was the story of a people,’ although

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.
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’

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.
article in 1816, 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,* 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. 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’ 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. He divided it further into five groups: The Indo-Malay islands

---

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.
33 Ibid., p. 249.
Peninsula, Singapore, Borneo, Java, and Sumatra), the Timor group (Timor, Flores, Sumbawa, and Lombok), Celebes, the Maluku groups, and the Papuan group. 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’. 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. 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 with the description that the Malays occupied the entire archipelago without a specific definition of the Malays. Wallace mentioned Crawfurd’s dissertation, i.e. the *Dissertation on the Affinities of the Malayan Languages* (1852), 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.’ 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.
39 Ibid., p. 205.
Malays dwelt. 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, 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.’ 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 Wallace’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.
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

\(^{46}\) The Straits Times, 28 May 1961, p. 1.
\(^{47}\) Ibid., 29 May 1961, p. 1.
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

---

smaller islands.\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{54} \textit{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.\textsuperscript{55} Other evidence is also shown in the \textit{Glasgow Herald} in 1892. The newspaper made brief reviews for

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{The Examiner}, 30 Jan. 1869, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Morning Post}, 23 July 1890, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{55} \textit{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...’ 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.’ 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. 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.’ 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.
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. 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.

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, 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.’ 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.


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.


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 confines 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,
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\(^{68}\) *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.
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.\textsuperscript{78}

However, as Emerson said, the term ‘Malaysia’ was ‘a somewhat unfamiliar term,’\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{78} Rupert Emerson, \textit{Malaysia: A Study in Direct and Indirect Rules}, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1964. The original publication year was in 1937.

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., p. 9.

\textsuperscript{80} R. O. Winstedt (ed.), \textit{ibid.}, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{81} British and Australian newspapers begun to use the term ‘British Malaya’ since 1884. Refer to \url{http://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/}; For Australian, see \url{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.

---


\(^{85}\) Thoburn, ibid., p. 483.

Nevertheless, the term ‘Malaysia’ has survived. Joseph Fernando pointed out that the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO) wished to name the new independent country as ‘Malaysia.’ 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. 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.’ 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. Subsequently, the country started to use ‘Malaysian’ for its nationals.

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.
88 Ibid.
89 Ibid., p. 10.
91 Presumably, Fay-Cooper, an American anthropologist, was the first scholar to use ‘Malaysian,’ though he mentions 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.’

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,’ 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, 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, 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

---

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 ulamas 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. Nevertheless, once grouped together under a unitary region, despite the fact that they come from different birthplaces, they were still conscious of their similarities. 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. 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.

---

96 Ibid., p. 13.
98 Michael Francis Laffan, ibid., p. 13.
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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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. 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. 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. 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

---

during the early twentieth century. 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. 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.’ 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, the two articles in 1940 and 1941 hint about it. 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 confirms this in his work *Sejarah Alam Melayu.* The three-volume

---

111 Abdul Hadi bin Haji Hasan, *Sejarah ‘Alam Melayu, Penggal I-II-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.\(^\text{112}\)
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.’\(^\text{113}\) 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 Dikasih.*’\(^\text{114}\) 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.’\(^\text{115}\) In the 1927 issue, the editor also wrote that ‘we recognise Indonesia and the Peninsula as one community.’\(^\text{116}\) 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


\(^{114}\) *Seruan Azhar*, Vol. 1, 1925.


\(^{116}\) 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*. 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 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

---

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

\(^{120}\) Cheah Boon Kheng, *ibid.*, pp. 104-105.
\(^{122}\) Cheah Boon Kheng, *ibid.*, pp. 110-112.
Malaya as a part of Free Indonesia.' 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.’ 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. The President of the party, Dr. Buruannudin 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 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 Oon 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.

\(^{132}\) Ibid., p. 36.

\(^{133}\) Ibid., p. 36.
essential tradition in the Malay culture.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Melayu Raya/Indonesia Raya}. This is the reason the conservative party UMNO also shared the idea of PKMM/MNP, namely \textit{Melayu Raya}.\textsuperscript{135}

However, PKMM/MNP has quickly lost popularity, and UMNO by Dato Onn has grown its strength.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{Persatuan Islam Se-Malaya} (Pan-Malayan Islamic Organisation) (PAS), proposed in the parliament that the concept of \textit{Melayu Raya} should be adopted and include the Peninsula, Singapore, Brunei, North Borneo, Sarawak, Indonesia and the Philippines.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Melayu Raya} was dead.

\textsuperscript{136} COS37/1581, p. 231.
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’\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{138} Refer to the Chapter five.
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 ...’ 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. 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.’

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.
Ibrahim Yaacob knew the English regional term and consistently used ‘Asia Tenggara’ in his book.\textsuperscript{143} Za’ba also employed the term ‘Tenggara Asia’ in his book in 1961.\textsuperscript{144} The Malay newspaper \textit{Berita Harian}, used the two terms: ‘Tenggara Asia’ and ‘Asia Tenggara’ since the 1950s, and ‘Tenggara Asia’ gradually disappeared in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{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.

\textbf{Indonesia}

\textbf{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{143} Ibrahim Yaacob, \textit{Nusa dan Bangsa Melayu}, N. V. Alma Arif: Djakarta, 1951.
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.\textsuperscript{147}

Majapahit was established in East Java in 1293, after the last king of the Singahari dynasty, Kertarajasa, was killed. His son-in-law 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.\textsuperscript{148}

The Dutch first appeared in Banten in 1596, and founded the \textit{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.\textsuperscript{149} Although the VOC went bankrupt because of high military and administrative costs in 1800,\textsuperscript{150} its territorial claims were handed over to the

\textsuperscript{147} M. C. Ricklefs et al., \textit{A New History of Southeast Asia}, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 29-30 and pp. 61-62.
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Netherlands government.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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,
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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. 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.

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.’ 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.’ 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.
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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:
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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
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‘the Eastern Archipelago.’ 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. 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.’ 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 ‘Indunesians’ and ‘Malayunesians’ respectively. In spite of his creation, Earl preferred to use ‘Malayunesians.’ James Logan, a friend of Earl’s, revised ‘Indunesians’ 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. 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

---

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.\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Researches into the Physical History of Mankind}, and argued that among the British, only he used the term ‘Malasia.’\textsuperscript{168} Subsequently N. B. Nannys, an English linguist, mentioned in 1880 the definition of ‘Indonesia,’ abiding by Logan’s scope.\textsuperscript{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 Indie’ (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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{167}Ibid., p. 278n. The Italic is mine.
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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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Indische Vereeniging} (Indies’ Association) was established in 1908, but the students changed its name to \textit{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

\textsuperscript{171} R. E. Elson, ibid., p. 3.
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make the term popular ‘at every possible occasion.’\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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
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*Darah* were also popularly used before the Second World War for the archipelago, 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. 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.

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*, 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.

The young Sukarno also used in his speech in the period that ‘our proud ground was once called *Nusantara*’ 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
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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
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family or stock instinct), explaining an affiliation among the peoples of *Nusantara*. 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. 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, as a reason to exclude Malaya from Indonesia. The territory of Indonesia was laid out based on the one of the Dutch Indies.

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.’ Drekker also argued that ‘it is not racial unity, not unity
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of interests, not unity of language, which form the state, but it is legal unity which
governs the expansion of the state,’\footnote{Ibid.} 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.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 18.} The racial factor was not included in the five
important factors contributing to the growth of Indonesian nationalism, as suggested by
George Kahin.\footnote{George McTurnan Kahin, Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959, pp. 37-41.}

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.\footnote{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.} 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.’\footnote{Joseph Chin Yong Liow, ibid., p. 160.} 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.\footnote{Anthony Milner mentioned this, but does not discuss in his work. See Anthony Milner, The Malays, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, p. 150.}

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
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.’

His later article titled ‘Indonesianism and Pan-Asianism’ also endeavoured to unify Asians under Pan-Asianism in order to defeat colonialism together. 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.’ 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, the Dutch and the Republic of Indonesia, which was not officially recognised yet, signed the Linggadjati agreement in March 1947. The agreement recognised the
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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.’

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,

---

and Burma, to convene the Asia-Africa Conference to solidify relations between regional countries and appeal to eliminate colonialism.\footnote{See on the process for the conference on chapter 4.}

The Asia-Africa Conference was held in April 1955. This meeting was ‘the first intercontinental conference of coloured peoples in the history of mankind.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 39.} 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.\footnote{Ibid., p. 44.} 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.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 50.} This successful conference gave him ‘the opportunity to appear as the great unifier’ in the Third World.\footnote{J. D. Legge, *Sukarno: A political Biography*, Singapore: Archipelago Press, 2003 (Third edition), p. 292.}

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.’\footnote{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.}

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
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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’
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(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.  

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.’ 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.

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. 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!’ This passage shows that
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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.’\(^{210}\) 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
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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. 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. 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.’ 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, 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.
224 English translation was quoted from Mohammad Hatta, Portrait of a Patriot: selected writings by Mohammad Hatta, The Hague: Mouton 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.
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 pendjadahan 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. Even in a 1944 speech regarding future independence, Hatta repeatedly mentioned the term, 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.’ 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,
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Malaya in early December 1941. 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.’

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.’
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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.’ 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. At the time, the then Prime Minister of Japan, Nobusuke Kishi proposed to set up ‘the South East Asian Development Fund’ 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
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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
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and Sutan Sjahrir,\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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
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democratic principles that have been achieved, because of lack of wisdom’ and possibly to prevent war from outside powers.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{243} In the following year his speech shows that he mentioned the same countries as being part of the Southeast Asian region.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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.
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Indonesian foreign policy turned towards a ‘militant policy of struggle and confrontation against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.’ 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.

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.’ That was why the government grouped into the two forces to struggle ‘toward a new world based upon justice.’ 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
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‘Malay Archipelago’ was derived from that meaning and indicated the area that Malays inhabited. 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.