

SECTION A

You must answer Question 1.

INDONESIA'S OPPOSITION TO THE FORMATION OF MALAYSIA

- 1 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

Source A

In the vicinity of Indonesia lie fortresses of imperialism, colonial and semi-colonial countries. To the north lie Malaya, Singapore, Siam, South Vietnam, Sarawak, North Borneo and the Philippines. To the south lie Australia as well as the Christmas Islands and the Cocos Islands, which are under British domination. On the east is East Irian under Australian domination, while West Irian is still under the complete domination of the Dutch imperialists. Indonesia has no frontiers with a country which is already completely liberated from imperialists.

From the writings of D.N. Aidit, the General Secretary of Partai Komunis Indonesia (Communist Party of Indonesia), 1958.

Source B



An illustration by a New Zealand cartoonist, 17 April 1964.

The figures in the cartoon represent the ghost of Adolf Hitler (left), Indonesia President Sukarno (middle) and New Zealand Prime Minister Keith Holyoake (right).

Source C

One of the many reasons – and there are very many – advanced by Indonesian leaders to justify their opposition to Malaysia is that we have never paid them the respect due to Big Brother. Some Indonesia leaders, in particular Dr Subandrio, have complained that we have never looked to Big Brother for guidance, advice and for the salvation of our national soul. I remember Subandrio complaining to the press some two years ago that Tunku Abdul Rahman had never, as a dutiful young brother should, made a pilgrimage to Indonesia to sit at the feet of Sukarno and gather such pearls of wisdom as may be flung at the Tunku.

But today, I think we need not feel so uninhibited about criticising our Indonesian Big Brother. After all, for nearly two years the Indonesia leaders have not only denounced us as colonial stooges, but are now determined to destroy us and ultimately devour us for good.

One reason for this is that many of the Indonesia leaders made their name and reputation by fighting colonialism. It became extremely difficult to re-mould their thinking and their emotions for a different kind of fighting – to fight poverty, to fight for positive things like rebuilding a country's economy. Therefore, it is my belief that the anti-Malaysia stand of the Indonesia leaders derives from the necessity to sustain the illusion that they were still locked in a mortal battle.

*Singapore's Minister for Culture S. Rajaratnam, in a speech made to local journalists,
20 February 1964.*

Source D

Setting another arbitrary date two weeks later, despite the fact that the poll was not completed, showed Britain's utter disregard of the outcome of this puppet survey. I was infuriated. The Indonesian government had been tricked and made to look like a dummy. The subsequent demonstrations of enmity happened because of our bitter sense of betrayal. This high-handed announcement, made while the ascertainment of the people's wishes was only in the opening stages, is ludicrous. Britain never even awaited the outcome of the United Nations' assessment. I state that under the nose of the United Nations, internal conditions in Brunei were cleverly juggled by the colonialists who had considerable rubber, oil, and tin fortunes to lose. Indonesia has been duped and humiliated in the eyes of the whole world. This affront to my country is a personal hurt.

An extract from Sukarno's memoirs, published in 1967.

Source E

The years following the 1955 elections brought many internal problems. Party rivalry was bitter and the conflict between the export-producing outer islands and the urbanised island of Java became more marked. The outbreak of revolts in Sumatra and Sulawesi in 1958 catalysed Sukarno's argument that Western-style parliamentary democracy was unsuitable for Indonesia's particular needs and conditions. In July 1959, the system of 'Guided Democracy' was instituted as an authoritarian alternative to parliamentary arrangements. It strengthened the hand of Sukarno's executive leadership.

This development engendered a climate of political competition in which political parties needed to out-bid each other in strident nationalist rhetoric, in order to preserve their power by demonstrating loyalty. Sukarno's ruling strategy was to reconcile competing political forces by nurturing an overriding sense of national purpose.

Once Sukarno had committed the nation to Confrontation and couched the anti-Malaysia campaign in shrill nationalist terms, neither the army nor PKI could afford to distance itself from the policy and risk losing political legitimacy.

From a dissertation by a Singaporean scholar, published in 2001.

Source F

Strategic intelligence seems to have confirmed the British view that Indonesia was implacably hostile to the creation of Malaysia. For example, in January 1963, the British High Commission in Kuala Lumpur informed London about the latest reports which indicated 'increasing determination on the part of Indonesians to unmask Tunku as a neo-imperialist and to frustrate Malaysia.' In August 1963, a decrypted Indonesian telegram stated unambiguously that 'The anti-Malaysia movement is aimed at the overthrowing of British power in Southeast Asia'.

But a joint Foreign Office/Commonwealth Relations Office paper produced for the new Labour government in January 1965 was more suspicious of Indonesian intentions. It claimed that Indonesian opposition to Malaysia was 'inevitable' because Sukarno had 'a long-cherished ambition to seize Malaya, politically if not territorially'.

An excerpt from an article written by a British academic, published in 2001.

Now answer the following questions:

- (a) Compare and contrast the evidence provided in Sources C and D on the reasons for the breakdown in regional relations in Southeast Asia during the 1960s. [10]
- (b) How far do Sources A-F support the view that Indonesia's decision to oppose the formation of Malaysia was motivated by its desire to eradicate imperialism in the region? [30]

SECTION B

You must answer **two** questions from this section.

You must support each answer with examples drawn from **at least three** countries.

EITHER

- 2 To what extent did mass political participation sustain democracy in independent Southeast Asian countries? [30]

OR

- 3 'Promotion of a dominant culture impeded the attainment of national unity in independent Southeast Asian states.' How far do you agree? [30]

AND EITHER

- 4 To what extent was economic growth consistently a priority for independent Southeast Asian states? [30]

OR

- 5 How resilient were Southeast Asian states in the face of the Asian Financial Crisis of 1997? [30]