EARLY USES AND CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE TERM 'SOUTHEAST ASIA'

Ito Mitsuomi
Joseph M. Fernando

Abstract

This article traces the earlier use and conception of the term 'Southeast Asia' in the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries. In the period not only the term but also several regional terms were used in the United Kingdom and Singapore. The article examines how these terms have been defined and used in English newspapers published in the two countries in the past. The author argues that the term 'South East Asia/Southeast Asia' was well used and the conception recognised before the establishment of the military organization, South East Asia Command (SEAC) in 1943, which made the regional term popular. Though the regional term 'Southeast Asia' became a widely-used term in public after that year, partly because of the development of the area studies of Southeast Asia in the United States, the regional conception varied from one scholar to another by the 1960s. The establishment of the indigenous regional organizations such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) helped to increase recognition and usage of the term and also to reach a consensus on its conception. This article examines the terms for this region used earlier in India, China and Japan, before tracing the emergence of the English usage of the regional terms.

Introduction

Southeast Asia is one of the sub-regions in Asia. It lies south of China, east of India, and north of Australia, geographically dividing

into 'mainland' and 'maritime'. While the former consists of Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam, the latter forms a string of archipelagos in the southern part of the region and includes Brunei, East Leste, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore. This region is among the most diverse region in the world. Climate, ethnic composition, linguistic composition, religions, and government systems all exhibit differences in each country of the region.

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

This article traces the earlier use and conception of the term *Southeast Asia*. It examines how the old and new terms have been defined and used in English newspapers published in the United Kingdom and Singapore in the past. This article will first examine the terms for this region used in India, China and Japan, before tracing the emergence of the English usage of the regional terms. We shall now examine how the neighbouring countries of India, China, and Japan referred to the region known to the West as Southeast Asia.

Terms Used in India, China, and Japan

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

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

the peninsula.'[4] George Coedès also interpreted the term as a reference to Sumatra or the Malay Peninsula. [5] On the other hand, other scholars concluded that the term was used for Lower Burma.[6] Though the Indian term might not have included the whole of modern Southeast Asia, at the very least, the term identified parts of the region.

China used two regional terms in ancient times, namely *Nanhai* (South Sea) and *Nanyang* (South Ocean) to refer to the region. According to Miyazaki Sadaichi, a prominent Japanese scholar on Chinese history, *Nanhai* was defined as a collective term for southern countries in the era of the Emperor Xianzong of the Tang dynasty.[7] *Nanyang* referred to the southern countries from Quanzhou or Guangzhou, where the major international seaports were located. Hence, according to the Chinese, *Nanyang* was divided into two sub-regions, namely the East ocean and the West ocean.[8] While these regional terms had been used since the ninth century, '[i]t was not until the British had confirmed their power in India and sharpened their taste for the China market that the basic condition for a Southeast Asia in-between region appeared during the nineteenth century'.[9]

The scope of *Nanyang* remained unclear till the beginning of the twentieth century, though it was much closer to the modern idea of Southeast Asia.[10] However, with the establishment of *Nanyang Zhibu* (*Tongmeihui* headquarters of South Ocean) in Singapore by Sun Yat-Sen in 1907,[11] the term *Nanyang* became well known among Chinese. Sun Yat-Sen's political campaigns in the region to topple the Qing dynasty attracted much interest among the Chinese within and outside China, and the term *Nanyang* was woven into the fabric of Chinese society. Although the term *Nanyang* was often used, it was gradually replaced by *Dongnanya* (Southeast Asia, literally East-South Asia) after the Second World War. According to Wang Gungwu, it was due to change of an ideological shift against Communist China among Western powers and Deng Xiaoping's economic reforms.[12] While academic journals in China continued to use *Nanyang* between the 1950s and the 1960s, the term disappeared completely from academic journals by the 1980s.[13]

Another neighbouring country, Japan, named the region *Nanyo* (South Ocean), before the term *Tounan Ajia* (Southeast Asia, literally East-South Asia) became widely used. The term *Nanyo* was derived from the Chinese term *Nanyang,* pronounced in the Japanese language. The early use of *Nanyo* dates back to the eighteenth century. According to Shimizu Hajime, the term was first used in *Seiiki Monogatari* (Tales of the Western Regions) by an intellectual, Honda Toshiaki, in 1798. Shimizu argued that the concept of *Nanyo* was almost the same as that of current Southeast Asia.[14] This regional term was popularly associated with the idea of 'southward advance' (Nanshin-ron) during the Meiji

(1868-1912) and the Taisho (1912-1926) eras, indicating the expansion of business and immigrating to the region. During this period, two books on the region were published, namely *Nanyo Jiji* (the South Seas Affairs) by a geographer, Shiga Shigetaka, in 1887, and *Nangokuki* (Travels in Southern Country) by a historian, Takekoshi Yosaburo, in 1910, helped the Japanese people navigate the region.[15]

Although other terms such as *Nanpo* (the South) and *Nanpo-ken* (the Southern sphere) were also popular by the time of the Second World War, *Nanyo* was more frequently used among the Japanese. The region attracted much attention as it was rich in natural resources. The invasion of the region by the Japanese military in 1941 was also to gain access to these resources. After the end of the Second World War, the Japanese terms were gradually replaced with the term *Tounan Ajia* (Southeast Asia)[16] because the older terms, along with *Daitoua* (Greater East Asia), had overtones of military aggression.

While the Asian countries surrounding the region had their own terms and concepts since early times, the emergence of the term *South East Asia* in English, led to Asian countries using the English translation of this term in their local languages. We now examine the regional terms used to describe farthest Asia in English.

The Usage of the Old Terms by the Nineteenth Century

In the eighteenth and nineteenth century present Southeast Asia was not collectively described and was divided into two areas. Modern mainland Southeast Asia was referred to as *Farther/Further India*, while the maritime area was referred to as *the Indian Archipelago* or *Malay Archipelago.* In 1742, the term *Farther India* was used in a newspaper article about the kingdom of Pegu in Burma.[17] The term *Further India*, which has a slight spelling difference, appeared in 1788. A passage in the article stating 'the Peninsula of Further India to the mouth of Ganges' referred to the current mainland area.[18] With regard to the maritime area, the term *Indian Archipelago* was used in 1751 in *The Ipswich Journal*.[19] This term was sometimes used in other newspapers after that. Another term for the same area, *the Malay Archipelago,* appeared in a newspaper, *Inverness Courier*, in 1824.[20]

An attempt was made to define clearly the old terms. Howard Malcom, who travelled as a missionary to the region, defined *Farther India* as 'India beyond the Ganges, embracing Burmah, Asam, Munnipore, Siam, Camboja, and Cochin-China and all the region between China and the Bay of Bengal, south of the Tibet Mountains'.[21] On the other hand, *the Indian Archipelago* covered 'Ceylon, the Laccadives *(Lakshadweep islands in India)*, Maldives, Andaman's Nichobars, Moluccas, Philippines,

Borneo, Sumatra, Java, Celebes, and all their minor neighbors'.[22] The scope of the latter term was more extensive than the concept expounded by J. H. Moor in a publication two years earlier. Moor's definition was straightforward because the scope of the term was almost the same as modern maritime Southeast Asia.[23] In 1905, Hugh Clifford, a British colonial officer, outlined the boundaries of *Farther India*[24] which consisted of Burma, Malaya, Siam, and Indo-China. Unlike Malcom, Clifford narrowed it to only what is now mainland Southeast Asia.[25] This term was relatively commonly used in British newspapers in the second half of the nineteenth century, but was hardly used in the twentieth century.[26]

The term *Indian Archipelago*, on the other hand, was used more often in British newspapers in the late eighteenth century. Growing interest in the Asian islands in the nineteenth century popularized the use of the term, *Indian Archipelago.* A clear definition was made by John Crawfurd in 1820. His concept of *The Indian Archipelago* covered from Sumatra as the most east island to Papua New Guineas as the most west including the Malay Peninsula, and from Java as the most south island to the Philippines as the most north.[27] In short, this term applied to the entire archipelago or what was known as maritime Southeast Asia. Horace John who wrote about the history of the Archipelago[28] thirty years after Crawfurd's publication, adopting the latter's concept. It appears that no writer attempted any further definition of the *Indian Archipelago* till the twentieth century. It might be said that newspaper editors in Britain accepted the definition of the *Indian Archipelago.*

Besides these terms, there was another regional term which was used to describe the whole of the archipelago, namely *the Malay Archipelago*. This regional term became well known after a British naturalist, Alfred Russel Wallace, published *The Malay Archipelago* in 1869. He explained that there were 'a number of large and small islands forming a connected group distinct from those great masses of land, and having little connection with either of them' between Asia and Australia. He named this area *the Malay Archipelago* simply because of the Malay inhabitants in this region.[29] The author writes, '[t]he Malay Archipelago extends for more than 4,000 miles in length from east to west, and is about 1,300 [miles] in breadth from north to south'.[30] As is clear from these passages, the regional term had a concept that was almost similar to that of modern maritime Southeast Asia. Compared with the term, *the Indian Archipelago*, the scope of *the Malay Archipelago* by Wallace was slightly larger because it included the Tenasserim Island in Burma and the Nicobar Islands in India. In fact, the term *the Malay Archipelago* was not created by Wallace. This regional term had appeared in British newspapers in the 1820s.[31] The use of this term subsequently became more frequent after the publication by Wallace in

1869.[32] This book inspired newspaper writers to use it more often. This regional term was also often used along with the *Indian Archipelago* by the twentieth century.

Table 1: The Number of Usage by Year

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

Source: The British Newspaper Archive accessed on 18 and 19 March 2012.

For example, a search in the British Newspaper Archive shows that in the nineteenth century the terms *the Indian Archipelago* and *the Malay Archipelago* were still frequently used. The frequent usage of the former appellation peaked in the 1850s when it was used in 971 articles. As the Table 1 shows, it gradually decreased by the end of the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the usage of *the Malay Archipelago* increased from the 1860s; the term was used in 251 articles in the 1880s, surpassing 224 articles which referred to *the Indian Archipelago*. The usage of *the*

Malay Archipelago further increased, finding its way into 268 articles, exceeding the mention of *the Indian Archipelago* in 114 articles in the 1890s.[33]

The Use of the New Terms in the Nineteenth Century

One of the new terms in English for Southeast Asia emerged between the 1820s and the 1830s. A newspaper, *Bells Weekly Messenger* in 1822 used the term 'south-east of Asia' in an article, defining it as the 'dominion of the waters between the south-east of Asia and south-west of America from the 51st degree of north latitude'.[34] The term did not have the same geographical span as modern day Southeast Asia, as it described a much larger area from China to modern Southeast Asia. The writer of the article perceived the whole area as a single regional unit.

The earliest book to use the other new term *South-Eastern Asia* was *Travels in South-Eastern Asia: Compiled from the most authentic and recent sources,* which was published in 1831.[35] The author is unknown, but this book indicates clearly the scope of the regional term; it embraces 'the British possessions in the East, Hindostan, and the countries adjacent, Caubul, Nepaul, and the Birman empire' and also the vast empire of China, 'which on account of its commerce with England, passing through the hands of the East India Company'.[36] It should be noted that this description was much more extensive than the scope of 'south-east of Asia' in 1822.

Howard Malcom, as mentioned above, published his travelogue of the region and, interestingly, this book has the same title as the previous book published in 1831.[37] While the author did not provide the definition of his 'South-Eastern Asia', judging from the title, it is probable that the four geographic names in the title (Hindustan, Malaya, Siam, and China) indicated the scope of the term. Nevertheless, the attached map in the book shows the regional scope from the East of India to the Indochina Peninsula, the Malay Peninsula and the north of Sumatra Island. The exact demarcation of the region thus remains unclear. Malcom might have construed South-Eastern Asia as a collective term encompassing both *Farther India* and the *Indian Archipelago*. The term *South-Eastern Asia* might have been 'self-evident enough to need no definition'in the author's and readers' opinions. [38] Although Yano Toru argues that his scope of South Eastern Asia might have referred to only modern mainland Southeast Asia excluding most of maritime Southeast Asia,[39] this remains unclear.

The Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia, which was first published in 1847 and became '[t]he first regional scholarly journal',[40] published two articles on Southeast Asia, 'The Ethnology of Eastern

Asia'[41] by J.R. Logan, which had a section entitled 'The ethnology of South Eastern Asia', and 'Contributions to the physical geography of South-Eastern Asia and Australia'[42] by George Windsor Earl. Both of them do not provide us the definition of the term *South(-)Eastern Asia* but it seems clear that while Logan applies the term to modern mainland Southeast Asia, China, and a part of India, Earl uses it only for current mainland Southeast Asia because he distinguished the term *South Eastern Asia* from *the Indian Archipelago* in his article.

After the 1870s, the new terms *South Eastern Asia/South East Asia* were more popularly used. For example, though it is not well known, a book *The land of the elephant: Sights and scenes in South-Eastern Asia* was published by Frank Vincent in 1874. This book does not provide a clear definition of South-Eastern Asia, either, but it was reviewed and advertised in several newspapers. [43] Also, *The Graphic*, a weekly illustrated newspaper, showed a clear and detailed map using the title 'South-Eastern Asia' in 1883, demarcating the region including China, India, Ceylon, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and all present ASEAN countries. [44]

The term *South Eastern Asia*, which was used mainly in travelogues by then, were found in articles on economy such as trading, ship transportation and natural resources, and international politics in the 1890s. At the same time these articles using the term were published in local newspapers in urban and rural areas in British. The same phenomenon was born in U.S.A.[45] with use of some varieties of the regional term, Southeast of Asia and Southeast Asia. [46]

In Singapore, the regional terms were often used in local newspapers. *The Straits Times* started to use the term in 1850.[47] When Joseph Balestier, Consul of the United States to Singapore, was staying on the island, his letter to Secretary of State, John Clayton, was published in the newspaper. The Consul described the term *South Eastern Asia* twice in the letter. In fact, Balestier was appointed in 1849 as 'Special Agent of the United States to Cochin-China and the other portions of South Eastern Asia' by the President, Zachary Taylor, in order to improve relations with Cochinchina, 'negotiate a commercial treaty with Cochinchina', persuade the Siamese to follow the terms of a treaty, and 'negotiate treaties with several principalities' in the Archipelago.[48] As a Special Agent, his reference to the term covered a region corresponding to the whole of modern Southeast Asia. However, the regional term was hardly used for almost the next forty years in the local newspaper since then. It appeared again in 1887 in the newspaper which reported the speech of Holt S. Hallett, a British administrator who simply described the term *South-eastern Asia* as a region roughly between India and China.[49] Another article described the scope of the term in 1898: 'From south

eastern Asia, the Malay Peninsula stretches like a long arm for nearly a thousand miles down into the greatest archipelago on the globe'.[50] This scope covered only the present-day mainland Southeast Asia. Thus, during this period the scope of the term *South Eastern Asia* had two definitions, in which the preferred definition differed depending on the writers. The advent of the twentieth century saw wider use of the term not only in newspapers but also in government documents, academic journals, and corporate documents.

The British government officially started to use the term *South-East Asia* in documents at the start of the twentieth century. When the British government published importation rules in 1919, it used the phrase 'importation to Australia from India, Ceylon, South Eastern Asia, East Indian Islands, Philippine Islands and Japan'.[51] In this context, 'South Eastern Asia' was applied only to the modern mainland Southeast Asia, because it was separately referred from East Indian Islands under the possession of Dutch and the Philippines, which is now labelled as the maritime Southeast Asia. However, the scope was broadened to the whole modern region ten years later. S. P. Waterlow, a British officer in Bangkok, referred to the term in a letter which was sent on 28 May 1928 to Sir Austen Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in which he mentioned that the countries of South-East Asia were 'Siam, India, Burma, Malaya, Indo-China, Hong Kong, Manila and the Dutch Indies'.[52] The British government also published the *Further Correspondence Respecting Siam & South-East Asia: Part 1* in 1928□ which included letters related to South-East Asia for the use of the Foreign Office. Compared with the importation rules in 1919, the scope was extended to the whole of current Southeast Asia. It is unclear why the government referred to Siam and South-East Asia separately in the title but it is noteworthy that government officials had used internally the clearly defined term much earlier than the Second World War, with the scope being enlarged from mainland Southeast Asia only to the whole of present day Southeast Asia.

Academicians also have used the term frequently. When Dr. Stein van Callenfels, a Dutch archaeologist who was 'well known as an authority on the pre-history of the Far East',[54] had an audience with the King Prajadhipok and Queen Rambhai Barni of Thailand in 1931, the professor spoke about 'the Pre-history of South Eastern Asia'.[55] Evidently, the indigenous people of the region had already learnt the term. Dr Callenfels also used the term *South Eastern Asia* in an academic seminar later. In the 3rd Congress of Prehistorians of the Far East in 1938, he gave three presentations on the prehistory of South-East Asia.[56] Although other presenters did not use the regional term, it was widely accepted in the academic circles.

Companies set up in Singapore used the regional term in the names of branch offices. For example, while most insurance companies were established and operated as 'a Singapore branch' or 'an Eastern branch',[57] Federal Life Assurance Company of Canada, a British-Canadian company incorporated in 1882, formed a 'branch of South Eastern Asia' in 1908.[58] This company regularly placed advertisements of the *South Eastern Asia* branch in local newspapers in the 1910s. After this branch was founded, other leading insurance companies such as the Sun Life Insurance, The National Mutual Life Association of Australasia, and The Motor Union Insurance also formed branches in South Eastern Asia.[59] The scope of the term might have had the same definition as that of modern Southeast Asia. It is significant to note here that by using it frequently, corporations clearly gave recognition to the regional term.

Politicians, too, learnt the regional term in this period. On 17 January, 1931, Jawaharlal Nehru, who would later become Prime Minister of India, referred to 'south-eastern Asia' in a letter to his daughter.[60] In the following year, he wrote another letter entitled 'Farther Indian and the East Indies' in which he explained the scope of 'south-east Asia' to his daughter. According to Nehru, the regional definition embraced the mainland and maritime area of modern Southeast Asia.[61] His conceptualization of the regional term was exactly the same as the current regional scope. This passage deserves attention not only because the two regional terms (*Farther India* and *the East Indies*) had been used to respectively identify the mainland and the maritime sections of modern Southeast Asia, but also because the term *south-eastern Asia* was used with the combined conceptualizations of both *Farther India* and *the East Indies*. After the Second World War, *The Discovery of India*,[62] published by Nehru in 1956, discussed the history of relations between India and South East Asia. Judging from the contents of the book, his conceptualization of the term seems to be the same as his earlier conceptualization in 1932.

Increased Popularity of the Term *South East Asia*, Post-1940s

The term *South East Asia* leapt to public attention in the 1940s. As scholars emphasized, the formation of SEAC in 1943 made the term more prevalent. Although the military body had no stable regional concept for political reasons, its formation was an important step towards official identification of the region. Initially, the organization covered only Burma, Malaya, Siam, Singapore, and Sumatra. French Indo-China was controlled by Chiang Kai-shek, who became the President of the Republic of China later on. The Philippines was then under the control of the United States. Subsequently, Borneo, Celebes and Java islands

were covered by SEAC.[63] South East Asia was separately controlled by several external powers because of political reasons. Nevertheless, the term *South East Asia* began to gain recognition uniting the region of *Farther India* and *the Indian/Malay Archipelago*. It was, therefore, logical to identify the region as *South East Asia* after the name of the military body. In this sense, Fifield was right in saying that the formation of SEAC 'was a major step in the military and political identification of the region'.[64]

In addition, since the 1940s, there has been increased research in area studies of South East Asia. Scholars began to focus on the region 'as a new "space" 'for academic concentration as part of an Anglo-American movement which established 'area studies' as a legitimate and important field of academic endeavor'.[65] However, as there was no consensus regarding the regional definition among researchers, the scope of the region varied with each scholar. Furnivall's book in 1941[66] was the earliest academic work which had the regional term in its title, subsequently, by 1943 he wrote three books on the region.[67] In all his books, Furnivall's interpretation of the region included modern day Southeast Asia as well as India and Formosa (Taiwan). John Christian, who analyzed the literature of the region, defined the regional concept as one which included the Yunnan province in China.[68] Lennox Mills edited the special issue on Southeastern Asia and the Philippines in an American journal in 1943,[69] isolating the Philippines from the grouping, but his book published in 1949 included the island country into the region.[70] Helmut Callis and Rupert Emerson's books in 1942[71] covered Taiwan, but Emerson added Hong Kong in the region. K.M. Panikkar, a prominent Indian scholar, excluded the Philippines from the region.[72]

Even after the end of the World War, the scope of the region differed from the current understanding of the regional term. First, *The Journal of Politics* in 1947, which focused on politics in the Asian region, saw modern day Southeast Asia as being divided into four areas, namely the Netherlands East Indies, the Philippines, French Indo-China, and British Southeast Asia. There was a different writer for each area. Duncan Hall, who wrote about British Southeast Asia, embraced Ceylon (Sri Lanka) as a part of the region.[73] Second, Virginia Thompson, an expert in Thai studies, separated the Philippines from the region. Even her subsequent book published in 1955 excluded the Philippines from the region.[74]

Regional concepts among scholars in the 1950s were 'flexible'. With the development of area studies of South East Asia, the publication of books and journals on the region considerably increased in the 1950s. While H.J. van Mook defined South East Asia as the region covering 'Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, French Indo-China, Malaya, Indonesia, the Philippines, and the smaller territories of British Borneo and Portuguese Timor',[75] D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia* in 1955

(first edition) hesitated to include the Philippines because it was 'outside the mainstream of historical developments'.[76] But the second edition (1964) included the country. Probably Tibor Mende's concept of South East Asia had the widest scope of the region among scholars in the period, as it included India, Pakistan, and Ceylon into the region.[77] In the works by Army Vandenbosch and Richard Butwell, and George Kahin,[78] the scope of the region used by them then and that of modern day South East Asia are similar. The former clearly listed the countries which comprised the region in 1967, and provided justification for doing so. The region is 'forced by physical circumstances to be wholly internally oriented'. It is because 'high mountains divide the area from China and India to the north… and oceans from natural boundaries to the east, south, and west'.[79] The latter grouped the present Southeast Asian countries together without any clear definition.

As discussed above, the regional concept varied from one writer to another even in the 1950s. This phenomenon of 'flexible concepts' was reflected not only in the academic circle, but also in the political arena. Although the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), which was formed in 1954, derived its name from the regional term, the term was not clearly defined. Considering that many scholars had different conceptualizations of the regional term, the articles laid out in the treaty described vaguely the scope of the term in the phrase 'general area of South East Asia, including also the entire territories of the Asian Parties'.[80] This 'general area' is evidence that the military body itself was not able to clearly demarcate the regional concept. This organization, as Liefer said, was to protect Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam from communists.[81] Though the countries under its protection included those in modern day Southeast Asia, its actual members were only Thailand and the Philippines. Some of the abovementioned scholars excluded the Philippines from the definition of the regional term, but the Philippines recognized itself as a member of South East Asia. The Philippines included itself in SEATO because of 'an opportunity to develop close relations with Asian states'.[82]

While the 1960s saw a consensus among scholars being gradually built up partly because of the formation of indigenous regional organizations, different concepts of the region still prevailed in this period. John Cady and Nicholas Tarling explain the history of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands under the Republic of India in their books. Tarling places emphasis on the inclusion of the islands in the region and pointed out that 'the establishment of territorial dominion in India and the development of trade to China gave the Andaman and Nicobar Islands their importance in British policy in the late eighteenth century'.[83] This implies that the inclusion of the islands was from a

historical point of view based on the British policy. Denis Warner's definition of the regional concept excludes Burma and the Philippines.[84] Another scholar, George Coedès, also excludes the Philippines and the north of Vietnam on the grounds that they were not historically *Indianized* along with the Assam region. [85]

When a consensus regarding a common regional definition was almost reached among scholars, indigenous political leaders had slightly different regional conceptualizations. Indigenous regional organizations such as Association of South East Asia (ASA) and Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)[86] were formed in 1961 and 1967 respectively. During the formation of ASEAN, these political leaders invited Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) to join the organization. The government of Ceylon rejected the invitation, thus the island country did not become a member of Southeast Asia,[87] but it is clear here that ASEAN leaders recognized Ceylon as being part of the region.

Further, it is interesting that local political leaders did not recognize the two countries as being part of Southeast Asia. Although the Republic of China (Taiwan) expressed a desire to join ASA in 1966, ASA leaders turned down its request to become a member. It seems that this rejection was due partly to the People's Republic of China, with which all ASA members had no diplomatic relations. Thai officials expressed their opinion that 'China is not in Southeast Asia'.[88] The other country of interest which is not part of Southeast Asia today is Pakistan. Pakistan, a member of SEATO which was dissolved in 1977, was included in Southeast Asia as per the definition of the military organization. Some scholars in the 1950s also included this country in the region. However, there is no evidence that ASA and ASEAN leaders had invited Pakistan to join their organizations. Geographically, the Muslim country had territories to the west and east of India; when Pakistan's territory to the east of India gained independence in 1971, it became Bangladesh, and it is located directly beside Burma. For this reason, some scholars considered including that territory into the region, but the regional organizations did not accept the country as a member of the region probably because of diplomatic relations between the organizations' members and India.

Conclusion

In the nineteenth century, the area that we know today as Southeast Asia was divided into two regions, namely *Farther India* that referred to mainland Southeast Asia and *the Indian/Malay Archipelago* that referred to maritime Southeast Asia. Though the term *South East(ern) Asia* was also used during this period, it was re-defined to embrace the scopes of

the two aforementioned terms at the beginning of the twentieth century. This redefined term has been commonly used by government officials, scholars, writers and corporate managers since then. The prevalent definition of the regional term recognizes the region as that which includes the mainland area as well as the maritime areas.

When the military organization, SEAC, was set up in 1943 to defend member countries from communism, its name included the phrase *South East Asia*, which was not exactly a newly-coined term. The term had been 'inherited' from the pre-War era, as well as the years after the War. Nevertheless, it is significant that SEAC operated beyond the two areas (mainland and maritime), playing an important role to further promote recognition of the region.

The following years saw area studies of the region being given much attention in the United States, and this resulted in the publication of numerous books and journals on South East Asia. Nevertheless, the definition of South East Asia still varied from one scholar to another for about twenty years, before a consensus on the regional term among scholars was reached in the 1960s. The establishment of indigenous regional organisations (ASA and ASEAN) acted as a catalyst for the increase in recognition and usage of the concept of Southeast Asia.

Notes

[1]   O. W. Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce: A study of the origins of Srivijaya*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967, pp. 31-48 and C. P. Fitzgerald, 'Early Chinese contacts with South-East Asia', pp. 39-54, in Geoff Wade (ed.), *China and Southeast Asia: Routledge Library on Southeast Asia, Volume I: Introduction and history to the fourteenth century*, London: Routledge, 2009.

[2]   Colin Jack-Hilton, 'Marco Polo in South-East Asia: A preliminary essay in reconstruction', *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, Vol. 5 (1964), p. 84.

[3]   Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese: Studies in the historical geography of the Malay Peninsula before A.D. 1500*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1961, pp. 177-179.

[4]   Ibid., p. 182.

[5]   George Coedès, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1968.

[6]   Kanai Lai Hazra, *History of Theravada Buddhism in South-East Asia*, Munshiram Manoharlal, 1982, p. 58.

[7]   Miyazaki Ichisada, 'Nanyo wo touzaiyouni wakatsu konkyo nitsuite (Evidences divided the East and the West ocean in the South ocean)', *Toyoshi Kenkyu* Vol. 7, No. 4 (1942), p. 200.

[8]   Ibid.

[9]   Wang Gungwu, 'Two Perspectives of Southeast Asian Studies', in Paul H Kratoska, Remco Raben, and Henk Schulte Nordholt, *Locating Southeast*

Asia: Geographies of knowledge and politics of space, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005, pp. 64-65.

[10]   Ibid., p. 65.

[11]   See his activities in *Nanyang* to Yen Ching-hwang, 'Tongmenghui, Sun Yat-Sen and the Chinese in Singapore and Malaya: A Revisit', in Leo Suryadinata (ed.), *Tongmenghui, Sun Yat-Sen and the Chinese in Southeast Asia: A Revisit*, Singapore: Chinese Heritage Centre, 2006, p. 117.

[12]   Wang Gungwu, 'Two Perspectives of Southeast Asian Studies', pp. 64-65.

[13]   Ibid., p. 69.

[14]   Shimizu Hajime, 'Southeast Asia as a Regional Concept in Modern Japan', in Paul H. Kratoska et al., *Locating Southeast Asia: Geographies of Knowledge and Politics of Space*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005, pp. 85-86.

[15]   See the analysis for the two books in Yano Toru, *Nanshin no Keihu (The lineage of southern expansion)*, Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha, 1975, pp. 55-64.

[16]   This term was used in text books in elementary and middle school immediately after the First World War. See Shimizu Hajime,   pp. 82-112.

[17]   *Newcastle Courant*, 25 Sept. 1742, p. 2.

[18]   *Norfolk Chronicle*, 21 June 1788, p. 2.

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

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

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

[22]   Ibid., p. 134.

[23]   J. H. Moor, *Notices of the Indian Archipelago, and adjacent countries*, Vol. I, Singapore, 1837, p. iv.

[24]   Hugh Clifford, *Further India: Being the Story of Exploration from Earliest Times in Burma, Malaya, Siam and Indo-China*, London: Alston Rivers, limited, 1905.

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

[26]   See Table 1.

[27]   John Crawfurd, *History of the Indian Archipelago Containing an Account of the Manners, Arts, Languages, Religions, Institutions, and Commerce of Its Inhabitants*, London: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 1820, pp. 2-7.

[28]   John, Horace St., *The Indian Archipelago: Its History and Present State*, London: Longman, 1853, p. 4.

[29]   Alfred Russel Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago*, Oxford: John Beaufoy Publishing, 2009, p. 1.

[30]   Ibid., pp. 2-3.

[31]   See *Royal Cornwall Gazette*, 9 Dec. 1820, p. 4, *Leads Intelligencer*, 28 Oct. 1824, p. 3, *Northampton Mercury*, 30 Oct. 1824, p. 1 and so on.

[32]   See the Table 1.

[33]   See the Table 1.

34   *Bells Weekly Messenger*, 7 July, 1822, p. 4, *Royal Cornwall Gazette*, 13 July, 1822, p. 4. Both papers used the same article titled 'Pretentions of Russia' by Sir James Mackintosh who was a professor in the East India Company's College in Britain.

35   *Travels in South-Eastern Asia: Compiled from the Most Authentic and Recent Sources*, London: C.J.G. and F. Rivington, 1831.

36   Ibid., p. v.

37   Haward Malcom, *Travels in South-Eastern Asia: Embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam, and China*, Boston: Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln, 1839.

38   Donald Emmerson, '"Southeast Asia": What's in a Name?', *Journal of Southeast Asia Studies,* Vol. 15, No. 1, 1984, p. 5.

39   Yano Toru, *Tonan ajia sekai no kouzu: Seijiteki seitaishikan no tachibakara (Structures of Southeast Asian World: From View of Point of Political Ecological History)*, Tokyo: Nihon housou kyoukai, 1984, p. 18.

40   Anthony Reid, 'A Saucer Model of Southeast Asian Identity', *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 27, No. 1, 1999, p. 12.

41   J.R. Logan, 'The Ethnology of Eastern Asia', *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Vol. 4 1850.

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

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

44   *The Graphic*, 22 Sept. 1883, p. 28.

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

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

47   The term is found in an article 'The American Trade with the East', *The Straits Times*, 17 Sept. 1850, p. 4.

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

49   *The Straits Times*, 12 July, 1887, p. 3.

50   *The Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser*, 17 Jan. 1898, p. 3.

51   *The Straits Times*, 14 Jan. 1919, p. 6.
52   Ibid., p. 76.
53   *Further Correspondence Respecting Siam and South-East Asia: Part 1*, 1928, FO422/85.
54   *The Straits Times*, 2 Jan. 1935, p. 11.
55   Ibid., 12 Dec. 1931, p. 12.
56   *Proceedings of the Third Congress of Prehistrians of the Far East*, Singapore: The Government Printing Office, 1940.
57   Commercial Union Assurance Company, Limited. had a Eastern branch. See to *Weekly Sun*, 8 Oct. 1910, p. 1.
58   *The Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser,* 21 Nov. 190, p. 12.
59   *The Straits Times*, 3 Feb. 1908, p. 22, 12 June, 1912, p. 3 for The National Mutual Life Association of Australiasia, Limited and 6 July, 1918, p. 14 for The Motor Union Insurance Co., LTD.
60   Jawaharlal Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, Asia Publishing House, 1962, p. 31.
61   Ibid., pp. 483-490.
62   Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, London: Meridian Books, 1956, pp. 192-199.
63   Russell Fifield, 'The Concept of Southeast Asia; Origins, Development, and Evolution', *South-East Asian Spectrum*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Oct. 1975, p. 44.
64   Ibid., p. 43.
65   Philip Charrier, 'ASEAN's inheritance; The Regionalization of Southeast Asia, 1941-61', *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 2001, p. 317.
66   J. S. Furnivall, *Progress and welfare in Southeast Asia: A comparison of colonial policy and practice*, New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1941.
67   J. S. Furnivall, *Problems of Education in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1942 and *Educational progress in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943.
68   For example, John L. Christian, 'Recent Literature Relating to Southeast Asia', *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 4, Aug. 1942, Robert Heine-Geldern 'Conceptions of State and Kingship in Southeast Asia', Vol. 2, No. 1,Nov. 1942, Kenneth Perry Landon, 'Nationalism in Southeastern Asia', Vol. 2, No. 2, Feb. 1943, Rupert Emerson, 'An Analysis of Nationalism in Southeast Asia', Vol. 5, No. 2, Feb. 1946.
69   Lennox A. Mills (ed.), 'Southeastern Asia and the Philippines', *Annals of the American Academy of Politics and Social Science*, Vol. 226, March, 1943.
70   Lennox A. Mills (ed.), *The New World of Southeast Asia*, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1949, p. 3.
71   Helmut Callis, *Foreign capital in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institution of Pacific Relations, 1942, and Rupert Emerson, Lennox Mills, and Virginia Thompson, *Government and Nationalism in Southeast Asia*, New York: Institution of Pacific Relations, 1942.
72   K.M. Panikkar, *The Future of South-East Asia: an Indian View*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943.
73   Duncan H. Hall, 'Post-war Government and Politics of British South East Asia', *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1947, pp. 692-716.

74   Virginia McLean Thompson, *Labor problems in Southeast Asia*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947. Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, *Minority problems in Southeast Asia*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955.

75   H.J. van Mook, *The Stakes of Democracy in South-East Asia*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1950, p. 33.

76   D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, London: Macmillan, 1955, p. 3.

77   Tibor Mende, *South-East Asia between Two Worlds*, London: Turnstile Press, 1955.

78   Army Vandenbosch and Richard Butwell, *Southeast Asia among the world powers*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1957. George Kahin (ed.), *Governments and Politics of Southeast Asia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959.

79   Army Vandenbosch and Richard Butwell, *The Changing Face of Southeast Asia*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967, pp. 3-4.

80   Leszek Buszynski, *SEATO: The Failure of an Alliance Strategy*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1983, p. 229.

81   Michael Liefer, *Dilemmas of Statehood in Southeast Asia*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1972, p. 134.

82   Leszek Buszynski, *SEATO: The Failure of an Alliance Strategy*, p. 58.

83   John Frank Cady, *Southeast Asia: Its historical development*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964. Nicholas Tarling, *Southeast Asia: Past and Present*, Melbourne: F. W. Cheshire, 1966, p. 142.

84   Denis Warner, *Reporting South-East Asia*, Sydney: Argus and Robertson, 1966.

85   George Coedès, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1968, p. xv. This book is a translation. The original book in French was published in 1947.

86   The spelling of South East Asia of the names follows the original at the time of the formation.

87   *The Straits Times*, 9 Oct. 1967, p. 1.

88   Estrella D. Solidum, *Towards a Southeast Asian Community*, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1974, p. 44.