

Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) After 50 Years: Impacts towards Malaysia's Security

Noraini Zulkifli & Mohd Ridwan Zainal Abidin

Department of International Relations, Security, and Law, Faculty of Defence Studies and Management, National Defence University of Malaysia, 57000 Kuala Lumpur

Received: 20.06.2025 | Accepted: 25.07.2025 | Published: 02.08.2025

*Corresponding Author: Noraini Zulkifli

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.16729012](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16729012)

Abstract

Original Research Article

This study explores the enduring significance of the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) in shaping Malaysia's security landscape over five decades. Through a comprehensive analysis of its historical evolution, structural components, and role within the ASEAN region, this research highlights the FPDA's contributions to regional stability. Defined by resilience, adaptability, and a sustained commitment to security cooperation, the FPDA has played a crucial role in safeguarding sovereignty and stability for Malaysia and Singapore. Its influence extends beyond military collaboration, encompassing strategic dialogue and responses to emerging security challenges, solidifying its status as a cornerstone of Southeast Asia's defence architecture. Employing a qualitative approach, this study examines the FPDA's trajectory from 1971 to 2021 by analyzing historical records, policy documents, and expert perspectives. The findings underscore the FPDA's ongoing relevance in addressing evolving security threats, enhancing defence capabilities, and fostering multilateral cooperation. The study concludes that the FPDA's adaptability and strategic foresight have ensured its continued effectiveness in navigating regional security complexities. By facilitating defence interoperability, promoting diplomatic engagement, and responding to geopolitical shifts, the FPDA remains integral to maintaining peace, stability, and collective security in Southeast Asia. As geopolitical dynamics evolve, the FPDA's ability to bridge capability gaps and expand security cooperation will be crucial in reinforcing its strategic value. This study affirms the FPDA's indispensable role in shaping Malaysia's defence posture and strengthening Southeast Asia's broader security framework, ensuring its long-term relevance in an increasingly complex security environment.

Keywords: Australia, Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA), Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore, the United Kingdom.

Citation: Zulkifli, N., & Zainal Abidin, M. R. (2025). Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) after 50 years: Impacts towards Malaysia's security. *Global Academic and Scientific Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies (GASJMS)*, 3(6), 23-34.

INTRODUCTION

Between 1970 and 2020, Malaysia's security architecture underwent significant transformation, shaped by domestic, regional, and global developments. The country has successfully navigated historical conflicts and insurgencies, while adapting to modern threats such as pandemics, terrorism, and cyber vulnerabilities. This evolution reflects Malaysia's resilience and strategic foresight in ensuring national stability and regional harmony. Malaysia's engagement with multilateral security arrangements most notably the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) has been pivotal in this trajectory. The FPDA has enabled Malaysia to contribute to cooperative defence efforts and strengthen deterrence in a shifting geopolitical context (Guan, 2011a). Through its emphasis on consultation and collaboration, the FPDA supports

Malaysia's broader aims of safeguarding national interests and promoting citizen welfare. The FPDA's geographical scope encompasses Singapore, Peninsular Malaysia, the Straits of Malacca, and the South China Sea critical maritime zones vital to global trade. The FPDA plays a foundational role in securing these waterways, which are susceptible to piracy, geopolitical competition, and environmental threats (Sari, 2019). Motivated by Britain's military withdrawal from the region in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the FPDA was designed to fill the resulting strategic vacuum. Malaysia and Singapore, as former British colonies, faced heightened vulnerabilities during this period. Their decision to forge a regional defence partnership alongside the UK, Australia, and New Zealand reflected the urgency of sustaining a credible deterrence posture and building interoperability among likeminded states (Tan, 2008; Emmers, 2012).

The FPDA operates through regular joint exercises, intelligence exchanges, and coordinated patrols. These practices enhance readiness and ensure rapid response capabilities against evolving threats. The framework's effectiveness is rooted in mutual trust and long-standing bilateral relationships among its members. Historical connections particularly those between Malaysia, Singapore, and the United Kingdom have provided a strong foundation for sustained collaboration (Thayer, 2007). While countries like Germany and Thailand possess substantial defence capabilities, their exclusion from the FPDA stems from geographical and strategic factors. Germany's location outside Southeast Asia, and Thailand's focus on different subregional dynamics, limit their direct relevance to FPDA objectives (Bristow, 2005; Thayer, 2011). Nonetheless, Thailand remains engaged in broader regional mechanisms, such as the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting (ADMM) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), which address Southeast Asia's wider security concerns. Australia and New Zealand's inclusion reflects their Commonwealth ties and established defence cooperation with the United Kingdom. Military interoperability, joint training, and the broader ANZUS alliance further deepen their strategic integration with FPDA priorities (Keating, 2006; Guan, 2011b).

While countries such as Germany and Thailand possess notable defence capabilities and engage in various security partnerships, they lack the depth of historical and strategic ties with the core member states of the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA). This absence of established bilateral defence relations helps explain why they are not included in the FPDA framework (Chen, 2022). Their exclusion, however, does not diminish their contributions to regional and global security. Many countries pursue cooperative security initiatives through frameworks that better reflect their own geopolitical contexts, strategic interests, and regional alliances. The core member states of the FPDA Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom benefit from long-standing historical relationships and shared defense commitments, which have significantly shaped the formation and effectiveness of the arrangement. These relationships foster trust, interoperability, and mutual understanding, enabling more cohesive responses to evolving security challenges (Chen, 2022).

ASEAN, comprising ten Southeast Asian nations, plays a pivotal role in promoting peace, stability, and security across the region. It provides robust platforms for dialogue and cooperation on a broad range of issues, including defence and strategic coordination. Thailand, as an active ASEAN member, contributes significantly to regional security efforts through its involvement in mechanisms such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting (ADMM). The ARF facilitates multilateral security dialogue and confidence-building measures (CBMs) among ASEAN countries and external partners. It serves as a key forum for addressing emerging threats, exchanging perspectives, and fostering strategic trust. Similarly, the ADMM supports practical defence collaboration and serves as a space where ministers can enhance mutual understanding and develop coordinated responses to regional concerns (Thayer, 2011).

Although the FPDA operates independently of ASEAN, its focus on maritime security in critical zones like the Straits of Malacca and the South China Sea complements ASEAN's broader objectives. Regional security mechanisms such as the ARF and ADMM offer meaningful opportunities for states like Thailand to engage in collaborative defence initiatives, address shared challenges, and contribute to sustained peace and stability in Southeast Asia (Montratama, 2018).

THE SHIFT FROM AMDA TO THE FPDA

The expansion of the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) through the inclusion of Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand significantly deepened its scope and capacity for regional defence cooperation. This multilateral framework allowed member nations to pool resources, capabilities, and strategic expertise, creating a more comprehensive and resilient response mechanism to evolving security challenges in Southeast Asia (Amador, 2013). By distributing responsibilities across multiple participants, the FPDA promotes equitable burden-sharing. Each member contributes its distinct strengths, leading to synergistic defence outcomes that no single nation could achieve alone. This shared commitment fosters collective ownership, mutual trust, and cost efficiency, ultimately enhancing the arrangement's operational effectiveness. Crucially, the FPDA benefits from the diversity of strategic perspectives among its members. Each country offers unique military experiences, regional insights, and defence postures, which enrich collective deliberations and broaden strategic assessments. Such inclusivity encourages nuanced defence planning, mutual understanding, and the development of robust and adaptive security strategies (Henderson, 2011).

The FPDA's emphasis on regular joint exercises, intelligence sharing, and coordinated military operations improves interoperability among its armed forces. This alignment across doctrines, procedures, and communications systems is vital for swift and coordinated responses during crises or conflicts. Additionally, the FPDA serves as a vital platform for diplomatic engagement and confidence-building measures (CBMs). Routine consultations promote transparency, reduce misperceptions, and facilitate peaceful resolution of disputes key to preserving regional stability in the face of unpredictable geopolitical shifts (Pratama & Candra, 2014).

The transition from the Anglo-Malayan Defence Agreement (AMDA) to the multilateral FPDA framework marked a strategic shift toward broader regional inclusivity. This evolution brought tangible benefits: diversified viewpoints, shared responsibilities, improved operational readiness, and enhanced diplomatic coordination, all contributing to a more cohesive security environment in Southeast Asia (Marsh, 2020). The FPDA Communique, established in 1971, emerged as a strategic response to Britain's military withdrawal from the "East of Suez." This retreat part of a wider recalibration of British global presence raised immediate concerns over security vacuums in Malaysia and Singapore, both of which had been heavily reliant on British defence infrastructure (Maharani, 2016). To address these vulnerabilities and sustain stability, the



FPDA was formed as a multilateral successor to AMDA (1957). Unlike its predecessor, which was limited to bilateral cooperation, the FPDA broadened its scope to incorporate multiple nations, while preserving British defence engagement in the region (Ong & Ho, 2005). The arrangement allowed the UK to maintain strategic influence through institutionalised multilateralism, reflecting a continuity of its legacy in postcolonial Southeast Asia.

Evolution of FPDA 1971 – 2021

A. Formation and Early Years (1971-1980s)

The establishment of the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) in 1971 represented a significant milestone in regional defence collaboration within Southeast Asia. Its creation was a direct response to the strategic vacuum resulting from the British military withdrawal from East of Suez. In recognising the imperative to maintain regional stability and security, member states namely Malaysia, Singapore, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand are collectively formalised the FPDA as a multilateral defence framework (Wey, 2016). During its initial phase, the FPDA prioritised the development of cooperative mechanisms among its members. Regular consultations and defence dialogues were convened to foster both bilateral and multilateral ties. These engagements provided a structured platform for member nations to exchange views, address common security concerns, and build strategic trust among their respective armed forces. Joint military exercises were central to these early efforts, with the aim of enhancing interoperability, operational coordination, and collective preparedness. Through such exercises, the FPDA facilitated the alignment of defence procedures and doctrine among participating states, thereby strengthening shared defence capabilities. Equally vital was the emphasis on information and intelligence sharing. Member countries recognised the value of collaborative strategic assessment to boost situational awareness and improve response readiness. These exchanges cultivated a common understanding of evolving security threats and enabled coordinated decision-making. The initial focus on structured defence cooperation, joint exercises, and strategic information sharing laid the groundwork for enduring military relationships among FPDA members. These activities fostered trust, supported meaningful dialogue, and enhanced mutual understanding of national defence policies and operational cultures. Ultimately, the FPDA became an essential platform for deepening both bilateral and multilateral engagement in the regional security domain (Bateman, 2007).

B. Maritime Security and Regional Stability (1990s)

During the 1990s, the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) underwent a significant strategic recalibration, shifting its emphasis toward maritime security and the consolidation of regional stability. This evolution was prompted by growing awareness of the geostrategic importance of the Straits of Malacca and the South China Sea, both vital maritime corridors facilitating extensive global trade and

commerce. Recognising the critical role these sea lanes play not only for member states but also for the international community, FPDA stakeholders intensified efforts to safeguard their stability and address emerging threats (Bristow, 2005). In response, coordinated maritime patrols and joint exercises were institutionalised as key operational components of the FPDA framework. Member countries engaged in joint naval patrols to monitor these strategic waterways, aiming to counter piracy, illicit activities, and broader maritime security threats. These activities fostered shared responsibility and demonstrated a unified commitment to regional security. Concurrently, the FPDA prioritised joint training focused on maritime operations. Such exercises enhanced naval interoperability and facilitated seamless coordination among member states' maritime forces. They offered opportunities to simulate and refine surveillance, interdiction, and crisis response capabilities, thereby improving operational effectiveness in real-world scenarios. Through these concerted maritime initiatives, the FPDA significantly strengthened its collective ability to respond to evolving security challenges. The sustained focus on maritime exercises and patrols contributed to the resilience of regional defence architecture and the protection of critical sea lanes (Emmers, 2011).

C. Engagement with Non-Traditional Security Challenges (2000s)

In the 2000s, the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) broadened its operational focus to include non-traditional security threats reflecting a strategic shift in response to changing regional dynamics. This expansion addressed emerging challenges such as counterterrorism, piracy, and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR), which were increasingly recognised as significant risks to regional stability (Thayer, 2011). Counterterrorism became a pressing concern during this period due to the rise of extremist movements and transnational terrorist networks. FPDA member states intensified cooperation in intelligence sharing and jointly conducted training programmes aimed at enhancing surveillance, counterinsurgency, and crisis response capabilities. These initiatives supported a more cohesive regional approach to combatting terrorist threats. Simultaneously, growing maritime trade across Southeast Asia elevated the risk of piracy, particularly in vulnerable sea lanes. FPDA countries responded by coordinating maritime patrols and establishing mechanisms for real-time information exchange. These efforts yielded a notable decline in piracy incidents and reinforced maritime security (Thayer, 2011).

In addition to military preparedness, the FPDA recognised the importance of proactive engagement in humanitarian operations. Joint exercises and coordination mechanisms were developed to improve HADR readiness. Member states shared best practices, resources, and operational insights, enhancing their collective capacity to respond to natural disasters and humanitarian emergencies. This cooperation not only increased resilience but also reinforced regional solidarity in times of crisis. To align with broader regional priorities, the FPDA strengthened dialogue with external partners, notably the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).



Engagements through platforms such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting (ADMM) allowed FPDA members to harmonise their efforts with ASEAN's wider security agenda and reinforce trust-based cooperation (Rolls, 2010).

D. Enhanced Interoperability and Information Sharing (2010s)

In the 2010s, the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) placed renewed emphasis on enhancing interoperability and information sharing among its member states. This strategic focus reflected the growing recognition that seamless coordination and integrated operational readiness were critical in addressing complex and rapidly evolving security threats across the region (Cotton, 2013). To deepen integration across armed forces, the FPDA prioritised joint training and multidimensional exercises simulating diverse scenarios from humanitarian crises to hybrid threats. These exercises evolved in complexity, shifting the operational paradigm from isolated national capabilities to fully integrated joint operations, where personnel from multiple member countries operated in synchronised deployments. Such activities strengthened procedural understanding, improved tactical coordination, and fostered mutual trust among defence forces.

The FPDA advanced its mechanisms for intelligence cooperation and strategic information exchange. Member states acknowledged the increasing fluidity of contemporary security challenges and responded by establishing platforms for the timely sharing of intelligence. These efforts significantly enhanced situational awareness, enabling earlier threat detection and more effective joint responses. Intelligence collaboration became essential for FPDA's capability to manage both traditional and non-traditional risks. To institutionalise these practices, the FPDA introduced a range of dialogues, workshops, and technical seminars that facilitated the exchange of operational experiences, technological innovations, and lessons learned (Meng, 2014). These settings allowed member countries to identify capability gaps, strengthen interoperability, and collectively refine their defence strategies. The FPDA's continued focus on integration and collaboration demonstrated its adaptability to the evolving regional security architecture, affirming that no single nation can address multidimensional threats alone. By strengthening joint capabilities and fostering deeper cooperation, the FPDA reinforced its role not only as a defence arrangement but as a contributor to wider regional security and strategic resilience (Simon, 2009).

E. Modernisation and Capability Development (2010s)

Throughout the 2010s, member states of the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) undertook extensive modernisation initiatives to strengthen their collective defence posture. This period reflected a concerted response to shifting regional threat landscapes and rapid technological advancement. Modernisation efforts included substantial

investments in the procurement and upgrading of military assets, enhancing both conventional and strategic capabilities. A core component of this transformation involved the acquisition of advanced naval platforms, including frigates, submarines, and patrol vessels. These upgrades significantly enhanced the FPDA's maritime operational reach—enabling coordinated surveillance, sea lane patrolling, and swift reaction to emerging maritime threats (Arshad et al., 2020). Parallel developments were seen in aerial capabilities, with member countries acquiring state-of-the-art fighter aircraft and air defence systems. These assets facilitated joint air operations such as coordinated patrols, aerial interceptions, and combat readiness exercises contributing to airspace security and strategic deterrence across the FPDA's operational theatre. In addition, substantial improvements were made in surveillance and intelligence systems. Investments in cutting-edge radar technologies, satellite-based monitoring platforms, and command-and-control systems bolstered situational awareness and improved early warning and threat detection capacities. This technological enhancement enabled more agile and responsive engagement with evolving security dynamics (Ye, 2020).

Complementing these hardware upgrades was a strategic push towards joint force integration, interoperability, and coordinated planning. The FPDA prioritised cross-national military collaboration through joint exercises, personnel exchanges, and shared training initiatives. These efforts aimed to harmonise operational procedures and maximise the efficiency of combined responses to regional challenges. Regular strategic consultations and planning sessions became institutionalised within the FPDA framework. These activities enabled member states to synchronise defence strategies, conduct shared threat assessments, and allocate resources more effectively resulting in a more unified and responsive regional security architecture. The cumulative effect of these modernisation and coordination efforts was a measurable enhancement of the FPDA's operational readiness. By expanding its technological base, integrating forces, and deepening strategic cooperation, the FPDA reinforced its relevance as a dynamic and adaptive defence arrangement within the Asia-Pacific region. These initiatives helped maintain stability, address emerging threats, and ensure the continued resilience of the regional security environment (Niessl, 2020).

F. Adapting to Changing Regional Dynamics (2020s)

In the 2020s, the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) continued to demonstrate strategic responsiveness to evolving regional dynamics, particularly with regard to the intensifying geopolitical tensions in the South China Sea. Recognising the strategic significance of this maritime domain—marked by territorial disputes and increasing militarisation the FPDA emphasised the need to uphold regional stability, freedom of navigation, and adherence to international law, notably the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) (Pratita, 2022). As concerns escalated over unilateral actions and destabilising manoeuvres



in the South China Sea, FPDA member states consistently voiced support for a peaceful, rules-based approach to conflict resolution. Their collective stance reinforced diplomatic norms and underscored the FPDA's commitment to safeguarding open sea lanes and supporting a stable regional order.

Parallel to these efforts, the FPDA broadened its engagement with other regional security mechanisms. It cultivated dialogue and cooperation with ASEAN institutions and external partners, recognising the importance of collective action and trust-building in managing shared security concerns. Regular participation in regional forums promoted interoperability, mutual understanding, and collaborative problem-solving among stakeholders. The FPDA also actively explored avenues of strategic alignment and joint activities with frameworks such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM-Plus). Through these platforms, member states advanced efforts to bolster regional security architecture and address transboundary challenges in a multilateral context (Nicholson, 2020). Ultimately, the FPDA's strategic posture in the 2020s reflected its adaptability and enduring relevance. By prioritising maritime stability, deepening diplomatic engagement, and investing in cooperative security, the FPDA reinforced its role as a linchpin in promoting peace, resilience, and prosperity across the Asia-Pacific region (Bhattacharya, 2021; Le Thu, 2020; Syarifuddin et al., 2022).

MALAYSIA SECURITY SHIFT FROM 1970 UNTIL 2020

A. 1971 – 1980

The Indonesia–Malaysia Confrontation, or Konfrontasi, was a period of heightened bilateral tension from 1963 to 1966, following the formation of Malaysia from former British territories Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, and Sabah (Wardhani, 2010). Indonesian President Sukarno opposed this development, perceiving Malaysia's creation as a neocolonial construct supported by Western powers. In protest, Indonesia initiated a series of military incursions and covert operations aimed at destabilising Malaysia. These actions included cross-border infiltration, bombings, and indirect support for communist and nationalist movements. The conflict disrupted regional stability and led to casualties on both sides. Tensions eased following Sukarno's removal from office and the subsequent rise of General Suharto in 1966, whose administration adopted a conciliatory stance, paving the way for bilateral normalisation (Sutimin, 2019). Malaysia's internal security faced renewed strain with the onset of the Second Communist Insurgency, led by the reconstituted Communist Party of Malaya (CPM). Though historically linked to the earlier insurgency, this wave active from 1968 to 1989 was marked by distinct geographic and operational features. The conflict concentrated around the Malaysia–Thailand border, where CPM militants had established base areas (Ghani et al., 2020). Their objective remained the overthrow of the Malaysian government in favour of a socialist state. The insurgency was characterised by guerrilla tactics, targeted bombings, and political assassinations. In response, Malaysian security forces,

with support from Thailand, launched cross-border operations, reinforced border security infrastructure, and denied insurgents safe havens. Complementary development programmes were introduced to improve livelihoods in rural regions and undermine insurgent influence. Over time, the CPM encountered ideological fragmentation, operational fatigue, and diminishing public support. These dynamics culminated in a ceasefire declaration in 1989 and a formal peace accord in 1990, effectively ending the insurgency (Kusmayadi, 2017). Alongside national security concerns, Malaysia's rapid industrialisation and urban expansion in the 1970s introduced significant environmental challenges. Notable issues included deforestation, water and air pollution, and widespread habitat degradation. Deforestation became particularly critical due to agriculture expansion, logging activities, and infrastructure development, resulting in biodiversity loss and ecological disruption. To mitigate these effects, Malaysia initiated environmental governance measures such as establishing protected areas, adopting sustainable forestry practices, and promoting reforestation (Leonen & Santiago, 1993). Water and air pollution were exacerbated by unchecked industrial processes and inadequate waste management systems. In response, the government introduced environmental regulations, upgraded wastewater treatment capacity, and incentivised cleaner production methods in the industrial sector (Shafie et al., 2011).

B. 1981 – 1990

Jemaah Islamiyah (JI) emerged circa 1985 in Malaysia, founded by radical Islamist figures Abdullah Sungkar and Abu Bakar Ba'asyir. Rooted in Salafi-jihadist ideology, the movement aspired to establish a transnational Islamic state, Daulah Islamiyah encompassing Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, southern Thailand, and Singapore (Aslam, 2009). The founders' ideological convictions were significantly shaped by participation in the Afghan jihad, where JI members joined the mujahideen against Soviet forces, gaining combat experience and adopting a global jihadist outlook. By the late 1980s and early 1990s, JI had established operational training camps in the remote regions of the southern Philippines. These facilities became centres for military instruction and ideological indoctrination, reinforcing members' preparedness for future militant activities across Southeast Asia. The organisation concurrently built a regional network by affiliating with local extremist groups, including Kumpulan Mujahidin Malaysia and several Indonesian factions. This transnational linkage enabled the sharing of operational expertise, recruitment pipelines, and resources. Notably, JI was connected to significant violent incidents during this period, including the bombing of Borobudur Buddhist temple in Indonesia and coordinated attacks targeting churches in Jakarta and other cities during Christmas Eve. Internally, the late 1990s saw JI grappling with leadership fragmentation and strategic discord. In 1997, Abu Bakar Ba'asyir assumed a more dominant leadership role, marking a period of further radicalisation. Under his stewardship, the group intensified its militant posture and solidified its ideological alignment with global jihadist movements (Abuza, 2003).



C. 1991 – 2000

The 1998–1999 Nipah virus outbreak in Malaysia represented a major public health and agricultural crisis with far-reaching implications. Named after the village of Sungai Nipah, where the initial cases were detected, the virus was first identified during this outbreak and rapidly became a focal point of epidemiological concern (Nor & Rahim, 2016). The virus, transmitted primarily through direct contact with infected pigs or the consumption of contaminated pork, subsequently demonstrated the potential for human-to-human transmission via close personal contact. Clinical manifestations ranged from mild respiratory symptoms to severe encephalitis, with high mortality rates observed across affected populations. Early symptoms included fever, headache, vomiting, and muscle pain, often escalating to drowsiness, altered consciousness, and neurological complications. The outbreak significantly impacted Malaysia's pig farming sector. In a decisive containment measure, the government ordered the culling of over one million pigs to halt transmission. This intervention, while epidemiologically necessary, inflicted substantial economic losses on farmers and disrupted the pork supply chain. Compensation schemes were introduced, and long-term restructuring followed incorporating enhanced biosecurity protocols and relocation of farms away from densely populated zones (Gurley et al., 2020). Public health responses included the isolation and treatment of infected individuals, contact tracing, quarantine procedures, and nationwide education campaigns. Surveillance systems were strengthened to enhance early detection and improve outbreak management. Malaysian authorities worked closely with international partners to advance diagnostic tools, share epidemiological data, and formulate containment strategies. Although Malaysia controlled the 1999 outbreak, subsequent Nipah virus incidents were reported in Bangladesh, India, and parts of Southeast Asia. These outbreaks, marked by variable transmission dynamics and case fatality rates, underscored the importance of regional health cooperation, rapid response mechanisms, and public engagement (Muniandy & Aziz, 2004).

D. 2001 – 2010

The 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) epidemic was a pivotal global health crisis originating in Guangdong province, China, with first cases reported in November 2002. The virus is believed to have originated in bats, transmitting to humans via intermediate hosts, likely palm civets or other wild animals sold in live animal markets. International alarm was triggered in early 2003 following secondary transmission in Hong Kong, linked to infected travellers (Henderson & Ng, 2004). SARS spread primarily through close contact with respiratory droplets, but transmission also occurred via contaminated surfaces and fomites, particularly in healthcare environments. The disease proved highly contagious in clinical settings, accelerating international spread via global air travel to regions including Vietnam, Singapore, and Canada. Socioeconomically, the epidemic disrupted education, commerce, and public services. Tourism and air transport industries were especially impacted due to travel advisories and quarantine mandates. Governments

implemented rigorous public health interventions quarantines, travel restrictions, and contact tracing to suppress viral transmission. The epidemic prompted an unprecedented global response. The World Health Organization (WHO) classified SARS as a global health threat and collaborated with national health ministries to coordinate surveillance and containment strategies (Devnath & Masud, 2021). International research cooperation led to the rapid development of diagnostic tools, enabling early detection and targeted response. Hospitals deployed strict infection control protocols, including patient isolation, personal protective equipment (PPE), and environmental sanitation procedures, to prevent nosocomial transmission. Equally vital were public awareness initiatives that promoted hygiene, encouraged symptom reporting, and countered misinformation—facilitating community engagement in mitigation efforts (Hazreen et al., 2005).

E. 2011 – 2020

Between 2010 and 2020, Malaysia sustained a comprehensive counterterrorism agenda focused on both tactical and preventive strategies. Intelligence operations enabled early threat detection and mitigation, while community-based education programs aimed to address root causes of radicalisation and reduce vulnerability to extremist ideologies. Law enforcement agencies executed targeted operations to dismantle terrorist networks and arrest suspects. Malaysia also deepened international cooperation participating in platforms such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and collaborated with partners including the United States, Australia, and Indonesia to share intelligence and standardise counterterrorism practices (Gupta, 2018). In tandem, deradicalisation efforts targeted individuals influenced by extremist narratives, offering support in the form of counselling, education, and vocational training to reintegrate them into society. Malaysia contributed actively to global counter-extremism dialogues via institutions like the United Nations and the Global Counterterrorism Forum, sharing insights to shape policy and rehabilitation frameworks internationally (Hamidi, 2016).

Parallel to these efforts, Malaysia recognised cybersecurity as an essential domain of national security. With increasing incidents of cybercrime, data breaches, and espionage, the government prioritised the development of resilient cybersecurity structures, supported by collaborative input from academia, industry stakeholders, and international experts (Ganesin et al., 2016). Key initiatives included risk evaluations, the formulation of robust security standards, and legislative reforms to prosecute digital offences and protect personal data (Jani, 2017). Malaysia also operationalised dedicated response units including Cybersecurity Incident Response Centres to ensure rapid containment and analysis of cyber incidents (Saidin & Khalid, 2023). Public and private sector awareness campaigns were central to national efforts, empowering organisations and individuals to adopt best practices and strengthen cyber hygiene. These integrated measures reflected the country's commitment to safeguarding its digital infrastructure amid evolving global threats (Tan et al., 2020).



Maritime security, too, remained a core priority throughout the decade, as Malaysia confronted piracy, terrorism at sea, and complex territorial disputes, notably in the South China Sea. The Malacca Straits Patrols (MSP) facilitated multilateral patrols and intelligence-sharing among littoral states, enhancing regional efforts to curb piracy (Dollah et al., 2016). Concerns over maritime terrorism led to capacity-building and joint exercises among ARF member countries. Meanwhile, diplomatic engagement through ASEAN platforms enabled Malaysia to advocate for peaceful resolution of territorial issues and support negotiations around a binding Code of Conduct (Zulkifli & Musa, 2022). Significant investments were made to modernise maritime surveillance capabilities including procurement of aircraft, patrol vessels, and radar systems to improve operational readiness and enforcement effectiveness (Zulkifli et al., 2020).

The emergence of COVID-19 in 2019 introduced a multidimensional crisis that reshaped Malaysia's security landscape. Containment efforts involved swift border closures, travel restrictions, and quarantine protocols. Domestically, lockdowns and public health interventions such as testing, contact tracing, isolation measures, and nationwide vaccination campaigns were implemented to manage transmission risks (Menhat et al., 2021). The government mobilised healthcare resources to ensure system resilience and protect frontline personnel. Economically, stimulus packages and targeted aid programs helped cushion vulnerable sectors and promote recovery, while employment protection and income support addressed systemic inequities (Shah et al., 2020). Transparent communication and community engagement were critical, as authorities delivered frequent updates and collaborated across sectors to sustain public compliance and social cohesion. Malaysia's pandemic response reflected an integrated security model merging health, economic, and societal dimensions to mitigate fallout and inform future preparedness frameworks (Murdad et al., 2022).

THE IMPACTS OF FPDA

In the dynamic context of Southeast Asian regional security, the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) have emerged as a multifaceted mechanism for promoting stability, strategic cooperation, and deterrence. Initially established in response to threats from Indonesia, the FPDA has evolved into a central pillar of defence diplomacy cultivating trust and operational engagement among its member states. Through confidence-building measures (CBMs), joint training initiatives, and responses to both conventional and non-traditional threats, the FPDA continues to play a pivotal role in safeguarding the sovereignty of Malaysia and Singapore while enhancing regional security discourse (Thayer, 2011).

Confidence-Building Measures (CBM) Given the historically strained ties between Malaysia and Singapore, the FPDA has functioned as a strategic bridge facilitating ongoing military cooperation. It emerged as part of reconciliation efforts following the separation of Singapore from the Federation of Malaya in 1965 (Wah, 1991). As Child (1995) notes, CBMs often emerge in environments of tension and limited

transparency, where worst-case strategic assessments dominate planning. CBMs help disrupt cycles of mistrust and secrecy by revealing capabilities and intentions fostering mutual understanding and potentially reducing arms proliferation. Within this framework, the FPDA has served as a forum for open dialogue and inter-military transparency. Malaysian Defence Minister Datuk Seri Hishammuddin Hussein reaffirmed in 2018 that the FPDA has enhanced interoperability, strengthened legal norms, and promoted peace across the region. Scholars such as Emmers (2012), Saravanamutthu (2011), and Sinclair (2013) further emphasize the FPDA's function as a CBM between Malaysia and Singapore, enabling both countries to benefit from joint access to strategic doctrines and training platforms. This utility remains evident amid recurring disputes, such as the 2018–2019 maritime standoff and airspace violations in 2021 (Yaacob, 2021). The FPDA also adapts to emerging challenges, including its incorporation of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR) planning since 2006 (Rolfe, 2011). Recent conferences such as the 20th FDCC and the 11th FDMM in 2021 underscore the FPDA's growing emphasis on counterterrorism, maritime security, and interoperability in non-traditional domains.

Enhanced Professional and Military Cooperation The FPDA continues to strengthen professional ties through its structured exercise programmes. These multilateral drills enhance operational capabilities across all three services in Singapore and Malaysia, foster planning cohesion via HQIADS, and serve as proof of concept for joint training among Commonwealth and regional forces. **Deterrence Against Conventional Threats** Despite a shift in Southeast Asia's strategic landscape post-Cold War, the FPDA remains a credible deterrent against conventional aggression. With rising military capacities across the region particularly China's modernisation efforts the FPDA's non-provocative yet defensive posture continues to offer strategic assurance for member states (Bitzinger, 2010).

Addressing Non-Traditional Security Threats Beyond conventional defence, the FPDA plays a vital role in preparing member militaries to confront non-traditional threats, including piracy, arms trafficking, and environmental disasters. While many such threats require non-military actors, FPDA exercises offer scenarios for integrated responses, particularly in areas where military support enhances effectiveness. **Individual Member Benefits** FPDA membership yields strategic dividends tailored to each nation. Malaysia and Singapore gain from having Australia, the UK, and New Zealand as defence partners, thereby reinforcing security across both peninsulas. The arrangement also provides access to advanced platforms, operational doctrines, and joint training opportunities strengthening individual defence capabilities and enriching institutional expertise. **Spill-Over Effects to Non-FPDA Security Activities** The FPDA's collaborative ethos extends beyond its core mandates, creating positive spill-over effects in wider regional and global engagements. Examples include cooperative efforts in Timor-Leste, coordinated disaster relief, and joint contributions to peacekeeping and security operations in Afghanistan (Thayer, 2011b).



FPDA Preserve Stability in Malaysia

The establishment of the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) during the 1970s was primarily driven by the need to provide a stable environment in which Malaysia and Singapore could cultivate their defence capacities particularly in the air and maritime domains (Bateman, 2011). Malaysia's enduring stability has been supported through its participation in regional security mechanisms such as ASEAN and the FPDA (Kamaruddin & Rogers, 2021), and it views the strategic presence of the United States in the region as vital to sustaining broader security in Asia (Sari, 2019). Singapore shares this perspective, considering American engagement a cornerstone of its own security posture (Mak, 2004). In this context, bilateral ties with the United States mirror the role of the FPDA in reinforcing defence resilience and deterring external threats. Following the terror attacks in New York (September 2001) and Bali (October 2002), Southeast Asia's security perceptions underwent a dramatic shift, leading to increased concern over terrorism and piracy, particularly in the Straits of Malacca and Singapore. In response, the FPDA expanded its institutional framework and operational scope, increasing the frequency of strategic-level meetings and reinforcing its governance architecture (Emmers, 2011). This institutional consolidation was matched by heightened activities at tactical and operational levels, including advanced joint military exercises. At the fifth FPDA Defence Ministers' Meeting (FDMM) in June 2003, member states publicly reaffirmed their commitment to interoperability and regional stability (Thayer, 2011). Australia and the United Kingdom further underscored their enduring engagement through the FPDA at the third Australia-UK Ministerial Consultations in January 2011, highlighting the arrangement as a practical mechanism for cooperation in Southeast Asia (Thayer, 2011). In scenarios involving external threats against Malaysia or Singapore, the FPDA serves as a strategic forum for initiating multilateral consultations among its five members reinforcing its relevance as a stabilising force in a shifting security landscape (Emmers, 2012).

FPDA Preserve Freedom, Independent and Sovereignty in Malaysia

The Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA), while not constituting a formal defence alliance, serve as a consultative mechanism that contributes meaningfully to regional stability in Southeast Asia (Sari, 2019). According to Thayer (2007), FPDA incorporates multilateral operational structures that function within the region's strategic framework. Its architecture comprises three core pillars: the Integrated Air Defence System (IADS), which safeguards Malaysian and Singaporean airspace; high-level consultative bodies such as the Joint Consultative Council (JCC) and Air Defence Council (ADC), which oversee strategic coordination; and a joint exercise programme managed through the Exercise Scheduling Conference (ESC) focused on enhancing preparedness beyond air defence. Historically, the FPDA provided psychological deterrence, particularly toward Indonesia, following the 1963 Konfrontasi that arose in protest against Malaysia's formation

(Emmers, 2012). Although the arrangement does not involve explicit security guarantees or troop deployments, its consultative nature and strategic presence have been credited with creating political deterrence and regional confidence. Zakaria (2011) identifies the FPDA as a critical factor in the strategic calculations of Malaysia, Singapore, and Australia. For Malaysia and Singapore, it offers a form of insurance against external threats, while for Australia, it reinforces regional engagement and deterrence. Despite growing attention to non-traditional security (NTS) concerns, FPDA military exercises remain predominantly focused on conventional threats, and no unified stance currently exists among member states regarding NTS responses. Malaysia has debated the FPDA's potential evolution toward NTS engagement but continues to regard its conventional deterrent value as integral to national defence planning. Initially envisaged as a transitional arrangement until Malaysia and Singapore achieved self-reliant defence capabilities (Sinclair, 2013), the FPDA gained renewed relevance amid regional instability, including Soviet naval movements in the Malacca Strait, Vietnam's presence in Cambodia, and territorial disputes. While the FPDA remains vital to Malaysia and Singapore, it faces ongoing challenges particularly skepticism from some Indonesian elites, who perceive it as an instrument of containment (Yaacob, 2021). Its deterrent value lies in its psychological effect: any adversary contemplating aggression must account for potential joint responses from all five members—Australia, New Zealand, the UK, Malaysia, and Singapore. Thayer (2007) suggests that this latent threat may even invoke broader Western involvement, notably the United States. Emmers (2012) reinforces the notion that FPDA's emphasis on interoperability and multilateral exercises sustains its role as a counterbalance to external aggression and reaffirms its historical function in deterring regional adventurism.

Strategic Studies and Regional Studies in FPDA

Scholarly discourse on the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) is generally bifurcated into strategic studies and regional studies, each offering distinct analytical lenses (Sari, 2019). Strategic studies explore FPDA's capacity to respond to evolving and unpredictable security developments, positioning it not merely as a reactionary mechanism but as a proactive security structure anticipating future threats. These analyses situate FPDA within both its historical origins and current strategic relevance, demonstrating its maturation over time and its utility in addressing conventional and emerging challenges (A. T. H. Tan, 2008). Strategic interpretations also highlight FPDA's evolving role in response to geopolitical shifts—such as the presence of American forces in the Philippines—and its potential collaboration with ASEAN in shaping a broader regional security architecture (Wah, 1991). FPDA's involvement in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), as well as its expansion of bilateral and multilateral defence relations, particularly with the United States, further underscore its strategic adaptability (Sari, 2019). In contrast, regional studies examine FPDA's broader impact on Southeast Asia's security landscape. These studies often emphasise FPDA as a stabilising institution whose



presence influences regional threat perceptions and defence postures. The United States' indirect association with FPDA is also considered crucial, given Southeast Asia's strategic significance in American foreign policy (Sari, 2019). The regional security context—marked by persistent tensions and competing claims—is seen as fertile ground for FPDA's institutional evolution and operational relevance (Pratama & Candra, 2014). Indonesia, in particular, has exhibited a nuanced response to FPDA's presence, engaging in strategic evaluations and exploring multilateral coalitions, security partnerships, and regional forums to safeguard its national interests (Montratama, 2018). These studies collectively reflect the complexity of FPDA's role, balancing internal member cooperation with external perceptions and regional dynamics.

FPDA Functions As Defence Diplomacy Platform

Following the end of the Cold War, the concept of defence diplomacy emerged as a vital mechanism for promoting international stability. This shift is reflected in the increased use of military cooperation and defence assistance as tools to foster ties with former adversaries and states perceived as future strategic risks (Cottey, 2004). Defence diplomacy adopts a non-confrontational approach, leveraging military institutions not for coercion but as elements of soft power within broader foreign and security policy frameworks. It reframes military capabilities from instruments of force to vehicles for trust-building, conflict prevention, and strategic engagement—especially in environments marked by uncertainty and evolving geopolitical challenges. In this context, defence ministries play a critical role in cultivating peaceful relations and mitigating threats through collaborative engagements (Cottey, 2004).

Many nations, particularly those in the Global South, endorse the utility of soft power as preferable to force, reserving coercive measures for existential threats such as territorial incursions. The Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) exemplify this diplomatic model within Southeast Asia. While the FPDA is not a formal alliance, it operates as a strategic conduit for military coordination and conflict prevention. It offers a framework through which Third World nations can engage with historical rivals or major powers in a constructive security dialogue. Notably, the FPDA predates ASEAN's formal defence structures such as the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting (ADMM) and ADMM-Plus—which includes key external partners like Australia, China, India, Japan, New Zealand, Russia, South Korea, and the United States (Emmers, 2012).

FPDA diplomacy is reinforced through regular Defence Ministers' Meetings and continuous engagement by actors traditionally involved in foreign policy. Its military-to-military ties extend not only among allies with shared traditions but also between states with past or potential tensions. Defence diplomacy, particularly since the Cold War's conclusion, spans diverse activities—from strategic reassurance and regional balancing to peacekeeping and enforcement operations. Within the FPDA, such cooperation is grounded in a collective

Commonwealth legacy and operationalised through multilateral exercises. Since the early 2000s, FPDA drills have increasingly addressed contemporary security concerns, reflecting the arrangement's commitment to maintaining relevance and responsiveness in an evolving strategic environment (Emmers, 2012).

CONCLUSION

The Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) remain a strategically invaluable component of Southeast Asia's evolving security architecture. Its longevity and adaptability underscore not only its institutional resilience but also its capacity to navigate shifting geopolitical tides and reinforce multilateral defence cooperation. For Malaysia, the FPDA offers not just military assurance but a broader strategic anchorage contributing to deterrence, interoperability, and sovereignty preservation. As regional security threats continue to diversify in scope and complexity, the FPDA's embedded principles of consultative defence diplomacy, operational integration, and forward-looking engagement render it uniquely equipped to respond to both conventional and non-traditional challenges. Its continued relevance rests on its ability to translate shared strategic intent into concrete defence outcomes, bridging capability gaps while fostering trust and cohesion among member states. Thus, the FPDA stands not merely as a relic of post-colonial defence planning, but as a dynamic and enduring framework for collective security in the Indo-Pacific strategically situated to fortify Malaysia's defence posture and sustain regional stability in an increasingly volatile global order.

REFERENCES

- Abuza, Z. (2003). Funding terrorism in Southeast Asia: the financial network of Al Qaeda and Jemaah Islamiya. *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, 25(2), 169-199.
- Amador III, J. S. (2013). Five Power Defence Arrangements at Forty. *Asian Politics & Policy*, 5(1), 146-150.
- Arshad, M. H., Zulkifli, N., Yasid, A. F. M., & Rahman, A. A. (2020). Malaysia's Contribution in the South China Sea. *Asian Journal of Law and Governance*, 2(2), 1-14.
- Aslam, M. M. (2009). The Radical Islam in Southeast Asia: The Connections between the Malaysian Militant Group and Jemaah Islamiyah and Its Implications for Regional Security. *International Journal of the Humanities*, 7(1).
- Bateman, S. (2011). The FPDA's contribution to regional security: the maritime dimension. *Five Power Defence Arrangements at Forty*, 68-84. <https://doi.org/10.1355/9789814345408-009>
- Benvenuti, A., & Dee, M. (2010). The Five Power Defence Arrangements and the reappraisal of the British and Australian policy interests in Southeast Asia, 1970-75. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 41(1), 101-123.
- Bhattacharya, S. (2021). ASEAN at 50: External actors and its



- relevance. In *ASEAN and India–ASEAN Relations* (pp. 17-34). Routledge.
- Bateman, S. (2007). Australia's Defence Update 2007: Implications for Southeast Asia. *Maritime Studies*, 2007(156), 17-19.
- Bitzinger, R. A. (2010). A new arms race? Explaining recent southeast Asian military acquisitions. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 32(1), 50–69. <https://doi.org/10.1355/cs32-1c>
- Bristow, D. (2005). The five power defence arrangements: Southeast Asia's unknown regional security organization. *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, 27(1), 1-20.
- Child, J. (1995). Confidence-building measures and their application in Central America. *JSTOR*, 5–21. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/resrep10904.7>
- Chen, C. (2022). Rupture or continuity? The evolving Australian approach to the Five Power Defence Arrangements from Gorton to Whitlam. *History Australia*, 19(2), 247–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14490854.2022.2050464>
- Cottey, A. (2004). *Reshaping defence diplomacy: new roles for military cooperation and assistance*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315000817>
- Cotton, J. (2013). Five Power Defence Arrangements at Forty. *Pacific Affairs*, 86(2), 386.
- Devnath, P., & Masud, H. M. A. A. (2021). Nipah virus: a potential pandemic agent in the context of the current severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 pandemic. *New Microbes and New Infections*, 41, 100873.
- Dollah, R., Hassan, W. S. W., Peters, D., & Othman, Z. (2016). Old threats, new approach and national security in Malaysia: issues and challenges in dealing with cross-border crime in east coast of Sabah. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(3 S1), 178.
- Emmers, R. (2011). The Five Power Defence Arrangements and The Regional Security Architecture. *Edited by Bhuphinder Singh and See Seng Tan, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies*, 42-53.
- Emmers, R. (2012). The five power defence arrangements and defense diplomacy in southeast asia. *Asian Security*, 8(3), 271–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14799855.2012.723921>
- Ganesin, A., Supayah, L., & Ibrahim, J. (2016). An overview of cyber security in Malaysia. *Kuwait Chapter of the Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 6(4), 12.
- Ghani, R. H. A., Kib, M. Z. M., & Eah, A. M. (2020). Indonesia-Malaysia Confrontation (1963-1966) and the Peace Talks for Restoration of Relationship. *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, 23(3).
- Guan, A. C. (2011a). Malaysia, Singapore, and the road to the five power defence arrangements (FPDA), July 1970–November 1971. *War & Society*, 30(3), 207-225.
- Guan, A. C. (2011b). 2 On the Establishment of the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA). In *The Five Power Defence Arrangements at Forty* (pp. 24-35). ISEAS Publishing
- Gurley, E. S., Spiropoulou, C. F., & De Wit, E. (2020). Twenty years of Nipah virus research: where do we go from here?. *The Journal of infectious diseases*, 221(Supplement_4), S359-S362.
- Gupta, T. (2018). *Islamic State Impact: Terrorism and Counter-terrorism in Malaysia* (Vol. 15, pp. 86-113). Mantraya Special Report.
- Hamidi, A. Z. (2016). Malaysia's policy on counter terrorism and deradicalisation strategy. *Journal of Public Security and Safety*, 6(2).
- Hazreen, A. M., Farizah, H., Abd Rashid, M., Chai, C. C., Dymna, V. K., Gilbert, W., & Diana, S. (2005). An evaluation of information dissemination during the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) outbreak among selected rural communities in Kuala Kangsar. *The Medical Journal of Malaysia*, 60(2), 180-187.
- Henderson, M. J. (2011). An arrangement for all seasons: the contributions of the Five Power Defence Arrangements to Australian strategic interests, 1971-2010.
- Henderson, J. C., & Ng, A. (2004). Responding to crisis: severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and hotels in Singapore. *International journal of tourism research*, 6(6), 411-419.
- Jani, M. H. B. (2017). Countering violent extremism in Malaysia: Past experience and future prospects. *Counter terrorist trends and analyses*, 9(6), 6-10.
- Kamaruddin, N., & Rogers, R. A. (2021). Attempting to remain apolitical: Assessing the challenges of Malaysia's military. *Asian Affairs(UK)*, 48(3–4), 153–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2022.2068361>
- Keating, G. (2006). The Five Power Defence Arrangements: a case study in alliance longevity. *Australian Defence Force Journal*, (170), 48-61.
- Kusmayadi, Y. (2017). Politik Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia Pada Masa Konfrontasi Indonesia-Malaysia Tahun 1963-1966. *Jurnal Artefak*, 4(1), 23-34.
- Leonen, M. M., & Santiago, J. S. S. (1993). Disparities in EIA systems of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand: implications for the ASEAN free trade area. *ASEAN Economic Bulletin*, 166-175.
- Le Thu, H. (2020). The Quadrilateral Security Dialogue and

- ASEAN centrality. In *Minilateralism in the Indo-Pacific* (pp. 88-102). Routledge.
- Mak, J. N. (2004). *Malaysian defence and security cooperation: coming Out of the closet* (S. S. Tan, Ed.; 1st ed)
- Maharani, D. D. (2016). *Kerjasama Five Power Defence Arrangement Bagi Kepentingan Keamanan Australia Dewasa ini* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Gadjah Mada).
- Marsh, K. (2020). Military and political risk in South-East Asia 1971-1989 Australia's commitment to the five power defence arrangements and the integrated air defence system. *Sabretache*, 61(3), 4-22.
- Meng, L. Y. (2014). Malaysia's security concerns. *Routledge handbook of contemporary Malaysia*, 391.
- Menhat, M., Zaideen, I. M. M., Yusuf, Y., Salleh, N. H. M., Zamri, M. A., & Jeevan, J. (2021). The impact of Covid-19 pandemic: A review on maritime sectors in Malaysia. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 209, 105638.
- Montratama, I. (2018). Strategic Re-alignment: 1 Alternatif Indonesia Dalam Mengimbangi Ancaman Aliansi Five Powers Defence Arrangement (FPDA). *Jurnal Pertahanan & Bela Negara*, 5(1), 129-154.
- Muniandy, N., & Aziz, J. A. (2004). Effects of intensification of the traditional farming system on the environment and bio-safety of the human population: Nipah virus outbreak in Malaysia. *Kyoto Area Studies on Asia*, 8, 303-318.
- Murdad, R., Muhiddin, M., Osman, W. H., Tajidin, N. E., Haida, Z., Awang, A., & Jalloh, M. B. (2022). Ensuring urban food security in Malaysia during the COVID-19 pandemic—Is urban farming the answer? A review. *Sustainability*, 14(7), 4155.
- Nicholson, M. A. (2020). *Sang Kancil and the Eagle: Cultivating Malaysia's Defence Capabilities*. Naval War College Newport RI.
- Niessl, R. (2020). Rifle Company Butterworth 1970-2020: Origins, role and future possibilities. *Australian Army Journal*, 16(2), 81-101.
- Nor, A. A., & Rahim, R. A. (2016). Infectious disease and bioterrorism: disaster to public health and security in Malaysia. *Jurnal Undang-Undang dan Masyarakat*, 20, 43.
- Ong, G. G., & Ho, J. (2005). Maritime Air Patrols: The New Weapon Against Piracy in the Malacca Straits. *RSIS Commentaries*, 70.
- Pratama, C. P., & Candra, D. S. (2014). Development of Five Power Defence Arrangements in responding to peace dynamics of South east Asia after Cold War. *Global*, 16(1), 34-46.
- <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.7454/global.v16i1.3>
- Pratita, C. K. B. (2022). Security Dynamics Of Southeast Asia: The Role Of The Uk And Its Implications On Regional Security. *Journal of Social Political Sciences*, 3(1), 18-28.
- Rolfe, J. (2011). An FPDA role in humanitarian assistance and disaster relief?: it's more than just the armed forces. In I. Storey (Ed.), *The Five Power Defence Arrangements at forty* (pp. 85-96). Institute of South. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1355/9789814345408-010>
- Rolls, M. G. (2010). ASEAN and the non-traditional regional security agenda. In *Asia: NZ Foundation: Track II India-NZ Dialogue*.
- Saravanamutthu, J. (2011). Malaysian foreign policy and Five Power Defence Arrangements. *Five Power Defence Arrangements at Forty*, 36-50. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1355/9789814345408-007>
- Sari, D. L. (2019). Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) And The Role Of Strategic Engagement In The Southeast Asian Region. *Jurnal Studi Diplomasi Dan Keamanan*, 11(2).
- Saidin, M. I. S., & Khalid, K. A. T. (2023). Combating Daesh: Insights into Malaysia's Counter-Terrorism Experience and the Deradicalisation of Former Detainees. *Religions*, 14(3), 367.
- Shafie, S. M., Mahlia, T. M. I., Masjuki, H. H., & Andriyana, A. (2011). Current energy usage and sustainable energy in Malaysia: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 15(9), 4370-4377.
- Shah, A. U. M., Safri, S. N. A., Thevadas, R., Noordin, N. K., Abd Rahman, A., Sekawi, Z., & Sultan, M. T. H. (2020). COVID-19 outbreak in Malaysia: Actions taken by the Malaysian government. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 97, 108-116.
- Simon, S. W. (2009). The ASEAN Regional Forum. In *The Routledge Handbook of Asian Security Studies* (pp. 316-326). Routledge.
- Sinclair, P. (2013). *FPDA A New Zealand's perspective*. https://www.wgtn.ac.nz/strategic-studies/documents/strategic-background-papers/09_Five-Power-Defence-Arrangements_Strategic-Background-Paper_10.2013.pdf
- Sutimin, L. (2019). Development of students' knowledge of history: Acceptance and rejection of the Indonesia-Malaysia confrontation narratives. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 10(2), 290-307.
- Syarifuddin, K. F., Perwita, A. A. B., & Prasajo, M. (2022).



- Tan, A. T. H. (2008). The Five Power Defence Arrangements: the continuing relevance. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 29(2), 285–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260802284175>
- Tan, O. S. L., Vergara, R. G., Phan, R. C., Khan, S., & Khan, N. (2020). Cybersecurity laws in Malaysia. In *Encyclopedia of Criminal Activities and the Deep Web* (pp. 435-448). IGI Global.
- Thayer, C. A. (2007). The Five Power Defence Arrangements: The Quiet Achiever. *Security Challenges*, 3(1), 2–10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265154467_The_Five_Power_Defence_Arrangements_The_Quiet_Achiever#:~:text=The%20scope%20of%20FPDA%20exercises%20has%20gradually%20expanded,%27the%20quiet%20achiever%27%20in%20contributing%20to%20regional%20security.
- Thayer, C. A. (2011b). The Five Power Defence Arrangements at Forty (1971-2011). *Southeast Asian Affairs 2012*, 61–72. <https://doi.org/10.1353/saa.2012.0006>
- Wah, C. K. (1991). The Five Power Defence Arrangements: Twenty Years After. *Pacific Review*, 4(3), 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09512749108718918>
- Wardhani, B. L. S. W. (2010). Indonesia-Malaysia relations in the post confrontation era: The role of the serumpun concept. *dalam Jurnal Masyarakat Kebudayaan dan Politik*, 12(4).
- Wey, A. L. K. (2016). Mates all the way! From Konfrontasi to confronting China: Australia–Malaysia geostrategic cooperation. *Comparative Strategy*, 35(2), 131-138.
- Yaacob, A. R. (2021, November 27). *Keeping the Five Power Defence Arrangement relevant at 50*. East Asia Forum. <https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2021/11/27/keeping-the-five-power-defence-arrangement-relevant-at-50/>
- Ye, W. C. (2020). Airpower And Malaysia’s Maritime Zones: Reality And Rhetoric. *Zulfaqar Journal of Defence Management, Social Science & Humanities*.
- Zulkifli, N., Ibrahim, R. I. R., Rahman, A. A. A., & Yasid, A. F. M. (2020). Maritime Cooperation in the Straits of Malacca (2016-2020): challenges and recommend for a new framework. *Asian journal of research in education and social sciences*, 2(2), 10-32.
- Zulkifli, N., & Musa, M. A. (2022). The Importance of the US-Malaysia Maritime Security Cooperation (2010-2021). *Asian Journal of Law and Governance*, 4(2), 1-27.
- Zakaria, A. (2011). A Quasi-Pact of Enduring Value: A Malaysian Perspective of the FPDA. *Five Power Defence Arrangements at Forty*, 98–104. <https://doi.org/10.1355/9789814345408-011>