

A CRITICAL OVERVIEW OF THE FIVE POWER DEFENSE ARRANGEMENT

Victor Ularju Pius

Department of Political Science and international Relations
University of Abuja, Abuja, Nigeria

Abstract

In an era marked by shifting global power dynamics and regional security uncertainties, multilateral defence arrangements play a pivotal role in maintaining peace and stability. One such example is the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA); a unique and long-standing regional security framework in Southeast Asia. Using the secondary approach and library instrument, findings show that, formed in 1971, the FPDA brings together Malaysia, Singapore, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand in a consultative defence pact originally designed to safeguard Malaysia and Singapore in the post-colonial era. Unlike traditional military alliances such as NATO, the FPDA does not bind its members to collective defence obligations but instead commits them to consult one another in the event of external aggression. The paper concludes that this non-binding nature has allowed the FPDA to remain flexible and relevant, evolving over time in response to both geopolitical changes and emerging non-traditional security threats. The paper recommends trust building, continuity, and shared strategic interests in sustaining cooperative security frameworks in the region.

Keywords: Five Power; Defense Arrangement; Security Interest; Collective Defense; Security Strategy

Introduction

The establishment of the FPDA was a direct response to the strategic vacuum created by the British withdrawal from its "East of Suez" military commitments, which left newly independent Southeast Asian states vulnerable to regional instability (Till, 2014). Amid Cold War tensions, communist insurgencies, and concerns over regional power imbalances, both Malaysia and Singapore sought reliable security assurances. Their objective was to deter potential aggression and maintain internal stability, particularly in light of ethnic divisions and political fragility following their respective post-independence transitions (Leifer, 2000; Storey, 2007). What emerged was a consultative defence framework rather than a formal military alliance, reflecting the political sensitivities and strategic diversity of the member states. Despite this, the FPDA has proven to be remarkably durable and adaptable, facilitating sustained military cooperation, joint training, and strategic dialogue (Tan, 2011). Over the past five decades, the FPDA has expanded its focus from traditional territorial defence to addressing non-traditional security threats such as piracy, terrorism, cyber threats, and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (Ghoshal, 2014). It stands today not only as a testament to pragmatic diplomacy but also as a model for informal multilateralism in regional security affairs. Thus, it is against this backdrop that this paper is poised to examine the origins, structural mechanisms, operational dynamics, and strategic relevance of the FPDA, while also

critically assessing the contemporary challenges it faces within a rapidly evolving Indo-Pacific geopolitical landscape.

Historical Context and Formation

The Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) emerged from a complex confluence of historical, strategic, and geopolitical factors during the early 1970s. At the heart of its formation was the United Kingdom's strategic retrenchment from Asia, most notably its decision in 1968 to withdraw all its military forces "East of Suez" by the mid-1970s (Leifer, 2000). This policy shift, largely driven by economic constraints and a reorientation of British foreign policy towards Europe, marked a significant turning point for the defence posture of post-colonial Southeast Asia, particularly Malaysia and Singapore, which had previously relied heavily on British military guarantees (Bristow, 2005). The British withdrawal created an immediate security vacuum in the region. The threat of communist expansion, internal insurgencies, and the lingering instability from the Indonesia-Malaysia Confrontation (Konfrontasi) of the 1960s heightened the vulnerability of the newly independent states (Storey, 2007). Moreover, the Cold War had firmly taken root in Asia, with the Vietnam War escalating and regional powers such as China and the Soviet Union vying for influence. In this uncertain environment, Malaysia and Singapore recognized the urgent need for a credible security framework that could deter aggression and reassure their populations of external defence support. Rather than opting for a formal alliance, which might provoke regional sensitivities or infringe upon ASEAN's principle of non-alignment, the five nations Malaysia, Singapore, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand agreed on a more flexible arrangement based on consultation rather than obligation. The FPDA was not founded on a treaty with legal enforcement mechanisms but on a series of coordinated defence declarations and bilateral understandings that took effect in April 1971 (Till, 2014). According to the terms of the arrangement, member states would "consult immediately" in the event of an armed attack on Malaysia or Singapore, with a view to deciding what measures should be taken, either individually or collectively (Emmers, 2012).

This consultative clause, while stopping short of a formal commitment to collective defence, served both political and strategic purposes. It allowed the inclusion of external powers (UK, Australia, and New Zealand) without compromising the sovereignty or diplomatic autonomy of the host nations. It also provided a platform for continuity in defence cooperation, especially in air defence, given the existing British military infrastructure, such as the Royal Air Force base at Butterworth, Malaysia, which was retained as part of the agreement and subsequently transformed into a hub for FPDA activities (Storey, 2007). Crucially, the formation of the FPDA symbolised a transition from colonial defence dependency to multilateral cooperation, allowing the newly independent states to gradually develop indigenous defence capabilities while still benefitting from the experience and presence of their more advanced Commonwealth partners (Leifer, 2000). The arrangement also avoided the political baggage associated with military pacts like SEATO, which had become increasingly ineffective and controversial by the late 1960s. In essence, the historical context and formation of the FPDA reflected a pragmatic response to the changing security landscape of Southeast Asia. It provided a minimum credible deterrent through coordinated defence planning and consultations, while respecting the political sensitivities of post-colonial nations and maintaining a Western military presence in the region without direct domination.

Structural Features and Key Mechanisms

Although the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) is not a formal alliance treaty like NATO or ANZUS, it possesses a well-developed structure and set of mechanisms that enable it to function as a practical and effective regional defence framework. Its strength lies in its institutional flexibility, the consensus-based nature of its consultations, and the regularity of joint military activities that reinforce interoperability and trust among the member states. At the core of the FPDA is the principle of consultation, not collective defence. The arrangement obliges members to consult each other “immediately” in the event of an armed attack on Malaysia or Singapore, to determine the appropriate collective or individual response (McDougall, 2006). This consultative mechanism is deliberately non-binding, respecting the sovereignty and diplomatic freedom of member states while still fostering a sense of shared responsibility and security cooperation (Storey, 2007). The flexibility of this approach has allowed the FPDA to persist and adapt across multiple geopolitical eras without being constrained by rigid treaty obligations.

The structural backbone of the FPDA is provided by two key command centres based in Malaysia and Singapore: the Integrated Air Defence System (IADS) headquartered at the Royal Malaysian Air Force Base in Butterworth, and the FPDA Headquarters in Singapore, which oversees broader coordination (Till, 2014). The IADS, established in 1971 as a joint military institution, plays a vital role in coordinating the region’s air surveillance, radar operations, and air defence planning among the FPDA nations. The commander of IADS is usually an officer from one of the external partners (UK, Australia, or New Zealand), rotated periodically to maintain neutrality and shared leadership (Tan, 2011).

Another important structural feature is the combined military exercises conducted regularly under the FPDA framework. These include Exercise Bersama Lima, Exercise Suman Warrior, Exercise Bersama Shield, and others. These joint drills involve land, sea, and air forces from all five nations and are designed to enhance interoperability, readiness, and mutual understanding in responding to a variety of security scenarios, including conventional warfare, maritime threats, and humanitarian disasters (Storey, 2007). These exercises often simulate coordinated responses to external threats, testing communication channels, command hierarchies, and logistical support systems. Beyond traditional defence operations, the FPDA has expanded its mechanisms to incorporate non-traditional security challenges, reflecting the changing nature of regional threats. In recent years, the agenda of FPDA exercises has included counter-terrorism, disaster relief, and maritime security, including anti-piracy patrols and surveillance in the Strait of Malacca a vital global trade route (Ghoshal, 2014). This reflects a growing awareness among FPDA members that security in the 21st century requires multi-dimensional cooperation, going beyond conventional military threats.

The FPDA also supports high-level defence dialogues and regular meetings of defence chiefs and senior officials. These engagements serve not only to reinforce strategic alignment and transparency but also to provide a diplomatic space for discussing regional security trends, threat perceptions, and shared interests (Leifer, 2000). While not part of ASEAN, the FPDA complements ASEAN’s security architecture by providing operational and strategic depth without

undermining the principle of non-interference. Overall, the structural features and operational mechanisms of the FPDA are purposefully lightweight but highly functional, allowing the arrangement to remain relevant, responsive, and strategically useful. The combination of institutionalised air defence coordination, regular joint military exercises, and flexible consultations makes the FPDA a unique and enduring model of multilateral defence cooperation in the Indo-Pacific region.

Evolution and Modern Relevance of the FPDA

Since its establishment in 1971, the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) has undergone significant evolution in response to both global geopolitical shifts and the changing nature of regional security challenges in Southeast Asia. What began as a narrowly focused arrangement to safeguard Malaysia and Singapore against external aggression has transformed into a multifaceted and enduring framework of defence cooperation. The FPDA's continued relevance lies in its adaptability, its strategic value as a stabilising force, and its capacity to foster military interoperability and political dialogue in a region marked by uncertainty and strategic competition. Initially, the FPDA was primarily focused on conventional territorial defence, particularly in the air domain, reflecting Cold War anxieties and the perceived threat of state-on-state aggression in the wake of the British military withdrawal from the region (Thayer, 2012). The Integrated Air Defence System (IADS) was the most visible manifestation of this purpose, ensuring that Malaysia and Singapore had a credible air defence shield supported by their Commonwealth partners (Till, 2014). In its early decades, the FPDA's activities centred on relatively small-scale air and naval exercises with limited media visibility or political emphasis, consistent with the low-profile nature of the arrangement (Leifer, 2000).

However, the end of the Cold War and the growing prominence of non-traditional security threats led to a redefinition of the FPDA's operational scope. The rise of transnational challenges such as terrorism, piracy, cyber threats, and natural disasters prompted member states to broaden the FPDA's focus. For instance, in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks and the 2002 Bali bombings, the FPDA began incorporating counter-terrorism scenarios into its exercises, reflecting growing concern over extremist violence in Southeast Asia (Storey, 2007). Exercises like Bersama Lima and Suman Warrior were restructured to include joint operations in urban warfare, crisis response, and intelligence sharing, showcasing the FPDA's adaptability (Ghoshal, 2014). Additionally, maritime security has become an increasingly important pillar of FPDA operations, especially in response to threats to freedom of navigation in critical sea lanes such as the Strait of Malacca and the South China Sea. The region's strategic waterways are vital for global trade and energy supplies, making their security a shared priority. FPDA exercises now routinely simulate maritime interdiction operations, search and rescue missions, and anti-piracy patrols, thus aligning with contemporary regional security imperatives (Tan, 2011).

The FPDA has also grown in importance as a confidence-building mechanism amid the growing strategic rivalry between major powers such as the United States and China. While not explicitly aligned against any particular actor, the FPDA offers smaller regional states a way to engage with external powers without choosing sides. It strengthens defence diplomacy, reinforces norms of transparency, and promotes dialogue among militaries in an era where miscalculation and mistrust are increasing (Thompson, 2015). For Malaysia and Singapore in particular, the FPDA remains a

valuable tool for hedging against regional uncertainties while maintaining a balanced foreign policy. Moreover, the FPDA has embraced technological modernisation, integrating cyber defence and advanced surveillance systems into its training programmes and strategic planning. This shift reflects not only the evolution of warfare but also the shared understanding among members that hybrid threats require collaborative approaches. By keeping pace with technological developments and modern warfare doctrines, the FPDA continues to provide its members with relevant and credible security assurances (Till, 2014). Politically, the FPDA enjoys sustained support from all five members. Regular ministerial and defence chiefs' meetings ensure that strategic objectives are updated and aligned. For example, during the 50th anniversary in 2021, member states reaffirmed their commitment to the FPDA, issuing joint statements emphasising its continuing relevance in addressing both traditional and non-traditional security threats (RSIS, 2021). This milestone illustrated not only the longevity but also the political resilience of the arrangement.

Strategic Importance in the Asia-Pacific

The Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) hold enduring strategic significance within the broader Asia-Pacific region, a theatre marked by evolving power dynamics, maritime disputes, and rising geopolitical tension. Although the FPDA is often described as a modest security arrangement compared to more formal alliances like NATO or the U.S.-Japan security pact, it occupies a critical niche by contributing to regional stability, promoting military interoperability, and functioning as a stabilising mechanism amid intensifying U.S.-China competition. At the heart of the FPDA's strategic value is its geographical positioning. The member states Malaysia and Singapore in Southeast Asia, and the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand from the wider Anglosphere form a unique bridge between regional and external powers. Malaysia and Singapore sit astride the Strait of Malacca, one of the world's busiest and most strategically vital maritime chokepoints, through which approximately a quarter of global trade and energy supplies transit (Kaplan, 2011). Any disruption in this corridor could have severe economic and security implications not only for Asia but for global commerce. By reinforcing the defence of this zone, the FPDA contributes significantly to freedom of navigation and the protection of sea lines of communication (SLOCs).

Moreover, the FPDA's presence enhances regional deterrence without escalating tensions. Unlike more confrontational security arrangements, the FPDA's non-aligned, consultative character allows it to avoid provoking regional sensitivities, particularly among ASEAN states that favour neutrality and non-interference (Tan, 2011). This positions the FPDA as a diplomatically acceptable security architecture neither overtly Western nor explicitly anti-China making it a useful platform for balancing competing interests in the Indo-Pacific. The arrangement also plays an essential role in military capacity-building and interoperability. Through regular joint exercises like Exercise Bersama Shield and Exercise Suman Protector, FPDA members share operational expertise, develop joint operational doctrines, and improve readiness to respond to both conventional and non-conventional threats (Storey, 2007). These drills are particularly valuable for Malaysia and Singapore, enabling them to access training and technologies from more advanced military partners, while also allowing external powers to maintain a strategic foothold in Southeast Asia without establishing permanent bases.

In addition, the FPDA acts as a quiet counterweight to China's expanding regional footprint, particularly in the South China Sea. While not an explicit tool of containment, the regular presence of British, Australian, and New Zealand forces through FPDA activities serves as a reminder of the enduring external interest in regional security, reinforcing the idea that Southeast Asia is not solely within any one power's sphere of influence (Ghoshal, 2014). The inclusion of the UK a key advocate of a "Global Britain" post-Brexit strategy adds a dimension of extra-regional engagement, showcasing the FPDA's role in fostering rules-based order in maritime Asia (UK MoD, 2021).

Furthermore, the FPDA complements broader regional frameworks such as ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM+) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). While ASEAN focuses on diplomatic consensus, the FPDA adds an operational layer to regional security by facilitating joint training and military-to-military engagement. This combination of political dialogue and operational readiness contributes to comprehensive security governance in the Asia-Pacific (Till, 2014). Lastly, the FPDA's strategic significance lies in its symbolic continuity. In an era where alliance fatigue and regional instability are on the rise, the FPDA stands as one of the longest-surviving multilateral defence arrangements outside Europe. It represents a model of flexible, non-binding defence cooperation that adapts to new threats while reinforcing strategic confidence among member states and the wider Asia-Pacific community.

Challenges and Limitations of the FPDA

Despite its longevity and flexibility, the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) faces several challenges and limitations that constrain its overall effectiveness and long-term strategic influence in the Asia-Pacific region. These limitations stem from its non-binding nature, asymmetric contributions by member states, lack of institutional depth, and the increasing complexity of the regional security environment. One of the most fundamental limitations of the FPDA is its non-treaty status. Unlike alliances such as NATO, which include explicit mutual defence clauses, the FPDA is not a collective defence pact but rather a consultative mechanism. Member states are only obliged to consult in the event of an armed attack on Malaysia or Singapore, with no requirement for military intervention (Sari, 2019). This lack of a binding security guarantee can create ambiguity regarding the depth of commitment among the five members, especially during high-stakes crises. Such a structure, while diplomatically flexible, may be viewed as insufficiently robust in deterring potential aggressors or responding swiftly to threats.

Another major challenge lies in the asymmetry of military capabilities and strategic priorities among member states. The United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand possess far more advanced military capabilities compared to Malaysia and Singapore. This imbalance sometimes leads to unequal burden-sharing during joint exercises and operations (Storey, 2007). Moreover, while Malaysia and Singapore consider the FPDA integral to their defence strategies, the external partners especially the UK have other global priorities, leading to variability in strategic commitment and resource allocation (Chua, 2017). For example, the UK's "Global Britain" agenda has renewed its interest in the Indo-Pacific, but this engagement remains limited compared to its Cold War-era presence.

The FPDA also suffers from a lack of institutionalisation. It does not have a permanent secretariat, formal bureaucracy, or binding charter to guide its evolution. Coordination is largely dependent on periodic ministerial meetings and joint exercises, which, while useful, may not suffice for long-term strategic planning or rapid decision-making during crises (Jones, 2014). This contrasts with more institutionalised security architectures like the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) or the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (Quad), which offer more structured diplomatic and strategic mechanisms. Additionally, the FPDA faces the challenge of relevance in a rapidly shifting security landscape. The Asia-Pacific is increasingly defined by great-power competition, especially between the United States and China, with the South China Sea emerging as a flashpoint. While the FPDA aims to remain neutral and non-provocative, this approach may render it less influential in shaping broader regional security outcomes (Brawley, & Radcliffe, 2017). Its inability or reluctance to directly address regional flashpoints limits its geopolitical utility in comparison to newer strategic coalitions like AUKUS or the Quad, which are more overtly aligned in their strategic postures.

The rise of non-traditional security threats, such as cyber warfare, terrorism, pandemics, and climate change, also poses adaptation challenges. Although the FPDA has made efforts to expand its agenda to include counter-terrorism and humanitarian assistance in its joint exercises, its response capacity remains limited by its military-centric structure and lack of dedicated resources (Till, 2014). Without significant reforms or dedicated funding, its ability to contribute meaningfully to comprehensive security will remain constrained. Lastly, the FPDA must navigate diplomatic sensitivities within Southeast Asia, particularly ASEAN's emphasis on neutrality and consensus. Over assertion by external partners within the FPDA framework could raise concerns among other ASEAN members, especially Indonesia, about potential encroachment on regional autonomy (Halvorson, 2019). Balancing strategic relevance with regional sensitivities thus remains an ongoing challenge for the arrangement.

Navigating the Future of the FPDA in a Shifting Security Environment

Looking ahead, the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) are poised at a critical juncture, where their continued relevance and effectiveness will depend on their ability to adapt to emerging regional and global security challenges. While the FPDA has proven its durability since 1971, its future prospects are increasingly shaped by evolving geopolitical realities, technological advancements, and the shifting nature of warfare and threats in the Indo-Pacific (Haacke, & Breen, 2020). One of the most promising avenues for the FPDA lies in its potential to broaden its strategic scope beyond traditional military threats. With the region now grappling with non-traditional security issues such as cyber threats, maritime piracy, pandemics, and climate-induced disasters, the FPDA could redefine its operational agenda to include humanitarian assistance, disaster relief (HADR), cybersecurity cooperation, and maritime domain awareness. Expanding into these domains would not only enhance the arrangement's practical utility but also align it with the evolving security priorities of Southeast Asia and the wider Asia-Pacific (Storey, 2018).

In addition, the FPDA is well-positioned to become a convening platform for middle-power diplomacy. As ASEAN member states continue to emphasise neutrality and strategic autonomy, the FPDA's non-aligned and consultative character offers a model for how external powers can engage constructively in the region without contributing to bipolar rivalry. By enhancing strategic

dialogue and military transparency among its members, the FPDA could serve as a confidence-building mechanism amidst rising U.S.-China tensions and uncertainties surrounding other emerging security pacts such as AUKUS and the Quad (Chen, 2022). Technological modernization is another critical area for the FPDA's future relevance. As member states update their defence capabilities, particularly in areas such as unmanned systems, artificial intelligence, and integrated command-and-control, the FPDA must keep pace by integrating these technologies into its joint training and operational doctrines. Increased investment in interoperable platforms and real-time information sharing would strengthen the arrangement's collective preparedness and response capacity.

Moreover, there is scope for institutional deepening. While the FPDA's informal structure has allowed it to remain flexible and politically non-intrusive, the creation of a permanent secretariat or coordination centre could help streamline its decision-making processes, enhance policy continuity, and support strategic planning. Such a move could also facilitate better engagement with other regional bodies such as ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM+) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), enabling the FPDA to contribute more actively to broader regional security governance. Lastly, the FPDA's strategic communication and visibility may need strengthening. In an era where narratives and perception shape regional alignments, the arrangement could benefit from more deliberate public diplomacy, highlighting its achievements, relevance, and peaceful purpose (Manullang, & Rachman, 2023). Enhancing transparency and outreach could help dispel misperceptions about its intent, particularly from regional stakeholders wary of foreign military involvement.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) represent a distinctive model of multilateral security cooperation that has endured for over five decades in the dynamic and often volatile Asia-Pacific region. Born out of the geopolitical anxieties of post-colonial Southeast Asia and Britain's military withdrawal east of Suez, the FPDA has proven to be remarkably resilient and adaptive in the face of shifting global and regional power configurations. Its historical roots lie in a strategic effort to ensure the security of Malaysia and Singapore, yet over time, it has evolved into a mechanism for defence diplomacy, joint training, and regional confidence-building. Structurally, the FPDA's flexibility underscored by its consultative and non-binding nature has been both its strength and its limitation. It allows for broad participation and low political risk among member states, fostering military interoperability and strategic dialogue without the encumbrances of formal treaty obligations. However, this very informality also curtails its ability to act decisively during crises and limits its potential to address emergent, non-traditional threats.

In terms of strategic relevance, the FPDA continues to play a stabilising role in the Indo-Pacific by reinforcing maritime security, preserving freedom of navigation, and facilitating collaboration between regional and extra-regional powers. Its strategic location, particularly near the Strait of Malacca, ensures that it remains a crucial node in the maintenance of regional security architecture. Yet, the rise of new security alignments such as the Quad and AUKUS, coupled with the intensifying U.S.-China rivalry, has posed new questions about the FPDA's future role and scope. Despite its limitations ranging from asymmetrical member contributions and lack of institutional depth to geopolitical constraints the FPDA remains an important component of Southeast Asia's

pluralistic security order. Its continued relevance will depend on its ability to modernise, expand its mandate to include cyber and humanitarian challenges, and deepen cooperation without alienating other regional actors or provoking strategic tensions.

In conclusion, while not a panacea for the region's complex security dilemmas, the FPDA offers a pragmatic and enduring platform for multilateral defence collaboration. Its survival and adaptation over the decades illustrate that security arrangements do not need to be treaty-bound to be effective. Instead, trust, continuity, and shared strategic interests can sustain cooperative security frameworks that contribute meaningfully to regional peace and stability.

References

- Brawley, S. & Radcliffe, M. (2017). Losing the Blanket, Building a Fence: Australian Anxiety and the End of Military Colonialism in Malaysia. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 45(6), 1026–1048. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03086534.2017.1379669>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1355/CS27-1A>
- Chen, C.-F. (2022). Rupture or continuity? The evolving Australian approach to the Five Power Defence Arrangements from Gorton to Whitlam. *History Australia*, 19, 247–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14490854.2022.2050464>
- Chua, D. W. B. (2017). America's Role in the Five Power Defence Arrangements: Anglo-American Power Transition in South-East Asia, 1967–1971. *International History Review*, 39(4), 615–637. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2016.1241952>
- 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>
- Ghoshal, B. (2014). *The FPDA: Southeast Asia's most successful sub-regional security arrangement?* RSIS Commentary.
- Haacke, J., & Breen, J. H. (2020). From Benign Neglect to Effective Re-engagement? Assessing British Strategizing and Policies Towards Southeast Asia Since 2010. *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, 41(3), 329–363. <https://doi.org/10.1355/CS41-3A>
- Halvorson, D. (2019). *Commonwealth Responsibility and Cold War Solidarity: Australia in Asia, 1944–74*. <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/23598>
- Jones, M. (2014). Ending 'East of Suez': The British Decision to Withdraw from Malaysia and Singapore, 1964–1968. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 42(2), 362–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03086534.2014.912422>

- Kaplan, R. D. (2011). *Monsoon: The Indian Ocean and the Future of American Power*.
- Leifer, M. (2000). *Singapore's Foreign Policy: Coping with Vulnerability*. London: Routledge.
- Manullang, G., & Rachman, M. F. A. (2023). *Diplomasi Pertahanan Indonesia Dalam Menghadapi Ancaman dari Five Power Defence Arrangement (FPDA)*. 10(4), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.55960/jlri.v10i4.367>
- McDougall, D. (2006). Australia and Commonwealth Southeast Asia. *The Round Table*, 95(387), 717–725. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00358530601046919>
- RSIS (2021). *FPDA at 50: Relevance in a Changing Strategic Environment*. S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies.
- Sari, D. L. (2019). *Five power defense arrangements (FPDA) and the role of strategic engagement in the Southeast Asian region*. 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.31315/JSDK.V11I2.3135.G2463>
- Storey, I. (2007). *Southeast Asia and the Rise of China: The Search for Security*. London: Routledge.
- Tan, S.S. (2011). The Five Power Defence Arrangements: The Quiet Achiever. *Security Challenges*, 7(1), pp. 17–32.
- Thayer, C. A. (2012). The five power defence arrangements at forty (1971-2011). *Southeast Asian Affairs*, 2012(1), 61–72. <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/485126>
- Thompson, S. (2015). *Non-Military Means of Influence* (pp. 125–142). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137314482_9
- Till, G. (2014). *Asia's Naval Expansion: An Arms Race in the Making?* London: IISS/Routledge.
- UK Ministry of Defence (2021). *Defence in a Competitive Age*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk>