THE INDONESIA-MALAYSIA
DISPUTE CONCERNING
SOVEREIGNTY OVER
SIPADAN AND
LIGITAN ISLANDS
The ISEAS – Yusof Ishak Institute (formerly Institute of Southeast Asian Studies) is an autonomous organization established in 1968. It is a regional centre dedicated to the study of socio-political, security, and economic trends and developments in Southeast Asia and its wider geostrategic and economic environment. The Institute’s research programmes are grouped under Regional Economic Studies (RES), Regional Strategic and Political Studies (RSPS), and Regional Social and Cultural Studies (RSCS). The Institute is also home to the ASEAN Studies Centre (ASC), the Temasek History Research Centre (THRC) and the Singapore APEC Study Centre.

ISEAS Publishing, an established academic press, has issued more than 2,000 books and journals. It is the largest scholarly publisher of research about Southeast Asia from within the region. ISEAS Publishing works with many other academic and trade publishers and distributors to disseminate important research and analyses from and about Southeast Asia to the rest of the world.
THE INDONESIA-MALAYSIA
DISPUTE CONCERNING
SOVEREIGNTY OVER
SIPADAN AND
LIGITAN ISLANDS

Historical Antecedents and
the International Court of
Justice Judgment

D.S. RANJIT SINGH
To my wife, Gurmit Kaur
Contents

List of Figures ix

List of Abbreviations xi

Acknowledgements xiii

Preface xv

1. Introduction 1

2. Historical Background: The Partitioning of the Malay Archipelago 16

3. The Resolution of Anglo-Spanish Claims and the Anglo-Dutch Boundary in North Borneo, 1878–1915 46

4. Delimitation of the North Borneo–Philippines Sea Boundary and the Transfer of Sovereignty over Certain Islands to North Borneo, 1903–30 71

5. The Emergence of Successor States to Colonial Regimes and the Phenomena of Expansionist Nationalisms in Maritime Southeast Asia 105

6. The Bases of Indonesia’s Claim 127

7. The Bases of Malaysia’s Claim 144

8. The ICJ’s Judgment 160

9. Conclusion 175
Appendixes
A: The Madrid Protocol, 1885. Protocol between Great Britain, Germany and Spain, signed at Madrid, 7 March 1885 193
B: Convention between Great Britain and the Netherlands Defining Boundaries in Borneo. Signed at London, 20 June 1891 197
C: Agreement between the United Kingdom and the Netherlands Relating to the Boundary between the State of North Borneo and the Netherland Possessions in Borneo. Signed at London, 28 September 1915 200
E: The Secretary of State (U.S.A.) to the British Ambassador, 19 December 1906 208
F: Exchange of Note of 3 July 1907 between Britain and the United States 210
G: Exchange of Note of 10 July 1907 between Britain and the United States 212
H: Boundary Convention between Great Britain and the United States, 2 January 1930, and Exchange of Notes, 2 January 1930 and 6 July 1932 214

Bibliography 227

Index 235

About the Author 244
List of Figures

1.1 Sabah, the Philippines and Indonesian Borneo 2
1.2 Location of Islands Relevant to the Dispute 3
1.3 Sipadan Island 4
1.4 Ligitan Island and the Light Tower 6
1.5 The Semporna Region 7

3.1 Extract of a Map of Northeast Borneo published by Edward Stanford in 1888 Showing the Approximate Boundaries Claimed by the Dutch (Red Line) and the BNBC (Yellow Line) 50
3.2 A Section of the Dutch Explanatory Memorandum Map of 1891 60
3.3 Copy of Map attached to the Anglo-Dutch Boundary Treaty of 1915 65
3.4 Enlarged Section of the 1915 Boundary Map Showing the Boundary Line on Sebatik Island 66

4.1 Map Showing the Three Marine Leagues Distance from the Coast of North Borneo 73
4.2 Map Showing the Line Described in the Treaty of Paris, 1898 76
4.3 Map Showing the Extent of the Philippines Territory as Defined by the Treaty of Paris, 1898 and the Convention of 1900 77
4.4 List of Islands over Which Lieutenant Francis Boughter, Commander of the American Gunboat USS Quiros Proclaimed United States Sovereignty in 1903 82
4.5 H.O.C 2117 Showing Boundary Line Incorporating All the Islands in Sibuku Bay, North Borneo over Which the United States Proclaimed Sovereignty in 1903 83
4.6 Map of North Borneo Annexed to the Notes of 3 July 1907 and 10 July 1907, Exchanged between Britain and the United States, Showing the Durand Line 87
LIST OF FIGURES

4.7 Reconstructed Map Showing the Boundary Convention of 1930 Line between North Borneo and the Philippines 92
4.8 Map Showing a Comparison of the 1898, 1907 and 1930 Treaty Lines 93
List of Abbreviations

ASEAN  Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BNBC  British North Borneo Company
BNBPA  British North Borneo Provisional Association
C.O.  Colonial Office
DEIC  Dutch East India Company
EEIC  English East India Company
EEZ  Exclusive Economic Zone
FEER  Far Eastern Economic Review
F.O.  Foreign Office
H.M.G.  His Majesty’s Government
H.O.C.  Hydrographic Office Chart
ICJ  International Court of Justice
IGC  Inter-Governmental Committee
MCA  Malayan Chinese Association
MCP  Malayan Communist Party
MIC  Malayan Indian Congress
MPAJA  Malayan Peoples Anti-Japanese Army
MSCC  Malaysia Solidarity Consultative Committee
ODA  Overbeck-Dent Association
PCA  Permanent Court of Arbitration
PRB  Party Rakyat Brunei
R.O.E.C.  Resident of the East Coast
SSA  Sabah State Archives
TAC  Treaty of Amity and Cooperation
UK  United Kingdom
UMNO  United Malays National Organization
US  United States
Acknowledgements

In the process of writing this volume, documents were obtained from a number of archives and organizations. In this context, I would like to thank the following: National Archives of the United Kingdom (London); Algemeen Rijksarchief of the Netherlands (Leiden); National Archives of the United States (Washington, D.C.); Sabah State Archives (Kota Kinabalu); and International Court of Justice (The Hague). On a personal note, I would like to record my sincere thanks to Associate Professor Dr Jatswan Singh Sidhu for having gone through my manuscript and for having rendered me assistance in many other ways.
The conclusion of the First United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1958 (UNCLOS I) and the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1982 (UNCLOS III) caused a flurry of activities among coastal states in Southeast Asia and many other areas to extend their jurisdiction over seas and oceans based on the new limits permitted for the extension of the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone (EEZ). The result was that the territorial seas and EEZs of many nations-states overlapped, producing in their wake a trail of rival territorial claims and disputes. The dispute between Indonesia and Malaysia concerning sovereignty over the two islands of Sipadan and Ligitan, situated on the northeast coast of Borneo, was one such case that arose in 1969 while the two countries were in the midst of delimiting their continental shelf boundaries. Both countries advanced rival sovereignty claims over the two islands, but as the issue could not be resolved even after prolonged negotiations, the two countries decided in 1996 to place the case before the International Court of Justice (ICJ) for settlement. The case was filed with the ICJ in 1998 and the verdict delivered in 2002. Malaysia’s case, and that of Indonesia as well, was fought by renowned international lawyers. However, long before the lawyers came into the picture, a great deal of meticulous, precise and laborious preparation for collecting, arranging and developing evidence for the case had already taken place. Although a number of agencies, representing different types of expertise, specializations and disciplines were involved in this massive task, there was one field and discipline which played an important role without which no country can have a case to present and without which no international lawyers would have a case to prepare; and this is the discipline of History. I can vouch for this statement as I was appointed as team leader by the Malaysian Government to prepare the historical evidence for its case concerning sovereignty over the Sipadan and Ligitan Islands.

While analysing the verdict of the ICJ in the Sipadan and Ligitan case and about that of Pulau Batu Puteh/Pedra Branca, it became evidently clear to me that the ICJ gives priority consideration to the possession of a legal
title based on historical developments. Thus, for a country to successfully defend its claim over a disputed territory, it must produce concrete historical evidence in support of its title. And here I cannot downplay the role of historians, their area of specialization, and the importance of rigorous and meticulous research. It is about this realization concerning the importance of the historical setting, not only for the sake of building up an unassailable case but also for a comprehensive understanding of the issue at hand, that persuaded me to develop a number of chapters in this work before even approaching the analysis pertaining to the bases of the claims advanced by the respective claimants and the ICJ’s verdict. As will be seen from Chapters 2 to 4 of this book, the story of disputed areas of control goes back to precolonial times. Although the Sipadan and Ligitan case was settled in 2002, this work has taken a long time to complete, partly due to the sheer volume of documents which had to be acquired and analysed before the narrative could be written. The delay, however, has benefitted the writer and enriched the volume in the sense that the Pulau Batu Puteh case was concluded in 2008 and this enabled the author to make more meaningful comparisons and generalizations between these two cases. A number of areas in Southeast Asia and East Asia, including the Straits of Malacca, the South China Sea, the Natuna Sea, the Celebes Sea, the Sulu Sea, and the East China Sea abound with contested maritime claims. It is the writer’s ardent hope that this volume will serve, in some ways, as a guide for interested parties to understand the essential requirements for upholding a valid claim.