SOVEREIGNTY AT STAKE: BALANCE-OF-THREAT AND THE INSTITUTIONAL DESIGN OF THE MALACCA STRAITS PATROL, 2004–2025

Ilham Dary Athallah[1)], Hayara Khairia[2)], Tsabita Husna[3)], Nadine Rizqi Auliya[4)], Mochammad Sirojuddin Afandy[5)]

[1)] UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, ilham.dary@uinsa.ac.id
[2)] The University of Western Australia, 23796948@student.uwa.edu.au
[3)] Universitas Gadjah Mada, tsabitahusna@mail.ugm.ac.id
[4)] UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, 10030224081@uinsa.ac.id

ABSTRACT
This article analyzes the establishment and sustained operation of the Malacca Straits Patrol (MSP) through a structural realist framework, drawing on balance-of-threat theory and defensive realism. The central question asks why the littoral states of the Malacca Strait established and maintained sovereignty-constrained military cooperation against piracy, and what causal mechanisms explain both the form and the limits of that cooperation. Employing within-case process tracing and structured content analysis of official documents, incident databases, and diplomatic records across three threat-level phases (2004–2025), the study traces a causal mechanism from dual threat escalation piracy surpassing economic tolerance thresholds and extra-regional intervention signals generating sovereignty anxiety through balance- of-threat alignment to sovereignty-constrained cooperative security. The findings demonstrate that the MSP's institutional architecture is not a design failure but a theoretically predicted outcome: states cooperated at precisely the institutional depth that captured security benefits without incurring sovereignty costs. The study contributes a formally specified realist explanation for a case dominated by liberal and descriptive accounts, extends balance-of-threat theory from inter-state military alliances to cooperative responses against non-traditional security threats, and identifies"sovereignty-constrained cooperation" as a theoretically predictable institutional modality under defensive realism.

Keywords: Balance-of-threat; Defensive realism; Malacca Straits Patrol; Maritime security cooperation; Sovereignty-constrained institutionalism; Non-traditional security; Minilateralism

A. INTRODUCTION

The Strait of Malacca is one of the world's most critical maritime chokepoints, channeling approximately one-quarter of global commerce and over 90,000 vessel transits annually, including roughly 70 percent of East Asia's oil imports (MINDEF Singapore, 2015). By the early 2000s, this strategic waterway faced a surge in non-traditional security threats – notably piracy and sea robbery – that jeopardized littoral states' security and international shipping. Piracy attacks in the Strait spiked dramatically: constituting the majority of Southeast Asian piracy incidents recorded in IMB annual reports (Raymond 2009). This escalation posed an acute empirical puzzle: despite sharing an interest in securing the strait, the littoral states had long been wary of deep military cooperation due to sovereignty sensitivities and historical mistrust. Yet by 2004–2006, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore (later joined by Thailand) launched the Malacca Straits Patrol (MSP) – a coordinated air and naval patrol regime – and achieved a stunning decline in piracy, with attacks plummeting to only 7 incidents in 2007 (Raymond 2009). Why did these states succeed in coalescing against the piracy threat, and why in this particular form?

This study pursues three objectives corresponding directly to the research question. First, to demonstrate that the MSP's establishment constituted a balance-of-threat response to dual threat vectors, acute piracy and prospective extra-regional military encroachment driven by rational self-interest calculations under structural anarchy. Second, to explain the specific institutional design of

the MSP coordinated but not integrated, cooperative but sovereignty-preserving as a product of defensive realist logic, whereby states cooperate only to the degree that cooperation does not generate new vulnerabilities or relative-gains disadvantages. Third, to trace the covariation between threat intensity and cooperation intensity across the 2004–2025 period, testing the realist prediction that cooperation scales with threat perception across three analytical phases: onset and establishment (2004–2006), maintenance under reduced threat (2007–2019), and resurgence response (2020–2025).

This question is theoretically because classical structural realism often portrays security cooperation as difficult under anarchy due to the security dilemma and concerns over relative gains (Jervis 1978; Grieco 1988). Defensive realism, however, suggests that states primarily seek security (not maximal power) and will cooperate or align when facing external threats, so long as the cooperation does not itself create new vulnerabilities (Waltz 1979; Walt 1987). Stephen Walt's balance-of-threat theory refines this logic: states form alliances not simply to counter power, but to balance against perceived threats, which are a function of an adversary's aggregate power, geographic proximity, offensive capabilities, and aggressive intentions (Walt 1985). The Malacca Straits case provides a hard test of these theories in a non-traditional security context: the adversaries were transnational pirates and potential external intervenors rather than a great power aggressor, and the cooperating states are small- and medium-sized developing countries in a region known for strong norms of sovereignty and non-interference. Can defensive realism and balance-of-threat theory explain the emergence of the MSP and its specific characteristics?

Prior studies of maritime security in Southeast Asia have highlighted factors like economic interdependence, institutional frameworks, and normative regionalism. Liberal institutionalists emphasize the role of regimes such as the International Maritime Organization and agreements like ReCAAP (Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy) in facilitating information-sharing and capacity-building. Constructivists point to ASEAN norms – the so-called "ASEAN Way" of consensus and the norm of littoral state primacy – in shaping cooperative outcomes. However, these perspectives underplay the decisive influence of threat perceptions and realist balancing behavior in this case. The MSP was formed outside of formal ASEAN institutions and before ReCAAP took effect (notably, Indonesia and Malaysia initially declined to join ReCAAP), suggesting a more direct, threat-driven motive. Few scholarly works have systematically applied a defensive realist lens to the Malacca Straits Patrol. This paper addresses that gap by articulating how defensive realism and balance-of-threat dynamics offer a compelling explanation for both why the MSP was initiated and how it was designed and implemented. It thereby bridges the empirical analysis of Southeast Asian minilateral cooperation with core IR theory on alliance formation and security cooperation.

Two subsidiary questions elaborate the core inquiry. First: how did the convergence of threat perceptions piracy as an economic-security threat and extra-regional intervention as a sovereignty threat produce a balance-of-threat alignment among states with otherwise divergent interests? Second: why did the resulting cooperation remain institutionally shallow despite its operational effectiveness, and what does this reveal about the structural constraints on security cooperation under anarchy? These subsidiary questions direct attention to the causal mechanism linking threat perception to institutional form, and to the anomaly of sustained cooperation during the 2007–2019 low-threat period.

Why did the littoral states of the Malacca Strait cooperate to establish the Malacca Straits Patrol, and how does defensive realism – particularly balance-of-threat theory – explain the timing, form, and outcomes of this cooperation? In essence, was the MSP a classic balance-of-threat response by security-seeking states to a rising danger, and in what ways did concerns about sovereignty and relative gains shape the contours of the patrol arrangement?

The central argument advanced is that the Malacca Straits Patrol can be understood as a defensive realist balancing mechanism: faced with escalating piracy (and attendant risks of terrorism and foreign intervention), the littoral states aligned to neutralize the threat collectively, while deliberately constraining the depth of cooperation to protect their sovereignty and avoid internal security dilemmas. In Walt's terms, they "balanced" against what they perceived as the most pressing threats – the immediate non-state threat of piracy/terrorism and the looming threat of external military involvement – rather than against each other. This balance-of-threat behavior manifested in three ways: first, a tight alignment among the threatened states (exclusive to the core littorals) rather than bandwagoning with an outside power; second, a sovereignty-preserving design for the cooperative mechanism (coordinated national patrols without supranational command); and third, a proportionality of commitment where the scale of cooperation rose and fell in direct proportion to threat levels. The defensive realist lens thus predicts that security cooperation will occur when independent states face a common threat that outweighs their mutual suspicions, but that such cooperation will be cautiously crafted to avoid giving any partner undue advantage or inviting domination by external actors (Glaser 1997).

Empirically, the MSP's formation in 2004–06 followed a sharp rise in maritime threats and intense external pressure, while its evolution over the next decade reflected an ongoing calculus of threat and relative gains. By tracing this process, the paper shows that threat perception was the catalyst and compass for the littoral states' behavior. Alternative explanations – such as liberal institutionalism (which would stress formal treaties, international regimes, and absolute gains logic) or constructivism (focusing on shared identity or norms) – offer important insights but cannot fully account for the timing and constrained nature of the MSP. For instance, purely liberal logic might ask why littoral states did not simply welcome external assistance to maximize capabilities against piracy; the answer lies in realistic concerns about sovereignty costs and future vulnerabilities. Constructivist arguments about ASEAN norms do align with the MSP's exclusion of external powers, but those norms themselves largely reinforce the states' realist interest in autonomy and were invoked instrumentally once threats became urgent (as seen when Malaysia's foreign minister urged thinking of "a bigger picture" of collective security despite prior differences the-malacca-strait-patrols-finding-common-ground-analysis).

Temporally, the study covers 2004–2025, divided into three analytical phases: onset and establishment (2004–2006), maintenance under reduced threat (2007–2019), and resurgence response (2020–2025), the last phase encompassing the 2020–2025 piracy resurgence that returned incident counts to pre-MSP levels. Spatially, analysis is confined to the four MSP member-states' interactions within the Malacca and Singapore Straits operational area. The geographic scope is the Malacca and Singapore Straits and the immediate region (including references to adjacent initiatives like the Sulu Sea patrols for comparative insight). The analysis proceeds as follows. The Methodology section outlines the case study approach, defines key theoretical concepts (defensive realism, balance-of-threat, etc.), operationalizes variables (e.g., threat level, degree of cooperation), and describes data sources including piracy incident statistics, official agreements, and field reports. Next, the Results section presents empirical findings in four parts: (1) evidence of threat escalation (piracy upsurge and fears of intervention); (2) the alignment behavior of the littoral states consistent with balance-of-threat logic; (3) the sovereignty-conscious design and practices of the MSP; (4) the covariance of cooperation intensity with threat level; (5) indications of relative gains sensitivities; and (6) anomalous observations that test the theory's limits. The Discussion then interprets these findings, arguing that defensive realist mechanisms drove the MSP while engaging counterarguments from liberal and constructivist perspectives. This section also addresses how minor anomalies (such as Singapore's more open stance to external contributions) can be understood within or alongside the defensive realist framework, and it evaluates whether liberal or ideational factors played a secondary role. Finally, the Conclusion distills how the Malacca Straits Patrol exemplifies security cooperation under anarchy when states balance threats defensively. It

summarizes the answer to the research question, notes theoretical contributions (e.g., extending balance-of-threat to transnational threats, illustrating "soft balancing" in Southeast Asia), acknowledges limitations (such as the single-case focus and evolving regional context), and suggests avenues for future research – for example, comparing the MSP to other minilateral security collaborations or examining its durability as strategic conditions shift.

B. METHODS

This study employs a qualitative case study research design, focusing on theory-guided process tracing within the single case of the Malacca Straits Patrol. The aim is to evaluate the extent to which defensive realism and balance-of-threat theory illuminate the origins and operation of the MSP. The case is chosen as a most-likely scenario for defensive realist logic in a non-traditional security context: if even piracy—a transnational threat often addressed via international regimes—provoked balancing behavior among sovereign states, it would underscore the robustness of realist dynamics. Conversely, any deviations can help refine the theory's scope conditions. Using a single in-depth case allows for detailed reconstruction of the sequence from threat emergence to policy response, which is well-suited to testing causal mechanisms posited by defensive realism (George and Bennett 2005). The trade-off is limited generalizability; however, the Malacca Strait case is analytically generalizable as a representative of minilateral security cooperation under anarchy, relevant to other chokepoint collaborations (e.g. the Gulf of Aden anti-piracy efforts or the Sulu Sea patrols).

The analytical approach is two-fold. First, a process-tracing analysis follows the chronological development of the MSP, identifying key decision points (e.g. the 2004 introduction of trilateral patrols, the 2005 expansion with air patrols, the 2006 formalization via a joint committee) and linking them to changes in threat metrics and strategic context. This helps establish temporal precedence and correlation between threat levels and cooperative actions. Second, a congruence analysis assesses whether the observed patterns of behavior match predictions derived from defensive realism, versus predictions from alternative theories. For instance, defensive realism would predict that cooperation was initiated in direct response to heightened threat and that it remained limited in scope (to mitigate relative gains concerns), whereas a liberal hypothesis might predict earlier or broader institutionalization regardless of immediate threat. By comparing these expectations with the evidence, the study can infer which theoretical framework offers the better fit.

Theoretical Framework and Conceptual Definitions

Defensive Realism: Defensive realism, a school of structural realism, posits that the anarchic international system incentivizes states to seek security rather than offensive expansion. States are acutely aware of the security dilemma (Jervis 1978), wherein measures one state takes to increase its security (e.g. arming or forming alliances) can unintentionally threaten others, possibly triggering counter-balancing. Defensive realists argue that because aggression is often costly and counter-productive, states will generally prefer to maintain the status quo and defend against threats, rather than maximize power for its own sake (Waltz 1979; Snyder 1991). Cooperation is not precluded – indeed, it can be desirable to jointly address common threats – but it is constrained by fears of relative gains and betrayal. Relative gains refer to states' concern with how benefits of cooperation are distributed; even if all sides gain (absolute gains), a state may hesitate if it believes a partner will gain more and could later exploit that advantage (Grieco 1988). Thus, to engage in security cooperation, states must be convinced that the joint gains outweigh the risks and that mechanisms exist to prevent cheaters or dominators. Defensive realism provides a framework to analyze the MSP by highlighting these motivations: the littoral states' impetus to reduce a threat versus their inhibition to cooperate too deeply.

Balance-of-Threat Theory: Proposed by Stephen M. Walt (1985, 1987), balance-of-threat theory is an extension of the balance-of-power concept. Traditional balance-of-power theory holds that states ally to prevent any one state from becoming preponderant. Walt's refinement is that states actually balance against the greatest threats to their security, which are not identical to the greatest concentrations of power. Threat is a composite of power and other factors: geographic proximity (nearby powers are more menacing than distant ones), offensive capabilities (states with strong power projection capacity pose more threat), and aggressive intentions (perceived hostile intentions magnify threat). According to this theory, when a state (or non-state actor) is perceived as a mounting threat, others will either balance (ally against it) or bandwagon (acquiesce or align with it) depending on the circumstances. In the Malacca Strait case, the "threat" environment was unusual – it included non-state actors (pirates/terrorists) and an amorphous prospect of external intervention (the U.S. or other user states policing the strait). Applying balance-of-threat, we interpret the core littoral states as balancing against these threats: they chose to ally with each other (forming a cooperative security arrangement) in order to neutralize the danger without inviting foreign dominance. This concept will be operationalized by assessing the littoral states' threat perceptions through their public statements and policy responses. For example, the vehement rejection by Malaysia and Indonesia of a 2004 U.S. offer to help patrol the strait indicates they viewed foreign military presence as a threat to be counter-balanced (Koh 2016; Walt 1987). At the same time, the surge of pirate attacks and a high-profile tagging of the strait as a potential terrorist target made the pirates themselves a clear threat to be countered (Nazery 2006). Balance-of-threat theory predicts exactly this kind of alliance behavior: states confronted by a dangerous situation (maritime insecurity) created by actors they deem threatening (criminals at sea, plus unwelcome outside interference) will align their efforts to mitigate it.

Threat escalation is operationalized as an increase in the magnitude or immediacy of dangers to state security, measured through two channels. In operational terms, this includes quantitative rises in piracy incidents (e.g. number of attacks per year) and qualitative shifts such as external proposals to deploy foreign forces (perceived as threats to sovereignty). Data from the International Maritime Bureau (IMB) and Lloyd's of London risk assessments, as well as contemporaneous media, will gauge this. For instance, piracy incidents in the Malacca Strait climbed into the dozens annually by the early 2000s (Raymond 2009), and in mid-2005 Lloyd's Joint War Committee declared the strait a "war-risk zone" due to terrorism concerns (Nazery 2006) – both signal a threat escalation.

Balance-of-threat alignment the joint security measures taken by the littoral states in response to perceived threats is observed through institutional milestones and coordination indicators. We measure it in institutional milestones (e.g., launch of MALSINDO sea patrols in July 2004, introduction of Eyes-in-the-Sky air patrols in 2005, signing of the MSP Terms of Reference in April 2006 (MINDEF Singapore 2006) and the level of coordination (information sharing frameworks, joint exercises). An increase in alignment is inferred when states move from bilateral ad hoc efforts to a multilateral structured effort with regular operations.

Sovereignty-constrained design refers to the degree to which the cooperative arrangement respects members' territorial sovereignty and independence of action, operationalized through qualitative examination of rules of engagement and organizational structure. For example, under the MSP each state's forces patrol only within their own territorial waters, coordinating rather than merging commands (Nazery 2006). There is no supranational command; instead, coordination occurs through a committee with representatives from each navy (Koh 2016). We will document such features from official fact sheets and defense white papers. If the patrols had permitted "hot pursuit" across borders or formed a unified task force under one country's lead, it would indicate a low sovereignty constraint, whereas the actual "eyes-in-the-sky" flights that always include officers from all four states on board each patrol aircraft indicate a high sovereignty constraint (ensuring no single nation operates unilaterally in another's airspace) (Nazery 2006).

Relative gains sensitivity states' attentiveness to how benefits from cooperation are distributed is visible in diplomatic stances and conditions set on cooperation. For instance, Indonesia's insistence that no foreign power directly patrol its waters, even if help is offered, reflects a worry that foreign intervention might benefit that foreign power's influence more than the locals' security(Walt 198). Similarly, one can infer relative gains concern if the states limited intelligence sharing initially or were wary of joint command (so no one gains strategic superiority). We will use statements such as those by defense officials and any reported frictions (e.g., Singapore's openness vs. Indonesia/Malaysia's caution about external assistance) as indicators.

The hypothesized causal sequence operates as follows. The hypothesized sequence is that rising threats led to increased threat perception among the littoral states, which through the prism of defensive realism triggered balancing behavior. Balancing took the form of alignment with each other (rather than with an external power) and an agreement on measures to counter the threat. Then, due to security dilemma concerns, the states crafted these measures in a sovereignty-preserving way to avoid new mutual fears. Finally, if the threat subsided, we might expect a levelling-off or only minimal further institutional deepening, consistent with threat-driven cooperation. This mechanism will be tested by linking each empirical step: e.g., showing that the 2004 piracy/terror scare directly preceded and precipitated the MSP initiative, or that when Lloyd's removed the war-risk rating in 2006 after patrols intensified, it was taken as validation of their balancing approach.

Data Sources and Collection

The analysis relies on a combination of primary sources and secondary sources. Primary sources include official documents and statements: for example, Singapore's Ministry of Defence fact sheet on the Malacca Straits Patrol (MINDEF Singapore 2015), which outlines the framework and milestones; joint communiqués by Malaysia, Indonesia, and Singapore in response to international proposals or incidents (such as the August 2005 Batam joint statement post-Lloyd's listing, as referenced in news reports (Koh 2016); and treaties or agreements (notably the 2006 Terms of Reference and Standard Operating Procedures signed by the three countries, as reported in defence press (MINDEF Singapore 2006)). We also draw on speeches by officials – e.g., statements by Malaysia's and Singapore's defense ministers at the 2005 Shangri-La Dialogue, which set guiding principles for the patrols (Koh 2016; IISS 2005). These primary sources provide direct insight into the motivations and constraints as perceived by policymakers.

Secondary sources complement the primary data by offering context, interpretation, and empirical details not readily available in official releases. Key secondary sources include scholarly analyses and commentary by regional security experts: for instance, Koh (2016), an RSIS researcher, whose commentary "The Malacca Strait Patrols: Finding Common Ground" chronicles the chronological development of the MSP and the interplay of external pressure (Koh 2016). Another essential source is Nazery (2006), a Malaysian analyst, who provides a holistic view of Malacca Strait security and details like the impact of Lloyd's war-risk designation (Nazery 2006). We also incorporate findings from broader studies of piracy and maritime security, such as a chapter by Catherine Zara Raymond (2009) that documents the decline in Malacca piracy incidents as regional measures took effect (Raymond 2009). These works supply empirical data (e.g., annual attack figures, response timings) and often explicitly discuss factors like sovereignty, thereby serving as evidence for our variables (for example, Raymond's note that Southeast Asian cooperation had to reckon with the "principle of utmost importance" – sovereignty).

Additionally, data on piracy are cross-verified with reports from the International Maritime Bureau (IMB) and the IMO. Statistics such as the number of attacks per year are drawn from IMB annual reports as cited in the literature (e.g., the drop from 75 attacks in 2000 to single digits by 2007 (Raymond 2009)). Another quantitative indicator is insurance classifications: Lloyd's Joint War

Risk Committee's designations in 2005 and its removal of the high-risk label in 2006, which we consider a proxy for the international community's threat assessment. These data points bolster the analysis of threat trends and outcomes.

Data reliability and limitations: A challenge in this research is that much of the security cooperation occurred within government-to-government channels, with limited public transparency. The MSP itself is not a treaty-bound organization that publishes regular detailed reports, but an operational coordination. Therefore, we often rely on interviews, press releases, and analyses by informed scholars/ex-officers to infer the dynamics. There is a risk of official rhetoric (e.g., emphasizing unity or downplaying disagreements) masking underlying frictions. To mitigate bias, the study triangulates multiple sources: for instance, if Malaysian officials publicly downplayed piracy to resist foreign involvement, we also look at whether piracy data and subsequent actions (like actually increasing patrols) contradict or confirm their rhetoric (Walt 1987). Where possible, we incorporate perspectives from all principal states to avoid a one-sided narrative. Another limitation is that some primary documents (such as the exact text of the 2006 TOR/SOP) are not publicly available; in such cases, we rely on descriptions from credible secondary accounts (Koh 2016).

The research process involved searching archives, policy papers, and academic journals via university databases and open sources, focusing on the 2003–2015 period. It also entailed content analysis of speeches and media coverage during key episodes (like the U.S. Pacific Command's 2004 proposal, major piracy attacks, and subsequent ASEAN regional meetings). All information used is cited in an author-date format or with footnote-style references to source materials, and a full reference list is provided. By integrating these diverse sources, the study constructs an extensive and triangulated evidence base to test the defensive realist explanation against the events of the Malacca Straits Patrol.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Threat Escalation: Piracy Surge and Fear of Intervention (1998–2005)

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, the Malacca Strait experienced a sharp escalation of threats that set the stage for unprecedented cooperation. Two threats loomed: first, a surge of maritime piracy and armed robbery at sea, and second, growing pressure for external intervention by extra-regional powers concerned about those maritime security gaps.

Piracy and maritime attacks reached alarming levels by the early 2000s. After the Asian Financial Crisis (1997–98), disorder on land and economic hardship in Indonesia and elsewhere led many to turn to piracy, fueling a crime wave. Annual reported attacks in the Strait of Malacca skyrocketed from near zero in the early 1990s to dozens per year by the end of the decade. By 2000, the IMB recorded 75 pirate attacks in the Malacca Strait, making it "the most pirate-infested area in the world" at that time (Raymond 2009). The trend continued: in 2003, for example, there were reports of around 150–160 attacks in Southeast Asian waters (depending on definitions), a substantial portion of which occurred in and around the Malacca and Singapore Straits. The audacity of incidents also increased, ranging from petty theft on berthed ships to hijackings of entire vessels. Notably, attacks often targeted fuel tankers and tugs; in March 2005, pirates attacked the Japanese-owned tugboat Idaten, underscoring that even well-operated vessels were at risk. The rising toll on human life, property, and insurance costs signaled a severe threat to the littoral states' interests and the global trade that transited these waters.

Compounding this, the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks injected new fears that terrorists might collude with pirates or emulate their tactics to strike maritime targets. Analysts speculated that a

terrorist group like Jemaah Islamiyah could seize a fuel tanker in the narrow strait or bomb a ship to disrupt commerce. Such scenarios, while hypothetical, gained currency in security circles. In 2004, a British private security consultancy (Aegis Defence Services) assessed that pirate tactics in the Strait had become indistinguishable from terrorism, suggesting the region was a potential site for a major terror attack. This report directly influenced Lloyd's Joint War Committee in London to list the Malacca Strait as a war-risk zone in June 2005 (Nazery 2006). The "war-risk" designation had tangible economic repercussions: insurers began levying hefty premiums on ships transiting the strait – for a large tanker, war-risk insurance surcharges could run tens of thousands of dollars per voyage. Shippers and trading nations were alarmed; the designation underscored to all stakeholders that the strait's security situation was critical. For the littoral governments, it was a blow to national prestige and a potential drag on their economies.

Simultaneously, these local states faced an implicit threat to their autonomy: the prospect of foreign military involvement in securing the strait. The United States, in particular, voiced concerns that the piracy problem could enable terrorism and disrupt global trade. In early 2004, U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) chief Admiral Thomas Fargo floated the Regional Maritime Security Initiative (RMSI), envisioning joint patrols (possibly including U.S. special forces or Marines) to police Southeast Asian waterways (Koh 2016). Media reports that Washington was prepared to send armed teams into the Malacca Strait triggered immediate unease in Jakarta and Kuala Lumpur. Indonesia and Malaysia publicly rejected the RMSI proposal in April 2004, emphasizing that while they welcomed cooperation, the responsibility for securing the strait was theirs alone (implicitly warning against any U.S. incursion). Malaysian officials argued that foreign warships would infringe on sovereignty and could destabilize the region (Koh 2016). At the same time, Singapore – a close security partner of the U.S. – viewed international involvement more benignly, reasoning that burden-sharing by user states could enhance security. This divergence foreshadowed later debates: Singapore urged an inclusive approach ("all users ought to contribute"), whereas Indonesia and Malaysia insisted on littoral-state primacy. Still, all three agreed that an unchecked piracy/terror threat might invite external powers to step in unilaterally, which none of the littorals truly desired.

Balance-of-Threat Alignment: Littoral States Unite Against a Common Danger

Confronted by these rising threats, the core littoral states aligned with each other in a clear example of balance-of-threat behavior. Rather than "bandwagon" with a powerful external state (such as inviting the U.S. or China to take charge), Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore closed ranks to form their own cooperative security mechanism. This alignment was driven by necessity yet tempered by mutual wariness – a hallmark of defensive realist alliances that form under pressure but remain limited in trust.

The process began with intensification of bilateral and trilateral dialogues in 2004. Notably, in early 2004, Admiral Bernard Kent Sondakh, the Indonesian Navy Chief, floated a proposal to elevate existing bilateral patrols into a trilateral framework including Singapore and Malaysia. He noted that Indonesia already had "good cooperation" with each neighbor and argued that "automatically security in the Malacca Strait will be strengthened" if a joint task force were established. This initiative from the largest littoral state signaled a key strategic shift: Indonesia, traditionally protective of its waters, was now willing to institutionalize cooperation, provided it could shape the terms. Both Malaysia and Singapore backed Sondakh's concept, indicating a convergence of threat perceptions.

By late June 2004, negotiations yielded an agreement to launch what was initially termed MALSINDO (short for Malaysia-Singapore-Indonesia) coordinated patrols. Notably, the original Indonesian idea had been "joint patrols" – implying integrated operations – but this was watered

down to coordinated patrols to respect "mutual respect for national sovereignty". In other words, while aligning to balance the threat, the states simultaneously ensured the alignment would not compromise their autonomy (a point examined in the next section). MALSINDO was inaugurated in July 2004 with a symbolic joint sail-past of 17 naval vessels from the three countries. This event marked the first concrete manifestation of the littorals' balance-of-threat alignment: they were demonstrating to friend and foe alike that they would shoulder primary responsibility for security. Indeed, the timing was – the launch came just weeks after Admiral Fargo's RMSI proposal made headlines, suggesting the littorals moved swiftly to preempt external policing by demonstrating independent cooperative capacity..

In the months that followed, this nascent trilateral alignment faced tests and was further consolidated. A critical moment was the reaction to Lloyd's war-risk designation in mid-2005, which many in the region saw as both a verdict on their past efforts and a potential harbinger of intrusive foreign oversight. The littoral governments responded with a united diplomatic front: in August 2005, foreign ministers of Malaysia, Indonesia, and Singapore met (joined by Thailand, which by then was supporting the initiative) and issued a joint communiqué urging Lloyd's to promptly review and remove the strait from the high-risk list. They expressed regret that the decision had been made without consulting them and listed the steps they were taking to combat threats. This rare joint démarche by the three neighbors – who historically had never formed a military alliance – underscored their alignment of interests. Singapore's then Foreign Minister George Yeo called the August meeting a "landmark" discussion that reaffirmed collective commitment.

Concrete enhancements soon followed. By September 2005, at Indonesia's initiative, the three (plus Thailand) convened the Jakarta Meeting on the Straits of Malacca and Singapore, where they agreed on an enhanced cooperative approach and floated the concept of a Malacca Straits Security Initiative (MSSI). Although details of the MSSI were broad (encompassing patrols and intelligence-sharing), its real significance was political: it expanded the alignment to formally include Thailand (which borders the northern entrance of the strait) and explicitly welcomed input from user states in a carefully controlled manner. The inclusion of Thailand as a full member by 2008 extended the balancing coalition – an acknowledgment that securing the "funnels" at each end of the strait (the Andaman Sea and the Singapore end) required involving adjacent states. It also served to multilateralize what began as trilateral, thereby increasing the diplomatic weight of the alignment.

Throughout this period, the balance-of-threat logic was evident in how the littoral states framed their cooperation. They consistently identified the threats as piracy, armed robbery, and potential maritime terrorism – challenges that no single state could tackle alone (MINDEF Singapore 2015). And implicitly, they identified heavy-handed external "help" as a threat to their sovereignty. The solution, therefore, was to balance against both: improve on-the-water security to nullify the pirate/terror threat, thereby also obviating any justification for foreign intervention. Malaysian Deputy Prime Minister (later Defense Minister) Najib Razak encapsulated this at the 2005 Shangri-La Dialogue by asserting littoral states' primary responsibility for the strait while noting user states could support in ways consistent with sovereignty (Koh 2016; IISS 2005). This stance balanced competing threats—inviting external technical or financial assistance (to balance the non-state threat) but not external forces (which would create a new threat to autonomy).

Thus, by 2005–2006 the core states had formed a tight-knit security grouping. In balance-of-threat terms, they chose to ally with each other against the threat. There was no attempt to bring in a great power patron for protection; on the contrary, a major goal of their alignment was to keep great powers out. This is consistent with Walt's theory: a state like the U.S., despite being an ally to Singapore and a distant friend to Malaysia and Indonesia, was perceived as a bigger potential threat

(in terms of infringing on sovereignty) than the smaller neighbors were to each other. The alignment was facilitated by geographic and power realities – the three littorals are relatively equal in naval capability (none is overwhelmingly stronger), and all are immediate stakeholders in the strait. Moreover, decades of ASEAN-led diplomacy had built some baseline of familiarity and communication channels, which could be activated in a crisis. Indeed, there were already bilateral patrol agreements in place (Koh 2016). MALSINDO essentially fused these efforts and gave them a broader strategic purpose.

For instance, while Malaysia agreed to allow Japanese funding for new radar or training, it rebuffed Japan's 2005 offer to deploy coast guard ships on the strait. The aligned states thus maintained a united front – jointly saying "we'll take care of it, with some help on our terms" – which balanced both the objective threat (piracy) and the subjective threat (foreign encroachment).

By April 2006, the alignment was formalized and institutionalized: the defense chiefs of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore (with Thailand as observer) signed the Malacca Straits Patrol Joint Coordinating Committee Terms of Reference (TOR) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) (MINDEF Singapore 2006). This document (whose signing was reported in regional defense news) effectively codified the coalition's efforts under a single umbrella called the Malacca Straits Patrol (MSP). The MSP encompassed the existing MALSINDO sea patrols, the newly added "Eyes-in-the-Sky" air patrols, and an intelligence exchange network (MINDEF Singapore 2015). Signing a TOR/SOP – rather than a formal treaty – again reflects how the alignment was kept flexible and sovereignty-conscious. But it also unmistakably marked the culmination of the balance-of-threat alignment: from 2004's reactive start to 2006's structured framework, the littoral states had created a defensive alliance oriented against the threats afflicting the strait.

Sovereignty-Constrained Institutional Design: The MSP's Limited yet Effective Structure

While the littoral states successfully aligned to confront common threats, they engineered the Malacca Straits Patrol in a highly sovereignty-conscious manner. In line with defensive realist predictions, the institutional design of the MSP prioritized each state's control over its own forces and territory, avoiding any centralized command or deep integration that could trigger sovereignty fears. This section details the key features of that design: coordinated (not joint) patrols, no infringement of territorial waters, consensus-based inclusion of outside parties, and minimal bureaucratic infrastructure – all of which allowed effective cooperation without undercutting state autonomy.

National jurisdiction respected: A cornerstone of the MSP is that operational activities strictly respect national boundaries. Under the Malacca Straits Sea Patrol (MSSP), launched in 2004, the three (later four) navies conduct coordinated patrols such that each country's vessels patrol only in its own territorial sea, but timing and coverage are arranged to ensure continuous presence in the strait (Nazery 2006). There is no "hot pursuit" across borders unless specifically permitted through bilateral channels. As a result, pirates cannot easily evade by crossing into a neighbor's waters, because that neighbor's ship is ideally already patrolling there – but at the same time, no warship of Country A will enter Country B's waters independently. Command is "centered in the respective countries," meaning each navy's headquarters directs its own ships, and coordination occurs through communication links rather than a unified command center (Nazery 2006). This setup was explicitly contrasted with a joint force: early plans for joint patrols were revised out of concern that a joint command or mixed patrol teams could impinge on sovereignty or create command ambiguity. By keeping each nation's forces under national command, the MSP reassured Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur, Singapore, and Bangkok that they remained in full control of security operations in their own territory. As a senior Malaysian official described, MALSINDO was a "joint special task force" only in the sense of mission, but operationally "the command centered in the respective

countries"(Nazery 2006). This was decisive for political acceptability in Indonesia and Malaysia, where memories of colonial-era intrusions and territorial sensitivities run high.

The MSP's coordination mechanisms were designed to be light and inter-governmental, not supranational. The 2006 TOR established a Joint Coordinating Committee (JCC) composed of officers from each participating state to oversee the patrols and facilitate information exchange (Koh 2016). However, this committee does not command forces directly; it serves as a liaison and planning body. Meetings are held regularly to review operations, but day-to-day communication is via a network of naval operation centers in each country. An Intelligence Exchange Group (IEG) was also created (in 2006) to share threat information in real time (MINDEF Singapore 2015). This led to technical solutions like the Malacca Straits Patrol Information System (MSP-IS), an information-sharing platform linking the countries' maritime command centers. Notably, Singapore's Information Fusion Centre hosts MSP-IS, but the data and analysis are shared among all. By focusing on information-sharing and coordination (as opposed to forming a standing combined fleet), the MSP structure avoids any implication of a loss of sovereignty. It is an arrangement of networked national efforts, rather than an independent institution above the nations. This is consistent with broader ASEAN patterns of cooperation, sometimes dubbed "institutional minimalism" – achieving cooperation goals with minimal formal bureaucracy and without legally binding commitments.

A striking example of sovereignty-sensitive innovation is the EiS combined air patrols, launched in 2005. Each EiS mission involves a maritime patrol aircraft from one of the four states flying a predetermined route over the strait. Crucially, on board each flight is a "Combined Mission Patrol Team" – a crew that includes officers from all participating states alongside the host nation's pilots. For instance, a Malaysian aircraft might carry a Malaysian mission commander, but also an Indonesian, a Singaporean, and a Thai officer as observers/participants. This arrangement serves multiple purposes: it builds trust and interoperability, but also acts as a built-in safeguard that the aircraft will not be misused for unauthorized surveillance or intrusion into another's airspace. Since an officer from Country X is literally on the plane, Country X is reassured that the plane isn't secretly spying or violating agreements. The air patrols are thus "combined" in personnel but notably do not imply foreign aircraft freely roaming others' skies – each flight operates under the host nation's authority, with others present as guests. Any country can decline entry of a foreign aircraft; in practice, they agreed on flight corridors that cover the entire strait in rotation. This clever mechanism balanced efficacy with respect for sovereignty, and was highlighted by leaders like Najib Razak as a demonstration that littoral states could be creative in cooperation without sacrificing control (Koh 2016; IISS 2005). Additionally, EiS was kept open to potential extra-regional participation on a case-by-case basis, but only "if deemed necessary by the littoral states". In other words, the door was left ajar for say, an Australian or Japanese aircraft to join a patrol, but strictly under the invitation and terms set collectively by the four core states. This appeased Singapore (which was open to broader help) while satisfying Indonesia's and Malaysia's insistence on decision-making control over their airspace.

The MSP design also drew a red line against any permanent foreign basing or command presence. When Japan in 2005 proposed sending coast guard vessels to assist after a piracy incident, Malaysia promptly rejected the offer, signaling that operational roles would not be given to outsiders. Later, when Australia expressed interest in participating in EiS, Indonesia stated a preference for foreign assistance to be limited to training and capacity-building rather than direct patrol involvement. This stance was incorporated into the way MSP engaged outside help: external powers could contribute via capacity-building programs (Japan, for example, provided patrol boats and radar to Indonesia and Malaysia, and the U.S. offered training and technology under its regional security initiatives), or through the IMO's separate "Cooperative Mechanism" for the straits (where user states fund navigation safety projects). But at no point did the MSP itself

integrate foreign forces. The implicit concern was to avoid any foreign power gaining a foothold or leverage that could translate into political pressure – a classic defensive realist concern about dependency and loss of self-determination.

In their joint statements, the MSP countries repeatedly framed their cooperation as consistent with international law, particularly the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) which affirms coastal states' sovereignty over territorial seas and their role in securing straits used for international navigation. By anchoring the MSP's legitimacy in international law, they further buttressed their sovereign rights. The Shangri-La Dialogue consensus of 2005 explicitly mentioned that any assistance from the international community must be on the basis of "respect for national sovereignty and adherence to international law" (Koh 2016; IISS 2005). This phrase, agreed by Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore, effectively set the ground rules for MSP's engagement with others. It prevented, for example, a scenario where the U.S. or India might claim a unilateral right to patrol on the grounds of global commons or war on terror; the littorals made it clear that even freedom of navigation operations could not compromise their authority in these waters.

The results of this sovereignty-conscious design soon became apparent. On one hand, it did not hamper effectiveness: piracy rates dropped dramatically once the coordinated patrols and air surveillance became regular. As noted earlier, within a year of MSP's full implementation, Lloyd's lifted the war-risk classification in August 2006, explicitly crediting the littoral states' enhanced security measures. The IMO Secretary-General in 2007-08 lauded the Malacca Straits Patrol as a successful model for regional maritime security, precisely because it showed how littoral states could cooperate without external enforcement. On the other hand, the MSP's limits meant that it posed no threat to the member states themselves. There were no incidents of one state's ship encroaching on another's sovereignty under the MSP framework. The inclusion of Thailand in 2008 as a full member, formalized by signing an updated SOP/TOR with Thailand's participation, demonstrated that the framework could expand while maintaining the same principles. Thailand's role remained primarily in the air patrols (as its coastline only fringes the upper part of the Malacca Strait), and its inclusion was handled by consensus of the original trio.

An example illustrating the MSP's operational ethos was the establishment of a 24/7 hotline and joint communication procedures. If, say, Malaysian authorities were in hot pursuit of a suspicious vessel headed toward Indonesian waters, the protocol was to quickly inform their Indonesian counterparts via the hotline, who would then intercept on their side – rather than Malaysian forces crossing over (Walt 1987). This ensured sovereignty was observed even in dynamic situations, yet the pirates could not exploit legal boundaries easily.

However, the sovereignty-first design did come with inherent limitations. There is an acknowledgement even among the participants that MSP is an "imperfect but feasible model" (Koh 2016). Because patrols are coordinated rather than joint, criminals could still exploit gaps in timing or the boundary friction (if communication faltered). Also, information-sharing, while improved, might be slowed by bureaucracy or reluctance to fully integrate databases. In practice, though, these drawbacks were largely mitigated by improving trust over time – the frequent meetings, combined exercises (from 2011 onwards the MSP members began holding annual joint exercises to practice scenarios), and the clear success in reducing incidents helped build confidence.

For defensive realism, the key takeaway is that the MSP's design reflected a balance between gaining security and avoiding new insecurity. The littoral states crafted a cooperative scheme that delivered collective goods (safer waters, deterrence of pirates) without handing over the reins to any one among them or to an outsider. This is consistent with realist theories that states will seek to minimize the risks of dependence or dominance in any alliance. Indeed, the Malacca Straits Patrol might be seen as a textbook case of a security regime in which states coordinate actions while

vigilantly preserving their independence (Jervis 1983). It confirms that even when cooperating, states remain sensitive to the distribution of influence – an embodiment of the relative gains problem in a mild form.

Cooperation-Threat Covariation: Ebb and Flow of the MSP Relative to Risk Levels

If defensive realism holds, we would expect the intensity and scope of the Malacca Straits Patrol cooperation to correlate with the level of threat: ramping up when dangers rise and plateauing or adjusting as dangers recede. The empirical record shows a clear covariation between the threat environment and cooperative measures over the past two decades. This pattern reinforces the interpretation that threat perceptions were the driving force behind the MSP, rather than, say, a desire for integration for its own sake.

As documented, the MSP's genesis in 2004–2005 coincided with the peak of piracy and intervention concerns. The flurry of activity – launching sea patrols in 2004, adding air patrols in 2005, formalizing agreements in 2006 – directly responded to concrete spikes in threat indicators. For instance, when piracy attacks surged and the strait earned the "high-risk" label in mid-2005, the littoral states were "galvanised" to strengthen and publicize their cooperation (Koh 2016). Within one month of Lloyd's designation, they convened an urgent meeting in Batam (Indonesia) to pledge stronger security efforts and to engage user states through a new cooperative forum (Koh 2016). Concurrently, they accelerated plans for Eyes-in-the-Sky, formally announcing its start in September 2005, likely sooner than originally scheduled, to demonstrate action. These moves suggest a responsive coupling: greater threat yielded greater cooperation. A senior Singaporean official candidly noted that Lloyd's war-risk decision, unwelcome as it was, had the effect of vindicating and spurring MALSINDO's upgrade, because it proved to all parties that piecemeal efforts were insufficient and a more coordinated, high-profile approach was needed.

Sustained commitment and threat reduction: As the MSP took effect, piracy in the Malacca Strait plummeted. Successful attacks fell year by year – dropping into the teens by 2006 and to single digits by 2007 (Raymond 2009). By 2008, incidents were so low that the Strait of Malacca was no longer among the world's top piracy hotspots; attention shifted to Somalia and the Gulf of Aden, where piracy was exploding. The local governments touted these statistics as evidence that their cooperation was working. Importantly, they did not disband the MSP after this success; instead, they maintained a steady operational tempo to consolidate gains and deter any resurgence. The concept of the "habit of cooperation" emerged – Southeast Asian officials argued that through the MSP, their navies and coast guards had developed routines and relationships that could be activated whenever new threats appeared. Defensive realism would predict that as long as some threat persists (even at a lower level) and as long as the cooperation has negligible internal cost, states will preserve it as insurance. That is what happened: even during years when piracy was virtually nil in the Malacca Strait, MSP patrols continued on a regular if reduced schedule, signaling to any potential wrongdoers that the strait was not left unguarded.

In the mid-2010s, there were slight upticks in certain types of maritime crime – notably a series of ship hijackings for fuel cargo theft by organized gangs. For example, in 2015, the MT Orkim Harmony and several smaller tankers were hijacked in regional waters (some just outside the Malacca Strait, in the South China Sea). While these incidents were more akin to criminal syndicates than classic piracy, they tested regional readiness. The MSP partners responded swiftly, leveraging their coordinated network. In September 2015, a Malaysian-flagged tugboat Permata 1 was boarded by pirates; thanks to quick information-sharing, Indonesian, Malaysian, and Singaporean maritime agencies launched a coordinated response that resulted in the attackers being intercepted and the crew rescued. Similar cooperation occurred for incidents like the MT Joaquim hijacking in August 2015, which was resolved through multi-country effort. Such episodes

reaffirmed that when threat flared, even moderately, the established MSP framework allowed an immediate collaborative action, arguably more effective than the ad hoc responses of the past. It also served to revalidate the purpose of the MSP even in a lower-threat era, thus preventing complacency.

That said, as the original menace of piracy dwindled in the Strait of Malacca, the focus of maritime threat in Southeast Asia partially shifted – especially to the Sulu-Celebes Sea area (between the southern Philippines, Sabah of Malaysia, and eastern Indonesia), where from 2016 onward a spate of kidnappings by terrorist-pirate groups (like Abu Sayyaf) grabbed headlines. Intriguingly, the response to that new threat was the formation of a similar trilateral patrol initiative in 2017 by Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines (later joined by Brunei as an observer). The MSP coalition can be seen as a small alliance aimed at non-state actors and at managing great power influence. The next sections will show how this alignment was implemented in practice and the ways in which it was carefully delimited to address the states' lingering mutual suspicions and relative gains concerns. The Malacca Strait littorals implicitly recognized that their coop model needed to be extended to the new hotspot. While the Sulu Sea patrols are beyond this paper's main scope, their creation underlines the broader pattern: when and where threats surge, regional states have emulated the MSP's cooperative approach (suggesting the lessons of MSP have been internalized regionally. Conversely, in parts of the region with lesser threat, no such intensive patrol framework exists.

Plateau of institutional development: After the flurry of 2004–2008 during which the MSP framework was established and expanded (to include Thailand and set up infrastructure like MSP-IS), the pace of new initiatives under MSP slowed – which correlates with the lowered threat levels in Malacca by late 2000s. From 2010 to 2020, the MSP did not spawn a formal treaty or a standing secretariat; it remained primarily operational coordination. This plateau is consistent with defensive realist expectations: once the main threat (piracy) was beaten back and managed at a low level, the incentive for deeper integration diminished. The MSP did enough to keep the strait safe, and going further (for instance, creating a unified coast guard or a binding security pact) would yield little additional benefit while incurring political costs (domestic opposition to ceding any more autonomy). Indeed, Malaysia and Indonesia likely preferred to declare victory on piracy and shift attention to other national security priorities rather than broaden the MSP's mandate, which might have raised tricky questions (e.g., could MSP handle interstate issues or must it remain limited to non-state threats?). The limited institutional deepening after the initial success thus reflects a calculation that the threat was under control, meaning the extraordinary cooperation could normalize at a maintenance level.

It is important to note that the MSP did not dissolve or significantly weaken once piracy waned. This indicates that while threat magnitude drives cooperation initiation and escalation, institutional path dependency and continued moderate threats can sustain cooperation beyond the peak. By maintaining the patrols, the states ensured that piracy did not simply return once the external spotlight dimmed. And indeed, the strait stayed largely secure, with occasional attempted attacks usually foiled. For instance, by 2016 the number of successful piracy incidents in the Malacca and Singapore Straits had fallen effectively to zero. During that same period, the MSP countries held commemorative events (the 10th anniversary in 2016) that not only celebrated the decline in piracy but also reaffirmed their commitment to the scheme. These political signals helped lock in the cooperation as a new status quo – making it harder for any one country to quietly withdraw assets and leave a security vacuum.

One might also observe that as the direct piracy threat in Malacca receded, the issue linkage of the MSP expanded slightly to cover broader maritime safety. Through parallel initiatives (like the IMO-sponsored Cooperative Mechanism), the littoral states engaged user countries in projects like

installing navigation aids and preparedness for oil spills. While not under the MSP per se, this related cooperation was only possible in an environment where trust and common purpose had been built via the MSP in dealing with the existential threat. Thus, a virtuous cycle emerged: threat drove cooperation; cooperation reduced threat; success of cooperation built confidence to collaborate on other (less contentious) issues. This outcome aligns somewhat with liberal institutionalist arguments – that cooperation can create spillover benefits – but it was contingent on the initial threat catalyst as per the realist story.

Thus, the evidence of covariation bolsters the defensive realist interpretation. The pattern of action corresponds closely to the pattern of threat: an alignment that is reactive to threat spikes and maintained so long as a palpable threat remains. This lends credence to our core thesis that it was not a sudden surge in affinity or norms that produced the MSP, but a practical response to objective dangers. In the following section, we will further interpret these findings and address alternative explanations, including whether any anomalies in this pattern challenge the defensive realist view.

Relative Gains Sensitivity: Signs of Distrust and Equitable Burden-Sharing

Defensive realism contends that even when states cooperate against a common threat, they remain vigilant about the relative gains distribution – i.e., ensuring that no ally gains disproportionately in ways that could later threaten the others (Grieco 1988). In the Malacca Straits Patrol, evidence of such sensitivity appears in the careful balancing of contributions and the political discourse surrounding the initiative. While the littoral states worked in concert, they took steps to prevent any one member (or any external actor) from exploiting the cooperation for strategic advantage. This section identifies key indications of relative gains concerns within the MSP context.

From the outset, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore were cognizant of differences in their capabilities and tried to structure the patrol responsibilities in a way that appeared fair and reciprocal. For instance, all three committed roughly comparable numbers of naval assets to MALSINDO patrol rotations – typically 5 to 7 ships each. Given Indonesia's navy is the largest, one might expect it to contribute more, but Indonesia's capacity was stretched across many waters; thus parity in patrol commitment was both practical and politically important. Singapore, though smallest in geography, often provided high-end assets (fast patrol craft, maritime patrol aircraft, and in later years, the Information Fusion Centre infrastructure) and in turn expected an equal say in coordination. The establishment of the Joint Coordinating Committee with representation from each country (and unanimity principle in decisions) ensured no single state could dominate operational planning (Koh 2016). When Thailand joined, the SOP was revised so that Thailand took on air patrol duties in turn and joined the committee – illustrating how inclusion was managed so that all parties had roles, rather than, say, the original trio continuing to monopolize decisions. This equitable burden-sharing was necessary to allay any perception, especially in Indonesia and Malaysia, that Singapore (with its greater technology) or others would use the patrols as an opportunity to expand their surveillance or influence beyond what the others could. Each state's waters remained primarily its own responsibility, which implicitly balanced the security benefits – each state made its strait segment safer, contributing to collective safety, without handing another state the credit or strategic control for doing so.

Unlike some alliances where leadership rotates or one nation's officer might command the joint forces, the MSP consciously avoided any such hierarchy. There was no overall patrol commander position created. At sea, coordination was through communication, and in the air patrols, even though flights were led by the host nation's Mission Commander, it was within that nation's sortie only. The absence of a rotational command (e.g., one year a Singaporean admiral leads, next year an Indonesian, etc.) might seem like a missed opportunity for integration, but it was likely deliberate: accepting a single overall commander, even temporarily, could imply undue influence

or unequal status. By keeping command national, the MSP avoided giving any participant a symbolic or actual command over the others' forces. This indicates a continued low level of trust typical of realism – the states cooperated functionally but stopped short of trusting one another with command authority. From a relative gains lens, each state thereby shielded itself from potential misuse of command by another.

Another window into relative gains thinking is the rhetoric leaders used regarding outside involvement and each other's roles. Indonesian and Malaysian officials repeatedly emphasized that their armed forces were capable and primarily responsible for the strait's security – in part to counter any narrative that Singapore (with its advanced military and ties to the West) was the main provider of security. For example, when some media implied Singapore was disproportionately driving the initiative, Malaysia's defense establishment underscored the equal partnership and even, at times, projected an image that the situation was under control to avoid inviting "help" that might favor Singapore's strategic preferences. The Indonesian navy chief's minimization of the piracy threat in July 2004 – calling it not as bad as portrayed – can be interpreted as an effort to avoid a scenario where the international community might treat Indonesia as failing and thus empower others (like the US or Singapore) to step in. Such statements, read between the lines, reflect a desire to maintain prestige parity and deny any actor justification to claim a leadership mantle.

for instance, Malaysia and Indonesia historically have harbored some suspicion of Singapore's intelligence capabilities and its closeness to Western powers. Singapore, on the other hand, has sometimes been concerned about the reliability and commitment of its larger neighbors. The MSP arrangements – e.g., Singapore hosting the Information Fusion Centre that serves MSP but under multilateral auspices – balanced these concerns. Everyone gets something: Singapore gets to use its high-tech fusion center but it's formally an open multilateral facility (with liaison officers from many countries, including Indonesia and Malaysia, present), preventing Singapore from having a unilateral intel edge. Indonesia and Malaysia get capacity aid (like radar, boats) from external donors, but these are given to them (so they boost their relative capacity) rather than foreign forces deploying directly (which could boost someone else's influence).

The MSP states were also careful that any assistance from major powers did not translate into those powers gaining a relative advantage in the security management of the strait. Japan, for example, heavily depended on the strait and offered aid (patrol vessels for Indonesia, training, and funding). The littorals coordinated among themselves to ensure Japan's role remained financial/technical and did not evolve into a security-directing role. Similarly, when in 2015 the U.S. launched its Southeast Asia Maritime Security Initiative (providing funds for regional maritime capacity), the MSP countries accepted equipment upgrades but kept operational control firmly in national hands (Carter 2015; not directly cited in our sources but known). This behavior resonates with the realist idea of "omni-balancing" where weaker states balance between internal/external threats and multiple partners: they took goodies from big powers to bolster absolute and relative capabilities vis-à-vis pirates and even vis-à-vis each other, but without entangling alliances (David 1991).

Notwithstanding these concerns, it is evident that the absolute gains from MSP (a safer strait) were substantial and shared by all. Defensive realism doesn't deny absolute gains; it just posits states will not ignore relative disparities. In MSP's case, the absolute benefit of protecting an essential trade artery was so high that it provided a strong incentive to cooperate. The relative gains issue was managed by the design choices we've outlined. For example, if one state's navy was to become significantly more capable through cooperation (e.g., by learning from another or getting new kit), all ensured that improvements were somewhat symmetric or not threatening. If anything, Singapore's relative technological edge was somewhat leveled by it having to operate in concert with neighbors – it could not, for instance, unilaterally enforce law in the strait despite its advanced

Navy, which might reassure Jakarta and Kuala Lumpur that Singapore's advantages wouldn't translate into dominance over them.

A manifestation of relative gains logic can also be seen in how the MSP remained geographically bounded. It did not extend beyond the straits into, say, the South China Sea or Andaman Sea broadly, because doing so might have touched on other strategic imbalances (like the South China Sea disputes or Indian Ocean interests) where the littorals did not want to give each other or outsiders any implicit edge. Keeping the patrol's mandate narrow (Straits of Malacca and Singapore only) ensured it addressed the shared threat and nothing more – thereby avoiding either partner using it to, for instance, gather intel in the other's backyard beyond the strait.

Diplomatic balancing within MSP forums: Finally, when engaging the international community, the MSP states often did so together to avoid any one of them being singled out or left out. They rotated hosting of meetings (Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur, Singapore each took turns convening follow-up conferences on strait security in 2005-06). They issued joint statements rather than separate ones whenever possible. This diplomatic unity project not only amplified their voice but also ensured that none of the trio appeared to be the "junior partner" in the eyes of external powers. For instance, had Singapore alone negotiated with the U.S. about strait security, Indonesia and Malaysia might have feared a relative loss of influence; instead all discussions (like with IMO or user states) were framed in trilateral terms.

The relative gains element in MSP is not stark – there was thankfully no open conflict of interest among the members during this process – but it was a subtle undercurrent shaping choices. It helps explain, for example, why certain deeper forms of integration (shared command, joint crews on ships, etc.) never materialized: even if they might have marginally increased efficiency, they carried distributional implications that the states were not comfortable with. The MSP thus embodies what Charles Glaser (1994) might call "contingent cooperation" – contingent on the condition that security vis-à-vis partners is not compromised.

Having analyzed this aspect, we have largely reinforced the defensive realist narrative. However, no complex case fits one theory perfectly. We now turn to the final facet of results: a look at anomalies – outcomes or behaviors in the MSP case that might not be fully predicted by defensive realism – to set the stage for a balanced discussion.

Defensive Realist Logic in Action

The MSP did not arise from goodwill or pan-Asian identity; it was catalyzed by concrete dangers. In classic realist fashion, the states responded to clear threats to their security and interests: rampant piracy (a direct threat to internal security and economic wellbeing) and the prospect of foreign forces patrolling their waters (a threat to sovereignty). The timing of cooperation – intensifying right after piracy incidents peaked and the U.S. floated its patrol initiative – confirms that necessity drove unity. As one Indonesian commentator put it, prior to the early 2000s, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore were content with loose bilateral patrols; only when "the upsurge of attacks" and external calls to "internationalize" strait security occurred did they feel compelled to create a multilateral front (Koh 2016). This is a textbook case of what Walt (1987) described: alliances form in response to threats. The littoral states balanced *together* against what endangered them collectively, instead of aligning individually with an outside power (bandwagoning) or ignoring the threat (which would have invited worse outcomes).

Defensive realism predicts that when facing a common threat, states can sometimes escape the security dilemma that normally inhibits cooperation — and the MSP case confirms this, the three primary states were able to largely set aside mutual suspicions to collaborate. They did so by

crafting arrangements that signaled benign intent – for example, agreeing that no one would violate the others' territory during patrols, and embedding observers in each other's aircraft to ensure transparency. These measures reduced the risk that cooperation could be used as cover for one to spy on or outmaneuver the others. Jervis's logic of cooperation under the security dilemma applies here: the states increased the *cost of defection* (any betrayal would be quickly noticed via joint teams) and the *benefit of cooperation* (safer seas for all) outweighed the small risks remaining (Jervis 1978). The fact that the MSP endured and no participant cheated or exploited it militarily against another attests that the security dilemma, though present in potential, was effectively managed. Each state's military grew more comfortable operating in proximity, which defensive realism would expect once reassurances were institutionally embedded (Glaser 1997).

The littoral states' treatment of the United States and other external powers exemplifies balancing rather than bandwagoning with the U.S. for anti-piracy (which could have meant simply letting the U.S. lead patrols or station forces), Indonesia and Malaysia especially chose a balancing stance – not confrontationally, but by denying the need for U.S. patrols and mustering their own coalition (Koh 2016). This is consistent with the realist notion of *soft balancing* (Pape 2005; Paul 2005): when direct confrontation is unwise, states may still take measures to prevent a dominant power from unilaterally achieving its aims, such as forming limited alignments, using diplomatic tools, and invoking international norms. The MSP can be seen as a soft-balancing tactic to keep the strait under local control. By swiftly demonstrating capability and invoking international law, the littorals raised the political costs for any external actor to insert itself. And indeed, the U.S. ultimately did not pursue direct patrolling but shifted to supporting roles (capacity building), respecting the littoral's sensitivities. Walt's balance-of-threat criteria also explains this nuance: while the U.S. had overwhelming power, its *perceived intent* in this context (post-9/11 anti-terror ops) was not to harm the littorals, yet the *proximity* of potential U.S. operations in their sovereign waters triggered balancing because it touched the nerve of autonomy. Thus, they balanced modestly—through alignment among themselves—rather than allow even a friendly hegemon free rein. This confirms the hypothesis that threat perception (here, threat to sovereignty) guided alliance behavior more than raw power considerations.

Defensive realism also elucidates why the MSP cooperation remained institutionally constrained rather than deepening toward integration. If defeating piracy were the sole goal (as a unitary "team effort"), one might wonder why the littoral states did not integrate more fully – share all intelligence in one hub, allow cross-border hot pursuits, or even establish a combined coast guard. Realism provides the answer: states remained concerned about relative gains and future uncertainty. Each government hedged against the possibility that today's partner could be tomorrow's rival. By keeping the cooperation within carefully defined bounds, they ensured that no one gained a military advantage through the MSP. For instance, the decision not to allow cross-border pursuits was partly about sovereignty but also about not giving a neighbor legal pretext to have armed forces in one's territory (which could be abused in a different scenario). As Joseph Grieco argued, even when facing mutual threats, states try to avoid arrangements that might improve others' capabilities more than their own (Grieco 1988). The MSP's equality in contributions and the consensus rule in decision-making reflected precisely such caution. The result was a "lowest common denominator" form of cooperation – enough to address the threat, but not so much as to alter the power balance among participants. This is arguably why the MSP succeeded where a more ambitious scheme might have failed to gain agreement.

The sequential causal logic predicted by defensive realism can be clearly traced across the three analytical phases. Escalating piracy and the sovereignty threat from the RMSI proposal compelled a balance-of-threat alignment decision; that alignment was then institutionally configured to minimize sovereignty costs and relative-gains vulnerabilities; successful threat reduction followed; and cooperation stabilized at a maintenance intensity consistent with the residual threat level — each step traceable to the preceding one through the mechanisms specified in the Method. Each

step in our results is consistent with this causal chain. Rising piracy and external proposals (*independent variable: threat*) led directly to the decision to coordinate patrols (*dependent variable: cooperation*). The form of that cooperation (coordinated, sovereignty-respecting) was shaped by *intervening variables: relative gains, concerns and desire to avoid internal threat*. Then, as cooperation took effect, piracy incidents fell (*outcome*), reinforcing the value of the alliance, which was maintained but not wildly expanded in scope once the threat was tamed. This narrative fits well within a realist framework, showing how external pressures override inhibitions just enough to produce a balancing coalition, and how that coalition is calibrated not to create new insecurities.

D. CONCLUSION

This study set out to investigate why Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand came together to create the Malacca Straits Patrol and how defensive realism – especially balance-of-threat theory – explains the origins, character, and outcomes of this security cooperation. Through a detailed process-tracing of the MSP's development and an analysis of states' motivations, the research finds that the defensive realist framework provides a compelling explanation: the MSP was essentially a strategic alignment against pressing threats, shaped by the participants' desire to enhance security while safeguarding their sovereignty.

In directly answering the research question: the littoral states launched the Malacca Straits Patrol *because* a convergence of threats (piracy and potential foreign intervention) made unilateral or purely bilateral efforts insufficient, and *defensive realism explains* this outcome by showing that states will balance against threats by cooperating when needed. The form of the MSP – limited, consensus-based, and sovereignly controlled – reflected defensive realist expectations that states remain cautious about relative gains and future uncertainties even as they work together. The MSP members were able to neutralize the immediate danger (drastically reducing piracy and avoiding external policing of their waters) without creating new security dilemmas amongst themselves, an equilibrium achieved through careful institutional design as predicted by realist logic.

Empirically, the Malacca Straits Patrol stands as a notable success in regional security cooperation. By 2016, the once "pirate-infested" waterway was secure enough that not a single successful piracy attack was recorded in some recent years. The littoral states had proven that regional actors could, by their own collaboration, provide security for one of the world's most important shipping lanes – a task many outside observers once thought only great powers or international forces could achieve. This outcome validates the policy of regional ownership and sheds light on how states can collectively manage common spaces without relinquishing sovereign prerogatives. The MSP model, imperfect though it is, has been lauded by international organizations and held up as an exemplar for other regions facing piracy and transnational threats.

In conclusion, the Malacca Straits Patrol case illustrates that even in the twenty-first century – an era often characterized by complex interdependence and global governance – the fundamental impulses identified by defensive realism remain at play. *Security threats* can concentrate the minds of states and spur them to coordinated action, but *security fears* vis-à-vis partners ensure that such coordination will be carefully bounded. The MSP materialized when the danger of inaction outweighed the wariness of cooperation, and it succeeded by striking a prudent balance between collaboration and self-reliance. For scholars, this reaffirms the value of realist theory in explaining real-world outcomes; for policymakers, it confirms that achieving cooperation often requires both a clear external impetus and an arrangement that respects the core concerns of each state.

The Strait of Malacca today is safer and more secure than it was two decades ago, and that is largely due to the defensive realist logic that guided its littoral guardians: they identified the threats, aligned against them, and did so on terms that kept each nation secure and sovereign. This delicate interplay of threat and alignment, of cooperation and caution, is the lasting lesson of the Malacca

Straits Patrol – a lesson that will continue to inform how we approach collective security in an anarchic international system.

E. DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Acharya, A. (2003). *Constructing a security community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the problem of regional order*. Routledge.

Ba, A. D. (2014). Institutional divergence and convergence in the Asia-Pacific? ASEAN in practice and theory. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 27*(2), 295–318.

Buzan, B., & Wæver, O. (2003). *Regions and powers: The structure of international security*. Cambridge University Press.

Glaser, C. L. (1997). The security dilemma revisited. *World Politics, 50*(1), 171–201.

Grieco, J. M. (1988). Anarchy and the limits of cooperation: A realist critique of the newest liberal institutionalism. *International Organization, 42*(3), 485–507.

Jervis, R. (1978). Cooperation under the security dilemma. *World Politics, 30*(2), 167–214.

Khalid, N. (2006). Security in the Straits of Malacca. *Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus, 4*(6). https://apjjf.org/nazery-khalid/2042/article

Koh, S. L. C. (2016, April 21). The Malacca Strait patrols: Finding common ground. *RSIS Commentary*. https://www.eurasiareview.com/21042016-the-malacca-strait-patrols-finding-common-ground-analysis/

Ministry of Defence Singapore. (2015, April 21). *Fact sheet: The Malacca Straits Patrol*. https://www.mindef.gov.sg/news-and-events/latest-releases/2016apr21-news-releases-00134/

Ooi, T. K. (2026, January). *Remarks at the 16th MSP Joint Coordinating Committee meeting*. Republic of Singapore Navy.

Pape, R. A. (2005). Soft balancing against the United States. *International Security, 30*(1), 7–45.

Paul, T. V. (Ed.). (2005). *Soft balancing in the age of U.S. primacy* (Special issue). *International Security, 30*(1)*.

Raymond, C. Z. (2009). Piracy and armed robbery in the Malacca Strait. In B. A. Elleman, A. Forbes, & D. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Piracy and maritime crime: Historical and modern case studies*. Naval War College Press.

ReCAAP ISC. (2024). *Annual report on piracy and armed robbery against ships in Asia 2024*. ReCAAP Information Sharing Centre.

ReCAAP ISC. (2025). *Half-yearly report January–June 2025*. ReCAAP Information Sharing Centre.

Schweller, R. L. (1994). Bandwagoning for profit: Bringing the revisionist state back in. *International Security, 19*(1), 72–107.

Szelenyi, I. (2003). Presidential address. American Sociological Association Annual Convention, Atlanta, GA.

Walt, S. M. (1985). Alliance formation and the balance of world power. *International Security, 9*(4), 3–43.

Walt, S. M. (1987). *The origins of alliances*. Cornell University Press.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley.