THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO
COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

PJAEE, 17 (7) 2020

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

Mohd. Noor Yazid
Programme of International Relations, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the socio-politico Islamic movement in Southeast Asia after the September 11 Event, 2001. The objective of the paper is to examine the relationship between the September 11 event and the political situation and the socio-politico Islamic movement in the Southeast Asian countries. What different between the majority and minority Muslim population countries in Southeast Asia? The paper will not go to a specific discussion to any particular country, but a general discussion on Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand. This paper hopes could analyse the relationship between the September 11 event 2001and the socio-politico Islamic development changes in Southeast Asia; the differences between the majority of Muslim population countries and the minority Muslim population countries. Malaysia and Indonesia are the two countries that the majority population are the Muslim, otherwise, Thailand and the Philippines are not; Thailand is Buddhist and the Philippines is Christian Catholic countries. There are dramatic changes and unstable condition in the minority Muslim countries (i.e in the Southern Part of Thailand and the southern part of the Philippines) after the September 11 and relatively different in the situation in Malaysia and also in Indonesia.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper discusses the Islamic and socio-politico Islamic movement in Southeast Asia after the September 11 event, 2001. The objective of the paper is to examine the relationship between the September 11 event and the political situation and the Islamic movement in the Southeast Asian region. What different between the majority and minority Muslim population countries in Southeast Asia? The paper will not go to a specific discussion to any particular country, but a general discussion on Indonesia,

THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO
COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

PJAEE, 17 (7) 2020

Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand.[1] This paper hopes could analyse the relationship between the September 11 event 2001 and the political and Islamic development changes in Southeast Asian region, i.e. the differences between the majority Muslim population countries and the minority Muslim population countries. Malaysia and Indonesia are the two countries that the majority population are the Muslim, otherwise, Thailand and the Philippines are not; Thailand is Budhist and the Philippines is majority Christian Catholic countries. There are dramatic changes and unstable condition in the minority Muslim countries (i.e. in the Southern Part of Thailand and in the southern part of the Philippines) after the September 11 and relatively different in the situation in Malaysia and also in Indonesia.

The article is divided into seven parts; firstly, introduction, secondly, September 11, 2001 Event and International Political Structure after the End of the Cold War, thirdly, International Islamic Movement and Southeast Asia, fourthly, Islamic Movement in Southeast Asia after September 11, fifth, the Socio-Politico Islamic Movement in Majority Muslim Countries; Malaysia and Indonesia, sixth, the Socio-Politico Islamic Movement in Minority Muslim Countries; The Philippines and Thailand and finally a conclusion.

2.   THE   SEPTEMBER   11,   2001   EVENT   AND   INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL STRUCTURE AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR

The September 11 Event has a relationship with the international political structure after the end of the Cold War. Post-Cold War international political structure is important in analysing and studying international politics after 1991 including the event of September 11, 2001 and political development and the Islamic movement in Southeast Asian countries. After the end of the Cold War, i.e. after the collapsed of the Soviet Union in December 1991, the international political structure has been changed from bipolarity to the uni-polarity structure.[2] The early stage of uni-polarity international political structure is not stable compared to the bipolarity structure during the period 1945-1991.

Other strong power is required in creating international political stability. Based on the twentieth century and historical background, solely the America as a single power is not possible to create international stability. It means that the bipolarity structure is relatively more stable than uni-polarity structure.[3] The balancing power, as was played by the Soviet Union is required in creating international political stability. The existing of uni-polarity power structure refused to accept any power in the international stage because it would possible to create a new challenge for him (the America). In reality, the America could not stop creating or emergence a new power or a few new powers in the international political structure. What reality is the uni-polarity power (the America) only could make slow down the process of creating and

---

[1] Malaysia and Indonesia refer to majority Muslim countries and Thailand and the Philippines refers as the minority Muslim countries.

[2] The first decade after the collapsed of the Soviet Union in December 1991, (the period from 1991 until 2001) could be considered as period of unipolarity. After 2001 the international political structure was not considered as unipolarity structure.

[3] See Jackson, R and Sorenson, G., (2007). *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches* (third edition), Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, p. 79-81. See also Mearshiemer, J. (1990), Back to The Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War, *International Security,* 15 (1): 5-56.

THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO
COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

PJAEE, 17 (7) 2020

emerging a new power in international political structure? By the matter of time, one or more strong power will emerge in the international stage.

There are a few countries or group of countries that can form new power. The possible power are; European Union, China, Japan, India, the Soviet Union and a coalition of Islamic countries. One of the possible power is a group of Islamic countries.[4] This group of countries has strong reason to unite and fighting the America. The Islamic group also has rich with natural resources such as gas, oil, other minerals and agriculture resources.

The international political instability situations since 1991 were the first stage of the creation of a new international political structure. The process is much similar to the creation of bipolarity political structure after the end of the Second World War. The process of creation bipolarity was not started in the late 1940s or early 1950s. The process began in 1914 or earlier than the outbreak of the First World War. The political and fighting between the world great powers in 1914 continued until 1945 when all of the other great powers collapsed and the emerging two great powers, i.e. the Soviet Union and the United States.[5] The process of the creating new international political structure since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991 is slightly the same as what happened in the last century. If the power that would emerge were more than three powers it would create a multi-polarity structure or if only two powers it would be bipolarity structure. The American fighting and labelling Islam as 'terrorism' because Islam is the possible future political enemy for the America. Before a strong Islamic power emerged as a great world power, the United States of America has to fight and destroyed her. If America succeeds to destroy Islam (and the other possible power that challenges America), America would still a strong uni-polar and control international political structure. If he failed, and one power arises, the bi-polarity would emerge. If there are more than two powers emerge, the multi-polarity structure will emerge in international political structure.

3. THE SOCIO-POLITICO ISLAMIC MOVEMENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA
The Socio-politico Islamic movement began in Southeast Asian since the early era of the coming of Islam in the early fourteen century. During the period of Malacca Sultanate, Acheh Kingdom, Brunei Sultanate, Sultanate of Sulu and Maguindanao, Pattani Kingdom: the sosio-politico Islamic movement had a good position in the Muslim kingdom in Southeast Asia. The character of the Southeast Asian kingdom contributed to the position of Islam in that kingdom. When the fall of great Muslim Southeast Asian Kingdom, and the coming of Western powers in sixteen centuries slowly Islamic group separated by the central government. The collapsed of the traditional Muslim kingdom and the separation of the Muslim kingdom after the

---

[4] See Huntington, Samuel. (2001). 'The Coming Clash of Civilizations or, The West against The Rest.' In Kegley, Charles W. (jr.) & Wittkopf, Eugene, R. (2001). *The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives* (sixth edition). New York; McGraw Hill, pp. 197-200. See also Huntington, Samuel. (2003). The Clash of civilization. in Art, Robert, J. and Jervis, Robert, *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues,* (sixth edition), New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc., pp. 411-425.

[5] The Germany failed in two times (first in 1914-1918 and second time in 1939-1945) to become a strong major power in the international political power. See Keylor, William, (1992). *The Twentieth Century World: An International History (second edition).* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, chapter 1 and chapter 5.

THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO
COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

PJAEE, 17 (7) 2020

coming of the West contributed to the Muslim sosio-political movement in Southeast Asia. For example, Sultanate of Sulu-Maguindanao became part of British, Spaniard and Dutch territory as well as Sultanate of Pattani in Southern Thai. Both Muslim Kingdom were controlled by the non-Muslim regime after the creation of new recognised boundaries after the Second World War.

The creations of nation-states after the end of the Second World War in South East Asia are based on the nationalism and Western colonial border. The existing nation-states today are based on the colonial experience and the Western political system. This background contributes to the Islamic movement in the Muslim majority Muslim on the purpose of promoting Islamic law and the creation of the Islamic state. This group claim that the existing government in Southeast Asia are not Muslim and secular. The responsibility of the Muslim to give support to them for the sake of implementing and the formation of an Islamic state that would protect the Muslim population and implementing Islamic law. Islamic political group in Malaysia and Indonesia, especially the 'radical group' uses this issue in their political movement.[6]

Some of the nations state in Southeast Asia are formed based on the colonial sphere and not based on domestic historical and common characteristic of the region. The southern part of Thailand and the Southern part of the Philippines are very different from the general characteristics of Thailand and the Philippines. Southern Part of Thailand became part of Thailand based on the Bangkok Treaty, i.e. the treaty between the United Kingdom and Thailand in 1909.[7] This southern region of Thailand is very different from other parts of Thailand. This region (especially the province of Narathiwat, Pattani and Yala) populated by the Muslim majority and with strong Malay-Muslim culture. Based on the different with central government southern Thai Muslim movement is for creating an independent Muslim state, free from Central Buddhists Thai control. Seeking independent from non-Muslim central government is the motive of the socio-political Islamic movement in Southern Thai and Southern Philippines.

4. THE SOCIO-POLITICO ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AFTER SEPTEMBER 11

September 11 Event greatly affected the socio-political Islamic movement in Southeast Asia in majority Muslim countries as well as in the minority Muslim countries. After the September 11 event 2001, Indonesia and Malaysia government facing a new political situation. During the ambiguous situation, they have to adapt to the new situation, where the American hegemonic power has proclaimed the war against terror. Only two choices given by the American, 'you with me against terrorism, or on the other side; assist terrorism'.

The position of majority Muslim countries foreign policy, like Malaysia and Indonesia in a great dilemma in adapting with the new political situation in the domestic and systemic level. The minority Muslim countries, i.e. Thailand and the Philippines are

[6] This issue will discuss in the latter part of this article.

[7] The British did not agree with the Southern Thai became a part of Thailand in 1909. The British tried hard to control the four majorities Muslim province in Southern Thai became a part of Federation Malay State together with Kedah, Kelantan, Terengganu and Perlis. The International political structure at that time (the hegemonic struggle between Great Britain and Germany) and the German influence in Thailand, made the British failed to control southern Thai. From that time Southern Thai with Muslim majority became a part of Thailand.

THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO
COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

PJAEE, 17 (7) 2020

seen more clear position in responding with American policy towards terrorism. The Philippines straight give support to America in the war against global terrorism, and then Thailand follows similar action towards terrorism.

The Socio-Politico Islamic Movement In Majority Muslim Countries: Malaysia And Indonesia

September 11, 2001 influenced the Islamic socio-political movement in both Muslim majority countries, Malaysia and Indonesia. They have to choose either giving support to the America, i.e. co-operating against terrorism or assist terrorism. In determining their stand in this issue, they have to adapt to the situation in domestic and systemic level. Both countries, Malaysia and Indonesia do not lead by the radical political party. Radical Muslim political group in Malaysia and Indonesia are on the opposition side. Indonesian and Malaysian government are controlled by the liberal Muslim group that categorised them as 'moderate Muslim'. Muslim group that controls Indonesia and Malaysia's government are the groups that more pro and practises 'western philosophy/law' than follow the 'Syariah law'. Generally, we can say that Malaysian and Indonesian government are moderate Islam, pro-Western (than 'anti-West.') and had good relations with the West.

Malaysia's Action And Development After September 11

Former Prime Minister of Malaysia, Dr Mahathir Mohamad openly criticised Islamic terrorist after September 11, 2001. In a show appreciation for Mahathir co-operation, Mahathir was invited by President Bush to Washington D.C. and meeting with President Bush in May 2002. During that May 2002 visit, the America and Malaysia signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) on counter-terrorism. The text of that memorandum became the basis for a subsequent declaration on counter-terrorism that the America and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) signed at the August 2002 ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) meeting.

America also has decided to downplay American human rights concern over Malaysia's issue of its Internal Security Act (ISA) to imprison political opponents without trial, when Malaysia has employed the ISA against suspected members of Jemaah Islamiyah and the Kumpulan Mujahideen Malaysia (Malaysian Mujahideen Group).

Mahathir visit and his meeting with President Bush at Washington D.C. on May 2002 symbolised the fundamental change in the American posture towards him since September 11, 2001 attack. Malaysia was suspected had related and co-operated with international terrorists such as al-Qaeda and Jemaah Islamiyah (JI) where several Al-Qaeda operatives believed used Kuala Lumpur as a meeting and staging ground. Malaysia was viewed as an ideal location for al-Qaeda meeting place because the strategic international location for transiting and meeting and also Malaysia immigration policy allowed visa-free entry for Muslim countries. Mahathir criticised and condemned the terrorist attack and agreed with America in that issue, but he criticised the America attack on Afghanistan in October 2001, Iraq 2003 and the new decision of American visa restriction on Malaysians seeking to enter America.

The Prime Minister of Malaysia after Mahathir, Abdullah Ahmad Badawi (replaced Mahathir in October 2003) pledged to continue Malaysian support for the war against terrorism. During Abdullah Badawi visit and meeting with President Bush in July 2004, he sought to strengthen bilateral ties with America and co-operate against terrorism. Abdullah Badawi used moderate way in his administration and a moderate

THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO
COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

PJAEE, 17 (7) 2020

Islamic leader that indicating that Malaysia will continue to be a partner in the war against terror in Southeast Asia. During the Counter-Terrorism Conference in Bali Indonesia, in February 2004, Malaysia showed his position and clear stand to anti-terrorism effort and gave support to the Mutual Legal Assistance treaty (MLAT). The MLAT will establish co-operation for the prosecution of terrorist suspects in both countries. It also assists in the exchange of witnesses and terrorist investigations in Malaysia and Indonesia.

The Abdullah Badawi's achievement in the 2004 Malaysian general elections could be considered as symbolic support by the Malaysian people. The achievement under Abdullah Badawi in 2004 general elections was much better than 1999 general elections. Abdullah Badawi's Barisan Nasional Party (National Fronts) polled 64.4 % of the vote and took 196 out of 219 seats in parliament. PAS (an Islamic Party in Malaysia) seats in Parliament fell from 26 seats to only seven in 2004. The 2004 General Elections result can be interpreted as a sign that Malaysian people are comfortable with Abdullah Badawi's policy. It is also seen as demonstrating the limited appeal radical Islamic policies espoused by Islamic Party of Malaysia (PAS).[8] PAS was tried to connect with the radical Islam where the son of Nik Abdul Aziz, Nik Mohd. Adli was said as the chief leader of Kumpulan Mujahidin Malaysia (KMM).

Malaysian respond upon September 11, 2001 was to say that Malaysia is anti-terrorism. Malaysia did not support terrorism and together with America in facing terrorism. The action taken by the Malaysian government was to arrest the suspect people in certain Muslim radical group under ISA. Malaysia co-operated with other anti-terrorism countries in controlling and reducing the attack by the terrorist in any level of their activities.

Indonesia's Action After The September 11, 2001 Event

Indonesia's President, Megawati Sukarnoputri made a state visit to America, one week after September 11, 2001. She shows Indonesian support to the war against terrorism. Some political leaders in Indonesia denounced the Megawati decision to give support to the war against terror. When Megawati came back from America, she had adapts their stand over terrorism with the domestic situation. It does not mean she changed from giving support to the war against terror to giving support to terrorist.

The Bali Bombing in October 2002 spurred Indonesia to take terrorism more seriously. The event was likely a key factor in the Indonesian government's decision to take a much stronger stand and co-operate with America. The trial of Abu Bakar Bashir brought much evidence of terrorist activities and terrorist threat existing in Indonesia.

The large Muslim moderate group, Nahdatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah have supported the arrest of Abu Bakar Bashir and the Megawati government's anti-terrorism. This support is important for Indonesian economic development where pro-America would encourage foreign capital and foreign investment especially from the West into Indonesia. The Muslim moderate group also would lose their power in case the radical Muslim group come to power in Indonesia.

---

[8] During the election 2004, the son (Nik Mohd. Adli Nik Abdul Aziz) of Chief Minister of Kelantan (one of the important PAS leader) was detained under Internal Security Act (ISA). Nik Mohd Adli was declared by the BN government as the leader of Kumpulan Mujahideen Malaysia (KMM).

President Bush visit to Indonesia in October 2003 was designed to strengthen bilateral counter-terror co-operation. America and Indonesia agreed to co-operate in the fight against terrorism. President Bush announced a USD 157 million programs in improving the quality of Indonesian schools by strengthening secular public education. The objective was to reduce the influence of radical Muslim, especially in the pesantren (Muslim boarding school). Pesantren has seen giving their support to the radical Muslim movement. Some pesantren are run by suspected Jemaah Islamiah members and use them to recruit members.

Bush's visit of October 2003 has been followed by a visit from Attorney General John Ashcroft and Secretary of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge. Ashcroft attended a regional counter-terrorism conference in Bali in February 2004. After both visits have been improved the American-Indonesian co-operation on counter-terrorism. America-Indonesia counter-terror programs including the following aspects:[9]

i.   USD 12 million for the establishment of a national police counter-terrorism unit;

ii. USD 4.9 million for counter-terrorism training for police and security officials over the period 2001-2003;

iii. Financial intelligence unit training to strengthen anti-money laundering, train counter-terror intelligence analyst and an analyst exchange program with the Treasury Department;

iv. Training and assistance to establish a border security system as part of the Terrorist Interdiction Programme; and

v.   Regional counter-terrorism fellowships to provide training on counter-terrorism and related issues to the Indonesian military.

President, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and his deputy, Jusuf Kalla continue co-operation with America on war against terror. Secular–Nationalist president play an effective role in control radical Muslim movement with co-operation with moderate Muslim groups at the national level and American hegemonic power at the international level.

The Socio-Politico Islamic Movement In Minority Muslim Countries: The Philippines And Thailand

The socio-politico Islamic Movement in the minority Muslim countries was facing more attack by their central government after the September 11, 2001 tragedy. Thailand and the Philippines gave their support to the America effort in attacking the war on terror. Both countries gave their support to the war against terror directly and more effectively. It is different from Malaysia and Indonesia, where the respond slightly slow. Indonesia gave more clear answer after the Bali Bombing in February 2002 and Malaysia gave their support to the war against terror but disagree with the war over Afghanistan in October 2001 and war against Iraq 2003.

The Islamic separatist movement in the Southern Part of Thailand and Southern part of the Philippines began since the last several decades. Thailand and the Philippines could use the opportunity on the name of war against terror to destroy the separatist

---

[9] State Department fact Sheet, "Summary of Counter-Terrorism Assistance for Indonesia," 10/03. (quoted in Manyin, M., Chanlett-Avery, E., Cronin, R., Niksch, L., and Vaughn, B., 'Terrorism in Southeast Asia,' CRS Report for Congress, 13 August 2004.

THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO
COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

PJAEE, 17 (7) 2020

Islamic movement in their country. With the September 11, 2001 event Thailand and the Philippine get more financial and military support from American hegemony in destroying the Islamic separatist movement. They could hide the long struggle behind the international slogan 'the war against terror.'

Thailand Military Action And Attack Towards The Socio-Politico Islamic Movement In The Southern Part After September 11.

Thai government made a clear stand in the war against terror. She worked closely with America in facing a terrorist attack in Thailand. The possibility of attack from the Muslim would come from the southern part of Thailand where the majority of the population in that region are Muslim Malay. The struggle of the Muslim people in the region began since the early twentieth century with the main purpose is to form an independent Islamic state, free from Bangkok central government control.

There are a few Muslim movement groups in the Southern Thai. The Pattani United Liberation Organisation (PULO), The Barisan Revolusi Nasional (BRN) and Gerakan Mujahadeen Islam Pattani (GMIP) and among the active group in Islamic and political movement in southern Thailand. This group was blamed by America has closed linked with Jemaah Islamiah (JI) and Gerakan Acheh Merdeka (GAM) and the members of the Islamic organisation had received military training in Afghanistan and in Pakistan.

Thai government blamed that the unstable condition in the majority Muslim provinces of Pattani, Yala and Narathiwat since 2003 (and earlier than 2003) had related impact of the international Islamic terrorist movement. Thai official blamed that occasional violence in the Muslim region was backed by the JI operation. Security advisor to Thai Prime Minister, General Rattanachaya blamed that Thai insurgents were trained by a radical Islamic group in Indonesia and the southern part of Thai become a fertile recruitment zone for JI.[10]

Unstable condition in the Majority Muslim provinces in Southern influenced Thai and America to co-operate in facing a war against terror in Southeast Asia. Thai and America have close anti-terrorism co-operation which was established in 2001 to provide better coordination among Thai security agencies. The America Central Intelligence Agency shares information in the bilateral intelligence relationship in the region. The CIA assigned about 20 agents to the Counter-Terrorism Intelligence Centre (CTIC) and in 2002 provided between USD 10-15 million to the centre.[11] President Bush designated Thailand as a major non-NATO ally in recognition of its support of the war against terrorism.

The Philippines Attack And Military Action Towards The Socio-Politico Islamic Separatist Movement In The Southern Part After September 11

The Philippines government under President Arroyo Macapagal directly condemned the September 11, 2001 attack. According to that event, Arroyo offered port and airport for America military activities in facing any terrorist possibilities in the Philippines, especially the Islamic political movement in the southern part of the Philippines.

---

[10] Crispin, Shawn, W., "Thailand's War Zone," *Far Eastern Economic Review,* 11 March, 2004.

[11] Crispin, Shawn, W., "Strife Down South," *Far Eastern Economic Review,* 22 January 2004.

THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO
COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

PJAEE, 17 (7) 2020

There are three Muslim groups in the southern Philippines, namely the Abu Sayyaf group, Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) and Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF). MNLF and MILF main political objective is the formation of an independent Muslim state in the southern part of the Philippines. Their movement began about fifty years ago. Before the Philippine gained independence from America in 1946 the Muslim in the region suggested to the central government of the Philippines for creating a separate state for Muslim Philippines, like India and Pakistan but the proposal was rejected by the central government.

Following to the agreement between President Bush and President Arroyo Macapagal, America provide USD 92 million for military assistance in November 2001 for combating terrorist movement in Southern Philippine, especially for Philippine military against the Abu Sayyaf group.[12]

The number of the American military personnel deployed between January and July 2002 was about 1,200 including 150 special forces. The military exercise, dubbed 'Balikatan' (or shoulder to shoulder) included the deployment of more than 300 troops to Southern Philippines to undertake 'civic action project such as road-building on Basilan islands.[13] The Philippine-America Balikatan operation main objectives were to weaken the Abu Sayyaf group. This group estimated members about 300-400, but very active in operation in the Sulu island south of Basilan and in Western Mindanao. Abu Sayyaf was claimed by America that this group has a strong connection with the international terrorist group.

The MILF, the biggest Muslim group in the Southern part of the Philippines has a clear motive in their struggle, i.e. the formation of an independent Islamic state in the Southern part of the Philippines. This group also claimed by the America that has closed link with the JI and al-Qaeda. MILF also provided training facilities for JI.

During President Arroyo official visit to America in May 2003, America announced a new USD 65 million programs for the military training of several Armed Forces of the Philippines battalion. President Bush also designated the Philippines as a major non-NATO ally.[14] During President Bush visit to Manila in October 2003, Bush described the America-Philippines military alliance as a "rock of stability in the Pacific" and committed America to provide technical assistance and field expertise and funding to help modernise the Philippines military.

5. CONCLUSION
The socio-political Islamic movement in Southeast Asia is different during the period before and after September 11. Political Movement in Southeast Asian region directly influenced with the political development in the international level and the foreign policy of the hegemonic powers, i.e. the United States. During the period of the Cold War period, the ideological struggle between democratic-capitalist and socialist-communist influenced and structured the political movement in the Southeast Asian region. The situation slightly changed after the end of the Cold war with the fall of socialist-communist and the emergence of the uni-polarity structure.

---

[12] Steven Mufson, "U.S. to Aid Philippines' Terrorism War," *Washington Post, 21 November 2001* (quoted in 'Terrorism in Southeast Asia,' CRS Report for Congress, 13 August 2004.

[13] Basilan is the centre of the Abu Sayyaf's group activities in the southern part of the Philippines.

[14] 'Terrorism in Southeast Asia,' p. 20

The socio-political Islamic movement is also different in the majority of Muslim countries (Indonesia and Malaysia) with the minority Muslim Southeast Asian countries (Thailand and The Philippines). The differences are in the respond taken by the central government of both types of level of Muslim population percentage. In the minority Muslim, in Thailand and the Philippines, the Muslim socio-political movement was taken serious action by the central Buddhist government in Thailand and Central Christian government in Manila. More serious military actions were taken by the central government military towards the Muslim separatist movement in Thailand and Southern Philippines. President Arroyo of Philippines and Premier Thaksin of Thailand played and took more serious action in destroying the Muslim separatist movement in their southern parts. Their action seen gained support from the hegemonic power. In the majority Muslim countries, premier of Malaysia (Mahathir Mohamad and Abdullah Badawi) and presidents of Indonesia (Megawati Sukarnoputri and Susilo Yudhoyono) also took some action towards Islamic groups (such as KMM and Jemaah Islamiah) but in a different type of action. There are no serious military actions towards the 'militant' group. The actions taken by the leaders from majority Muslim countries are just to adapt to the new situation at the international level, i.e. the war against terror. The action taken is just to prove to the hegemonic power that the majority of Muslim countries are not co-operating with the terrorist in their countries.

REFERENCES

- Acharya, Amitav & Acharya, Arabinda. (2007). The Myth of the Second Front: Localising the 'War on Terror' in Southeast Asia. The Washington Quarterly, 30 (4): 75-90.

- Art, Robert, J & Jervis, Robert. (2003). International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues (sixth edition). New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.

- Bretherton, Charlotte, (1996). Introduction: Global Politics in the 1990s. in Bretherton, Charlotte & Ponton, Geoffrey, Global Politics: An Introduction, Oxford, UK; Blackwell Publishers, pp. 1-20.

- Chow, Jonathan, T. (2005). ASEAN Counter terrorism Cooperation since 9/11. Asian Survey, 45(2):302-321.

- Crispin, Shawn, W. (2004). Strife Down South. Far Eastern Economic Review, 22 January 2004.

- Crispin, Shawn, W. (2004a). Thailand's War Zone. Far Eastern Economic Review, 11 March 2004.

- Emmerson, Donald, K. (2001). September 11, 2001: Attack on America Southeast Asia and the United States since 11 September. The Avalon Project, Yale Law School, http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept_11/emmmerson_001,htm

- Febrica, Senia (2010). Securitizing Terrorism in Southeast Asia: Accounting for the Varying Responses of Singapore and Indonesia. Asian Survey, 50 (3): 569-590.

- Gershman, John. (2002). Is Southeast Asia the Second Front. Foreign Affairs, July/August 2002, pp. 60-74.

THE SEPTEMBER 11 EVENT, 2001 AND ISLAMIC MOVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; A SOCIO-POLITICO
COMPARATIVE STUDIES AMONG THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

PJAEE, 17 (7) 2020

- Huntington, Samuel. (2003). The Clash of civilization. in Art, Robert, J. and Jervis, Robert, International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues, (sixth edition), New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc., pp. 411-425.

- Huntington, Samuel. (2001). 'The Coming Clash of Civilizations or, The West against The Rest.' In Kegley, Charles W. (jr.) & Wittkopf, Eugene, R. (2001). The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives (sixth edition).New York; McGraw Hill, pp. 197-200.

- Jackson, R and Sorenson, G., (2007). Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches (third edition), Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

- Kegley, Charles W. (jr.) & Wittkopf, Eugene, R. (2001). The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives (sixth edition).New York; McGraw Hill.

- Keylor, William, (1992). The Twentieth Century World: An International History (second edition). New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Mearshiemer, J. (1990), Back to The Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War, International Security, 15 (1): 5-56.

- Khosalee Awae. (2013), Konflik di Selatan Thai: Satu Kajian dan Analisis Demonstrasi Takbai (Conflict in Southern Thai: A Study and Analysis of Takbai Demonstration). (Masters thesis in Political Science, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia).

- Mohd. Noor Yazid. (2017). Asia Pasifik sejak 1945: Perubahan Struktur Antarabangsa dan Percaturan Politik Serantau (Asia Pacifik since 1945: The Changes of International Structure and Regional Political Configuration), Kuala Lumpur: ITBM.

- Mohd. Noor Yazid. (2013). Faktor Sistemik, Pergolakan dan Percaturan Kuasa di Selatan Thai (Systemic Factor, Conflict and Power Configuration in Southern Thai). in Mohd. Noor Yazid, Hubungan Antarabangsa: Analisis Sistemik dan Domestik (International Relations: Systemic and Domestic Analysis), Kota Bharu: Pustaka Aman Press Sdn, Bhd., pp. 176-184.

- Mohd. Noor Yazid. (2000). Pergolakan di Selatan Filipina (Conflict in the Southern Philippines). Jurnal Pemikir, no. 22, October-December 2000, pp. 179-198.

- Nik Anuar Nik Mahmud. (1999). Sejarah Perjuangan Melayu Patani 1785-1954 (The History of Malay Patani Struggle 1785-1954).Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

- Pathmanand, Ukrist. (2006). Thaksin's Achilles' Heel: The Failure of Hawkish Approaches in The South Thai. Critical Asian Studies, 38 (1): 73-94.

- Ponton, Geoffrey. (1996). The End of the Soviet Era: Implications for Global Politics. in Bretherton, Charlotte & Ponton, Geoffrey, Global Politics: An Introduction, Oxford, UK; Blackwell Publishers, pp. 74-99.

- See Seng Tan & Ramakrishna, Kumar. (2004). Interstate and Intrastate Dynamics in Southeast Asia's War on Terror, Review of International Studies, 24(1): 91-105.

- Sejaratul Islam, Syed. (1998). The Islamic Independence Movement in Patani of Thailand and Mindanao of The Philippines, Asian Survey, 38 (5):441-456.

- Simon, Sheldon, W. (2005). Southeast Asia and The U.S. War on Terrorism. http://www.ndu.edu/inss/symposia/Pacific2002/simonpaper.htm

- Sundararaman, Sankari. (2005). South-east Asian Perspections on the 'War Agains Terrorism.   http://www.idsa-india.org/SAARCHIVES/SA200203/JUL-SEP%2006.htm

- Terrorism in Southeast Asia, CRS Report for Congress, 13 August 2004.

- Vogler, John. (1996). The Structure of Global Politics. in Bretherton, Charlotte & Ponton, Geoffrey, Global Politics: An Introduction, Oxford, UK; Blackwell Publishers, pp. 23-48.

- Yuchengco, Alfonso, T. (2003). Islamist Terrorism in Southeast Asia. Pacific Forum CSIS, Honolulu, Hawaii, Issues & Insights No. 1-3, http://www.csis.org/pacfor/issues /v03n01_pdf.pdf#search='post%20sept%2011%20south east%20asia'