

4 The Colonial Origins of Theorizing Piracy's Relation to Failed States

Jennifer L. Gaynor

Abstract

Contemporary views of piracy often associate it with state failure. However, this view may be traced to nineteenth-century debates about Southeast Asia, and in particular, the writings of Sir Stamford Raffles for whom it became a pretext for intervention. Prior to this, European observers and officials tended either to naturalize piracy as a part of Southeast Asian life, or to label foes as pirates. Both nineteenth-century colonial debates and earlier stereotypes disconnected from maritime settings do not provide reliable evidence of piracy. Instead, they offer evidence of colonial ideology and statecraft. This essay historicizes piracy's association with failed states and offers another way to theorize piracy without adopting either statist or relativist points of view.

Keywords: failed states, Southeast Asia, Sulawesi, colonial rule, military intervention

Introduction: The Politics of Piracy, Pillaging, and Slavery

Images of piracy lie at the heart of talk about “failed states,” a term that entered the political lexicon of the United States in the early 1990s and that came to occupy a prominent place in international peace and security.¹ While this timing suggests that the notion of failed states and its association with piracy are recent additions to political theory, I argue here that they do not originate from the context of offshore Somalia and related international interventions in the western Indian Ocean. Instead, the failed states concept

¹ Charles Call, “The Fallacy of the Failed State,” *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 8 (2008), 1491–1507.

and its association with piracy may be traced to nineteenth-century colonial debates about Southeast Asia.

During the nineteenth century, colonial debates about piracy in maritime Southeast Asia encompassed views that ranged from taking piracy as a sign of state dissolution, much as it appears in contemporary failed states theory, to functionalist explanations of piracy as simply inherent to how some states worked. The latter view, in which maritime marauding was seen as a practice common to Southeast Asian statecraft, typified the much earlier remarks Tomé Pires made about coastal polities in sixteenth-century Southeast Asia. Pires, a Portuguese apothecary who spent time in Malacca shortly after the Portuguese conquest in 1511, left detailed notes about the main trade items of ports throughout Southeast Asia and beyond it, as part of his effort to plot their commercial ties with Malacca. He also recorded the naval capacity of port cities throughout the maritime world of the Indian Ocean and Asia, from the Red Sea to Japan. Although Pires specified little about the interactions between mariners and their nautical leaders, he took pains to note how many boats and rowers lay at the disposal of different ports and rulers.²

This attention to nautical resources mattered to Pires as a measure both of commercial and of naval capacity. Yet, he also recognized the inextricable relation of nautical resources to regional slavery. Some of the maritime commerce he described involved a trade in slaves, including captives acquired in maritime raiding and war. Such displaced people formed, among other things, a source of maritime labour. Hence, piracy in early modern Southeast Asia, which included the taking of people, intertwined with the slave trade both in its commercial aspect and as a source of maritime labour.

Pires noted carefully which regional ports of the early sixteenth century earned a reputation among Southeast Asians for marketing slaves, especially those located in the western archipelago and peninsular Southeast Asia. According to him, in addition to the many western archipelago ports that sold slaves, one could also buy slaves in regularly held fairs, some of which were renowned as venues openly geared toward the trade in slaves.³ Since these port markets and fairs were already well-known for selling slaves by

2 Tomé Pires, *The Suma Oriental of Tomé Pires, an Account of the East, from the Red Sea to Japan, Written in Malacca and India in 1512–1515*; and *The Book of Francisco Rodrigues, Rutter of a Voyage in the Red Sea, Nautical Rules, Almanack, and Maps, Written and Drawn in the East before 1515*, trans. Armando Cortesão (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1944).

3 Pires, *Suma Oriental*, 225–228.



Map 1. Political Southeast Asia

Pires' time, his work illustrates that a vigorous slave trade predated European involvement in Southeast Asia.

Pires clearly differentiated pillaging from trading. Nevertheless, he characterized both trading and pillaging as activities common to all nations.⁴ This view of pillaging as common to all nations contrasts with piracy, which is typically understood as being carried out by actors external to states and their presumption of political and legal authority. Pires often characterized pillagers as corsairs, a term that derives from a Mediterranean context,

4 *Ibid.*, 221.

where it implies state sponsorship.⁵ On the one hand, his use of this term is striking, given later Spanish use of the term *piratas* from at least the mid-seventeenth century onwards, especially in reference to “Moros” in the Philippines. On the other hand, it is also unsurprising that Pires should use the term corsairs in his writings on Indian Ocean and Asian maritime worlds, given his Iberian provenance. Pires’ use of the term corsairs reflects his understanding of the political structures in which many archipelagic mariners undertook plunder during the early sixteenth century. In other words, he recognized their pillaging as being, in some sense, sponsored by Southeast Asian political authorities, rather than, as we have come to understand piracy, conducted beyond sovereignty’s bounds.⁶

The extent to which pillaging in sixteenth-century Southeast Asia actually took place with political sponsorship remains hazy. Nevertheless, we can distinguish between Pires saying that pillaging was common to all nations, and the notion that piracy was intrinsic to everyday life in the maritime world. Regardless of whether plunder took place under some political authority, or despite it, it is hard to imagine that those who suffered the depredations of raids would have blithely accepted such violence as just a part of daily life, no matter how common it may have been. Though this may seem obvious, the point must be made explicitly: whatever one calls it – piracy or corsairing – we cannot presume that people simply accepted pillaging as something natural. Rather, a sceptical and curious approach rejects explanations of piracy as “natural,” which indeed explains nothing at all, to probe instead its social and political dimensions. In other words, the critical task is to resist approaches that naturalize piracy, in order to historicize piracy’s dynamics.

Pillaging, when it involved taking people, meant sudden dislocations for those taken, as well as consequences for those left behind. Emotionally wrenching, with implications for people’s safety and well-being, such dislocations moreover impacted practices and concepts of belonging and status, as well as relations between groups – in other words, politics. While Pires may not have given much thought to such social dimensions of pillaging in Southeast Asia, his observations clearly demonstrated his grasp of the maritime world’s immense need and competition for bodies – labour – to man commercial vessels and naval expeditions. Some of this demand for

5 Joshua M. White, *Piracy and Law in the Ottoman Mediterranean* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2017).

6 Jennifer L. Gaynor, “Piracy in the Offing: The Law of Lands and the Limits of Sovereignty at Sea,” *Anthropological Quarterly* 85, no. 3 (2012): 852.

maritime labour was filled by slaves.⁷ As noted above, Pires was perfectly aware that pillaging procured people for sale as slaves. However, nowhere in his work does he associate an abundance of pillaging with political disarray. The notion that such maritime pillaging was a sign of state dissolution would have been unthinkable to him.

Pirates, Territory, and the State

The tension between predation carried out by non-state actors on the one hand, and state-sponsored pillaging on the other, undergirds many debates about what was, or was not, piracy. While corsairs worked under some form of sponsorship by a political authority, whether a privateer's letter of marque and reprisal, or, as in Southeast Asia, a relation of clientship to a patron, piratical actions lay beyond the state. For the most part, it may be more accurate not to conceive this "beyond" in territorial terms, because when it comes to most historical piracy claims, territory was not the main determinant of sovereignty's limits. Nevertheless, territory did play an ever-greater role in the parameters of sovereignty from the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth.

Even as representations of territorial control featured increasingly in measures of where high seas lay and what constituted piracy, legal history reveals a counterpoint to colonial denials of native states' control over coasts. After all, if such coastal sovereignty were not recognized by would-be colonizers, their offshore waters would essentially be rendered "empty" space, whether for colonial appropriation or simply the rejection of native states' sovereignty. Maps, which formed a quasi-legal means to reconstruct the property histories of new colonial possessions, legitimized the spread of colonial power.⁸ Yet, even as the work of colonial cartographers supported territorial myths of dominion, in certain legal contexts, particular coasts were acknowledged to be part of independent native realms. The remarks of colonial officials in this regard actually deflate myths of colonial territorial control, demonstrating, for instance, that courts of every level in the lesser

7 Brett Baker, "South Sulawesi in 1544: A Portuguese Letter," *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 39, no. 1 (2005): 71. On Spain's use of Southeast Asian labourers as boatbuilders and mariners in the galleon trade, see Andrew Christian Peterson, "Making the First Global Trade Route: The Southeast Asian Foundations of the Acapulco-Manila Galleon Trade, 1519–1650," Unpublished PhD dissertation University of Hawai'i, Manoa, 2014.

8 Benedict Anderson, "Census, Map, Museum," in *Imagined Communities* (London and New York: Verso, 2006 [1983]), 174.

Netherlands Indies recognized the independence of allied realms and vassal principalities in Celebes (Sulawesi) between 1871 and 1881. Though the Council of the Indies reconsidered this fact of their independence in the 1890s, and the Minister of Colonies in 1902 denied self-governing realms any possibility of having their own territorial waters, these realms' shores had not previously been washed by the waters of the Netherlands East Indies.⁹ Such efforts to extend colonial territorial control coincided with colonial cooperation against "piracy" and the idea that it signalled native state dissolution.

Although questions of piracy often rely on authority over a particular location, as with the legal concept of jurisdiction generally, piracy may also entail a subject's political affiliation, as well as the nature of the acts in question. Whether through spatial authority or political subjecthood, the theft of goods and persons made pirates outlaws. Yet, whereas outlawry may exist in relation to a single state, piracy subsists in a fundamentally international or interpolity arena. That is, when the agents of a state or polity made piracy claims or designations, they signalled not just the bounds of a single state, but also the limits of sovereignty – both theirs, and from their view, that of others.¹⁰

What makes piracy international, then, is not so much its occurrence on the high seas, but instead its juridical location at the limits of sovereignty. Indeed, most historical piracy has taken place not on the high seas, but instead, in the offing, the visible offshore area beyond inshore navigational hazards. Rather than focus on piracy as an activity in "non-state" spaces, or by "non-state" people, actions that might be considered piracy in particular historical circumstances are best understood in relation to the relevant array of political authorities and law. Piracy as a phenomenon only occurred in international arenas where legal spaces between polities stretched and sometimes overlapped. These interpolity spaces, and the diplomatic, legal, and naval resources brought to them by different players, structured both the character of claims about piracy, as well as effective denials of piracy. Through such claims, authorities gathered political and legal legitimacy to

9 Barbara Sillars Harvey, *Tradition, Islam and Rebellion: South Sulawesi 1950–1965* (PhD, Cornell University, 1974), 47, note 66; Gertrudes Johan Resink, *Indonesia's History Between the Myths: Essays in Legal History and Historical Theory* (The Hague: W. van Hoeve, 1968), 136–8, 141–2, 165, 182–3. On the legal history of Netherlands Indies "sea territory" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, see John G. Butcher and R. E. Elson, *Sovereignty and the Sea: How Indonesia Became an Archipelagic State* (Singapore: NUS Press, 2017), 1–25, especially 14–16.

10 Gaynor, "Piracy in the Offing." A fuller discussion of piracy's definitions may be found on 822–824.

themselves, and attempted to deny it to others, in an effort to manage the limits of their sovereignty.¹¹

This conclusion followed from a consideration of piracy's many definitions, and a detailed examination of cases across different eras in Southeast Asia's engagement with the world, before and after the arrival of Europeans. Taking a close look at how the question of piracy unfolded in relation to particular configurations of politics, power, and cultural comprehension, "Piracy in the Offing" examined three examples. First, amidst the relations between Southeast Asian polities and China during the early fifteenth century, it looked at how Chen Zuyi, a transplant to the western archipelago, appeared to the fifteenth-century naval commander, Zheng He, and to the Chinese chroniclers of his deeds. Here, "pirates" (as Western scholars have translated the term), presented an impediment to the setting up of orderly tributary relations, or at least the fiction of them, with subordinate states along established trade routes through the Malacca Straits to the Indian Ocean.

Second, the piece probed the capture of a Portuguese carrack by three Dutch ships under Jakob van Heemskerk in early seventeenth-century Southeast Asia, along with the European political and legal context of this event. For Grotius, defending this ship's seizure near the Malacca Straits, pirates, whoever they might be, could never be the kind of admiral who he made every effort to portray as identified with the nascent Dutch state. Even though Heemskerk lacked letters of marque and was forbidden from engaging in conflict, Grotius portrayed him as an extension of the state—a state Grotius presumed already to exist—arguing that Heemskerk was both its representative and agent. The *Mare Liberum* cannot reasonably be understood separately from this context, as it comprises one of the chapters in Grotius' larger argument, bolstering the nascent Dutch state and this would-be (or perhaps would-not-be) pirate's supposed inseparability from that state. Third, the article took up the question of piracy in connection with nineteenth-century views on the proliferation of raiding in Southeast Asia and intercolonial attempts to curb it.¹²

Working up from analyses anchored in these different eras and settings provided a way to, in a sense, control for the frequently noted role of European colonial ideologies in piracy ascriptions. In other words, drawing from a range of cases and settings across different periods, with different configurations of interpolity relations, produced a set of qualitative data

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 852.

¹² *Ibid.*, 825–850.

that might yield less reductive analyses. Abstracting and comparing the dynamics they shared made it possible to infer new theoretical views on piracy, beyond those offered by a critique of colonial perspectives and relativist cultural arguments about piracy's representation. To build such an analytical strategy entailed asking not only how to look across eras and beyond European colonialism; it also meant employing methods open to the question of whether one could analyse piracy without adopting statist perspectives. Given that agents of the state have produced most of the relevant sources, how might one approach piracy without adopting statist perspectives?

In fact, the lens of the state is not the only optic available. Historical analyses of piracy that rely on the writings and actions of self-proclaimed pirates provide one avenue of analysis with, as it were, built-in critiques of the state, though it is not easy to come by such material. While not nearly as abundant as materials written by court scribes, politicians, jurists, and officials, records left by pirates provide a privileged point of view that, with ample contextualization, allow historians to reap unique insights into the motivations of pirates and the dynamics that contributed to their actions. Marcus Rediker, whose work exemplifies this bottom-up approach in the social history of piracy, drew on the actions and words of pirates to argue that they made not another, if alternate, state in the eighteenth-century Atlantic, but rather formed a multicultural, democratic, and egalitarian society – albeit one often beset by violence.¹³

Attending to such evidence, where it exists, is as important to understanding piracy as the writings and practices of slaves are to slavery, and as the voices of women are to our understanding of, well, history. Southeast Asia is typical in that records left by agents of the state are vastly more abundant than the seemingly non-existent jottings of pirates. Yet, this holds true especially for the colonial state, while indigenous Southeast Asian polities and imperial formations left far fewer resources for historical scrutiny. The vast region of maritime and coastal Southeast Asia, notorious for piracy in its past, remains so even today. Yet, in this region of infamously legion pirates, scholars have nevertheless found it a challenge to locate sources in Southeast Asian languages to illuminate acts that even states considered piratical.

Though offering a more modest type of evidence, the very languages of the region themselves provide historical clues to regional piracy in the past.

13 Marcus Rediker, *Villains of All Nations: Atlantic Piracy in the Golden Age* (New York: Verso, 2004); *idem*, *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World 1700–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995 [1987]).

Found neither in state archives, nor in pirate memoirs, instead, the inadvertent traces of past predations left their mark on the historical languages of the region's captives, the victims of marauding, and their communities' means of expression. For instance, the word *lanun*, now glossed as Malay for "pirate," became common throughout the region. It derives from the ethnic name Iranun, or Ilanun, famed for their pan-archipelagic raiding during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from bases in what is now the southern Philippines.¹⁴ The name "Tobelo" strikes a similar chord among people of coastal Sulawesi and parts of the eastern archipelago, though it retains its original ethnic overtones, like the names for other notorious historical pillagers, such as the Vikings and Cossacks. "Camucones" and "Tidong" were names the Spanish used during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to label particularly fierce, non-Muslim pirates with bases in northeastern Borneo and western Sulu, now parts of east Malaysia and the southern Philippines. "Tidong" survived for a time as a term for "pirate" in several central and northern Philippine languages, distant from where those bases lay, though this sense of it has since fallen out of use.¹⁵ These notions of pirate, or what we translate with this word, did not rely on differentiating the violence of pirates from the violence of states. Instead, these "pirates" inhere in the notoriety of a group's raiding and the traces left by the memory of their depredations.

Such evidence from linguistic traces, properly contextualized, offer a way to show that piracy could exist in settings where states did not. Yet, this, in a sense, silent testimony of language still cannot eliminate the challenge of analysing the historical record without reproducing statist perspectives. Especially in colonial contexts, relativist analyses usefully underscore the frequent ascription of piracy claims by those in positions of power, along with their assumption of epistemological privilege in legal and moral terminologies.¹⁶ The structure and substance of piracy claims, however, merit a fuller theoretical explanation than that provided by the relativist

14 James Francis Warren, *Iranun and Balangingi: Globalization, Maritime Raiding, and the Birth of Ethnicity* (Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2002), 141.

15 Charles O. Frake, "The Genesis of Kinds of People in the Sulu Archipelago," in *Language and Cultural Description: Essays by Charles O. Frake*, 311–332, 323, (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1980); and personal communication.

16 Stefan Eklöf Amirell, *Pirates of Empire: Colonisation and Maritime Violence in Southeast Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 10–14; Patricia Risso, "Cross-cultural Perceptions of Piracy: Maritime Violence in the Western Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf Region during a Long Eighteenth Century," *Journal of World History* 12, no. 2 (2001), 295–296; Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Qāsimī, *The Myth of Arab Piracy in the Gulf* (London: Croom Helm, 1986).

critique that they issue from a perspective or position of power. Hence, while relativistic approaches provide a critical lens on how states and imperial powers operated, nevertheless, critical analyses of these operations do not necessarily describe a theoretical framework for analysing the phenomenon, or question, of piracy.

A wealth of work on piracy theory, from Cicero to Alfred P. Rubin, and more recent work by scholars such as Daniel Heller-Roazen, views piracy from the state's perspective.¹⁷ What might a theoretical description of piracy that does not assume statist perspectives look like? One approach to building an analytical framework that neither privileges statist perspectives, nor inverts them, is to analyse a broad set of historical instances, and, comparing them, to abstract the features their dynamics share. By drawing on both non-European and pre-European settings alongside colonial ones, comparing analytical inferences from concrete historical settings offers opportunities to critique power, as well as to infer a theoretical description abstracted from the commonalities shared among their historical dynamics.

My own modest attempt to derive theoretical points from the analysis of such shared dynamics began with the metaphor of “the offing”: the visible waters beyond inshore navigational dangers. With its between-land-and-sea location and its perspectival lability – from which side is one viewing these waters? – the offing provided a neat model for understanding the structure and dynamics shared among situations that involved the question of piracy. As I clarify below, “the offing” implies a spatial deixis. Moreover, in settings where a question of piracy hangs in the balance, the metaphor of the offing provides a tool for thinking about deixis at the level of socio-legal interactions. In other words, the offing helps one understand piracy as a form of socio-legal deixis.

“The offing,” a term of art in the nautical field, encompasses a set of implicit spatial relations between land and sea. Ships in the offing can see the shore, and, conversely, from the shore one can see ships in the visible waters beyond the coast. The figurative sense of the offing as something about to happen may have derived from either direction, either from the shore, from which one may see a vessel, or from a vessel, from which one can see the shore. Though the term “the offing” comes from the world of mariners, it has a curiously even-handed structure that privileges neither land, nor sea. It is also a deeply phenomenological term, in how it implicitly orders

17 See Gaynor, “Piracy in the Offing,” 822–824; Daniel Heller-Roazen, *The Enemy of All: Piracy and the Law of Nations*. (Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books, 2009); Alfred P. Rubin, *The Law of Piracy*. (Newport, RI: US Naval War College Press, 1988).

structures of experience through perception, or reference to a perceptual context. The offing requires that one adopt the perspective of a perceiver, now at sea but referencing the shore, now on shore but referring to the sea, in order to grasp its play simultaneously in language and in space. An explicitly geographic term, the geography of the offing relies not on an abstract geometry of the earth, but instead on an embodied position, as well as, for instance, the weather, the height of one's vantage point, even how practiced one may be in sighting things at sea.

This structure provides a useful way to think abstractly about piracy across contexts, and how, in similar ways, cross-cutting interpolity political and legal relations structure piracy. Thus, the offing presents an apt metaphor for the structures of orientation and position that piracy questions raise. Able to distil commonalities among divergent examples, this approach to piracy works not through a static definition, but rather through an analytical framework for grasping dynamic sets of relations. Like the offing, questions of piracy play out in relations between ship and shore, and through political, legal, and social claims in which perceiving piracy relies, in part, on positionality in this structure of relations. Moreover, like the offing, the term "pirate" points towards, or indicates, the opposing side of that scaffold's structure. In other words, for the offing, this scaffold orients one from ship towards shore or from shore towards ship; while for piracy, it structures perspectives from within the state to what lies beyond sovereignty's limits, or, conversely, towards the state from beyond its graces.

Only after explaining these interrelated structures of perception, drawing out the metaphor of the offing, and applying it to historical cases focused on the question of piracy did the offing's resemblance to the concept of deixis become apparent, which necessitated an explanation of its theoretical relevance. Borrowed from the Greek adjective, *deiktikos*, meaning "pointing," or "indicating," deixis is typically understood as the process of "pointing" via language to the extra-linguistic context. Deixis belongs to the subfield of linguistics known as pragmatics, which studies how people understand and produce speech acts in particular, concrete situations. Deixis belongs to pragmatics because it directly involves the relationship between the structure of language and the context in which it is used.¹⁸ Deictic expressions use "pointing" language (for instance, "here," "there") that situates a speaker in relation to a shared context. Spatial or place deixis is only one form of deixis. Languages that express familiarity in pronouns, or use honorifics to indicate higher status, engage forms of person deixis. Although I had never

18 S. C. Levinson, *Pragmatics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 55.

before seen the concept of deixis used in fields outside of linguistics, the analytical power of the offing metaphor led me to transpose deixis from its linguistic origins and to elaborate its relevance in this recurrent type of socio-legal setting, initiating a new way to theorize piracy.

Textual Wakes

Another way to approach piracy is by understanding how activities considered piratical in a given time and place contrast with the things mariners did when they were not busy behaving like “pirates,” for maritime piracy takes more than theft. It requires skill in handling boats, and social knowledge about what to do with the things or people taken. Rarely does one find full-time pirates. Therefore, to grasp the motivations and means of piracy calls for some understanding of the social, political, and economic seascapes in which mariners lived when they were not out and about marauding, matters that must be sought in the sources.

Some boats left textual wakes on their travels, inscribing aspects of their undertakings in the historical record, if only a fraction of what occurred in wider maritime lives and settings. Tracing their paths through the sources can reveal considerably more than just their geographic mobility. While sources for piracy are hard to find in the languages of the region, nevertheless, the activities of mariners, both Southeast Asian mariners and others, did leave their mark in colonial archives, as well as in some indigenous language sources. These textual wakes may be followed, analysed, and contextualized, to help elucidate the times and places in which some mariners engaged in acts that might be considered piratical.

Where colonial concerns focused on the maritime world, archival sources present numerous boats to follow, and many such letters penned on boats, often dispatched to other vessels, proved useful in writing *Intertidal History*. Though such sources reveal a great deal, they present quite limited views of the region's littoral societies. Where Southeast Asian mariners' activities did appear in sources in regional languages, such as in Makassar's court chronicles, those sources helped reveal political, economic, and social relations that escaped the purview of colonial observers. Nevertheless, most regional mariners did not commonly keep records of their own, or, at least, thus far, few such records are known to have survived. Yet, even though their traces are few, Southeast Asian sources do more than simply relativize the views found in colonial archives. In presenting qualitatively different information, such “indigenous” sources may open new vistas for

analysing the past, clarifying alternate motivations for people's actions. For instance, Southeast Asian sources help to clarify why interethnic marriages were contracted between maritime people and other groups, and elucidate how maritime and naval labour formed an integral part of Southeast Asian littoral societies and politics.

Take, for instance, the Straits of Tiworo, in what is now Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia. During the mid-seventeenth century, this amphibious polity first came into the sights of the VOC (Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie, Dutch East India Company) for its alliance with Makassar and its role in the Great Ambon War, which formed part of the spice wars. The people of this maritime-oriented polity became the targets of a colonial campaign, though Dutch records of the time called neither Tiworo, nor its mariners "pirates" when the VOC first attacked Tiworo during the mid-1650s. In that 1655 attack, two hundred of Tiworo's men – those who were not off elsewhere at the time – were slaughtered, while three hundred of Tiworo's women and children, including the wives and daughters of Tiworo's ruling family, were taken captive by the VOC and its largely Ternaten allies. Possibly, some were eventually sold off as slaves, but records show that the VOC granted these captives to their local fighters, allowing those fighters to keep them. Aside from the political indignity and the personal tragedy of falling into the hands of enemies, this transfer of people also undermined the strength of ties between Tiworo and its main ally, Makassar. In this situation, one of many where the line between war and raiding overlapped, it is fair to say that it was not Tiworo's maritime-oriented people, but rather the VOC and their largely Ternatan allies, who had plundered captives.¹⁹

Twelve years later, in connection with the Makassar War, another conflict largely over the control of spices, Tiworo again came into the VOC's sights. During the dozen-years' interim, Makassar undertook campaigns of eastward re-expansion, encompassing parts of Sulawesi and areas to its east. Sultan Hasanuddin's justification for this re-expansion explicitly referred to Tiworo's earlier sacking and pillaging. By the time of the Makassar War, Tiworo had rebuilt its villages and had two forts rather than one. Yet again, in this set of conflicts, the VOC aimed to rein in Makassar and its supporters, since Makassar was the primary transshipment point for spices, such as cloves and nutmeg, from the eastern archipelago.

In 1667, during the run-up to the Makassar War, Tiworo's inhabitants evacuated when word reached them that VOC forces were hunting down a

19 Jennifer L. Gaynor, *Intertidal History in Island Southeast Asia: Submerged Genealogy and the Legacy of Coastal Capture*. (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 2016).

particular naval detachment under Makassar. The leader of the VOC's allies at the time, a Bugis prince from Boné called Arung Palakka, confiscated Tiworo's boats and banned their appropriation by the Governor General. Though most of Tiworo's population had fled, Arung Palakka invited a contingent of sixty Tiworo men to form half of his Guard of Prime Commanders. Thus, this large contingent of Tiworo men switched their allegiances from Makassar to Boné.

This detail of allegiance switching perhaps escaped the notice of Admiral Cornelis Speelman when he wrote his lengthy narrative of the Makassar War three years later. On the verso side of its first page, he labelled Tiworo a nasty (or vile) pirate's nest. Rather than any actual piracy claim, however, his derisive tone was precisely the result of Tiworo's effectiveness as Makassar's ally. We know from Speelman and other sources that Tiworo had a ruler (*raja*) who, along with his family, maintained close ties with Makassar's ruling elite. We also know the VOC regarded Tiworo as an important ally of Makassar's. In addition, we know details about how Tiworo and its mariners bolstered both Makassar's expansionary endeavours, as well as shared its interests in conflicts over spices.²⁰ Despite these close ties between Tiworo and Makassar, the writing on the wall led a large Tiworo contingent to shift their allegiances to Boné. Each of these sixty men gained a gun along with their new prominent positions under the Bugis leader Arung Palakka, and both the guns and the status conferral make it very unlikely that their family members would have been taken and involuntarily relocated or subordinated.

Tiworo, the so-called pirates' nest, was a polity in its own right, not an outsider beyond states, and one could not call its mariners non-state actors. On the contrary, Tiworo maintained alliances, first with the state of Makassar, and then with the latter's rival, Boné. Curiously, such disparagement – as Cornelis Speelman demonstrated – of Southeast Asian mariners as piratical, had not been characteristic of the Dutch work published in 1663 about the Great Ambon War, which related the 1655 attack on Tiworo.²¹ Nor did such characterizations as piratical, or designations of piracy, appear in archived letters between VOC commanders and ship captains engaged in fighting mariners from Tiworo and elsewhere during these conflicts of the 1650s and 1660s. Tagging Tiworo as a nasty pirates' nest only took place in retrospect,

20 The foregoing material on Tiworo and Southeast Asia's spice wars draws from Gaynor, *Intertidal History*, 65–106.

21 Livinius Bor, *Amboinse Oorlogen, door Arnold de Vlaming van Oudshoorn als superintendent, over d'Oosterse gewesten oorlogachtig ten eind gebracht* (Delft: Arnold Bon, 1663).

and in Admiral Speelman's 1669 report, he did not level a specific charge or claim of piracy, but instead, cast aspersions on a nautical realm that had challenged, and, for a time, helped to foil, his aims. Speelman's scorn was essentially name-calling in the mode of history written by the victors.

Though Speelman may have attempted to deny Tiworo's political and nautical legitimacy, his scornful words came well after the Tiworo contingent shifted their allegiance to Boné, and the Makassar War had reached its conclusion. Not only did he call Tiworo piratical after the conflict's conclusion. Of note for my purpose here, Speelman also did not couple this invective with any notion of failing political structures. This seventeenth-century example thus presents an interesting contrast with later nineteenth-century perspectives that took piracy as a sign of state dissolution. Also, whereas Speelman's invective was applied retrospectively, in contrast, nineteenth-century assessments of piracy as a sign of state dissolution mobilized piracy ascriptions to justify prospective actions and a politics of intervention.

The nineteenth-century vision that linked piratical activities to Southeast Asian maritime people does not seem to be connected in any substantial way to the historical role seventeenth-century Tiworo played as a vital non-urban maritime hub and opponent of European powers and their allies during the spice wars. In fact, one can trace in the historical record how Tiworo fell out of notice, disregarded rather than spurned, the memory of its social and political place in wider networks of political economy and social interaction faded beyond recognition.²² Later stereotypes of regional sea people as pirates, especially those of the Iranun and Balangingi Sama, instead appear to have roots in earlier Spanish views about *piratas* in the Philippines, views that flourished in connection with the raiding these mariners conducted from bases in the Southern Philippines during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Below, I discuss the changing dynamics of colonial "anti-piracy" efforts across the nineteenth century, and the popularization of the idea that such "piracy" grew out of native state decay. Yet, it must also be noted, as James Warren has argued, that Iranun and Balanangingi Sama raiding across the archipelago was carried out under the authority of the Tausug *datus* of the Sulu sultanate, hence, their activities were an extension of the state. In other words, Iranun and Balangingi Sama raiders effectively operated as clients of the Sulu state, and

22 Gaynor, *Intertidal History*, 11–22.

their “piracy” formed a functional part of the polity, rather than evidence of the state’s dysfunction.²³

Colonial “Piracy” and “Failed States”

During the first half of the nineteenth century, colonial powers in the eastern parts of the region viewed harassment of their European rivals by Southeast Asians as a strategic benefit. In the western archipelago, they were too suspicious of each others’ intentions to mount joint expeditions, as well as wary of the effect that independent anti-piracy actions might have on their diplomatic relations. They also began to realize that “piracy” was more than just a naval problem, and that it called for more cooperation regarding tactics, boundaries, and intelligence.²⁴ Yet, even when such cooperation was achieved it could be fleeting. For example, as late as 1897, a ban on the passage of arms in the Sulu zone lasted less than a year, since the Spanish-American conflict again made gun-running lucrative.²⁵

Attacks by colonial powers on what they viewed as pirate centres could result in the dispersal of survivors and a wider distribution of their activities. Dutch attacks on the Ilanun at Tolitoli in 1823, for instance, reportedly distributed their bases and activities to the Makassar Straits and the Flores Sea.²⁶ Similarly, the 1848 Spanish attack on Balangingi’s stronghold dispersed the raiders based there.²⁷ While colonial observers may not have recognized the wide networks of kinship and cooperation among some littoral seafaring people of the region, the perception that attacks resulted in dispersion rather than resolution led colonial powers to use other approaches, such as sedentarization, empowering native chiefs, and the facilitation of trade, which might yield better long-term results. However, since the people they relied on for these approaches sometimes also retained interests in raiding’s

23 James Francis Warren, *The Sulu Zone, 1768–1898: The Dynamics of External Trade, Slavery, and Ethnicity in the Transformation of a Southeast Asian Maritime State*. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2007 [1981]); Warren, *Iranun and Balangingi*.

24 Warren, *The Sulu Zone*, 197; Warren, *Iranun and Balangingi*, 276, 282–283; Ger Teitler, “Piracy in Southeast Asia, A Historical Comparison,” *MAST* 1, no. 1 (2002): 69–71.

25 Eric Tagliacozzo, “Kettle on a Slow Boil: Batavia’s Threat Perception in the Indies’ Outer Islands, 1870–1910,” *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 31, no. 1 (2000).

26 Warren, *Iranun and Balangingi*, 141; J.N.F.M. à Campo, “Discourse without Discussion: Representations of Piracy in Colonial Indonesia, 1816–25,” *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 34, no. 2 (2003): 205.

27 Warren, *The Sulu Zone*, 195–196, 345; Warren, *Iranun and Balangingi*, 355–358.

continuation, the success of these approaches had their limits.²⁸ As inter-colonial cooperation developed, it allowed for greater coordination among the powers. Eventually, steam made the expediency of such cooperation more feasible, while later, early twentieth-century administrative projects further narrowed the space for regional mariners to manoeuvre.²⁹

In his *Piracy and Politics in the Malay World* (1963), Nicholas Tarling argued that the eighteenth-century expansion of European trade into "Malay" areas threatened the economic foundations of indigenous coastal states, weakening the sultanates and allowing for the development of piracy. However, many have cast doubt on Tarling's analysis. Anne Lindsey Reber traced this analysis to Raffles' evolving views on Southeast Asia. Often omitted or cited only in passing by many authors, though extensively quoted and extolled by James Warren, Reber's 1966 thesis examined nineteenth-century British writings on Malay piracy as a historiographical problem.³⁰ She demonstrated how early nineteenth-century British colonials saw "piracy" in the western Straits, which reached across the archipelago from Sulu bases, as sufficient justification for intervention and conquest. Raffles, she explained, introduced biases into the historical record, for he, especially, came to write about nineteenth-century designations of piracy in Southeast Asia in ways that tied it to the notion of native state decay. Raffles largely faulted the Dutch for this situation of supposed native state decay, an unsurprising ascription of blame given early nineteenth-century intercolonial wars over territorial control. Raffles proposed to ameliorate these conditions through new commercial centres under British domination.

He may have first presented this interpretation of regional piracy's origins in an 1811 report to Lord Minto. However, his ideas were not restricted to the circumscribed realms of officialdom. Reber makes it clear from the start that, "Raffles was the first major publicist of the need for piracy suppression in the Indonesian archipelago."³¹ Nineteenth-century debate about Southeast Asian piracy brought the association of piracy and forms of "native rule" out from the corridors of colonial bureaucracy and into the emergent public space of the press.³² Though some afforded "piracy" a certain legitimacy

28 Campo, "Discourse," 205–209.

29 Warren, *The Sulu Zone*, 196–197; Campo, "Discourse"; Tagliacozzo, "Kettle," 75.

30 Warren, *Iranun and Balangingi*, 22.

31 Reber, "A Historiographical Problem," 1–2.

32 For instance, during the mid-nineteenth century, the newspaperman (and solicitor), James Richardson Logan, published a series of pieces that demonstrated a degree of sympathy, though not tremendous amounts of local knowledge, about maritime-oriented archipelagic society and culture. See "The Piracy and Slave Trade of the Indian Archipelago," *The Journal of the Indian*

in the Southeast Asian context by normalizing it, these debates took place without the contribution of Southeast Asian voices. However complex the debate was methodologically, this limited the epistemological reach of inquiry, and also underscores that the audience for this discourse was European, especially British. It was among these communicative networks, both the circles of colonial officialdom and the expanding dimensions of a reading public, that such debates found their *raison d'être*.

In a rather similar fashion, "failed states" made quite a splash in the press when piracy around the horn of Africa soared in the 1990s. However, it should be noted, in contrast, that one did not hear such talk of failed states to explain the high incidence of piracy in the contemporaneous Malacca Straits. When piracy in the Malacca Straits later declined, though, countries engaged in international cooperation were nevertheless quick to credit and congratulate themselves, having learned that cooperation was vital to their aims, much as intercolonial cooperation effectively brought "piracy" to an end, for a time, in the late colonial period. Curiously, those kudos of containment ignored how fishing communities in the Straits continued to be targeted. At the same time, one finds it encouraging that Somalia observers now more commonly integrate the political economy of fishing into analyses of piracy off its coast, where fish stocks were being raided by vessels from elsewhere.³³ Fishing is serious business. In the 1970s, Indonesia's small-scale fishers took matters into their own hands with Molotov cocktails when trawlers damaged their gear, and sometimes their persons, along with the large scale of extraction that threatened their livelihood. A nationwide ban on trawlers in 1980 was only partly successful.³⁴ In recent years, Indonesia's Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries has become famous for her orders to blow up foreign fishing vessels in Indonesia's waters.

While Raffles' and Tarling's interpretation of piracy's origin looked to native state decay, their explanation, which assigned agency to colonial actors, focused more on the consequences of commercial disruption. Theories of failed states, more than Tarling's or Raffles' explanations of native state decay, often imagine a lack of policing resources as one of piracy's main causes, which simultaneously positions "state failure" as a pretext for external intervention. Critics of the failed state concept have done a

Archipelago and Eastern Asia, James R. Logan, editor, III (1849): 581–588, 629–636; IV (1850): 42–52, 144–162, 400–410, 617–628, 734–746; V (1851): 374–382.

33 Gaynor, "Piracy in the Offing," 850–851.

34 Connor Bailey, "The Political Economy of Marine Fisheries Development in Indonesia," *Indonesia* 46 (1988): 33–37.

better job of providing context and explaining the political economy of disruptions in peoples' livelihoods.

A number of scholars in political science and related fields have argued against the analytical utility of the notion of failed states. For instance, Charles T. Call has pointed out that the concept contains culturally specific assumptions about what a "successful" state looks like, grouping together disparate kinds of states with different problems. Similarly, Stein Eriksen critiqued the "fast-growing discourse of 'state failure'." Whereas Call advocated that analysts should abandon the notion of "failed states" and similar concepts, Eriksen, after scrutinizing the notion of the state underlying debates about failed states and assessing the methodological strategies of their key contributions, outlined an alternative analytical approach based more on state practices and dynamic processes.³⁵ This proposal has several analytical advantages, chief among them doing away with the use of particular idealized notions of statehood as the basis against which deviations are measured.³⁶

The problem, as Eriksen rightly pointed out, is not that these notions are based on Western concepts of the state. In other words, the problem is not relativism. Rather, he explains, drawing on Mahmood Mamdani, the problem is doing "history by analogy," which tells us more about a normative

35 Charles T. Call, "The Fallacy of the 'Failed State'," *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 8 (2008): 1494; Stein Sundstøl Eriksen, "'State Failure' in Theory and Practice: The Idea of the State and the Contradictions of State Formation," *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 1 (2011): 230.

36 Such as with the following: William Zartman, *Collapsed States: The Disintegration and Restoration of Legitimate Authority* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner, 1995); Robert I. Rotberg, ed., *When States Fail: Causes and Consequences* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004); Robert Jackson, *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); and Stephen Krasner, "Sharing Sovereignty: New Institutions for Collapsed and Failing States," *International Security* 29, no. 2 (2004): 85–120. See also, inter alia, Harvey Starr, "'Introduction' to the CMPS Special Issue on Failed States," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 4 (2008): 281–284; Zaryab Iqbal and Harvey Starr, "Bad Neighbors: Failed States and Their Consequences," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 4 (2008): 315–331; Jack A. Goldstone, "Pathways to State Failure," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 4 (2008): 285–296; Robert Bates, "'The Logic of State Failure': Learning from Late-Century Africa," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 4 (2008): 297–314; Lisa Chauvet and Paul Collier, "Aid and Reform in Failing States," *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature* 22, no. 1 (2008): 15–24; and David Carment, Joe Landry, and Yiyagadeesen Samy, "State Failure, Development, and International Security: The Challenges of Intervening in Fragile States," in *Routledge Handbook of Civil Wars*, edited by Edward Newman and Karl DeRouen Jr. (New York: Routledge, 2014), 334–346.

model and what states purportedly “lack,” than about how particular states actually work.³⁷

Conclusion

Piracy’s nineteenth-century association with the decline of states in Southeast Asia differs from notable earlier sixteenth- and seventeenth-century views. For instance, while Tomé Pires found both trade and pillaging common to all, and not necessarily external to polities, during the famed seventeenth-century spice wars, Admiral Cornelis Speelman used the pirates’ nest label for an opponent that stymied Dutch efforts, and applied it only after the conflict’s conclusion. During the nineteenth century, colonial Europeans often applied the piracy label to pillaging. Though not everyone agreed that the capture of people was piratical, some normalized it as just part of the maritime world, while others remained blind to the circuits of exchange and political clientship that tied raiders to Southeast Asian states.

The notion that piracy was the result of native state decay may be traced to nineteenth-century debates. Popularized by Raffles, who had plans for developing alternate commercial centres under British domination, the idea has had a long life in the historiography of Southeast Asia. Though resuscitated by Nicholas Tarling, Anne Lindsey Reber shortly thereafter traced the idea that piracy resulted from native state decay to Raffles and critiqued it as a problem for historiography. The notion that piracy resulted from native state decay constituted a problem for historiography both because it was a colonial ideology adopted into the historical canon to explain dynamics in Southeast Asia’s past, and because it offered an ideological justification for colonial military intervention. James Warren turned the notion firmly on its head when he argued that raiders based in the Sulu zone had been clients of the Sulu state. Part of the state, rather than signs of its dysfunction or dissolution, raiding practices flourished in the connections between Sulu’s maritime-oriented political economy and the burgeoning world system.

When political scientists, journalists, and military officials used “failed states” to explain piracy during the 1990s, they did so in apparent ignorance of the idea’s colonial origins in nineteenth-century debates that posited a causal link between state dissolution and piracy. Needless to say, they were also unaware that this notion had already been critiqued for posing a

37 Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 9, cited in Eriksen, “‘State Failure’ in Theory and Practice,” 234.

historiographical problem, a problem that substituted an erroneous theory to explain piracy's causes, in disregard of historical specificities. Having entered the political lexicon of the United States, "failed states" came to occupy a prominent place in international peace and security. It was thereby again deployed to military ends. Better analysis would turn to local histories of interaction between state and society, political economy's impact on environments and populations, and the dynamics of intraregional politics. Better theory could use history inductively, and leave off tapping bad theory as a justification for intervention.

Bibliography

- Al-Qāsimī, Sulṭān Muḥammad, *The Myth of Arab Piracy in the Gulf* (London: Croom Helm, 1986).
- Amirell, Stefan Eklöf, *Pirates of Empire: Colonisation and Maritime Violence in Southeast Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).
- Anderson, Benedict, "Census, Map, Museum," in Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London and New York: Verso, 2006 [1983]), 163–186.
- Bailey, Conner, "The Political Economy of Marine Fisheries Development in Indonesia," *Indonesia*, no. 46 (1988): 25–38.
- Baker, Brett, "South Sulawesi in 1544: A Portuguese Letter," *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 39, no. 1 (2005): 61–85.
- Bates, Robert, "The Logic of State Failure: Learning from Late-Century Africa," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 4 (2008): 297–314.
- Bor, Livinus, *Amboinse Oorlogen, door Arnold de Vlaming van Oudshoorn als superintendent, over d'Oosterse gewesten oorlogachtig ten eind gebracht* (Delft: Arnold Bon, 1663).
- Butcher, John G. and R. E. Elson, *Sovereignty and the Sea: How Indonesia Became an Archipelagic State* (Singapore: NUS Press, 2017).
- Call, Charles, "The Fallacy of the Failed State," *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 8 (2008): 1491–1507.
- Campo, J.N.F.M. à, "Discourse without Discussion: Representations of Piracy in Colonial Indonesia, 1816–25," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 34, no. 2 (2003): 199–214.
- Carment, David, "Assessing State Failure: Implications for Theory and Policy," *Third World Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (2003): 407–427.
- Carment, David, Yiagadeesen Samy, and Stuart Prest, "State Fragility and Implications for Aid Allocation: An Empirical Analysis," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 4 (2008): 349–373.

- Carment, David, Joe Landry, and Yiagadeesen Samy, "State Failure, Development and International Security: The Challenges of Intervening in Fragile States," in Edward Newman and Karl DeRouen Jr., *Routledge Handbook of Civil Wars* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 334–346.
- Chauvet, Lisa and Paul Collier, "Aid and Reform in Failing States," *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature* 22, no. 1 (2008): 15–24.
- Eriksen, Stein Sundstøl, "'State Failure' in Theory and Practice: The Idea of the State and the Contradictions of State Formation," *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 1 (January 2011): 229–247.
- Frake, Charles O., "The Genesis of Kinds of People in the Sulu Archipelago," in *Language and Cultural Description: Essays by Charles O. Frake* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1980), 311–332.
- Gaynor, Jennifer L., *Intertidal History in Island Southeast Asia: Submerged Genealogy and the Legacy of Coastal Capture*. (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 2016).
- , "Piracy in the Offing: The Law of Lands and the Limits of Sovereignty at Sea." *Anthropological Quarterly* 85, no. 3 (2012): 817–858.
- Goldstone, Jack A., "Pathways to State Failure," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 4 (2008): 285–296.
- Harvey, Barbara Sillars, "Tradition, Islam and Rebellion: South Sulawesi 1950–1965" (Unpublished dissertation in Political Science, Cornell University, 1974).
- Heller-Roazen, Daniel, *The Enemy of All: Piracy and the Law of Nations* (Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books, 2009).
- Iqbal, Zaryab, and Harvey Starr, "Bad Neighbors: Failed States and Their Consequences," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 4 (2008): 315–331.
- Jackson, Robert, *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Krasner, Stephen, "Sharing Sovereignty: New Institutions for Collapsed and Failing States," *International Security* 29, no. 2 (2004): 85–120.
- Levinson, S. C., *Pragmatics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- Mamdani, Mahmood, *Citizen and Subject* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).
- Peterson, Andrew Christian, "Making the First Global Trade Route: The Southeast Asian Foundations of the Acapulco-Manila Galleon Trade, 1519–1650" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Hawai'i, Manoa, 2014).
- Pires, Tomé, *The Suma Oriental of Tomé Pires, an Account of the East, from the Red Sea to Japan, Written in Malacca and India in 1512–1515*; and *The Book of Francisco Rodrigues, Rutter of a Voyage in the Red Sea, Nautical Rules, Almanack, and Maps, Written and Drawn in the East before 1515*, trans. Armando Cortesão (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1944).

- Reber, Anne Lindsey, "The Sulu World in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries: A Historiographical Problem in British Writings on Malay Piracy" (Unpublished Masters Thesis, Cornell University, 1966.)
- Rediker, Marcus, *Villains of All Nations: Atlantic Piracy in the Golden Age* (New York: Verso, 2004).
- , *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World 1700–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1995 [1987]).
- Resink, Gertrudes Johan, *Indonesia's History Between the Myths: Essays in Legal History and Historical Theory* (The Hague: W. van Hoeve, 1968).
- Risso, Patricia, "Cross-Cultural Perceptions of Piracy: Maritime Violence in the Western Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf Region during a Long Eighteenth Century," *Journal of World History* 12, no. 2 (2001): 293–319.
- Rotberg, Robert I., ed., *When States Fail: Causes and Consequences* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004).
- Rubin, Alfred P., *The Law of Piracy*. International Law Studies, 63 (Newport, RI: US Naval War College Press, 1988).
- Starr, Harvey, "Introduction to the CMPS Special Issue on Failed States," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 4 (2008): 281–284.
- Tagliacozzo, Eric, "Kettle on a Slow Boil: Batavia's Threat Perception in the Indies' Outer Islands, 1870–1910," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 31, no. 1 (2000): 70–100.
- Tarling, Nicholas, *Piracy and Politics in the Malay World: A Study of British Imperialism in Nineteenth Century South-East Asia* (Melbourne: F. W. Cheshire, 1963).
- Teitler, Ger, "Piracy in Southeast Asia, A Historical Comparison," *MAST* 1, no. 1 (2002): 67–83.
- "The Piracy and Slave Trade of the Indian Archipelago," *The Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, James R. Logan, editor, III (1849): 581–588, 629–636; IV (1850): 42–52, 144–162, 400–410, 617–628, 734–746; V (1851): 374–382.
- Warren, James Francis, *Iranun and Balangingi: Globalization, Maritime Raiding, and the Birth of Ethnicity* (Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2002).
- , *The Sulu Zone, 1768–1898: The Dynamics of External Trade, Slavery, and Ethnicity in the Transformation of a Southeast Asian Maritime State*. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2007 [1981]).
- White, Joshua M., *Piracy and Law in the Ottoman Mediterranean* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2017).
- Zartman, William, *Collapsed States: The Disintegration and Restoration of Legitimate Authority* (Boulder: Lynne Reiner, 1995).

About the Author

Jennifer L. Gaynor is an historian and anthropologist of Southeast Asia and its surrounding seas. She is a Research Fellow at the SUNY at Buffalo, School of Law, State University of New York, and the author of *Intertidal History in Island Southeast Asia: Submerged Genealogy and the Legacy of Coastal Capture* (2016).