



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Significance of Study

Contemporary international politics focuses the spotlight on Southeast Asia--the region most vulnerable to Communism and yet the frontier of opportunity for democracy.¹ Although the next global war, if it happens would be instantaneous and can no longer be affected in terms of material resources, the small nations exercise that sobering influence and possess the ability to create a psychological deterrent to preserve and maintain the status quo. Thus, the Southeast Asian region gives the "balance of terror" a little flexibility in structure.

Southeast Asia consists of the fringes of the lands of the Asian continent and the off-lying islands--Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, Burma and Indonesia and a vast expanse of sea

Predominantly rich in resources, material and human, it is ironically backward so far as the economic standards of the West are concerned. Politically, it is experiencing

¹Pelaez, Emmanuel, "Asia-Front-Line of Greatest Danger, Frontier of Greatest Opportunity," a speech before the U.S. Regional Operations Conference, Camp John Hay, Baguio: Philippines, March, 12, 1962, p. 1.

a sweeping transitional and revolutionary change as a result of the withdrawal of the West and a vain attempt to catch up with the twentieth century. It is naive, uncertain and indifferent, plagued with disease and poverty.

The ideological and military fronts in this region are fluid and not well-defined. While the combatants are clearly identified elsewhere, in Asia, Communism comes in varied guises. Sometimes, it comes in the form of internecine struggles as in Laos, in brush-fires or guerrilla wars as in Vietnam and others, in open aggression as in Korea.

The contemporary situation hurls a great challenge to the peoples of Southeast Asia and they must take up that challenge if it were to survive and preserve its own identity. It should be admitted that the task at hand is gigantic and the Southeast Asian peoples can not move alone. They need the collaboration of the West. However, it is imperative that the initiative should come from themselves.

The study of the relations of the Philippines and Thailand is significant and timely because they are the only two nations which have come out openly in support of the West. Their commitment to the West can not be measured in terms of the support given it by their foreign policies but to the extent of a legal obligation embodied in the

Southeast Asia Defense Agreement. In the case of the Philippines, it is elaborated in a separate bilateral defense pact with the United States. It is obvious that a shift in the direction of their commitment to the opposite will mean utter defeat for the West and the victory of Communist China in Southeast Asia and probably world domination by Communism.

The Philippines and Thailand, in collaboration with the West, face and must take up a greater challenge and responsibility as bastions of individual freedom in this part of the world. They must prove to "every Asian that their system of freedom not only ennobles and enriches the human spirit.... but that democracy offers the healthiest environment for economic development and progress."² They must "convince him that it is the system that stands for growth and experimentation and expansion, that it is dynamic and not static and it is forward-looking and is not bogged down in the past."³

In connection with the present trend of establishing deeper and closer unity among the peoples of the region, the parts being played by both countries and the leadership and responsibilities they are assuming are tangible proofs that they are now waking up from lethargy.

²Ibid., p. 5

³Ibid.

Thailand's role of leadership has been that of keen and quality diplomacy behind-the-scenes. That of the Philippines' is more of an attempt to create an over-all federation to unify the whole of Southeast Asia in a collective front--both economically and politically.

Within the context of the shifting international scene, temporarily shifted to Southeast Asia, the roles of the Philippines and Thailand are evident and cannot be ignored.

Purpose of the Study

No society can now exist without a considerable amount of joint co-operative action. Co-operation may be achieved by either institutional or non-institutional means.⁴ Yet, co-operation through whatever means is most difficult to attain. Theoretically, co-operation can be obtained only in areas where there is conflict without aggression. In reality, however, co-operation usually is restricted to economic and security matters.⁵

⁴Institutional co-operation necessitates the existence of some organized procedures as the presence of an administrative machinery in regional organizations or its foundation upon a treaty or an agreement. Non-institutional co-operation lacks the above mentioned organization of process and thus co-operation is achieved more or less at random.

⁵Strausz-Hupe, R., and Possony, S. T., International Relations, in the Age of the Conflict Between Democracy and Dictatorship (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953), p. 28.

There are at least five objectives of co-operative political action,⁶ to wit: (1) integration of elements of strength in order to enhance mutual security and reduce defense costs; (2) stimulation of trade in commodities in order to improve living standards and enhance other economic advantages; (3) stimulation of exchange techniques and cultural goods in order to improve cultural and intellectual standards; (4) slow adaptive transformation of society in order to eliminate preventively causes of conflict; and (5) transaction of all types of business to the mutual benefits of several states. The present study stresses the extent of the area of co-operation so far achieved by the Philippines and Thailand with respect to the above mentioned objectives.

Co-operation becomes more inevitable because interdependence is logical and inherent in a political world and in the development of modern states. Consequently, it is becoming more and more entrenched in the lives of nations.

The present study attempts to answer three relevant questions:

1. How did the relations of the Philippines and Thailand come about?
2. What is the contemporary nature of their relations? What are the benefits derived from such a relation? What are some of its problems?

⁶Ibid., p. 30.

3. How may the area of co-operation be enlarged?

The emphasis draws upon the second and third questions. The third question particularly involves a theory and a method--the principle of common interest and the method of regionalization which may eventually lead to an effective and real pluralistic-security community.⁷

In the solution of the major problems of international relations, in the use of peaceful change and accommodation instead of those of violence and force, the element of common interest should be reckoned with. Not only is it a desirable solution but it is practical and attainable in the light of the present situation.

Coincidence and overlapping of national interests do not immediately take place in a world scale. It has to start between two countries, at least, then it spreads to a region before it attains international preponderance. This can only take place when nations believe that their respective national interests can be best served and defended by co-operative venture rather than by individual efforts.

The primary purpose of the present study then is to show the relations between the Philippines and Thailand through the instruments of two general types of co-operation

⁷See the definition in Terminology.

particularly their overlapping membership in regional organizations like the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and the Association of Southeast Asia which typify instruments through which institutional co-operation may be achieved. These are considered to be either functional instruments or a transitional stage to unity. Thus, they compensate for the absence of significant bilateral agreements between Thailand and the Philippines.⁸

Scope of the Study

The term "relations" in diplomatic parlance connotes the various and broader connections in which groups are brought together as in common interest. These groups can either be nations, states, governments, peoples, alliances, confederations, international or religious organizations.⁹ The scope of international relations is so broad that it has often been referred to as "that phase of human society which transcends national boundaries."¹⁰

⁸There is no bilateral agreement, like a Treaty of Commerce and Navigation, except for the Treaty of Friendship of 1949 and the Air Agreement of 1953.

⁹Wright, Quincy, The Study of International Relations (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955), p. 6.

¹⁰Schleicher, C. P., Introduction to International Relations (New York: Prentice Hall, 1954), p. 22.

It can be noticed that the use of the term "relations" here had not been qualified in the title for instance, as to draw a demarcation line between political and economic relations or just delimit the subject matter by using either qualifications.

This has been intentionally done for the reason that it is difficult nowadays to say what is economic and what is political since the tendency of both is to interlock. To eschew this difficulty and to obtain a little flexibility in writing, the unqualified concept of "relations" is being used. Moreover, the study of relations is a matter of emphasis and approach and the former had been so stated.¹¹

This study has been so written as to embrace all aspects of relations including both institutional and non-institutional co-operation between the two countries. Although many might not have been given enough emphasis and are only dealt with perfunctorily, it is hoped that their mere mention might stimulate deeper and more specific investigations in the future. This is only an initial attempt and probably much remains to be done.

¹¹Supra.

Sources

After extensive investigations, it was found out that there was no directly relevant material--book, pamphlet or monograph--except for an article written and published in the August-September 1963 issue of the Bulletin of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Thailand, by Dr. Jose D. Ingles, Philippine Ambassador to Thailand entitled the same as the present study.¹²

Extensive research was conducted making use of unpublished sources, letters and communications and other pertinent documents. Published sources were newspapers, publications and books on international relations, in general, on Southeast Asia, on the Philippines and on Thailand. To supplement some shortcomings of the abovementioned sources, the interview as a research-technique was used.

The student-writer met many difficulties in the process of preparing this thesis not only because this is a first attempt on the subject but the very nature of the subject matter, itself. The search for truth in the international relations field is beyond grasp because more often than not, what is written or said is a matter of superficiality. Much speculations and guess-work coupled with logical and realistic deductions had to be made.

¹²Foreign Affairs Bulletin, Vol. III, No. 1. August-September, 1963 (Department of Information, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Bangkok: Thailand), pp. 17-24.

The present writer was not able to conduct intensive research in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs due to the observance of strict security regulations which is quite understandable. The same case applies to SEATO, particularly with documents which are classified.

Another handicap met by the student was her inability to read releases, letters and documents in Thai.

Despite these limitations and handicaps, efforts were exerted to make the study as objective as possible and to include all relevant aspects which the title "The Relations Between the Philippines and Thailand" should cover with emphasis on institutionalized co-operation as in regional organizations.

Terminology

The present study shall make use of the following conceptual tools and subsequent discussions shall be made within their contexts:

Right of diplomatic intercourse--This means the right to send and receive diplomatic and consular envoys, to negotiate and conclude treaties, the privilege to enjoy priorities and immunities, and the duty to comply with obligations established by international law and comity. The right of diplomatic intercourse is incident and necessary to the existence of international relations.¹³

Treaty--It is an international agreement concluded between states or organization of states possessed with a contractual capacity to do so, creating rights and obligations.¹⁴ This definition implies the essential requisites of a valid treaty, namely: contracting parties, contractual capacity and legal obligations.

Regionalism--It is the "concept of organizing states and dependent areas on a regional basis."¹⁵ Regionalism taken literally is misleading. The term, region itself is subject to fluid interpretations. A region is a part of the earth's surface, but it does not necessarily mean contiguous territories. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is a case in point. Among the eight member states, only the Philippines and Thailand come from the Southeast Asian region. American membership in various regional security arrangements is much more complicated.

According to Judge Alejandro Alvarez, there is no hard and fast rule to determine regions. "Their existence must be shown by circumstances and in particular, by agreements made by states who constitute them.... Regions are

¹³Oppenheim, L., International Law, 2 Vols. (1-Peace, Great Britain: T & A Constable, Ltd., 1962), p. 773.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 877.

¹⁵Schleicher, op. cit., p. 129.

constituted by certain countries having affinities of race, institutions, or above all, political interests."¹⁶

Collective security--Georg Swarzenberger defines collective security as a "machinery for joint action in order to counter any attack against the established international order."¹⁷ Established international order is presumed to be the status quo.

Although collective security partakes of collective action, the latter does not necessarily imply collective security. Whereas collective action may mean the limited collaboration of a few states on an ad hoc basis, collective security implies far-reaching commitments and obligations.¹⁸ However, in general parlance, collective security denotes "any form of international co-operation and of collective action in dealing with threats to the peace and open acts of aggression."¹⁹

¹⁶Schleicher, op. cit., p. 284. Quoted from Norman Hill, International Organization (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932), p. 87.

¹⁷Swarzenberger, Georg, Power Politics (New York: F. A. Praeger, Inc., 1951), p. 494.

¹⁸Palmer and Perkins, International Relations (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., second edition, 1956), p. 274.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 287.

Foreign policy--In its broadest sense, it refers to the "objectives, plans and actions" taken by a state in relation to the conduct of its external affairs.²⁰

Diplomacy--Satow defines the word "diplomacy" as the application of tact and intelligence to the conduct of official relations between governments of independent states.²¹ It connotes the methods used in the management and adjustment of international relations.

While foreign policy is the substantive element of foreign relations, diplomacy is an instrument or process by which foreign policy is pursued and carried out.²²

Integration--The process of attaining within a territory of a sense of community and institutions and practices strong and widespread enough to assure, for a long time, dependable expectations of peaceful change among its population is called integration.²³

²⁰Schleicher, G. P., International Relations (Co-operation and Conflict) (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1962), p. 28.

²¹Satow, Sir Ernest, Guide to Diplomatic Practice, (London: Longman's Green & Co., 1957), p. 1.

²²Childs, J. R., American Foreign Service (New York: Holt, 1948), p. 64.

²³Haas, E., "Challenge of Regionalism," Theory of International Relations, edited by Hoffmann (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 223.

Security-community--A group of people which have become integrated.

There are two types of security-communities. Amalgamated security-community implies the "creation of a governmental structure, whether that of a unitary, federal or personal union type of state."²⁴

A pluralistic security-community is "any arrangement in which no control decision-making is created and in which the constituent states retain their independence, but which nevertheless provides for the kind of social interaction thought conducive to integration. Confederations and conventional international organizations at the regional level falls under this category."²⁵ The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and Association of Southeast Asia are pluralistic security-communities.

At the outset, it should be stated that the present study shall make use of the following abbreviations:

- SEATO -- Southeast Asia Treaty Organization
- ASA -- Association of Southeast Asia
- DFA -- Department of Foreign Affairs (Manila, Philippines)
- MFA -- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Bangkok, Thailand)

²⁴Ibid., p. 224

²⁵Ibid.

PWG -- Permanent Working Group
UN -- United Nations
EMPHIL-- Embassy of the Philippines
SCB -- Standing Committee/Bangkok
R -- Report
WP -- Working Paper

Methodology

The use of the comparative method is evident in order to point out as many parallels existing between the two countries as possible. The historical method was used also for the reason that the easiest way to comprehend the present is to find out how it began and developed.

On the whole, the methods of synthesis and analysis were found to be indispensable.

Organization

The justification for writing the introductory chapter is self-evident. The second chapter is written to set the tone of succeeding discussions. It deals with the contemporary setting of both countries--geography, economy, government and politics and social factors. The second half is particularly devoted to a discussion of their foreign policies. The historical development from the earliest contact known to the contemporary times is treated in the third chapter. The fourth chapter devolves upon the non-institutional co-operation between the two countries as in

political co-operation in the United Nations or in some socio-economic fields. The fifth chapter had been intentionally made compact to present the contents in a clear-cut manner. It concerns the institutional aspect of co-operation between the Philippines and Thailand in regional organization. The concluding chapter contains a summary of the whole thesis and an evaluation and recommendations on how to improve the contemporary relations between Thailand and the Philippines.



ศูนย์วิจัยทรัพยากร
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย