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ABSTRACT

The South China Sea has been a successful case of conflict prevention since the early 1990s. It has been, and continues to be the locus of a number of territorial conflicts between Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines, People’s Republic of China, Republic of China (Taiwan), Vietnam, and a conflict where there have been regularly military clashes. Moreover, it is a conflict in a region with a high level of intraregional distrust, deeply rooted historical issues and rapidly increasing military spending. This conflict can became “Asia’s next flash point”. However, this conflict is not yet escalated into serious military conflict but still need peace solution as soon as possible.

Nowadays the conflict is became more serious causes of the intervention from non claimant countries, such as United States. Here, the writer want to investigate United States way for intervention to the dispute with brings the interests although U.S. is non claimant countries in the dispute. And also investigate the others possible of United States interests in the dispute except the “freedom of navigation” that was stated by Hillary Clinton as the State Secretary of United States.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I.1 Background of the Study

Territorial disputes are the major causes of wars as states often try to assert their sovereignty over a territory through invasion, and non state entities try to influence the action through military actions or the use any means necessary of violence. This dispute is about a disagreement over the control of land between two or more territorial over the control of land by a new state and occupying power. These disputes are related to the culture and ethnic nationalism although the disputes can also be driven by the possession of natural resources such as rivers, fertile farmland, mineral or oil resources.¹

A dispute may be defined as a specific disagreement concerning a matter of fact, law or policy in which a claim or assertion of one party is met with refusal, counter-claim or denial by another². Disputes are an inevitable part of international relations, just as disputes between individuals are inevitable in domestic relations³. Disputes, whether between states, neighbors, or brothers and sisters, must therefore be accepted as a regular part of human relations and the problem is what to do about them⁴. Whereas, conflict is a social condition that arises when two or more actors pursue mutually exclusive or mutually incompatible goals⁵. In international relations conflict behavior can be observed as war both as a threatened outcome and as an existential reality and bargaining behavior short of the violent idiom. Hostile

³ Ibid.,
⁴ Ibid.,
⁵ Ibid.,
attitudes are evinced by elites, attentive and mass publics through such psychological dispositions as aggression and suspicion.

Many cases about territorial dispute happened in the entire world, one of them is the South China Sea disputes. The territorial dispute over a remote uninhabited island group in the South China Sea has become a major issue in Asia-Pacific region. The dispute is being driven by China’s claims of sovereignty in the South China Sea and its aggressive attempts to enforce those claims. Since that moment, a whole series of other claims have been made by Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines, Republic of China (Taiwan) and Vietnam. In the beginning the dispute is about history and nationalism of the territory but nowadays it is developed into national interest of each related country, either the claimant countries or even non-claimant countries.

The national interests, supported by a fact that the area is potentially rich in oil and natural gas deposits, but the estimation are highly varied. One of the estimation is the South China Sea may contain 17.7 billion tons of crude oil (compared to Kuwait with 13 billion tons) by Ministry of Geological Resources and Mining of the People’s Republic of China. Besides rich in oil, another potential of the South China Sea are one of the busiest trade route in the world, acting as a major conduit of Asian and global trade. Then the regional stability also in danger because of China’s assertive behavior over the claims, coupled with China’s lack of transparency in its military modernization program have created an arms race in Southeast Asia. Not only the claimants’ country has worried but the major power also worried about the situation, such as India, Indonesia, Japan, the United States, etc, which has also concerned over freedom of navigation.

The United States is one of the non claimants country that give strong reactions in this situation. This act was supported by China's neighbors who seek greater U.S. economic, diplomatic and military involvement in the region as a

---

counterbalance to China’s growing power.\textsuperscript{7} All this time U.S., role in the region is as the midst of a policy pivot to the Asia-Pacific, committing 60 percent of its naval assets to the Pacific Ocean. The involvement of U.S., also supported by historical alliances with the Philippines and now both of them taking actions to strengthen and modernize their relationship, as well as building “robust partnership” throughout the region in order to protect their national interest.\textsuperscript{8}

\section*{I.2 Problem Identification}

The South China Sea is a marginal sea that is part of the Pacific Ocean, encompassing an area from both the Singapore and Malacca Straits to the Strait of Taiwan of around 3,500,000 square kilometers (1,400,000 sq mi).\textsuperscript{9} The region includes several hundred small islands, rocks and reefs, with the majority located in the Paracel and Spratly Island chains.\textsuperscript{10} The islands are important for strategically and political reasons, so some related country claims for the surrounding sea and its resources.

According to data from the U.S. Energy Information Administration, the South China Sea is rich in natural resources such as oil and natural gas and ownership of virtually all of the South China Sea. The focus of the most attention regarding to the South China Sea’s resources has been on hydrocarbons, especially oil. Oil reserve estimates for the entire South China Sea region vary. From Chinese

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
estimate suggests potential oil resources as high as 213 billion barrels of oil (bbl).\textsuperscript{11} In 1993 - 1994 estimates by the U.S. Geological Survey estimated the sum total of discovering reserves and undiscovered resources in the offshore basins of the South China Sea at 28 billion bbl.\textsuperscript{12} The fact that surrounding areas are rich in oil deposits has led to speculation that the Spratly Islands could be an untapped oil bearing province.

Then another resource is natural gas. Natural gas might be the most abundant hydrocarbon resources in the South China Sea. Most of the hydrocarbon fields explored in the South China Sea regions of Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam contain natural gas, not oil. Estimates by the United States Geological Survey and others indicate that about 60 to 70 percent of the region’s hydrocarbon resources are natural gas.\textsuperscript{13} Not just for oil, estimates of the South China Sea’s natural gas resources also vary widely. From China, estimates for the entire South China Sea region estimate natural gas reserves to be 2 quadrillion cubic feet.\textsuperscript{14} Another Chinese report estimates 225 billion barrels of oil equivalent in the Spratly Islands alone.\textsuperscript{15} If 70 percent of these hydrocarbons are gas as some studies suggest, total gas resources would be almost 900 trillion cubic feet (Tcf).\textsuperscript{16} In April 2006, Husky Energy that was working with the Chinese National Offshore Oil Corporation announced a discovery of proven natural gas reserves of nearly 4 to 6 Tcf near the Spratly Islands.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{11} South China Sea Oil and Natural Gas. Retrieved on January 21, 2013 from http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/spratly-oil.htm
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} South China Sea Oil and Natural Gas. Retrieved on January 21, 2013 from http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/spratly-oil.htm
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
The risk of conflict escalating from relatively minor events has increased in the South China Sea over the past two years with dispute and nowadays with less chance to see peace negotiations and resolutions. Currently, the conflict has become more serious because much of the attention in the region has been focused on the abundant natural resources and strategic location. In fact, other countries are interested because of their own national interests to be part of the dispute with essentially the United State.

Although United States is an external party of the claimant countries but the Philippines encourage the alliances relationship with the U.S. The United States and the Republic of the Philippines maintain close ties relationship from the U.S. colonial period (1898 – 1946), the bilateral security alliance, extensive military cooperation, and common strategic and economic interests.\(^{18}\)

In 1992, United States closed its military bases in the Philippines, the two treaty allies have continued joint military activities related to maritime security and counter terrorism. The bilateral security relationship has gained prominence as a key link in the evolving U.S. foreign policy “pivot” toward Asia, and two sides are discussing supporting U.S. access to the Philippines military facilities. Both countries signed the “Manila Declaration”, which reaffirmed the bilateral security relationship and called for multilateral talks to resolve maritime disputes in the region. The treaty was signed on November 16, 2011 by U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Philippine Secretary of Foreign Affairs Albert F. del Rosario.\(^{19}\)

Seen from high tension conflict between China and the Philippines, one of the U.S. policy objectives in maintaining United States and the Philippines alliance is enhancing security and stability in the South China Sea. In 2011, Chinese naval forces had reported the harassment from the Philippine especially to the Chinese


\(^{19}\) Ibid.,
fishing and oil exploration vessels and erected structures in the territory near the Philippines island of Palawan. The Philippines President Benigno Aquino responded in part by announcing increases in the country’s military budget and welcomed by the increased security cooperation with the United States, so the Philippines can balanced the growth military power of China. The U.S. government supports a peaceful resolution in the South China Sea dispute that is based upon international law and involves a multilateral process. Washington also has promised greater military cooperation and assistance to the Philippines. Thus, in August 2011, the United States and the Philippines agreed to focus their efforts on the development of a framework for increased bilateral and multilateral security and maritime domain awareness. Among the measures that were considered are: 1) a U.S. rotational presence in the Philippines to assist the Armed Force of the Philippines in developing its own capability for territorial defense; 2) to increase bilateral maritime security activities; 3) development of joint-use maritime security support facilities; 4) improved bilateral information sharing; 5) coordinated and integrated maritime security initiatives between US Pacific Command and the Armed Force of the Philippines.

I.3 Statement of the Problem

The statement of the problems of this thesis is focused on two essential questions:

1. Why and How the United States of America interfered in the South China Sea dispute?

The writer of this thesis will describe the “Why”, which will give analysis of the national interest of the United States in the South China Sea. And as for the “How”

---

20 Ibid.,
will highlight the approach of the United States interferences in the dispute by using the Philippines as a proxy.

I.4 Research Objective

The main objectives of this research are:

a) To investigate United States interests in the South China Sea.

b) To investigate the ways in which United State uses the Philippines as a proxy in South China Sea conflict.

I.5 Significance of the Study

The writer expects is the thesis can contributes to the International Relations study about the study case of South China Sea dispute from the view of the United States interests and the Philippines as its proxy which is related with theories and concepts in the field of International Relations. And hopes this thesis can give new perspective to the others International Relations students or people who need the data. This issue is considered to be important for the security in Southeast Asia countries. The significance of this topic is also supported by some experts are predicting this hot political matter will result in a future conflict.

I.6 Theoretical Framework

The writer chooses Realism as the basic theory of this thesis because it can give a clear background of this territorial dispute. In the case of the South China Sea in which the writer wants to write about the interest and the Philippines as a proxy by the United States in the South China Sea dispute. This proxy word describes about
the cooperation between U.S. and the Philippines in the dispute according to their interest and supported by the former political relationship between them as alliance. This single reliably theory explains the wide range of international interactions, which has historically a central position in the study of International Relations. The theory reveals the human nature and state motivation, national interest, international anarchy, system structure and the balance of power.

In the realist perspective, the international system is anarchic. Anarchic in the international system is a reflection of the order of the international system: independent states with no central authority above them. Because of that, the realist believes states are the most important actors in the international system. Maintain their own security, the pursuit of their own national interest and struggle for power are the things states concerned with. To maximize their security or their power, according to Hobbes, in which even the weakest can beat the strongest by taking help from others or by using weapons, etc. In this dispute, People’s Republic of China as the Superpower compared with the other claimant countries' power is in unbalanced way according to the growth of economic and military power of China in nowadays. On the other hand, the Philippines have a weakness in military power try to maximize the power with alliance way, which supported by the historical of alliances relationship with the United States.

United States as the superpower country in the world has the ability to influence the dispute use the power. In international relations there are two kinds of power namely the hard power and the soft power. Hard power is the use of military and economic means to influence the behavior or interests of other political bodies. Whereas soft power is the ability to attract and co-opt rather than coerce, use force or give money as a means of persuasion. For Joseph Nye, power is

---

the ability to influence the behavior of others to get the outcomes that you want. There are several ways can achieve that; you can coerce them with threats; you can induced them with payments; or you can attract and co-opt them to want what you want. A country may obtain the outcomes it wants in the political world because other countries admire its values, emulate its example, and aspire to its level of prosperity and openness wants to follow it. In this sense, it is also important to set the agenda and attract others in world politics, and not only to force them to change by threatening military force or economic sanctions. This soft power gets others to want the outcomes that you want co-opts people rather than coerces them.

Here is the table that explains the differences of soft and hard power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Power</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soft</td>
<td>Attract and co-opt</td>
<td>Inherent qualities</td>
<td>Charisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Persuasion, example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>Threaten and induce</td>
<td>Threats, intimidation, Payment, rewards</td>
<td>Hire, fire, demote Promotions, compensation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actually, the United States influence the Philippines use soft and hard power. The assistances to the Philippines through military and economic fields can be defined as soft power. In terms of hard power, it can be argued that US military power guarantee that developing conflicts or disputes in Southeast Asia do not escalate into military conflicts. For example, it is partly the US alliance with the Philippines that assures the Philippines against potential military encounters with China, while on the other hand simultaneously reassuring China against the prospect

---

25 Ibid.,
that the Philippines may once again develop into an independent regional military power able to intimidate China and Chinese interests in the region. Likewise, it is the insurances provided by US naval power that has smoothed the progress of the commitment of China by Southeast Asian states, who as a consequence are less anxious of being embraced too closely by China. The complete explanation about realism theory, national interest and the realist alliance theory will be explained on Chapter II.

I.7 Scope and Limitation of the Study

There are some scope and limitation that should be decided by the writer in this thesis due to the limitation of the time and the limitation of the information. Thus, the scope and the limitation will be defined as:

1. This thesis will only focus to the United State interests in the South China Sea.
2. The data and information used are based on the event of the United State intervention from July 2010 to December 2012. The writer choose the time start from July 2010 because at the time the United States of America started the intervention, showed by the declaration of Hillary Clinton as secretary of United States that stated as a Pacific nation and resident power, the United States has a national interest in freedom of navigation, the maintenance of peace and stability, respect for international law, and unimpeded lawful commerce in the South China Sea. And the writer choose took the data until December 2012 because the writer has got enough data. The results of proxy system is success because both countries got benefits in the dispute.
I.8 Thesis Outline

This thesis consists of five chapters. It starts with introduction followed by literature review, research methodology, analysis of data and interpretation of results, and conclusion.

Chapter I: Introduction

This chapter is a briefing that highlights the current the South China Sea dispute. It starts with background of the study, problem identification, statement of the problem, research objective, significant of the study, theoretical framework. Then followed with the scope and limitation of the study, and finally ended with thesis outline.

Chapter II: Theoretical Framework

This chapter presents various research concerning on realism theory. It starts with how Realism theory answers the research question in this research. Then about the concept of national interest in Realism which is related with the United States interest in South China Sea. Next is about realist alliance theory that can describe about how do the United States as a superpower country choose to protect the Philippines from China threat in the dispute; how do the Philippines asked United States for helping the Philippines in the dispute; and how do the Philippines and United States have supported each other in the dispute. The realist alliance theory also explains about balance of power theory that will explain the presence of the United States in order to balance People’s Republic of China hegemony power in the dispute.

Chapter III: Research Methodology

In this chapter, the research method that is used by the writer is presented. Within this section, all criteria needed in qualitative research are explained as well as procedures to strengthen the credibility of this research.
Chapter IV: Analysis of Data and Interpretation of Results

This chapter is an extensive report of the results of the research. In this chapter writer presents a full analysis of the data gathered, from respondents’ profile to results of qualitative analysis.

This chapter presents about the former political relationship between the United States and the Philippines as an alliance and Mutual Defense Treaty in 1951 between Republic of the Philippines and United States of America in order to answer the problem about the way United States use the Philippines as the proxy in the South China Sea dispute; and the United States national interest in the South China Sea. All discussion will be based on the correlation analysis of the data and the International Relations theory and concept.

Chapter V: Conclusion

At this last part of the research, it explains the conclusion for the whole research as well as the limitation contained.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1 The Realist Theory of International Relations

The realist theory in International Relations first appeared in twentieth century in the aftermath of the First World War in response to the idealist perspective. Before in 1920s to 1930s, the idealists had the goal of building peace in order to prevent another world conflict. The idealist saw the solution to inter-state problems as being the creation of a respected system of international law, backed by international organizations. For the idealist, war did not originate in an egoistic human nature, but rather in imperfect social conditions and political arrangements, which could be improved. This fact, perhaps more than any theoretical argument, produced a strong realist reaction. Instead of focusing on what some might see as the inevitability of conflict between states and peoples, they chose to emphasize the common interests that could unite humanity, and the attempted to appeal to rationality and morality.

It is a very different concept, specifically about war, the realists believe that it is an inevitable part of an anarchical world system; that it ought to be resorted to only if it makes sense in terms of national self-interest; and that once war has begun, a state ought to do whatever it to win.26 States are simply not animated in terms of morality and justice; it is all about power, security and national interest for them. States creations of an utterly different kind, and we cannot expect them to live by the same rules and principles we require of individual persons, especially those in peaceful, developed societies. Morality is a luxury states cannot afford, for they inhabit a violent international arena, and they have got to be able to get in that game and win, if they are to serve and protect their citizens in an effective way over time.

Morality is simply not on the radar screen for states, given their defensive function and the brutal environment in which they subsist. The different of view makes the International Relations study was profoundly influenced in the initial years of the post-war period by the works of classical realists.

An approach to International Relations that has emerged gradually through the work of a series of analysts who have situated themselves within, and thus delimited, a distinctive but still diverse style or tradition of analysis. Some of the theorists are Hans Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes. Here in this part, the writer wants to write about the premises of realist theory according to the analysis from the theorists so reader can understand the general knowledge about realist theory itself.

First, the realism emphasizes the constraints on politics imposed by human nature and the absence of international government. The realist believes the international system is anarchic. Anarchy in international relations is a concept that the world system is leaderless; there is no universal sovereign or worldwide government. As mentioned by Thomas Hobbes about states of nature, there are no rules, no laws, no enforcement mechanism, it is means in the world of anarchy and state sovereignty, there is no higher authority to impose order and there is no place for states to complain when their interests are threatened. States must provide for their own defense and protection. Not like people in which not have absolute freedom but they sacrifice some liberty to that government in order to get order and security for solve some problem rises.

Second, the realists believe states are the most important actors in international system which recognize no authority above state and also have large

---

power as they have the most influence on the international arena. International institutions, non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations and individual are viewed as having little independent influence.

Third, in realist theory, states are concerned with their own security, act in pursuit of their own national interests and struggle for power. According to Professors Kegley and Wittkopf, realism is a paradigm based on the premise that world politics is essentially and unchangeably a struggle among self-interested states for power and position under anarchy, with each competing state pursuing its own national interest. State interest is one of the reasons behind every states action.

States seek power and they calculate their interests in terms of power (Keohane 1986b: 164 – 165). States always possess some military capacity enabling them to hurt and possibly to destroy each other (Mearsheimer 1995b, 2001c). John J. Mearsheimer infers that the states soon realize that the most efficient way to guarantee survival in anarchy is to maximize their relative power with the ultimate aim of becoming the strongest power, which is hegemony. However not all states can maximize their relative power simultaneously and, therefore, the state system is destined to be an arena of relentless security competition as long as it remains anarchic (Mearsheimer 2001c: Chapter 2).

According to Hobbes, the equality of ability increases the competition for states interest or limited resources between people or country, especially in a world without a central binding power in which even weakest can beat the strongest by

---

31 Ibid.,
32 Ibid.,
34 Ibid.,
taking help from others or by using weapons.\textsuperscript{36} No state can ever be absolutely sure of each other’s intentions nor be sure that other states will not use force against them.\textsuperscript{37} Furthermore, states suffer from imperfect information about each other’s intentions and intentions are in constant flux because even harmless intentions can quickly change into harmful ones and vice versa.

In addition, they live with the fear of being killed or loosing what they have. Hobbes calls this fear “diffidence” and explains it as the lack of confidence people have in the states of war due to their inevitably unsafe live.\textsuperscript{38} This fear forces individual to look for power after power not only gain more profit but also to protect what they have in their hands. After competition and diffidence, the third motive that orients people in the state of war according to Hobbes’ theory is desire to have glory. People want to have reputation and power but what they really want is to prevent potential threats by frightening or threatening other people/state who could attack and kill them in this unsafe world.

II.2. National Interest

The concept of “national interest” has been interpreted in different ways. In the globalization era today, all international aspects are connected each other. Where all countries have to live side by side, the subject of national interest has gained more importance. National interest is a country’s goal and ambitions whether economic, military or cultural. Each state has its own national interest and when they attempt to defend their national interests they may come into conflict with other states, whose national interests they may affect. At the same time, the protection of national interest of the implementation of policy aiming at the protection of national interests

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.,
can also evoke serious contradiction, if the official policy of the state differs from the actual goals the state pursue in terms of its national interests.\(^{39}\)

According to Morgenthau view, states act as they must, in view of their interests as they see them. And the objectives of foreign policy must be defined in terms of the national interest (Nardin & Mapel 1993: 92). The national interest thus provides both a descriptive account of the rules of international politics and perspective rules for international political success (Nardin & Mapel 1993:92). It is means national interests influence policy of a state.

Other aspect of national interest is each state pursues to take the advantageous position in the world economy and politics to maintain high standards of living for its citizens and maximize their own profits. The realists assume that nation states operate in an anarchic international system and that therefore the primary task of every individual nation is to ensure its own security and survival.\(^{40}\) Power and wealth are valued because they provide the means to insure both the state’s survival and to pursue other goals within an anarchic and international system. Power is a currency which to purchase security and other valued political goods (Mastanduno 1989: 462). Tranquility, profit and power which Waltz view as secondary interests that can only be safely sought ‘if survival is assured’ (Schweller 1997: 929).

According to Hans Morgenthau, a state action is national interest implementation the state itself. National interest is the main signpost that helps political realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics (Morgenthau 1978). The concept of national interest is the filter through which policy makers have deemed this action to be in the nation’s vital interests and therefore the concept of national interest permeates the entire policy and decision making process with regard to foreign policy. The national interest thus has


considerable power in that it helps to constitute as important and to legitimate the action taken by state.

In national interest concept also have categorization in order to classify the priority for any respective interest of a country. The national interest categorizations are vital interest, extremely important interest, important interest and less important of secondary interest\(^{41}\). Vital national interests are conditions that are strictly necessary to safeguard and enhance Americans’ survival and well-being in a free and secure nation. Vital US national interests are to: prevent, deter, and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons attacks on the United States or its military forces abroad; ensure US allies’ survival and their active cooperation with the US in shaping an international system in which we can thrive; prevent the emergence of hostile major powers or failed states on US borders; ensure the viability and stability of major global systems (trade, financial markets, supplies of energy, and the environment); and establish productive relations, consistent with American national interests, with nations that could become strategic adversaries, China and Russia.

Instrumentally, these vital interest will be enhanced and protected by promoting singular US leadership, military and intelligence capabilities, credibility (including a reputation for adherence to clear US commitments and even-handedness in dealing with other states), and strengthening critical international institutions – particularly the US alliance system around the world\(^{42}\).

Extremely important national interest are condition that, if compromises, would severely prejudice but not strictly imperil the ability of the US government to safeguard and enhance the well-being of Americans in a free and secure nation.

\(^{41}\) Graham Allison (Director, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs) and Douglas Dillon (Professor of Government), Harvard University. U.S. National Interest. Retrieved on April 1, 2013 from https://dnnpro.outer.jhuapl.edu/media/RethinkingSeminars/021810/Allison_ppt.pdf

\(^{42}\) Ibid.,
Extremely important US national interests are to: prevent, deter, and reduce the threat of the use of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons anywhere; prevent the regional proliferation of WMD and delivery systems; promote the acceptance on international rules of law and mechanisms for resolving or managing disputes peacefully; prevent the emergence of a regional hegemony important regions, especially the Persian Gulf; promote the well-being of US allies and friends and protect them from external aggression; promote democracy, prosperity, and stability in the Western Hemisphere; prevent, manage, and, if possible at reasonable cost, end major conflicts in important geographic regions; maintain a lead in key military-related and other strategic technologies, particularly information systems; prevent massive, uncontrolled immigration across US borders; suppress terrorism (especially state-sponsored terrorism), transnational crime, and drug trafficking; and prevent genocide

Important national interests are conditions that, if compromised, would have major negative consequences for the ability of the US government to safeguard and enhance the well-being of Americans in a free and secure nation.

Important U.S. national interests are to: discourage massive human rights violations in foreign countries; promote pluralism, freedom, and democracy in strategically important states as much as is feasible without destabilization; prevent and, if possible at low cost, end conflicts in strategically less significant geographic regions; protect the lives and well-being of American citizens who are targeted or taken hostage by terrorist organizations; reduce the economic gap between rich and poor nations; prevent the nationalization of US-owned assets abroad; boost the domestic output of key strategic industries and sectors; maintain and edge in the

43 Ibid.,
international distribution of information to ensure that American values continue to positively influence the cultures of foreign nations; promote international environmental policies consistent with long-term ecological requirements; and maximize U.S. GNP growth from international trade and investment. Instrumentally, the important U.S. national interests are to maintain a strong UN and other regional and functional cooperative mechanisms.\textsuperscript{44}

Less important or secondary national interests are not unimportant. They are important and desirable conditions, but ones that have little direct impact on the ability of the US government to safeguard and enhance the well-being of Americans in a free and secure nation. Less important or secondary US national interests include: balancing bilateral trade deficits; enlarging democracy everywhere for its own sake; preserving the territorial integrity or particular political constitution of other states everywhere; and enhancing exports of specific economic sectors.\textsuperscript{45}

\section*{II.3. The Realist Alliance Theory}

An alliance is a coalition of states that coordinate their actions to accomplish some purposes. Most alliances are formalized in written treaties, concern a common threat and related issues of international security, and endure across a range of issues and a period of time. Alliances generally have the purpose of augmenting their members’ power or their own power by pooling capabilities. For small states, alliances can be their most important power element, and for great powers the structure of alliances shapes the configuration of power in the system.\textsuperscript{46} Of all the

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{44} Ibid.,
\item \textsuperscript{45} Ibid.,
\end{itemize}
elements of power, none can change as quickly and decisively as alliances. Most alliances form in response to a perceived threat.\textsuperscript{47}

In a conflict, alliance members have responsibility for help each others who in conflict although must interfere through direct or indirect access in the conflict. Indirect access could be as limited as the stronger state’s ability to exert political or military pressure on the weaker state’s adversaries, and does not necessitate geographic proximity between the two potential allies, according to George Liska concepts. For example like in the South China Sea dispute, when the conflict still not yet finish and China behavior becomes more aggressive in the military threats, the conflicting sides (claimant countries, especially the Philippines) attempt to involve outside forces (such as United States) in order to add feasible credibility to their actions.

The realist emphasizes the fluidity of alliances. They are not marriages of love, but marriages of convenience. Alliances are based on national interest, and can shift as national interests change. This fluidity helps the balance of power process operate effectively. In addition, an alliance aims for balance of power in a conflict. In case of South China Sea dispute which the regional stability was in danger because the dominance of China’s military power so need the presence of another military power that can balanced such as United States military power, so that no one state is strong enough to dominate all others. Morgenthau viewed alliances as a necessity for maintaining balance of power in the international multi-state system. According to that argument, states seeking to improve their own power standing on the world arena could resort to three options: a build-up of armaments, adding their influence to that of other states, or preventing the adversary from obtaining the power of other states. Regarding chosen one of those paths will pursue an alliance-oriented policy.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.,
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Method

The research method is a strategy of inquiry, which moves from the underlying assumptions to research design, and data collection (Myers and Avison, 2002, p. 7). The most common research methods for research are used quantitative and qualitative. The distinctions of these two methods were the way data collected and analyzed. For quantitative research presents statistical results represented by numerical or statistical data, qualitative research presents data as descriptive narration with words and attempts to understand phenomena in “natural settings”. In this thesis, writer used qualitative as the research method for understand the study case in natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, p. 3).

3.1.1 Qualitative Approach

A qualitative approach is used as a vehicle for studying the empirical world from the perspective of the subject, not the researcher (Duffy, 1987). Benoliel (1985) expanded on this aspect and described qualitative research as ‘modes of systematic enquiry concerned with understanding human beings and the nature of their transactions with themselves and with their understandings’. The methodology itself is also described as phenomenology (Duffy, 1985), or as a humanistic and idealistic approach (Leach, 1990), with itself its origins lying in the disciplines of history, philosophy, anthropology, sociology and psychology (Cormack, 1991). The

---

48 Retrieved November 22, 2012 from http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/4245/05Chap%204_Research%20methodology%20and%20design.pdf?sequence=6
qualitative approaches produced soft data which were, and are still described by some, as being inadequate in providing answers and generating any changes\(^{49}\).

Through qualitative method can understand about the process of the conflict. And the act or influence of the main concern key players. It is also can identify unanticipated phenomena and influences with the related international relations theories. Furthermore, by using qualitative method the writer hope can answer the two questions are “how the way of United State does used the Philippines as proxy in South China Sea conflict” and “what are the United States interests in South China Sea”. These two questions can be determined by the collected data, such as the document about history of United States and the Philippines political relationship and the treaty between both of countries can reveal the factors of the Philippines can become U.S. proxy in the South China Sea. Then by document about the potential of South China Sea and the necessary of United States, writer analyzed that compatibility and gets the national interest of United States in the region.

### 3.1.2. Case Study

A case study is one of several ways of doing research in international relations study because its aim is to understand the interaction among countries that result international relations issues like war or conflict, cooperation and other event happened among countries or a case. Gillham (2000a, p. 1) defines a case study as an investigation to answer specific research questions which seek a range of different evidences from the case settings\(^{50}\). The case study approach is especially useful in

---


\(^{50}\) Retrieved on December 17, 2012 from http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/4245/05Chap%204_Research%20methodology%20and%20design.pdf
situations where contextual conditions of the event being studied are critical and where the researcher has no control over the events as they unfold\textsuperscript{51}.

The comparative advantages of case study methods include identifying new or omitted variables and hypotheses, examining intervening variables in individual cases to make inferences on which causal mechanisms may have been at work, developing historical explanations of particular cases, attaining high levels of construct validity, and using contingent generalizations to model complex relationships such as path dependency and multiple interaction effects. The case study also findings are usually contingent and can be generalized beyond the type of case studied only under specified conditions, such as when a case study shows that a variable is not a necessary condition or a sufficient condition for an outcome, or when a theory fails to fit a case that it appeared most likely to explain. A case study is thus a well defined aspect of a historical happening that the investigator selects for analysis, rather than a historical happening itself.

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001), a case study examines a bounded system or a case over time in detail, employing multiple sources of data found in the setting. The best possible to responses the research question(s) are by collected all the evidences or data. As a result the researcher may gain a sharpened understanding of why the instance happened as it did, and what might become important to look at more extensively in future research\textsuperscript{52}.

The nature of the research question, the case study method was considered the most appropriate approach to employ because it provides a systematic way to collect data, analyze information, and report the results, thus understand a particular problem or situation in great depth\textsuperscript{53}. The case study approach makes use of multiple methods of data collection such as interviews, document reviews, archival records, and direct

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.
and participant observations and subsequently ‘thick descriptions’ of the phenomena under study (Yin, 2003). Such ‘thick descriptions’ give the researcher access to the subtleties of changing and multiple interpretations (Walsham, 1995b).

Case studies do not claim to be representative, but the emphasis is on what can be learned from a single case (Tellis, 1997). Case studies have value in advancing fundamental knowledge domains. The underlying philosophy of a single case study is “not to prove but to improve” (Stufflebeam, Madaus, and Kellaghan, 2000, p. 283). Thus, writer tries to gather the data which related to the case even from the international relations theories or the data about the case that can answer the purposes of this thesis. The writer hopes this thesis might be applicable in international relations study under similar case or issue.

Yin (2003) argues that case studies are used for analytical generalizations, where the researcher’s aim is to generalize a particular set of results to some broader theoretical propositions. Researchers have to use data obtained with multiple methodologies because these for and against views indicate that no research methodology is perfect. Given the interpretive stance adopted in this research and the nature of the research question, the writer believes that the case study approach is the most appropriate research strategy for this study because its advantages in revealing in detail the unique perceptions and concerns of individual participants in a real world situation which would have been lost in quantitative or experimental strategies. The case study design is particularly well suited to situations where it is very difficult to separate a phenomenon’s variable from its context (Yin, 2003).

3.2. Data Collection

In qualitative research, different knowledge claims, inquiry strategies, and data collection methods and analysis are employed (Creswell, 2003). Qualitative data sources include observation and participant observation (fieldwork), interviews and questionnaires, documents and texts, and the researcher’s impressions and reactions
(Myers, 2009). Data is derived from direct observation of behavior, from interviews, from written opinions, or from public documents (Sprinthall, Schmutte, and Surois, 1991, p. 101). Written descriptions of people, events, opinions, attitudes and environments, or combinations of these can also be sources of data.

In this thesis, the writer has referred to certain documentation as the techniques of data gathering. According to Merriam (Ibid: 49) notes that most qualitative research inherently moulds or changes existing theory in that, firstly is data are analyzed and interpreted in light of the concepts of a particular theoretical orientation. Second is findings are usually discussed in relation to existing knowledge (some of which is the theory) with the aim demonstrate how the present study has contributed to expanding the knowledge base.

3.3.1. Document Analysis

This thesis focus is the examination of documents because this topic focuses on history and event with the main actors is state so writer chooses collected the data from the internet that posted about the history of the South China Sea dispute, the news or article that shows about the relationship between the United States and the Philippines and their action in the disputes, and about the potential of South china Sea that can possible becomes United States interest; and book or e-book about realist theory, national interest and the realist alliance theory which is as basic of this thesis and the books that writes about the South China Sea dispute.

3.4. Research Setting

This research used the South China Sea conflict as study case that focus on the United States interest in the region and United States intervention by using the Philippines as proxy. South China Sea is a territorial conflict between four ASEAN countries, or the Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia, Brunei Darussalam, include Taiwan and China. The reason why the writer used South China Sea dispute as a research
setting is because this case could be one of Asia’s most dangerous flashpoints in the future\textsuperscript{54}. Six claimant countries are longer competing, claims to various islands, sending token military forces to occupy barren rocks at great expense in the name of national pride. Nowadays develop become fueling tensions, in the sea are untapped oil and natural gas reserves, China’s growing strategic interest in protecting sea lanes by which it gets some of its oil, and Beijing’s desire to develop a “blue water” navy capable of projecting power far beyond China’s shores. The others claimants also want to manage the oil or natural resources in the South China Sea.

Another consideration to choose South China Sea conflict is because in a long time this conflict still not finished yet. Moreover the conflict is becoming more serious because other countries started to intervene in the conflict; one of the countries is United States. The interesting thing is not just the navigation become the concerned of United States likes Hillary Clinton said, but it seems U.S. scared if China take over in the South China Sea. Although according to this intervention, United States has declared will becomes neutral party in the conflict; but in the fact U.S. action was against China.

3.5. Data Analysis

Analysis of data is a process of inspecting, cleaning, transforming, and modeling data with the goal of highlighting useful information, suggesting conclusions, and supporting decision making\textsuperscript{55}. Data analysis is needed for analyzed and connected all documents and theory with the object of the research.


\textsuperscript{55} Data Analysis. Retrieved on December 2, 2012 from http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Data_analysis
3.5.1. The Process of Qualitative Data Analysis

According to Beverly A. Warden, Phd, MPH (Director of the Surveillance and Evaluation Division at Constella Group), the basic steps in qualitative data analysis:\n
Definitions

- **Data collection**: gathering information through qualitative methods such as interviews, focus groups, open-ended responses to surveys, texts, document, article, etc.
- **Note taking**: taking down notes of main ideas either during data collection, immediately after data collection, or during a review of an audio or video recording of the data collection.
- **Coding**: highlighting ideas, categories or themes that help to answer predetermined research questions and/or the more general query of, *what is going on here?*

---

- **Themes**: concepts that explain how ideas or categories are connected.
- **Illustrative quotes**: verbatim text that exemplifies a particular code or theme.
- **Saturation**: a point of diminishing returns in the collection and interpretation of data that signals completion.
- **Memoing**: noting hypotheses that arise about potential themes or relationships between categories
- **Sorting**: compiling and arranging themes, codes and illustrative quotes into the outline of a narrative that explains *what is going on here?*
CHAPTER IV

THE PHILIPPINES AS UNITED STATES INTEREST PROXY IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA DISPUTE

IV.1. The Root Causes of the South China Sea Dispute

In this chapter, the writer will analyze the data and elaborate the result of all gathered data. The elaboration of the result is separated into four parts which first is about the root causes of the South China Sea dispute. It is all about the history of South China Sea dispute generally until the United States intervention happened.

Second is about the importance of the South China Sea dispute. It is all about the potential in the South China Sea in which have attracting the countries interests in economics, politics and security; and short explanation about the importance for the related countries (claimants and non-claimants).

Third is about the intervention. There are two parts of sub chapter, are former political relationship between Republics of the Philippines and United States of America; and Mutual Defense Treaty in 1951 between Republic of the Philippines and United States of America. This part will tell the “how” United States can interfere in the dispute seen from the relationship and the treaty.

The last is about United States national interest in the South China Sea dispute. This part will be so influential because the writer tries to connect the potential in South China Sea related with United States conditions, and also supported by some the general United States National Interests.

In this section, the writer would like to discuss history of the South China Sea dispute so that readers can understand the cronology of this conflict. It was started
when there were two countries claiming sovereignty rights over parts of the South China Sea. They are the People’s Republic of China (China) in 1902 and France in 1931. France was the first state that occupied the region, evidenced by their buildings, statues of ownership, stationing temporary garrisons, and so on. China protested these actions, but did not take any equivalent action.

From 1930s until the World War II, Japan contested French claims and aggressively pursued its own claims to parts of this region. In 1939 during the Second World War, Japan invaded and occupied one part of the South China Sea, which was Spratly Islands. In December 1947 the Government of the People's Republic of China (PRC) claimed almost the entire South China Sea region by publishing a map that not only contained main islands in the South China Sea, but also gave eleven dotted lines (which is also called the U-shaped line) in the waters around the South China Sea. The People's Republic of China (PRC) claimed that when the map was first published there was no single country protested diplomatically, therefore they continued to utilize the island, after the victory of the Communist Party in 1949. In 1952, Japan renounced its claims. France let their claim lapsed in the 1950s. South China Sea became vacuum region in the end of the Cold War.

Apparently territorial disputes and control over the islands in the South China Sea did not stop there. The dispute started again with the claims from the People's Republic of China (PRC) over the entire region in the South China Sea, which sparked the attention of several countries around these waters. These countries are Vietnam, Philippines, Taiwan, Malaysia and Brunei. China claims referred to historical records, the discovery of the site, ancient documents, maps and island groups’ use by fishermen. According to the People's Republic of China (PRC) since 2000 years ago, the South China Sea has become the cruise line for them. China claims is supported by a border treaty between The Chinese and France in 1887 when
the Vietnam became the protector of France, where the Paracel and Spartly islands were handed over to China\textsuperscript{57}. China also claimed the Pratas Islands.

But Vietnam denies and considers Spartly and Paracel islands as parts of their sovereign territory. Vietnam claims that Spartly and Paracel islands have been effectively occupied by them since the 17th century, when both islands were not in control of any country. Vietnamese Emperor Gia Long was the one who claimed the Paracel Islands in 1816. Therefore Vietnam does not recognize the territorial sovereignty of the People's Republic of China (PRC) in that region.

By the end of World War II the newly unified Vietnamese government restated their long-standing claims to the Spratly and Paracel Islands in February 14, 1975\textsuperscript{58}. Along with the end of the Vietnam War, North Vietnamese troops had occupied six islands in the Spratly Islands in April 1976 which had previously been occupied by South Vietnamese troops in early 1975, and between the years 1975 to 1976 Vietnam has successfully expanded their control by occupying seven islands. Vietnam officially submitted their claim over the Spratly and Paracel islands in 1982. Vietnam claimed all of the Spratly Islands (Truong Sa in Vietnamese), and has occupied twenty of them. Vietnam claimed all of the Paracel Islands (Hoang Sa in Vietnamese) despite being forcibly ejected by the Chinese in 1974. However, if viewed from the angle of history, Vietnam claims is weaker than the China’s claims, this is because many documents showing ownership of Vietnam on several islands in the South China Sea, have been destroyed by the time Chinese invaded Vietnam\textsuperscript{59}.

\textsuperscript{57} Dieter Heinzig (1976). \textit{Disputed Islands in the South China Sea}, p. 21-42. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz
Besides Vietnam in 1956, the Republic of China (Taiwan) also occupied Itu Aba (Taiping Island), the largest of the Spratly Islands, and placed a garrison there. Taiwan claimed almost all of the South China Sea. Taiwan claimed all of the Spratly Islands (Nansha Islands in Chinese) and has announced its intention to build an airstrip on Taiping. Taiwan claims all of the Paracel Islands. Additionally, Taiwan occupied the Pratas Islands. Taiwan’s claims were similar based principles to China.

The Philippine’s claim in the South China Sea was based on the assumption that the region at the time was a res nullius60 territory, founded by Thomas Cloma. Thomas Cloma was a Philippine lawyer and businessman from the province of Bohol61. In 1947, Cloma, a Philippine adventurer and a fishing Magnate, found several uninhabited and unoccupied groups of islands / islets in the South China Sea. This formed part of the bases for justification of Spratly islands territorial claims by the Philippines, along with the basis from 1982 UNCLOS archipelagic doctrine62. On July 6, 1956, Cloma declared to the whole world his claim and the establishment of a separate government for the Free Territory of Freedomland / Spratly Islands with its capital on Flat Island (Patag Island).

Cloma based his claims on the discovery and occupation, which includes 33 very small islands, the Spratly Islands and the island of Amboyna with total width of

60 Res nullius literally means nobody’s property or a thing which has no owner. If the owner of a property abandons his/her property then that property is called res nullius. Such property is as much res nullius as a property that is ownerless. Res nullius is ownerless property and it can be owned by any person. The person who takes first possession of the res nullius is the owner of that property. Res nullius includes wild animals and abandoned property. Res nullius also refers to the principle by which a nation may assert control of an unclaimed territory. By this principle, a nation gains control when one of its citizens enters the territory. Retrieved on January 5, 2013 from http://definitions.uslegal.com/r/res-nullius/


64,976 square nautical miles\textsuperscript{63}. In the 1970s, after being jailed by Ferdinand Marcos for being popularly called "Admiral", Cloma "ceded" his claim to the Philippine government for one peso (Womack, 2006, p. 218)\textsuperscript{64}. The Philippines also pointed to the agreement of San-Francisco, 1951, which, among other stated, Japan has let go their rights to the Spartly islands. In 1982, the Philippines began to put their troops in six occupied islands. The Philippines claims a Sizeable portion of the South China Sea. The Philippines occupied eight of the Spratly Islands (Kalayaan in The Philippines). The Philippines did not claim the Paracel Islands.

Malaysia’s claim to the South China Sea is limited to the boundaries of the EEZ and continental shelf. In December 21, 1979 Malaysia claimed three islands of the Spratlys based on continental shelf boundary map by Malaysia in 1979, which covered most of the Spartly island, they are terumbu Layang-Layang (Swallow Reef), Matani (Marievekes Reef), and Ubi (Dallas Reef). Malaysia has built a hotel on one island and brought soil from the mainland to raise the level of another island. In year 1983, Malaysia landed their first troops on Swallow Reef, since then Malaysia still keeps on their troops on the islands. Malaysia makes no claim to the Paracel Islands.

While Brunei who gained full independence from Britain on the 1st of January 1984, also made claim. Brunei’s claim to the South China Sea is limited to its EEZ, which extends to one of the southern reefs of the Spratly Islands. However, Brunei has not made any formal claim to the reef nor to any of the Spratlys. Brunei made no claims towards any of the Paracel Islands. And until now, only Brunei is the country who has not put the military power to legitimize the claims in the region. With this condition, the problem of territorial disputes in the South China Sea is


\textsuperscript{64} Tomas Cloma. Retrieved on January 5, 2013 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tom%C3%A1s_Cloma
likely to become increasingly complex and requires a more cautious solution mechanism\textsuperscript{65}.

Over the time the dispute in the South China Sea became worse. Conflicts between claimant states became increasingly serious, caused by the actions of individual countries act arbitrarily. Each country began to take actions based on their own initiative without negotiate with others claimant countries makes rising protests from other claimant countries. The actions taken are like waving a flag, occupying and building forts, establishing building and signs on the island.

China made an aggressive move by enhancing the activities of their Navy on the South China Sea during 1986 to 1987. This move raised fears from other claimant countries. Due to this dispute, China with their military potential much bigger than other claimant countries, raised concerns, moreover with the existence of The Chinese's special fleet stationed in the South China Sea which also called the South China Sea Fleet, with the power of 600 warships consisting of 25 submarines, 200 amphibious ships and several other types of warships. China’s fleet was located in Zhanjiang, Shanton Guanzhou, Haikou, Yulin and Beihai.

China military actions provoked reactions from other claimant countries, such as Malaysia which in November 1986 had put their forces on Mantani and Ubi island, which was followed by Vietnam who occupied Barque Canada Reef Island in 1987. These tensions culminated in the open conflict between China and Vietnam on March 14, 1988 in the Spratly archipelago, fighting over Johnson South Reef. At that time Vietnam navy which was sailing in the South China Sea was hindered by twenty warships belonging to the People’s Republic of China (PRC) resulting in clashes that

killed more than 70 Vietnamese navy soldiers and three warships also stated lost, while China only got one victim.

This armed conflict between China and Vietnam contains significant meaning; other than demonstrating the supremacy of The Chinese in the Spratly Islands, it also carries two interrelated developments that have consequences for the stability of this region in the future. First is about the reaffirmation of China’s and Vietnam’s claims over the Paracel and Spratly islands. Second, the increase of militarization of the China, Vietnam and other claimant countries in order to better preparation if there will be military conflict in the future. The clash between China and Vietnam in March 1988 was exactly the main point to confirm the security of the region from military conflict.

Bilateral conflict in the South China Sea happened not only between China and Vietnam, bilateral conflict also occurred among other claimant countries. On April 5, 1988, Malaysian naval base succeeded to detain 49 Philippines fishermen that were catching fish in the area which was considered coastal waters of Sarawak territory, 120 miles northwest of Kinabalu city. This immediately led tensions between the two countries. The tensions between the two countries peaked in August, with the wave of anti-Malaysia demonstration in Manila. The Philippines opposition party even asked the government to sever their diplomatic relation with Malaysia.

Not only bilateral conflicts that caused tension in this dispute, full control action over disputed territorial also becoming more serious despite the uncertainty of territorial sovereignty of each claimant country. Start from the Philippines action on March 17, 1988 who gave warning to China, Vietnam and other claimant countries not to enter area that the Philippines have claimed. Philippine’s warning was showed

---

by placing mariner and artillery troops on high alert. This warning was quite seriously proven by the arrest of four Taiwanese fishing vessels which were considered to have entered the waters of the Philippines in the Spratly Islands in late August 1988.

The action followed by China who ratified the Law on the Territorial Sea and the contiguous Zone in 1992. In Article 2 of the Law states that: "The PRC's territorial land includes the mainland and its offshore islands, Taiwan and the various affiliated islands Including Diaoyu Island, Penghu Islands, Dongsha Islands, Xisha Islands, Nansha (Spratly) Islands and other islands that belong to the People's Republic of China. The PRC's internal waters refer to the waters along the baseline of the territorial sea facing the land."\(^{67}\)

Through this article, China clearly indicates that most of the islands in the South China Sea will be under their power. And in Article 6 of the law states the South China Sea region is no longer open to international shipping traffic; the ships that pass through these waters must ask permission to the Chinese government. This thing is difficult to be accepted by countries that have similar interest for the ships, merchant and warships.

This dispute continues to cause clash among claimant countries, in 1995 there occurred the Mischief Reef incident. The Philippines detained four Chinese fishing vessels and 62 Chinese citizens near Hal Moon Shoal, 50 nm (nautical miles) from Palawan Island. In this incident the Philippines accused China had violated international law by placing gunboats and building on the island. The Chinese denied the charges; by arguing that the buildings built in Mischief Reef is a haven for Chinese fishermen that were built by the Department of the Chinese Fisheries

\(^{67}\) Law of the People’s Republic of China on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, translated by the Legislative Affairs Commission of the Standing Committee of the People’s Congress of the People’s Republic of China
Administration. The Chinese also stated that the occupation of the atoll was ordered by the lower-level government officials without the known by the Chinese government.

Again the Philippines discovered new constructions built by China in Jackson Attoc, Sabina Reef and Hal Moon Reef, located about 70 nm west of Palawan. Other findings were also found in Pennsylvania Reef, First and Second Thomas Shoals and the Philippines get rid of all the signs. But China said, by getting rid of these signs, it will not help to resolve the dispute and did not rule out China's sovereignty in the region.

Over time, these conflicts never found a win-win solution to the entire claimant countries. Several ways have been used to resolve this conflict, including the negotiations between ASEAN and China, UNCLOS, etc but still not yet get the satisfaction results. The dispute over this territory was no longer just due to historical reasons and the nationality of each claimant country. The discovery of the facts of potential economic and political meanings in the South China Sea makes these claimant countries refuse to budge even that discovery also attract interest from non-claimant countries and take step to interfere in the dispute, such as the United States.

The longstanding disputes in the South China Sea have been one of the issues that Washington has exploited to drive a wedge between China and countries in South East Asia. At an ASEAN summit in mid-2010, Clinton stated for the first time that the US had “a national interest” in ensuring “freedom of navigation” in the South China Sea. He also offered to mediate in the territorial disputes, effectively undermining a decade of Chinese diplomacy aimed at resolving the outstanding issues bilaterally with its neighbors.

---

The Philippines attitude that welcomed the U.S. involvement in the South China Sea dispute sparked the outrage of the People's Republic of China (PRC). America and the Philippines issued a joint call for a peaceful resolution to resolving disputes in the South China Sea. However, the United States insists that they will not take a certain position in the South China Sea dispute. According to McCain, who is a former U.S. Navy field officer, said, “United States always welcomes good relationship with the People's Republic of China (PRC) and did not want to look for conflicts. But the United States also questioned the aggressive behavior of the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the territorial claims that cannot be justified”. But the fact is, even now this conflict never found a solution despite the intervention of the United States which is a superpower country and who intends to help resolving this conflict. Moreover, the dispute intention becomes worse.

IV.2. The Importance of the South China Sea

Based on the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) 1982, the South China Sea can be regarded as a semi-enclosed sea. Article 122 of UNCLOS defines a semi-enclosed sea, means a gulf, basin or sea surrounded by two or more States and connected to another sea or the ocean by a narrow outlet or consisting entirely or primarily of the territorial seas and exclusive zones of two or more coastal States. South China Sea is semi-enclosed and flanked by two oceans; the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, located between Asia and Southeast Asia, bordered by the ASEAN countries, China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. In the south, these waters met the Java Sea and the Malacca Strait, in the north meeting the Taiwan Strait and the Bashi Strait. In the South China Sea region, there are several groups of islands, namely: (1) Pratas Islands, (2) Paracel Islands, (3) Spratly Islands and Macclesfield Bank coral clusters.

70 Apriliani Sugianto. The South China Sea: Its Ecological Features and Potentials for Developing Cooperation. The Indonesian Quarterly, XVIII/2, 1990, hal 117.
The South China Sea is one of the world’s largest seas. According to the Guinness Book of Records, it covers 1,148,500 square miles. In the last 2,500 years mariners from Malaysia, China and Indonesia navigated the South China Sea to trade sandalwood, silk, tea and spices. Today it carries roughly a third of the world's shipping and accounts for a tenth of the world's fish catch. About $5.3 trillion of global trade passes through the South China Sea each year. Control of the South China Sea also means control of some of the world’s most important shipping lanes.

The Spratly Islands are 1,700 miles from the Strait of Malacca, one of the world's busiest shipping lanes. Everyday 200 merchant vessels, including ships that carry 80 percent of Japan's oil, pass through waters around the Spratly Islands. Estimates for proven and undiscovered oil reserves in the South China Sea range from 28 billion to as high as 213 billion barrels of oil, the U.S. Energy Information Administration said in a March 2008 report. For natural gas, the South China Sea has a 50 percent chance of at least 3.79 trillion cubic meters of undiscovered conventional gas.

With such great potential contained making this region has a lot of importance, both strategically, politically, economically, and the environmentally for the surrounding countries as well as for other nations whose interests are related to the region. Because based on the interests of the trade and natural resources that allegedly contained therein, not a single country would give up any rights in the region.

---
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The South China Sea region has a strategic significance both in terms of economic as well as political and security for China. In terms of the economy, as China's economy continues to grow through its transition from a planned to a market economy and with a population of over 1.3 billion, China seems poised to continue this economic growth and eventually compete with other economic superpowers on the global scale, nearly due to this large base of consumers and human capital alone. No matter the eventual extent of China's growth and development, one thing is certain: It will not take place without a large amount of oil, and the energy and materials it provides. Moreover with the fact where the amount of oil energy needs, especially in China since the early 1990s, began to exceed the amount of production. China’s growing need for oil became apparent when they began to import oil from abroad in 1993, while before they are exported oil country routinely to Japan.

In 2004, China had to import 100 million tons of crude oil to supply their energy needs, more than half of which came from the Middle East. From year to year, China needs for oil increases, making them continues to find ways to meet their needs, such as halted oil exports to Japan and started doing collaborations with oil producing countries around the world. They also look for areas of potential oil reserves which they could process for the future, such as the South China Sea region where they suspected to contain huge oil reserve. The Chinese does not want to continue to be oil dependence from other countries. Therefore, it is not surprising that China is consolidating their claim to the Spratly Islands which is estimated to contain abundant oil resources. Not only the issue of natural resources, the South China Sea as a strategic trade route for the countries of ASEAN, East Asia, and the United States makes freedom of navigation essential for the export-import of these countries.

---

For China the importance of the South China Sea region in the fields of politics and security is closely related to their overseas political strategy in Southeast Asia. Looking from China's military actions carried out in the South China Sea, it is clear that China would like to emphasize their importance and role as a developing country, not only in the economy but also in the military field. Then looking from the security and strategic interests of China’s, learning from past experience which is lack of attention to the sea and the beach security, making it easy for Western imperialism to penetrate China. And nowadays made China is very persistent in maintaining their nation unity and regional integrity. The past event named foreign encroachment. In this view the Chinese assertive attitude towards the conflict in South China Sea can be seen as a part of the efforts by China in strengthening their sovereignty while preventing the dispersal of other regions.

As with Vietnam, the country is in dire need of the potential contained in the South China Sea to rebuild the economy that has been drowning deeply due to never ending war for 30 years. After the war ended, Vietnam began to improve their economy by developing energy sources and offshore oil by inviting a number of foreign oil companies to operate in Vietnam. After achieving conflict resolution with Cambodia in 1991, Vietnam began to implement policies to boost economic ties and cooperation with ASEAN countries. The Cambodian conflict resolution has also led to the opening of relations with Japan, China and United States. Lifting off the economic embargo by the Japanese and U.S. as well as normalization of relations between Hanoi and Washington has opened up the opportunity for Vietnam to boost trade ties. Increased activity of Vietnam's trade with ASEAN countries, East Asian countries, and the U.S. is making the South China Sea shipping lanes become increasingly important and strategic for the Vietnamese’s economic interests.

The South China Sea region also has significant influence on the politics and security of Vietnam. Vietnam's main political interest is to maintain and preserve
their independence and territorial integrity. Geographical and colonial history of China, Japan and France to Vietnam has led independence and sovereignty issues become very sensitive to Vietnam. Their border with China in the north and the occupation of China for centuries caused Vietnam to regard China as a threat to their freedom and safety. Even after the establishment of Hanoi and Beijing normalized relations in 1991 did not necessarily eliminate the concerns of Vietnam towards China’s threat. In the dispute over the South China Sea, Vietnam occupation of the Spratly islands is part of their security interests. If the islands are controlled by a hostile state, the Vietnamese’s security will be threatened; moreover the northern coastline of Vietnam is geographically surrounded by Liuchow peninsula, China and Hainan Island.

According to the EIA the Philippines produced 25,000 bbl/day in 2003 and consumed an average 338,000 bbl/day, with net oil imports of 312,000 bbl/day. It can be seen from this information, the Philippine’s dependence on imported oil are enormous, reaching up to 93 percent. And this is not good for the condition of the Philippine’s economy if world oil prices spikes suddenly, making the price of the goods to be unstable and many other effects. This situation requires the Philippines to look for ways to reduce dependence on oil imports, also to have new regions containing natural resources, especially the region contained oil, such as South China Sea.

According to a source, with the discovery of new oil reserves off the coast of Palawan, it is estimated that the Philippine’s dependence on oil imports will be reduced to 85 percent. Meanwhile, based on past experience the control over Spratly islands for the Philippines is closely related to their security interests. Where during the World War II Japan utilized Spratly islands and reefs to invade the Philippines.

---

Although the Malaysian’s rate of oil production and consumption remains stable until now, but Malaysia continues to looking for a new region that has oil content for future reserves. While their security interests in the South China Sea includes, ensuring that the waters of the South China Sea will not be used to threaten the integrity of their territory. This is partly due to the geographical conditions of the South China Sea that separates East and West Malaysia.

For major powers like the U.S., Japan and Russia, the South China Sea also has significance in terms of economic, political, and security. For the U.S., the South China Sea is one of the six alternative route shipping lanes linking the U.S. west coast to the Persian Gulf. This route is also passed by U.S. commercial ships in activities of trade with the countries of Southeast Asia and East Asia. For Japan, these waters are cruise lines for oil tankers carrying 90 percent of oil from the Middle East. The line is also used by the Japanese merchant ships to transport raw materials from outside, also to ship industrial goods to other countries, including the countries of Southeast Asia.

While for Russia, the South China Sea is a cruise line that is used for traffic of oil tankers and commercial ships from Siberia to Vladivostok through the Straits of Malacca, the Indian Ocean and the Suez Canal. This path also has significance meaning for the Russian trade with the countries of Southeast Asia although its value is still relatively low.

**IV.3. The Intervention In the South China Sea Dispute**

The intervention is the shape of purposes from the alliances relationship between the Philippines and United States. An alliance is a coalition of states that coordinate their actions to accomplish some purposes. In order to achieve the purposes or interest in the South China Sea, they do cooperation. In this cooperation
will give mutual benefits for the alliance members, they are the Philippines and United States. The benefit for the Philippines itself is get helps from outside power that can balance China’s power so no dominant power that can push down the claimants country; so that the Philippines can fight to get the interests in the South China Sea. And in the other hand, the United States also has purposes or interests in the dispute that the writer will explain in the part of United States National Interest in the South China Sea Dispute.

This thesis use conflict by proxy because the system of this intervention. Although this dispute is looks like the conflict between the Philippines and China, then the United States comes to helps the Philippines because of the alliances responsibility; actually not just simple as that. The real conflict is not only between the Philippines and China but more seriously between the United States and China, the big power in the world. As now day’s situation, the United States is not the big power in the world anymore but China has growth and will compute with United States. Considering with the potential in the South China Sea, if China authorize the region, China will more powerful than before. So the United States cannot let that things just happen.

In this part, the writer will explain about the history of political relationship between Republic of the Philippines and United States of America; and will explain more about the mutual defense treaty in 1951 that become the cooperation basic between the Philippines and United States.

**IV.3.1. History of Political Relationship between Republic of the Philippines and United States of America**

After war between Spanish and United States in 1988, the Philippines became the first and only U.S. colony in the Asia-Pacific region. Although intense violence to suppress Philippine nationalism during U.S. colonialism’s earliest days, U.S. rule over time became the foundation for a tight personal bond between the United States
and the Philippines people, a bond cemented after a common experience of intense suffering under and resistance to Japan’s brutal occupation of the islands during World War II. The United States granted the Philippines independence in 1946. After World War II, US and Philippine authorities signed a military bases agreement in March 1947, eight months after the Philippines obtained nominal independence.\footnote{U.S. Bases In The Philippines. Retrieved on April 11, 2013 from http://www.wowessays.com/dbase/ae4/lny301.shtml}

Since U.S. helps the Philippines for against the Japan’s occupation, the Philippines became comfortable with the United States includes Westerners in generally and value freedom and democracy. The results are the Philippines committed to democratic institutions including freedom of speech with their distrust and rejection of authoritarianism. The development of a strong relationship between the United States and the Philippines also impacted to the Philippines culture. It because during the U.S. occupation in the Philippines under the Taft Commission for literacy and education that was have greatly influenced the way of the Philippine’s people live. In fact, the Philippines are presently the largest English speaking nation in the Asia.\footnote{Presidential News Desk, “Background on Philippine-U.S. Relations”. Cited on http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a553094.pdf by Colonel Jesus Managquil.}

Having common values for freedom and democracy makes the Philippines and United States relationship strengthened. The two countries agreed soon thereafter that the United States would continue to take responsibility for the defense of the Philippines and would establish military bases on the islands for that purpose. The military alliance between the United States and the Philippines, embodied in the 1951 Mutual Defense Treaty, was instrumental in deterring the spread of Soviet communism in Asia.

Unfortunately the situation was changed on November 1992, based on the 1947 Military Bases agreement, the United States maintained and operated major facilities at Clark Air Base, Subic Bay Naval Complex, and several small subsidiary
installations in the Philippines. Whereas, in August 1991, negotiators from both countries reached agreement on a draft treaty providing for use of Subic Bay Naval Base by U.S. forces for 10 years. The draft treaty did not include use of Clark Air Base, which had been so heavily damaged by the 1991 eruption of Mount Pinatubo that the United States decided to abandon it.\textsuperscript{78}

Resulted in September 1991, the Philippine Senate rejected the bases treaty, and despite further efforts to salvage the situation, the two sides could not reach an agreement. As a result, the Philippine Government informed the United States on December 6, 1991, that it would have 1 year to complete withdrawal. That withdrawal went smoothly and was completed ahead of schedule, with the last U.S. forces departing on November 24, 1992. On departure, the U.S. Government turned over assets worth more than $1.3 billion to the Philippines, including an airport and ship repair facility.\textsuperscript{79}

The lack of defense cooperation between both of countries has created a power vacuum that China has been exploiting. Remembered to the Mutual Defense Treaty in 1951 that the Philippines were guaranteed by U.S. Military intervention if any situation arose that affected the Philippine national security. In this conflict has spurred U.S. for build a strong cooperation with the Philippines. It also needs to exercise leadership to ensure that the U.S. and Philippines alliance serves both countries security need. One way to do this is to prepare to assist the Philippine military’s re-equipment program in the context of renewed U.S. and Philippine alliance cooperation.

\textsuperscript{79}Ibid.,
IV.3.2. Mutual Defense Treaty in 1951 Between Republic of the Philippines and United States of America

The Mutual Defense Treaty between Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America was signed on August 30th, 1951 in Washington, D.C. between representatives of the Philippines and United States. The overall treaty contained eight articles and dictated that both nations would support each other if either the Philippines or United States were be attacked by an external party.

The Treaty Text according to Chan Robles Virtual Law Library, as following:

The Parties to this Treaty,

Reaffirming their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments, and desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace in the Pacific Area,

Recalling with mutual pride the historic relationship which brought their two peoples together in a common bond of sympathy and mutual ideals to fight side-by-side against imperialist aggression during the last war,

Desiring to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity and their common determination to defend themselves against external armed attack, so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that either of them stands alone in the Pacific Area,

Desiring further to strengthen their present efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the Pacific Area,

Agreeing that nothing in this present instrument shall be considered or interpreted as in any way or sense altering or diminishing any existing agreements or
understandings between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines.\(^{80}\)

Have agreed as follows:

**Article I**

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations.\(^ {81}\)

**Article II**

In order more effectively to achieve the objective of this Treaty, the Parties separately and jointly by self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.\(^ {82}\)

**Article III**

The Parties, through their Foreign Ministers or their deputies, will consult together from time to time regarding the implementation of this Treaty and whenever in the opinion of either of them the territorial integrity, political independence or security of either of the Parties is threatened by external armed attack in the Pacific.\(^ {83}\)

**Article IV**

Each Party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific Area on either of the Parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common dangers in accordance with its constitutional processes. Any such armed


\(^{81}\) Ibid.,

\(^{82}\) Ibid.,

\(^{83}\) Ibid.,
attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.\textsuperscript{84}

Article V

For the purpose of Article IV, an armed attack on either of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the metropolitan territory of either of the Parties, or on the island territories under its jurisdiction in the Pacific or on its armed forces, public vessels or aircraft in the Pacific.\textsuperscript{85}

Article VI

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.\textsuperscript{86}

Article VII

This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Manila.\textsuperscript{87}

Article VIII

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely. Either Party may terminate it one year after notice has been given to the other Party.\textsuperscript{88}

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.,
When the relationship between the Philippines and United States was vacuum in 1992 then the Philippines got attacks from China; both countries remember their strong security relationship in 1951 that realized by Mutual Defense Treaty (MDT). United States was continues to play an important role in the Philippines economy. The United States bases era has seen both countries relations improved and broadened, with a prominent focus on economic and commercial ties while maintaining the importance of the security field. In February 1998, the Philippine and United States negotiators concluded the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA), paving the way for increased military cooperation under the MDT. The agreement was approved by the Philippine Senate in May 1999 and entered into force on June 1, 1999. Under the VFA, the United States has conducted ship visits to the Philippines ports and resumed large combined military exercises with the Philippines forces.

In November 2011, Secretary Clinton traveled to Manila where she commemorated the 60th anniversary of the Mutual Defense Treaty. The United States and Philippines held their first-ever Bilateral Strategic Dialogue on January 27-28, 2011, in Manila to advance discussion and cooperation on bilateral, regional, and global issues. The second dialogue is scheduled to take place January 26-27, 2012 in Washington, DC. The results of 60th anniversary of the Mutual Defense Treaty on June 5th, 2012 release a resolution. The resolution:

[Congressional Bills 112th Congress]
[From the U.S. Government Printing Office]
[S. Res. 252 Introduced in Senate (IS)]

112th CONGRESS
1st Session
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S. RES. 252

Celebrating the 60th Anniversary of the Philippines and United States Mutual Defense Treaty.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

August 2, 2011

Mr. Lugar (for himself, Mr. Kerry, and Mr. Inhofe) submitted the Following resolution; this was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations

RESOLUTION

Celebrating the 60th Anniversary of the Philippines and United States Mutual Defense Treaty.

Whereas Filipinos and Americans fought together in World War II, and an estimated 1,000,000 Filipinos gave their lives to defend freedom;
Whereas the United States and the Republic of the Philippines signed the United States-Philippines Mutual Defense Treaty in 1951;
Whereas the Philippines and the United States are longstanding allies, as demonstrated by the Mutual Defense Treaty, cooperation in conflicts since World War II, and the United States designation of the Philippines as a Major Non-NATO Ally;
Whereas the United States Government seeks to maintain an alliance with the Government of the Philippines that promotes peace and stability in Southeast and
East Asia, rule of law and human rights, economic growth, counter-terrorism efforts, and maritime security;
Whereas United States naval ships visit Philippines' ports, and the United States and Philippines' military forces participate in combined military exercises under the Visiting Forces Agreement established in 1998;
Whereas the United States Government and the Government of the Philippines work closely together in the struggle against terrorism to make local communities safer and help establish an environment conducive to good governance and development;
Whereas the navy of the Government of the Philippines has received a United States Coast Guard cutter and assistance in establishing a coastal radar system to enhance it’s monitoring of its waters;
Whereas the United States Government works closely with the Government of the Philippines on humanitarian and disaster relief activities, and in the past has provided prompt assistance to make United States troops, equipment, assets, and disaster relief assistance available;
Whereas the Mutual Defense Board and the Security Engagement Board serve as important platforms for the continuing stability of the long-standing alliance between the Philippines and the United States in a rapidly changing global and regional environment;
Whereas Philippines military forces have supported over the years many United Nations peacekeeping operations worldwide;
Whereas the United States ranks as one of the Philippines' top trading partners, with 11 percent of the Philippines' imports coming from the United States and 15 percent of exports from the Philippines delivered to the United States in 2010;
Whereas total United States foreign direct investment in the Philippines was almost $6,000,000,000 at the end of 2009;
Whereas the Philippines is one of four countries that has been invited to participate in the new Partnership for Growth Initiative, which promotes broad-based economic growth in emerging markets;
Whereas many Americans and Filipinos have participated in people-to-people programs such as the Peace Corps, the International Visitor Leadership Programs, the Aquino Fellowship, Eisenhower Fellowships, and the Fulbright Scholar Program; Whereas an estimated 4,000,000 people living in the United States are of Filipino ancestry, over 300,000 United States citizens live in the Philippines, and an estimated 600,000 United States citizens travel to the Philippines each year; Whereas the alliance between the United States and the Philippines is founded on core values that aim to promote and preserve democracy, freedom, peace, and justice, and is fortified by the two nations' partnerships in defending these values; Whereas the Government of the Philippines seeks to improve governance, strengthen the rule of law, and further develop accountable, democratic institutions that can better safeguard human rights, secure justice, and promote equitable economic development; and Whereas Secretary of State Hillary Clinton met with Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, Albert del Rosario, on June 23, 2011, in Washington, DC, and reaffirmed that the United States and the Philippines are longstanding allies that are committed to honoring mutual obligations, and strengthening the alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That--

(1) The Senate--

(A) Celebrates the 60th Anniversary of the United States-Philippines Mutual Defense Treaty;

(B) Confirms the alliance's enduring value as one of the key pillars of peace, stability, and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region; and

(C) Encourages both countries to mark this important occasion with continued high-level exchanges; and

(2) It is the sense of the Senate that--

(A) The United States Government should propose to the Government of the Philippines that a joint commission be established to review the potential for
enhancing security ties between the United States Armed Forces and the Armed Forces of the Philippines, including facilities access, expanded joint training opportunities, and humanitarian and disaster relief preparedness activities;

(B) The United States Government should redouble efforts to expand and deepen the economic relationship with the Government of the Philippines toward achieving broad-based economic development in that country, including by working on new bilateral initiatives that support the efforts of the Government of the Philippines to reform its economy and enhance its competitiveness, and through trade-capacity building;

(C) The private sectors of the United States and the Philippines should be urged to establish a United States-Philippines organization with a mission to promote actively and expand closer bilateral ties across key sectors, including security, trade and investment, education, and people-to-people programs;

(D) The Government of the Philippines should continue its efforts to strengthen its democratic institutions to fight corruption, curtail politically motivated violence and extrajudicial killings, expand economic opportunity, and tackle internal security challenges; and

(E) The United States Government should continue efforts to assist the Government of the Philippines the areas of maritime security, related communication infrastructure to enable enhanced information-sharing and overall military professionalization.

Annual bilateral military exercises contribute directly to the Philippine armed forces' efforts to increase maritime domain awareness, combat the Abu Sayyaf and Jemaah Islamiyah groups, and bring development and relief to conflict and disaster affected areas. The exercises include not only combined military training but also civil-military affairs and humanitarian projects. The International Military Education and Training (IMET) program is the largest in the Pacific and the third-largest in the world, and a Mutual Logistics Support Agreement (MLSA) was signed in November
In law enforcement, U.S. and Philippine agencies have cooperated to bring charges against numerous terrorists, to implement the countries’ extradition treaty, and to train thousands of Filipino law enforcement officers. A United States Resident Legal Advisor also provides training to Philippine prosecutors.

**IV.4. United States National Interest in the South China Sea Dispute**

This part is the second purposes of this thesis. Some of the point of the United States interest that the writer writes in this thesis is from the article by M. Taylor Flaver as an Associate Professor of Political Science and member of the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Bonnie S. Glaser as Senior Fellow pf the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

The declaration of the national interests, started when ASEAN Regional Forum in Phnom Penh, Cambodia on July 2010, Hillary Clinton as State Secretary of the United States said, “as a Pacific nation and resident power, the United States has a national interest in freedom of navigation, the maintenance of peace and stability, respect for international law, and unimpeded lawful commerce in the South China Sea.

The First United States interest in the South China Sea dispute is respect for international law. The United States has important interests in the peaceful resolution of South China Sea disputes according to international law. With the exception of China, all the claimants of the South China Sea have attempted to justify their claims based on their coastlines and the provisions of UNCLOS. China, however, relies on a mix of historic rights and legal claims, while remaining deliberately ambiguous about the meaning of the "nine-dashed line" around the sea that is drawn on Chinese maps. Failure to uphold international law and norms could harm U.S. interests elsewhere in the region and beyond. Because if China or any other party is permitted to simply

---

ignore the rules of one facet of the international system, in this case the Law of the Sea, then the entire system loses legitimacy.\textsuperscript{93} Towards this end, the United States has conducted multiple “operational assertions” of such freedoms in Chinese waters annually since 2007.\textsuperscript{94}

Ensuring \textit{freedom of navigation} is the second critical interest of the United States. Freedom of navigation in the South China Sea region is important for two reasons, about security and economic interest. First, \textit{security interest}, for defense of the allies is one of the U.S. National Security Interests in order to the foundation of regional stability and prosperity and the starting point for U.S. security engagement with the region. In review to the U.S. allies and friends around the South China Sea look to the United States to maintain free trade, safe and secure sea lines of communication (SLOCs), and overall peace and stability in the region.\textsuperscript{95} Claimants and non claimants to land features and maritime waters in the South China Sea view the U.S. military presence as necessary to allow decision-making free of intimidation. The alliances allow the United States to maintain a significant forward-deployed presence in the region.\textsuperscript{96} In order to maintain U.S. formal military alliance in the region such as Japan, South Korea, Thailand, the Philippines and Australia, and has a significant presence in Singapore; according to the e-book “Southeast Asia America Embrace” by Jessica Brown, the United States Pacific Command, which operates throughout the Asia-Pacific, is made up of about 325,000 military and civilian personnel. Six aircraft carrier strike groups are based permanently in the Asia-Pacific region. The U.S. Navy makes about 700 port visits each year, and carrier out a

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid.,
number of bilateral and multilateral military training exercises. 97 Freedom of Navigation also sustains the United States ability to project military power, not just in the Asia-Pacific region but also around the world, as many naval vessels from the West Coast and Japan pass through the South China Sea route to the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf.

In the South China Sea, regional stability faces several threats. According to the M. Taylor Flaver, the first is the potential for armed conflict among the various claimants in the disputes over territorial sovereignty and maritime rights. China and Vietnam have clashed twice, first in 1974 over the Crescent Group in the Paracel Islands (contested only by China and Vietnam) and in 1988 over the control of Johnson Reef. As zero-sum conflicts, territorial disputes are prone to the pernicious effects of the security dilemma and can quickly spiral out of control. A second threat to stability would be increasingly frequent use to coercive measures short of armed conflict to advance a state’s claims. China’s threats to American oil companies in 2007 and 2008 provide one example of such coercive behavior that can increase instability. A third threat would be ongoing naval modernization in the region. In addition the recapitalization and modernization of the China’s South Sea Fleet, Vietnam is also investing heavily in naval and air capabilities to be used in the South China Sea, such as Kilo-class submarines purchased from Russia that will enhance Hanoi’s own area denial capability. Spirals of instability in disputes over sovereignty and maritime rights could evolve into a capabilities race and increased security competition. A third source of instability, indirectly related to the South China Sea, would be the potential for spiral around efforts by China and the United States over threatening and maintaining access, respectively. In response to new Chinese “anti-access/area denial” capabilities, including anti-ship ballistic missile, the United States military has developed a new operational concept known as AirSea Battle intended to

---

ensure U.S. access to these waters in wartime. Peacetime efforts to develop such capabilities could result in an “access” arms race and increased instability.

Second, freedom of navigation is important for *economic interests*. A decade ago, Asia was an important economic region; today it is critical for U.S. prosperity. *Two-way merchandise trade between the United States and Asia is almost $1 trillion a year, amounting to 27 percent of total U.S. merchandise trade with the world versus 19 percent with the European Union. And the world’s six largest ports, both container and cargo, are in Asia.* If the United States cargo ships diverted to other routes would harm regional economies as a result of an increase in insurance rates and longer transits.

*European Union data includes all new members

*East Asia includes ASEAN, Japan South Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan

Source: Calculated form U.S. Census Bureau data
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Conflict of any scale in the South China Sea would hamper the claimants, moreover, non-claimants from benefiting from the South China Sea's proven and potential riches. Although China claims also supports freedom of navigation, but in the fact the United States has faces several threats. The first threat is China’s interpretation of rights of coastal states in the Exclusive Economic Zone. Since the EP-3 incident in 2001, China has mobilized a variety of legal arguments designed to limit military activities in this zone, especially U.S. surveillance and reconnaissance activities. Although China claims also supports freedom of navigation, but in the fact the United States has faces several threats. The first threat is China’s interpretation of rights of coastal states in the Exclusive Economic Zone. Since the EP-3 incident in 2001, China has mobilized a variety of legal arguments designed to limit military activities in this zone, especially U.S. surveillance and reconnaissance activities. Not impossible in the future, China may seek to impose similar restrictions in the entire South China Sea even based on embraced UNCLOS complaint claims that did not seek to restrict military activities, ambiguity surrounding the historic rights that China might claim in these waters based on the nine-dashed line sustains such concerns. Second threat is the modernization of the PLA Navy, which, over time, could be used to exclude U.S. naval vessels from these waters. Both of the threats provide evidence of possible Chinese intentions to block freedom of navigation in specific contingencies.

The other economic interest of the United States that is possible is concerned towards oil and natural gas that are contained in the South China Sea. The issue of energy security is also important to be considered. Review from the action of the United States that always intervenes in the dispute in the region contained oil. From the oil and natural gas condition in United States according to EIA, natural gas that

---

was consumed in 2010 was around 22 trillion cubic feet\textsuperscript{100} and total oil consumed in 2010 around 7.0 billion barrels.\textsuperscript{101} But then, the consumption always increases each year. Moreover, the United States is the biggest oil consumer in the world. If China takes control to the South China Sea, probably U.S. Oil Company will find difficulties to do exploitation in the region.

Here are the tables of intensify of the U.S. National Interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Interest</th>
<th>Intensity of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect For International Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring Freedom Of Navigation - Defense the allies (Security Interest)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring Freedom of Navigation – economic interest</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned towards oil and natural gas</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{100} Gas use for power generation leads increase in natural gas use in 2010. Retrieved January 24, 2013 from http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=4350

\textsuperscript{101} How much oil does the United States consume per day? Retrieved on January 24, 2013 from http://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.cfm?id=33&t=6
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

After exploring the gathered data, analysis and getting the result of discovery regarding to the United States interests in the dispute, this thesis concludes that a country do intervention based on the interests. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has been recognized as the one remaining global superpower. On the other hand, nowadays, China’s role in the world has demonstrably grown. It has developed capabilities, power and influence through the employment of various instruments of national power, including diplomacy, military, and economics. With the potentials in the South China Sea region, United States does not want China get more power in the future and have a chance bring down United States. So, indirectly these two big powers have competed in the dispute.

Unfortunately, the situation in the dispute becomes worst since United States intervention. Makes the dispute became more serious; China acts is more aggressive and assertive, pointed out by China action that puts map in China passports that includes the South China Sea area; China increasing the military power called “blue water”, etc; and there are some opinion said, this dispute has rising two superpower country that can lead to the war in the future. Become more worst because both countries searches support from ASEAN country member that resulted ASEAN as important organization in the region, cannot find good solution for the dispute because some of them have take side to U.S. or China. Countries that have good economic relationship with China cannot support the United States. And countries that have good relationship with U.S. like the Philippines and Indonesia were supported U.S. So, ASEAN cannot get neutral solution for the dispute. But on the other side, United States has balancing China power so that the other claimant countries did not felt intimidated anymore.
The complex situation makes U.S. need strengthening the relationship with the alliance, because of that on August 31, 2011 the Philippines and United States have celebrated the 60th anniversary of Mutual Defense Treaty. According to the Philippines, bilateral the Philippine and United States defense relationship built on the Mutual Defense Treaty is a cornerstone of external defense of the Philippines and a crucial element in maintaining regional peace and stability. And according to United States, on the historic occasion, reflect on the rich history of the alliance and the continuing relevance of the treaty for peace, security, and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

In this finding, the writer found that the proxy system was success, because of the alliance relationship both countries actually has almost same interests. Seen from the Philippines supported the interests of United States, they are freedom of navigation, the maintenance of peace and stability, respect for international law, and unimpeded lawful commerce in the South China Sea.
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