Monograph Series II No. 2

A COLD WAR ALLIANCE: PHILIPPINE-SOUTH KOREAN RELATIONS 1948—1971

LILY ANN POLO

Asian Center
University of the Philippines
1984

Monograph Series II No. 2

A COLD WAR ALLIANCE: PHILIPPINE-SOUTH KOREAN RELATIONS 1948—1971

LILY ANN POLO

Asian Center
University of the Philippines
1984

Published by the ASIAN CENTER

University of the Philippines System
Diliman, Quezon City
1984

FOREWORD

Since its establishment as the Institute of Asian Studies in 1955, the Asian Center has encouraged and supported research of Filipino scholars, particularly members of its faculty, who undertake research on Asian society and culture as well as issues and problems related to domestic and foreign involvements of Asian countries.

One of the main concentrations of the Center's research activities deals with the study of Philippine external relations, especially with neighboring Asian countries. This monograph of Professor Lily Ann G. Polo is one such study. Covering the Philippines' bilateral transactions with the Republic of South Korea since 1948, it is a first attempt by a Filipino at a systematic study of the relationship.

Under a scholarship grant from the Ministry of Education, Republic of Korea (1975-1977), Professor Polo studied Korean history, society, language and culture at Seoul National University and Ewha Woman's University. While in Korea, she gathered data relevant to the relationship between the two countries. She also availed herself of data from published and documentary sources found in libraries and other depositories within Metro-Manila. Among them, the libraries of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ayala Museum which is the depository of President Elpidio Quirino's papers, the National Library and the University of the Philippines. In order to fill in the gap of information yielded by written records, she interviewed some of those involved in the relationship between the Philippines and the Republic of Korea during the period covered by her study.

The publication of this monograph, it is hoped, will not only increase understanding of Philippine relations with the Republic of Korea but will also arouse interest in Philippine as well as Korean history, society and culture.

JOSEFA M. SANIEL
Dean
Asian Center

8 December 1984

PREFACE

This work was originally presented as a thesis for the masteral degree in Asian Studies at the Asian Center, University of the Philippines. Upon encouragement of senior colleagues, particularly Dean Josefa M. Saniel and Dr. Silvino V. Epistola, it was rewritten for this monograph series published by the Center. This is the first part of the author's continuing study on Philippine Relations with Korea. It provides a framework upon which historical relations between the Philippines and South Korea can be better understood and analyzed.

The reader may note that this work confines itself to a specific time frame: from the initial establishment of relations between the Philippines and the South Korean Republic in 1948, to the period of a trend towards multi-polarization in the East Asian region in the 1970s. The author's research on this topic, however, is a continuing one. Subsequently, a sequel to this initial study was funded by the Asian Center and presented early in 1984 in one of its Faculty Colloquia. Entitled "Philippine-South Korean Relations: Current Trends and Directions," it takes off from where the first study ends. Eventually the updated findings presented in the Colloquium will be shared with a wider audience through another publication.

This monograph would not have been made possible without the support of the following: Professors Eva Duka Ventura, Josefa M. Saniel and Silvino V. Epistola, who composed the members of my thesis committee: Eric Lacanlale, who helped in the initial conceptualization and organization of this work; Ajit Singh Rye, who was then the Director of the Asian Studies Program; Lilia Tengsico-Gacerez, a former colleague who accompanied me in some of my library-hopping trips around Metro-Manila; Hermie Garcia, who assisted in editing the manuscript; Millie Espinas who, as a colleague, gave the much needed moral support; the members of the Asian Center staff: Evelyn, Elvie, Larilyn, Mamerta and Sally, who assisted in the preparation of the manuscript for publication; Pancho de Guzman, my brother-in-law, who took time out from his busy schedule to assist in the final organization of the manuscript; my sister, Nanie, who patiently read the drafts for last minute comments and editing; and finally to the Asian Center of the University of the Philippines, for sponsoring the publication of this maiden attempt.

Above all, my deepest gratitude to the members of my family for their constant support and encouragement.

LILY ANN G. POLO

7 October 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Philippine -South Korean[1] relations from 1948-1971 can be viewed within the framework of an era where the world was divided into two distinct forces — that of the so-called Free World led by the United States and that of the communist camp led by the Soviet Union. This era is more popularly known as the Cold War years. In the early 1970s however, the Cold War seemed to have thawed into a trend towards a multipolarized alignment of forces in international politics.[2]

It was within the Cold War era that the Korean peninsula became one of the first battlegrounds of this ideological rivalry between the two superpowers. The Philippines, being also a part of the East Asian region to which Korea belongs,[3] could not help but develop significant relations with that country. And since Korea had become a tinder box in the region, the Philippines has every reason to feel a certain measure of anxiety.

In 1950, the Philippines became actively involved in the anti-communist war in Korea. Until now, it is still a member of the United Nations Command stationed in that divided country. And because South Korea is fast emerging as an economic force of growing importance in the region due to its rapidly expanding foreign trade, the Philippines cannot avoid relating with it.

---

[1] Philippine(s) refers to Republic of the Philippines or R.P. South Korea refers to Republic of Korea or R.O.K. The terms are hereafter used interchangably with their corresponding official names or abbreviations.

[2] Although observers differ as to exact periodization of different phases of the international climate, this study adopts Rosenau's characterization of international political history thus: tight bipolarization from 1945 to 1959; loose bipolarization in the 1960s; and a pattern resembling the balance of power system that emerged in the 1970s. See James Rosenau, Kenneth Thompson, and Gavin Boyd, *World Politics* (New York: The Free Press, 1976), pp. 22-23.

The distinctions between the tight and loose bipolar structures in world politics were first expounded by Morton Kaplan in *System and Process in International Politics* (New York: Wiley, 1957). According to his model, a tight bipolar system exists when two superpowers dominate world politics to such an extent that other states feel compelled to align themselves with one or the other; a loose bipolar system emerges when there is a breakdown within the hierarchy of the former system such that other states begin to evolve toward great-power status, and the two dominant powers are less able to command the strict allegiance of those in their orbit of influence.

[3] Sheldon Simon includes Korea and the Philippines in his geographical definition of East Asia. However, he qualifies that as a *system*, East Asia should not be taken as one but as a series of overlapping systems geographically subdivided into Northeast Asia, which includes Korea, and Southeast Asia, which includes the Philippines. See Sheldon Simon, "East Asia," in Rosenau et al., *World Politics*, chapter 23.

Philippine relations with Korea and other small Asian countries, however, have not assumed as much importance as had its relations with traditional partners like the U.S. and Japan. It was only in the late 1960s that the pressure of world events compelled the Philippines to reorient its foreign relations. Taking the form of closer identification with Third World countries in general and with its Asian neighbors in particular, among others, this new orientation has been increasingly reflected in Philippine foreign policy goals and behavior.[4]

With this particular thrust in foreign policy, there is a felt need to examine and evaluate the patterns of relations between the Philippines and these Third World countries. The present study therefore hopes to augment the limited body of knowledge on the Philippines' bilateral relations with its Asian neighbors.

No systematic study has been made and published on Philippine-South Korean relations. The few books, pamphlets, and articles on the subject deal mainly on certain specific military and trade aspects of the relations between the two countries.[5] The present work attempts to provide a coherent data base for the future study and further analysis of Philippine-South Korean relations.

At the same time, it also tries to examine the nature and the basis of the relations between the two countries in the context of the Cold War era.

The main assertion of this study is that the relations between the Philippines and South Korea from 1948 to 1971 were mainly a function of their congruent Cold War foreign policies characterized by and manifested in their close alignment with the United States and a rigidly anti-communist posture.

Theoretical Framework

The study makes use of the "systems theory" as its general tool of analysis in examining international relations.

International relations is here taken as "the interaction of governments of sovereign states,"[6] while the term "system" is used as a "set of

[4] See for instance, the following: Narciso Ramos, "Philippine Foreign Relations: 1968," *Fookien Times Yearbook* (October 1968), pp. 72f; Carlos P. Romulo, "Foreign Policy in the Seventies," *Fookien Times Yearbook* (September-October 1971), pp. 58f; Carlos P. Romulo, *Rejoining Our Asian Family* (Manila: Department of Foreign Affairs, 1969); see also "Marcos Bids to Bind Asia Ties," *Manila Daily Bulletin*, January 11, 1968, p. 7.

[5] These include: Juan Villasanta, *Dateline: Korea—Stories of the Philippine Batalion* (Bacolod City: Nalco Press, 1954); Ernesto Jimenez, ed., *These Are Your Boys, the Avengers* (Tokyo: International Printing Co., 1954); Manuel Gallego, *The Philippine Expeditionary Forces to Korea Before the Eyes of the Law* (Manila: Magsimpan Press, 1950; Clemente Abello, "Korea-Philippine Joint Meeting on Trade," *Commerce 12* (December 1964): 24-25; Wee Dong Chang, "Philippines-Korea Trade Prospects," *Fookien Times Yearbook* (October 1967), pp. 132f.

[6] E. Raymond Platig, "International Relations as a Field of Inquiry," in James Rosenau, ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, rev. ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1969), p. 16.

components with identifiable attributes, among which patterned relationships persist over a period of time."[7] The field of international relations can therefore be considered a system.[8]

There is a growing tendency to view the world as a global international system composed of parts or subsystems.[9] This view stresses the pattern of interstate relations within the different subsystems.

The general systems theory as applied to international relations can be explained as:

> the existence of a system in which all those engaged in action in international politics, the nation-states, governments, diplomats, politicians, interest groups, and national and international organizations, are elements in relationships, the interaction of which contributes to the system as a whole.[10]

Proponents of this framework say that its advantage lies in its holistic approach and comprehensiveness. It is said to give a clearer formulation of the main variables in the study of international politics.

Of the main variables identified, the present work focuses on only one — the actions of nations as components of the system.

The conduct of relations of a nation with other nations is said to be dictated by its foreign policy. This policy expresses the state's reactions to perceived dangers and opportunities in the international setting. It determines whether a state would become friendly toward some states and hostile toward others. States with congruent or harmonious national values, interests and ideologies are friendly to each other while those which conflict in these areas are generally unfriendly or hostile to each other.[11]

The foreign policy of a state may be determined with the use of three conceptual distinctions, namely, as a cluster of orientations, as a set of commitments and plans of action, and as a form of behavior.[12]

---

[7] Andrew Scott, *The Functioning of the International Political System* (New York: Macmillian, 1967), p. 27.

[8] Ibid.

[9] See for instance, Kaplan, *System and Process in International Politics,* chapter 1; Scott, *International Political System,* p. 26; Richard Rosecrance, *Action and Reaction in World Politics* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963); Klaus Knorr and Sidney Verba, eds., *The International System* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963); J. W. Burton, *Systems, States, Diplomacy and Rules* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1968); Joseph Frankel, *Contemporary International Theory and the Behavior of States* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973); James E. Dougherty. "The Study of the Global System," in Rosenau et al., *World Politics;* Charles Reynolds, *Theory and Explanation in International Politics* (London: Martin Robertson, 1973).

[10] Reynolds, *International Politics,* p. 15.

[11] Norman Padelford and George Lincoln, *The Dynamics of International Politics* (New York: Macmillan, 1962), pp. 221-223.

[12] James Rosenau, "The Study of Foreign Policy," in Rosenau et al., *World Politics,* p. 6.

Orientations specifically consist of "attitudes, perceptions and values that derive from the historical experiences and strategic circumstances which mark the state's place in world politics."[13]

As a set of commitments and plans of action, foreign policy consists of "specific goals and means for achieving them that are deemed to be appropriate responses to the opportunities and challenges abroad."[14]

As a form of behavior, on the other hand, foreign policy refers to the concrete actions taken by officials of nations with respect to external events and situations.[15]

The study of foreign policy as a form of behavior makes use of certain instruments and assumes certain patterns. The instruments used in this study were: diplomatic-political, economic, military and cultural.

The patterns of foreign policy as behavior include: 1) recognition of other states and the exchange of diplomatic and consular offices; 2) conclusion of treaties of friendship, commerce, and other administrative matters; 3) adherence to certain international agencies such as the United Nations; and 4) support of some principles of international law.[16]

In understanding the RP-ROK relations, the systems approach was used. However, the study also made use of the patron-client approach because it clarifies the basis of these relations vis-a-vis the influence of a superpower.

There are two broad levels of analysis used in this study, namely, the unit level and the global systems level.

Nation-states are considered the unit level of the state system. Their government's foreign policies are among the prime inputs into the international political system. It is important then to examine their foreign policies in order to understand their relationship with the other components of the international system.

There is a view that within the international political system, relationships are highly stratified. This structure includes a few "top dog" nations, namely, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.; several middle-level nations; and the rest, the "underdog" nations. This classification is made on the basis of a nation's wealth, power, and international status. This hierarchal structure limits the foreign policy alternatives of the "underdog" nations. Galtung, the proponent of this view, theorizes that the rank and position of a country in this international system largely define and limit the range of the country's foreign policy alternatives.[17]

---

[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Padelford and Lincoln, *Dynamics of International Politics*, p. 334.
[16] Ibid., pp. 334-335.
[17] Johan Galtung, "International Relations and International Conflicts: A Sociological Approach," paper read at the International Sociological Association Plenary Session, September 4-11, 1966, cited in Marshall R. Singer, "The Foreign Policies of Small Developing States," in Rosenau et al., *World Politics*, p. 275.

A major finding of Galtung in his studies shows that

> the interaction has a tendency to be rank-dependent, in the sense that there is much interaction between nations high in the ranking system, less between one nation that is high and another that is low, and much less between the nations low in the system.[18]

Thus, the foreign policy options of a nation are few or many depending on the rank of the nation in the structural ladder.

For the purposes of this study, proper attention was given to the characteristic behavior pattern of the foreign policies of most small, developing states. Studies tend to show that these states

> are highly dependent upon (and interactive with) a few middle and regional powers, and they often are still more directly dependent upon the bigger powers than they are upon middle-sized powers.[19]

The nation-state as a unit level of an international or global system interacts with and is usually a component of one or more subsystems of the general system. Hence, a multilevel systematic interaction is not uncommon in the behavior of nation-states.

As components of the East Asian subregional systems, the Philippines and Korea are assumed to have similar domestic characteristics and external orientations common to most of the states in the region, particularly during the immediate post-World War II period.[20]

1. They fall under the category of underdeveloped, agrarian-competitive economies producing primary goods.

2. They are relatively inferior to the dominant system, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

3. The states are subordinate to the dominant system in the sense that a change in that system will have a greater effect on the regional system than vice-versa. The dominant system also has a more intensive penetration of the regional system. Changes in the security relationship and diplomatic activity in the early 1970s among the countries in the region, for instance, have been largely a response to the Nixon doctrine.

4. There is a high dependence on the major powers for economic and military support. This was especially intense during the Bipolar bloc period from the 1950s to the mid-1960s.

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] Singer, "Foreign Policies of Small Developing States," p. 273.

[20] For a discussion of the general regional characteristics of the Asian subordinate systems in general, and the East Asian subsystem in particular, see Oran Young, "Political Discontinuities in the International System," in Rosenau, ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, pp. 336-345; and Simon, "East Asia," pp. 528-529.

However, Japan may be considered an atypical member of the Asian region in the sense that it has a dominant position in international trade and is an industrialized country.

5. Immediately after World War II, the individual states were often deeply involved in bilateral relations with various external powers than with one another. There was little involvement in international politics among the member states of the Asian subsystems.

6. Asian politics has been shaped to a large extent by the ideological problems of the Cold War. Asian states have generally been involved in the competition between the superpowers and the latter's respective power interests in the area. This competition is manifested in the bipolar alliance system and the efforts of the U.S. to construct an Asian defense perimeter against communist expansion.

Since 1945 the main protagonists that control the dominant (bipolar bloc) systems are the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Generally considered the only two nations qualifying as "superpowers," they exceed all other states by a "substantial margin in their economic potentials, military capabilities, mobility of power, and range of their interests."[21] As such, they have gained predominant influence over the international political system following World War II and have consequently set the tone of international politics since 1945.

The depth of the ideological and political differences between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. has given rise to a global rivalry that has often led to a two-power confrontation. This situation has brought about the Cold War and the characteristics of bipolarity. These two powers have greatly influenced the behavior of other states, dividing the world into the Free World or noncommunist bloc and the communist bloc.[22]

This study is viewed primarily from this ideological framework, that is, the Free World led by the U.S. versus the socialist world led by the U.S.S.R.

The global political environment also includes regional and international organizations. The functions of these organizations are to promote general welfare and to maintain stability within the international system. They also provide the forum for discussion and cooperation among member states.[23]

---

[21] Michael H. Armacost, *The Foreign Relations of the United States,* (California: Dickenson Pub. Co., Inc. 1969), p. 6. Also, for a comprehensive discussion on the international hierarchy and classification of states in terms of the five factors of power, see Steven Spiegel, *Dominance and Diversity: The International Hierarchy* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1972), pp. 38-128.

[22] See for instance, Louis Halle, *The Cold War as History* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967); David Horowitz, *The Free World Colossus* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1965); William Parker, *The Superpowers* (London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1972).

[23] Charles Pentland, "International Organizations," in Rosenau et al., *World Politics,* pp. 631-638.

However, the superpowers strongly influence these organizations in the performance of their role of pursuing the members' foreign policy goals. This is particularly true in the international organizations dominated by the superpowers. For instance, the degree of U.S. influence on the United Nations Organization, which has often become a major instrument of U.S. foreign policy goals, cannot be denied.[24] In the same vein, regional organizations have been widely used as instruments in implementing policies that reflect the bipolar alignments among member states.[25] A general assumption regarding international and regional organizations is that

> the degree to which any consensus created among the members [of regional or international organizations] is likely to be compatible with their [dominant powers'] particular interests.[26]

The present work views international organizations and organized international political activities as instruments of foreign policies that reflect the superpowers' ideological and political orientations.

It is assumed that the alignment of a small nation with a superpower will have a great influence on its relations with other states. This influence could be heavier when the small nation becomes a client state of the superpower.

A patron-client relationship involves the following features: defense agreements, military aid, training of troops, establishment of bases, economic-financial ties through investments, aids, exclusive or predominant trade relations, and currency agreements.[27]

In this study, it has been assumed that the United States has maintained a preeminent position in the Philippines and South Korea as reflected in their ideological orientation and patterns of foreign policy behavior. Thus, in understanding the bilateral relations between two client states of a superpower, a triangular arrangement emerges. At the peak of the triangle is the superpower which acts as a linkage in a bilateral relationship between its clients in a particular geographical region.

---

[24] For discussions and analyses of the relationship between the United Nations and American foreign policy, see Richard N. Gardner, *In Pursuit of World Order*, rev. ed. (New York: Praeger, 1966); Leland M. Goodrich, *Korea: A Study of U.S. Policy in the United Nations* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1956); J. G. Stoessinger, *The U.N. and the Superpowers* (New York, Random House, 1965); Jon Halliday, "The United Nations and Korea," in Frank Baldwin, ed., *Without Parallel: The American-Korean Relationship Since 1945* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1973).

[25] For instance, two regional European alliance organizations obviously illustrate this: the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), where American presence is overwhelming in terms of troops and bases; and the Warsaw Treaty Organization (Warsaw Pact), composed of Eastern European states. The Soviet presence in the organization is unmistakably predominant.

[26] Pentland, "International Organizations," p. 631.

[27] John Herz, "The Territorial State Revisited: Reflections on the Future of the Nation-State," in Rosenau et al., *World Politics*, p. 85. For a thorough discussion of the patron-client relationship in the international system, see Spiegel, *Dominance and Diversity*, pp. 129-169.

Organization and Presentation

As a primarily descriptive-analytical work, this study has been organized in the following manner: an introductory chapter (Chapter I) stating its scope, significance, and theoretical framework; followed by a comparative study (Chapter II) of the basic foreign policy orientation, tenets, and behavior of the Philippines and South Korea from their immediate post-independence period to the early 70s. This is to show the basic content and direction of the foreign policies of each country, particularly during the Cold War era.

Chapters III and IV examine Philippine and South Korean participation in organized international and regional affairs, as well as R.P.-R.O.K. bilateral relations, respectively. Specifically, the bilateral relations include the diplomatic-political, economic, military, and socio-cultural aspects. These chapters intend to seek the extent, nature, and function of Philippine-South Korean relations in the global, regional, and bilateral levels as determined by their respective foreign policies.

Finally, from the presentation of these historical facts, Chapter V attempts to draw some conclusions regarding the nature and function of Philippine-South Korean relations from 1948-1971.

Sources of Data

The data in this study come from primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include Philippine and South Korean government documents available in Metro Manila, such as presidential publications, annual embassy reports and dispatches, publications from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, treaties, agreements, and annual trade reports. Unpublished but decoded official communications on the presidential and ministerial levels were examined from the Quirino Presidential Papers File at the Ayala Museum and Library in Makati, Metro Manila. Official records and publications of international organizations relevant to the study were also used.

Other sources such as newspapers, magazines, journals, books, and other related publications were perused whenever primary sources were not available, or for leads to primary sources. Finally, some members of the Philippine and South Korean diplomatic corps were interviewed to help provide insights which could contribute to a substantial analysis of the data gathered.

The documents used in this study are limited to books, papers, and periodicals available in the Philippines. As a consequence, this work tends to present the Philippine point of view. The chapter on RP-ROK bilateral

relations in particular depends mainly on the reports of the Philippine embassy in Seoul as well as on local newspapers. This is primarily due to the inaccessibility of Korean foreign affairs reports to alien researchers.

A dearth of materials on Philippine-South Korean bilateral relations is noteworthy. Even the Philippine sources like the embassy reports, a gap in chronological reporting has been noted. The initial report of the Philippine mission in Seoul, for instance, was submitted only in 1957. Also, the annual reports from 1960 to 1967 were unaccounted for in the library files of the Philippine Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

CHAPTER II

PHILIPPINE AND SOUTH KOREAN FOREIGN POLICIES

This chapter is a comparative study of Philippine and South Korean foreign policies as they emerged and evolved from immediate post-independence period to 1971. Specifically, this examines the basic content, direction, and pattern of each country's foreign policies against the backdrop of the bipolarized superpowers' rivalry in the international environment. However, certain significant determinants of Philippine and South Korean foreign policies are first discussed in order to understand the two countries' respective orientation vis-a-vis the Cold War conflict.

The Philippines

Determinants of Foreign Policy

Several significant factors can be cited as having influenced the course of Philippine foreign policy since the Philippines became an independent Republic in 1946. These are: its Western-linked historical, political, and cultural experiences; its economic development and its national security considerations, which inevitably involve foreign aid.

Geographical Location. Geographically, the Philippines is situated along the southeastern rim of Asia. An archipelago consisting of some 7,100 islands, it extends to about 1,100 miles north to south, forming a land chain between the Pacific Ocean on the east, and the South China Sea on the west. The six hundred-mile breadth of the South China Sea separates the Philippine archipelago from Vietnam and the People's Republic of China. On the south, the Philippines is separated from Malaysia and Indonesia by a few miles of straits.

Historical, Political and Cultural Experiences. Historically and culturally, however, the development of the Philippines has deviated somewhat from the general trend in the area. The cultural forces from India and Arabia to the west, and from China to the north, which penetrated deeply into the Indo-Chinese and Malay peninsulas, did not gain as much foothold in the Philippines. Hence, the great religious and cultural traditions — the Hindu, Buddhist, and Islamic cul-

tures — that have been considered as common denominators in the development of ancient Southeast Asia, did not have as much chance to flourish in the Philippine archipelago.[1]

There are two factors that can explain this phenomenon: one, the Philippines is on the periphery of the Southeast Asian region, a geographical fact that made it relatively far from the mainstream of Indic and Sinic civilizations; two, the Philippines, in the sixteenth century, served as a gateway for Western penetration and colonization in the southeastern part of Asia.[2] With the exception of the southern part of the country, which had earlier deeply imbibed the Islamic cultures,[3] the rest of the Philippines came under the control of Catholic Spain. After more than three hundred years of Spanish colonization, the Philippines became a predominantly Catholic nation. To this day, the Philippines stands out as the only Christian nation in the midst of Buddhist and Muslim neighbors in Southeast Asia.

The defeat of Spain in the Spanish-American War, and the resultant Treaty of Paris of 1898, caused the Philippines to be ceded to yet another Western colonial power, the United States of America. Under the American colonial administration, the ethnically and linguistically diversified Filipinos of basically Malay stock were taught the English language. This became the language of instruction in schools established throughout the country. Unlike the Spaniards, the Americans made popular education more readily accessible to the colonized Filipinos. A new kind of political culture was also popularized. The Filipinos were promised political independence under a democratic form of government patterned after that of the United States.[4] However, independence would be granted only after they had undergone political tutelage under the colonial master.[5] Hence, when the Philippines was finally granted independence in 1946, America considered it as the "showcase of democracy in the Orient."[6]

---

1 For a brief survey of Southeast Asian history under this theme, refer to: B.R. Pearn, *An Introduction to the History of Southeast Asia,* 2nd ed. (Kuala Lumpur: Longmans of Malaysia, Ltd., 1965); Frank John Cady, *Southeast Asia: Its Historical Development* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964). Also, for a thorough discussion of the Indic influences on the region, specifically the geographic area called "Farther India," that is, Indonesia, Indo-Chinese Peninsula (Northern Vietnam excluding), and the Malay Peninsula, read two works by George Coedes, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia,* ed. Walter F. Vella, trans. Susan Brown Couring (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1968); *The Making of Southeast Asia,* trans. H.M. Wright (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966).

2 See for instance, John Bastin, ed., *The Emergence of Modern Southeast Asia: 1511-1957* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967).

3 For a comprehensive account of the coming of Islam to the Philippines, and the spread of Islamic culture in the country, see Cesar Adib Majul, *Muslims in the Philippines,* 2nd ed. (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1973).

4 See for instance, the Philippine Bill of 1902; the Jones Law of 1916; the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law in 1932-1933; and the Tydings-MacDuffie Law in 1934, in Teodoro Agoncillo and Milagros Guerrero, *History of the Filipino People* (Quezon City: R. P. Garcia Pub. Co., 1973), pp. 328-99.

5 Ibid.

6 Lawrence S. Finkelstein, *American Policy in Southeast Asia,* rev. ed. (New York: American Institute of Pacific Relations, Inc., 1951), p. 25.