

Willem Verdaasdonk
s1223194
Bachelor Thesis report
International Studies
Thursday 14 May 2015
Total Word Count: 15,328
Thesis Word Count: 10,739

US created Multilateral Alliances: Why they succeed in Europe but Failed in South East Asia: Evaluating NATO and SEATO



Written by: Willem Verdaasdonk

Supervised by: Giles Scott-Smith,
Daan Kok

Outline

- Introduction.....3
- Literary review.....4
- Relevance note.....11
- Chapter 1-(Why countries join different alliances).....14
- Chapter 2- (The survival of NATO).....,21
- Chapter 3- (The Failure of SEATO).....28
- Chapter 4 conclusion- (Why NATO survived while SEATO failed)36
- Bibliography41

Introduction

At the NATO summit in Chicago 2012, President Obama stated, "For the United States, there is no exaggerating the importance of this Alliance to our national security"¹. This is where President Obama referred to NATO's special position and importance. NATO was founded by the United States in which it is one of the oldest alliances in history that has stood the test of time and has survived up until this day, even when its purpose has often been questioned.²

However, NATO is one of the few multilateral alliances founded by United States that have had some level of success. Other multilateral alliances that the US have created have often failed, especially in the South East and East Asia region where the US now prefers to have bilateral relations/alliances with nations, as opposed to multilateral alliances. One of these multilateral alliances is named SEATO (also known as the "South East Asia Treaty Organization"), which was meant to prevent the spread of communism but eventually failed in 1977. Which brings us the question why did NATO succeed while SEATO failed.

This brings us to the investigation of this thesis, which will investigate why NATO has been so successful as a multilateral organization, while SEATO on the other hand has failed. This thesis will establish a theoretical framework by focusing on the balance of threat, bandwagoning and the balance of power in International Relations theory, followed by an in-depth focus on each organization; the thesis will analyze the reasons for their establishment, the different organizational treaties, member countries, geographical locations, important events - as well as the role and influence of the US in each organization. This should then present a clear conclusion as to why the United States has failed at making a multilateral alliance in South East Asia but has succeed in establishing a successful alliance in Europe?

¹ "Message from President Obama." *NATO Review Magazine*. NATO, 2012. Web. 14 Mar. 2015. <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2012/chicago/president-obama/en/index.htm>

² "Does Nato Have a Purpose Any Longer?" *The Guardian*. The Guardian, 12 June 2011. Web. 15 Mar. 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/jun/12/nato-usa>.

Literary review for thesis topic : US created Multilateral Alliances, why they survive in Europe but fail in East Asia: Evaluating NATO and SEATO

For the thesis “US created Multilateral Alliances: Why they work in Europe but fail in East Asia: Evaluating NATO, and SEATO” the paper will focus on four major parts: the first part involves how these alliances came into existence within the framework of International Relations theory, with a special focus on the balance of power, balance of threat, and bandwagoning. The second section will focus on NATO and how it has survived as an organization, followed by focusing on the “South East Asia Treaty Organization” (SEATO) and evaluating why it failed. Finally comparing and contrasting the main differences between both NATO and SEATO, in order to determine why SEATO failed, whereas NATO survived. Furthermore, when evaluating both these different organizations, the two main linking elements will envelope the role of the US in each of the two alliances, as well as the corresponding International Relations theory that will allow this thesis to demonstrate the systematic life-span of both NATO and SEATO, using the role of the US as a common denominator to judge their success and failure.

The literary work presented below gives an overview of the three main authors used in the thesis, in regards to International Relations theory, as well as the two main authors used for both SEATO and NATO. Their works will be grouped together by theory, and then by each organization (e.g. the different International Relations theories will be discussed first followed by NATO and then by SEATO). The literary review will then concentrate on the arguments and opinions of each author, in which the credibility of their point of view will also be evaluated – according to whether their approach is successfully integrated within the thesis’s primary argument and significance; nonetheless, the thesis will also be arguing the various aspects which literature might be lacking in regards to the thesis’s primary motivation. With all of this in mind, these seven academic works have been chosen for the literary review and will also follow the structure of the thesis itself, starting with the theory section of balance of power, balance of threat and bandwagoning.

To introduce the three different theories (the balance of power, bandwagoning and the balance of threat) that encompass the focal point of the thesis, the book “The Origins of

Alliances” by Stephen Walt will be cited, mainly because Stephen Walt, a professor of International Affairs at Harvard University uses all three theories to hypothesize why alliances are formed. He begins by theorizing as to why alliances are formed in the first place and what purpose they serve in their sphere of influence. Additionally, he comes up with an alternative theory, which he called the “balance of threat theory” that serves as an alternative to the balance of power theory.³ Although, these theories are relatively similar they do have a few distinguishable characteristics; Walt states that the balance of power theory occurs when there is an imbalance of power and states create alliances against the strongest state.⁴ However, Walt’s theory on the balance of threat believes that states create alliances when there is an imbalance of threat and alliances are created against the most threatening state.⁵

Conversely, although Walt’s theory of balance of threat is an important addition to International Relations theory, mainly because no other author explores the notion of ‘threats’ as having a major impact on alliance building, Walt has often been criticized for oversimplifying bandwagoning. Author Randall Schweller, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, and writer of the academic journal titled “Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State back in” (which we will get back to later) argues that “...profit rather than security drives alliance choices, there is no reason to expect that states will be threatened or cajoled to climb aboard the bandwagon; they do so willingly.”⁶ This determines that states will join alliances primarily for ‘gain’ and what they will be attaining from the alliance in the end; this serves to contradict Walt who argues in his definition that “...bandwagoning refers to alignment with the source of danger,”⁷ suggesting that states will join alliances mainly out of fear.

For this thesis, Stephen Walt’s work provides a good source of integration when referring to the balance of threat theory however, when referring to the balance of power, Walt’s source should not be used since Walt’s suggesting is that his theory, should be regarded as an updated of the balance of power. However, his book although

³ Walt, Stephen M. *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1987. Print. 27

⁴ Walt, 265

⁵ Walt, 265.

⁶ Schweller, Randall L. "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In." *International Security* 19.1 (1994): 72-107. JSTOR. Web. 09 Apr. 2015. P79

⁷ Walt, 17

oversimplifying bandwagoning, does provide some good examples of bandwagoning and makes a good comparison between the difference in the balance of threat and bandwagoning. Although, if we want to observe how alliances were formed under bandwagoning more focus must be placed on the works of Randall Schweller.

Randall Schweller claims how the bandwagoning theory has been wholly underappreciated, and that bandwagoning as a theory has far more common practice than authors such as Stephen Walt give it credit for. Moreover, besides critiquing Walt, Schweller continues to explain that bandwagoning is not the polar opposite of the theories of balancing of power or balances of threat, in which he continues to clarify the various different reasons as to why bandwagoning is a logical move for countries to make.⁸ The journal will prove to be an excellent source when it comes to analyzing which of the two alliances were formed or had elements of bandwagoning. Likewise, because Schweller is one of the few authors who argues that bandwagoning is by far a more common practice than other authors give it credit for, it is a unique piece of literature too apply to the thesis.

What Schweller's source nevertheless lacks is a substantial argumentative standpoint from the balance of power. Although heavily critiquing Walt's interpretation of bandwagoning, Schweller does not provide any definition for the balance of power, in which he instead opts to create his own theory.⁹ Similarly, Walt does the same and opts to replace his theory of the balance of threat as the "new" balance of power theory - thus neither author can provide a good argument for the balance of power. However, this thesis will argue that alliances can be formed under each of the different theories, as opposed to one theory being the dominant basis. Accordingly, Michael Sheehan, author of the book "The Balance of Power: History & Power" and professor of International Relations at the University of Aberdeen¹⁰ will be included, in order for the three different theories to be explained which is what this thesis aims to argue for (that each of these theories provides a reason to why states would join or leave an alliance).

⁸ Schweller, Randall L. "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In." *International Security* 19.1 (1994): 72-107. JSTOR. Web. 09 Apr. 2015

⁹ (*Balance of interest, which will not be discussed in this thesis, mainly because it fits into the previous definition that the author gave regarding bandwagoning*)

¹⁰ Sheehan, Michael. *The Balance of Power: History and Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.

Michael Sheehan explores the different definition and interpretations of the balance of power theory throughout history all the way up till the end of the 20th century. The book is an important source as it provides different ways in which the balance of power was interpreted, including during the Cold War. This should give a clear explanation under what type of definition NATO, and SEATO were formed, as well as an explanation as to why alliances which were previously interpreted as being created under the “balance of power”, were later further investigated and categorized under Walt’s balance of threat or under the bandwagoning theory. Additionally, the author also goes into great detail when it comes to explaining bandwagoning, which the author perceives as an alternative to the balance of power, and can thus provide additional information on bandwagoning that will aid the argument and development of the thesis.

On the other hand, the book also has a few negative aspects, in which the author does give a definition of the balance of power, however he gives a number of them (this is not entirely wrong), though it does not provide a concrete and decisive definition, which in turn makes it hard for the reader to have a clear definition of the balance of power, (in the thesis a specific definition will be chosen to argue what the thesis wishes to defend). Furthermore, while the author is highly successful in going through the history of balance of power, and giving multiple different definitions of the balance of power, when focusing on alternative theories to the balance of power, he only focuses on bandwagoning and makes no mention of the balance of threat. While bandwagoning is heavily explored (both in favor of Schweller’s arguments and against), the author fails to explore the balance of threat as a relative alternative to Walt’s theory - and although citing Walt multiple times throughout his text, the balance of threat is not explored. Thus, while Sheehan’s work can be cited in conjunction with Schweller’s work (and as mentioned earlier a combination of definitions can be presented) - when it comes to the balance of threat Sheehan provides no relation to the balance of power.

The three authors have all provided a different definition in regards to the balance of threat, balance of power and bandwagoning which will be used to explain why the alliances were formed, and under which theory they were created. In Chapter 1 of this thesis the different definitions per theory (that will be used throughout the thesis) will be explained and presented by the writer of the thesis. However, theory alone cannot explain why the

alliances were created, and thus we also need to look at the practical reasons for their creation and either success or failure.

The two books that will be focused on when looking at NATO will be “NATO’s anxious birth” by Andre Staercke and multiple other authors¹¹, as well as “NATO divided, NATO united: The Evolution of an Alliances” by Lawrence Kaplan¹². These two books should form the backbone when it comes to arguing why NATO survived. “NATO’s anxious birth” focuses on the how the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came into existence and the problems that it faced with each of the original member nations. For example, the American government coming out of its isolationist policy with the Truman doctrine, but facing reluctance to place ground troops in Europe; likewise Portugal joining NATO while at the time still being a dictatorship. “NATO divided NATO united” on the other hand, focuses mainly on different events and issues that formed the alliances, and why it is still applicable in today’s ever changing world, as well as looking at the different events that came after the organization’s creation (this offers a more global and all inclusive source that serves to explain NATO’S survival and success).

Both books are successful and work well as complimentary items to each other. For example, while “NATO’s anxious birth” solely focuses on its origins which gives good insight into the organizations beginnings, especially due to the fact that the other co-authors of the book all had a different role within NATO (as ambassadors, or statesmen etc.) - Kaplan’s work begins by continuing on from its creation and focusing on the different events that followed suit - thus providing a clear timeline from the start to finish. Moreover, both books highlight the role of the US which is important when looking at their particular role within the organization. However, while these two works do provided a good overview and work well together there are some ample differences.

Both Kaplan’s and Staercke’s work have numerous shortcomings and do at various points clash with one another. Staercke’s biggest shortcoming is that it lacks an

¹¹ Staercke, André De, Paul Van Campen, Theodore C. Achilles, Clark M. Clifford, Claude Delmas, Olafur Egilsson, Sven Henningsen, Nicolas Hommel, Albano Nogueira, Egidio Ortona, Escott Reid, Alexander Rendel, Olav Riste, Baron Robnert Rothschild, Andre De Staercke, and Grethe Vaerno. *NATO's Anxious Birth: The Prophetic Vision of the 1940s*. Ed. Nicholas Sherwen. New York: St. Martin's, 1985. Print.

¹² Kaplan, Lawrence S. *NATO Divided, NATO United: The Evolution of an Alliance*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004. Print.

in-depth focus on why the alliance survived after it had been created. Additionally, while one of its strong points was that it was written by former members of NATO, it can also be seen as having a certain bias to it, hence suggesting the act of sugar coating certain events, which may have been more harmful than anticipated. Kaplan's work on the other hand is critical of most events within NATO, which is helpful when evaluating certain events that harmed the organization, but it does not focus on NATO's origins or foundation which presents an important aspect to the organizations survival.

However, with both books the thesis should be able to look at why the alliances survived, the role of the US in Europe, and should further determine if the formation of the alliances was motivated by the balance of power or by the balance of threat. This brings us to the last section regarding SEATO.

Similarly to NATO, when focusing on SEATO the main focus will be placed on two books. The first piece of academic work regarding SEATO is from the book, "To Cage the Red Dragon: SEATO and the Defense of Southeast Asia 1955-1965" written by Damien Fenton¹³ who explores the major military, diplomatic and geo-political consequences of SEATO before its eventual failure. The other piece of academic work "SEATO, the Failure of an Alliance Strategy" written by Leszek Buszynski¹⁴ also focuses on the diplomatic and geopolitical consequence of SEATO from its beginning all the way to its end. Although, both authors explain the events surrounding SEATO and the impact it had on the surrounding region, the authors tend to disagree with one another on a number of key issues.

Even though, both authors agree that SEATO had an impact on the region and was important when it came to looking at US foreign policy in the area, the authors disagree on how big the impact truly was. For example, while Fenton argues that up until 1965 SEATO had a very large impact on the region and determined US foreign policy, Buszynski on the other hand argues that the impact of SEATO was relatively small throughout its years starting from its existence. Furthermore, unlike Fenton who viewed SEATO as a major military alliance, arguing how although it did not have an integrated military structure like

¹³ Fenton, Damien. *To Cage the Red Dragon: SEATO and the Defence of Southeast Asia, 1955-1965*. Singapore: NUS, 2012. Print.

¹⁴ Buszynski, Leszek. *SEATO, the Failure of an Alliance Strategy*. Singapore: Singapore UP, 1983. Print.

NATO, it was still extremely effective and prepared to fight communism in the region - Buszynski to the contrary disagrees and instead focuses on how the SEATO alliance was a massive failure to begin with. Buszynski does this by mainly pointing out the major shortcomings and crises SEATO failed to resolve, primarily because of the division within SEATO, the Laotian crisis (which partially began because of the creation of SEATO), as well as the US failure in Vietnam and its retreat from the South East Asia region. Both books provide a good overview of the organization, however, both also have their limitations.

The books work well in combination with one another, however, apart they do have a few shortcomings. Fenton further only focuses on the downfall of the organization in the final chapter of his book, hence providing very little insight into why it eventually failed; Buszynski alternatively emphasizes SEATO's failure much more, but does not focus on the positive aspects that the organization brought – which urges the thesis to turn to the work of Fenton that is needed to compensate for this. Furthermore, both authors tend to disagree about the impact of some of the events that prescribed the organization's failure; consequently, when the authors do agree on the impact of an event, considerable conclusions can be made on the way a certain event impacted the organization.

In conclusion these seven academic works all provide a good insight that is needed for the thesis. The first three academic works (those of Stephan Walt, Micheal Sheeman and Randall L. Schweller) provide the theoretical framework in which the thesis will be based on and further provide some insight in the future of US created multilateral alliances. The following four academic (Fenton, Buszynski, Kaplan, Staercke) literatures focus on the two different alliances that the US has created, with each author looking at the role of the US, how each of the organizations began, and the struggles that each organization faced - either resulting in the organization disappearing or surviving.

“US created Multilateral Alliances, Why they succeed in Europe but fail in East Asia: Evaluating NATO, and SEATO”

(Relevance note)

The thesis “US created Multilateral Alliances, why they work in Europe but fail in East Asia: Evaluating NATO, and SEATO”, will focus on two different types of military organizations/defense institutions that have been created by the US and look at why NATO in Europe has survived, while SEATO in East/South-East Asia has failed. The research of this thesis will be focusing on International Relations theory, as well as the different frameworks and institutions by which each of the organizations were set up. However, to understand why this thesis is important we need to place the question in a general context.

To help a wider audience understand the importance of this thesis, the question will be placed in a general context. With NATO and SEATO being two of the most important multilateral alliance that the US has had during the Cold War (and for some time after), it is important to analyze their success and failure in order to understand how the US will approach multilateral alliances in the future. Furthermore, by analyzing the different alliances through different International Relations theories (in this thesis those of the balance of power, balance of threat and bandwagoning) and looking at the framework and institutions that were set up with each of the alliances, we can observe how the US might approach future multilateral alliance building, and under what type of international theory, alliances created by the US have been successful. With this in mind we can form a more general question about the thesis.

If we were to place the thesis in a general question it would read, “Is NATO a unique institution and will US attempts to create future multilateral alliances in East Asia be successful?” Placed in this context the thesis will look at what is unique about NATO, can multilateral alliances only be created in Europe and if, because of previous attempts at creating a multilateral alliances in East Asia have failed, will it result in the US focusing instead on bi-lateral alliances like the ones with Japan, South Korea, the Philippines etc. However, the question remains why is this relevant?

With the rise of China and the increase of tension between Europe and Russia, many countries rely on the US for leadership and military power. What is interesting however is that in Europe the US main show of force is through NATO; while in East Asia it is mainly through bilateral alliances. By conducting research on previous alliances in East Asia and focusing on NATO as an institution, we can determine how the US will approach future conflicts in different regions of the world, and how it will maintain/create alliances in those areas. It is important to understand future US foreign policy in different areas of the world, and how they will respond to what they see as threats to their national security. Finally, by placing the alliances in the context of the International Relations theory, we can also determine if an alliance will be successful, depending on what type of theory it is created under.

The research will cover the two different defense organizations, as well as research on the three different International Relations theories (those of balance of power, balance of threat and bandwagoning). In the first chapter when researching all three theories, focus will be placed on how academics define the theories and how they are categorized. Then once put together to form a single definition, the two-defense organizations will be placed in the context of each of the three theories. For example, one of the expected outcomes is that the US approached NATO under the balance of power - however one difference may be that NATO's European members joined the alliance under the balance of threat. Furthermore, from this we can conclude how strong the alliances are in International Relations theory, and why they might have failed. However, although theory might conclude as to why some organizations were set up and under what theory they failed, the practical side of each of the alliances must also be taken into account -and this will be explored in the following three chapters.

The next chapter will focus on NATO and why it is one of the few alliance organizations created by the US that has survived. Although, looking at the conclusions that were found from International Relations theory in chapter one, this chapter will focus on the more practical side of things. Using information from academic sources, primary sources (such as the NATO treaty), as well as interviews from academics that work for NATO and at the NATO headquarters. This chapter is expected to find the more practical reasons why the institution has survived, even though having faced multiple obstacles in its way. Practical reasons including aspects such as its military structure, bureaucracy, institutionalization and events etc. that will all be covered and explained in

detail throughout the chapter. Next, the role of the US will be explored to see how much influence it has had on the organization and if without it NATO might have failed. Finally, the reason why NATO will be looked at first before SEATO is because it has survived. Thus, we can look at what some of the differences are between the NATO and SEATO. Consequently, it is logical that SEATO will be observed in Chapter three.

The multilateral alliance SEATO will be looked at in Chapter three and will mainly focus on the success that it had in the first half of its lifetime, until its eventual failure in the second half of its lifetime. It will look at the conclusions that were discovered in Chapter one as to why theoretically the organization failed as a whole, and will focus on why SEATO failed from a practical level. Furthermore, it will also look at the different challenges that SEATO faced as opposed to NATO - as well as the role of US in the organization. Finally, similar to the previous chapter, primary sources such as the treaty of Manila (the treaty that established SEATO) will be evaluated, as well as secondary sources from academic literature which should all combine to form a conclusion as to why the organization failed. After this the thesis will look at the final chapter in which it will focus comparing and contrasting both NATO and SEATO finally coming to a general conclusion as to why NATO survived, while SEATO failed.

The final chapter of the thesis will focus on NATO and SEATO and why NATO survived while SEATO failed. Although this chapter will follow a similar structure as the previous two, it will do so by comparing and contrasting each category. It will start by comparing the theoretical framework in which both organizations were created under. Additionally an evaluation of the treaty and its military and civilian structure will be done. This will be followed by looking at particular historic events that unfolded in the world, which may have had a major political impact on one organization, while being very limited to the other, and finally coming to a general conclusion. Since this chapter is mostly focusing on comparing and contrasting the two organizations, most of the same sources that were used in the previous three chapters will be used to come up with a proper conclusion for the thesis. On that note, this concludes the relevance note and gives an outline to how the research will be conducted, what sources will be used, and what the preliminary conclusions are.

Chapter 1-

The balance of power, the balance of threat and bandwagoning: Why nations join different alliances.

To understand why some alliances succeeded while others failed, we need to focus on why alliances form in the first place and what criteria draws different nations to co-operate with one another. Currently (in the world of academia) there are three forms of alliance creation; the balance of power, bandwagoning theory and a more recent interpretation, the balance of threat. For the purpose of this thesis it is important to come to a common definition for each theory, in order to attain a concrete definition to better understand why some alliance fail, while others survive. In this chapter we will focus on the three different theories as to why states join or leave alliances, followed by a definitive definition for each theory that will be utilized throughout the thesis. Once a definition has been established, the theories will be applied to each alliance and will then come to a general conclusion, adhering to each alliance's survival or failure – in which the thesis will begin the most common international theory of the balance of power.

The balance of power has been at the forefront of attempting to explain why certain countries join alliances. Michael Sheenan looks at this by reflecting on the historic use of the term balance of power in academic literature. He eventually comes to a general conclusion that the definition of the balance of power has changed throughout history, and presents multiple different definitions for the balance of power theory. Other authors have tried to do the same, such as Stephen Walt who attempts to do this in his book "The Origins of Alliances" by theorizing that the balance of power is when states balance against a threatening opponent, as he explains, "If balancing is the dominant tendency, then threatening states will provoke others to align against them...in a balancing world...strong states may be valued as allies because they have much to offer their partners, but they must take particular care to avoid appearing aggressive."¹⁵ For example, with the creation of NATO when individual states felt threatened by the more aggressive Soviets, they joined the NATO alliance led by the

¹⁵ Walt, 28

United States. Michael Sheehan is in accord with this statement by asserting that “NATO, in fact, far from being an example of collective security, was a classic example of realist balance of power politics;”¹⁶ nonetheless, although Walt suggests the balance of power is key to the initial formation of alliances, he eventually comes to the conclusion that alliances are formed under the balance of threat (which will be discussed later). Sheehan, as opposed to Walt, disagrees with Walt’s conclusion and still theorizes that most alliances are formed under the balance of power. Thus, to distinguish whether an alliance was formed under the balance of power, two of the definitions which Sheehan purposes will be combined to form a common definition that will be used throughout the thesis. Sheehan’s first definition to explain the balance of power states that it is when “... a state allies itself with the weaker of the two possible partners, because it recognizes that the other may finally prove the greater menace.”¹⁷ With the second definition being “a particular distribution of power among the states of that system such that no single state and no existing alliance has an “overwhelming” or preponderant” amount of power.”¹⁸ The reason for the merging of the two definitions for the purpose of this thesis is because the first definition explains one of the most important key factors which distinguishes the balance of power from the theory of bandwagoning, and demonstrates that states join alliances due to this aspect of perceived threat of a ‘greater menace’. Likewise, the second definition envelopes the generally accepted characteristic of the balance of power, that involves the principle of ‘power’, which stands as a significant domain of this theory. This definition will be used primarily because it is a definition created from the combination of all previous definitions given by other authors, and put together as a single definition by Sheehan. With the definition of the balance of power in place, (which will be used throughout the thesis), we now turn our attention to the other two theories, starting with the theory of bandwagoning.

The second theory, suggested in International Relations theory, is bandwagoning. Although often claimed as rare by various authors¹⁹, there are some examples of this theory in practice, such as when Germany tried to coerce the British into joining their alliance in World War One by building a bigger navy than the British (although, this eventually failed). Another example, is when President Bush declared after the 9/11

¹⁶ Sheehan, 161

¹⁷ Sheehan, 23

¹⁸ Sheehan, 4

¹⁹ Walt, 263, Schweller, 74/76

terrorist attack, "You are either with us or against us"²⁰, threatening that any other nation who was not with the US risked facing harsh consequences and assertive US action, in which there was this tangible feeling of separation between states, created by 'The Axis of Evil'. However, bandwagoning has been a hotly debated theory, mainly because finding a single definition has been difficult and thus resulted in some authors claiming it is a rare occurrence, while others claim it as being far more common. For example, Walt comes to the conclusion that bandwagoning is a far less common practice, while the balancing of threat theory was far more common.²¹ Nevertheless, other authors such as Randall Schweller, author of "Bandwagoning for Profit" has counter argued Walt with the phrase, "I adopt a different definition of bandwagoning-one that accords with common usage of the term-and argue that it is far more widespread than Walt suggests."²²

Due to the broad definition of bandwagoning and the large disagreement between the two authors, a combined definition from both Walt and Schweller will be used, in order to give a balanced and wholly perspective. Walt's definition states that "...bandwagoning was almost always confined to especially weak and isolated states"²³ This suggestion by Walt gives a clear picture of the characteristics of states that participate in bandwagoning. On the contrary, the definition by Schweller explains why states join alliances in the form of bandwagoning which is that "bandwagoning rarely involves costs and is typically done in expectation of gain;"²⁴ one is able to evaluate the two different sides to each definition, yet both of these definitions will be used correspondingly, since they both bring in aspects of bandwagoning that are significant when it comes to state alliances. With both these definitions we can clearly identify an alliance which has states that both practice and are likely to bandwagon - thus providing the thesis with the definition for bandwagoning. However, while both authors cannot agree on a common definition on bandwagoning, both do reject the balance of power theory, with Schweller suggesting that "... all sides in the debate have mistakenly

²⁰ "You Are Either with Us or against Us" *CNN*. Cable News Network, Nov. 2001. Web. 22 Mar. 2015. <<http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/11/06/gen.attack.on.terror/>>.

²¹ Walt, 263

²² Schweller, 75

²³ Walt, 263

²⁴ Schweller,93

assumed that bandwagoning and balancing are opposite behaviors..."²⁵ While Walt on the other hand is opting for his own version of the definition, which he labels as the balance of threat.

The balance of threat as opposed to the balance of power has only a slight difference according to Walt. As mentioned before in the literary review, (at the beginning of this thesis) Walt states that the balance of power theory occurs when there is an imbalance of power and states create alliances against the strongest state.²⁶ However, Walt believes that states create alliances when there is an imbalance of threat and alliances are created against the most threatening state.²⁷ This suggests that states respond to threats within their region and may join an alliance even if it may not agree with other member countries, in order to combat the greater threat. A common example would be the CCP (Chinese Communist Party) and the Kuomintang who although fighting a civil war with each other, join an alliance together to fight against the Japanese empire when they invaded to combat the greater "threat". Throughout this thesis Walt's balance of threat theory will be used, and primarily due to the fact that he is the author of the theory itself, his definition will be used throughout without any alterations. His definition of the balance of threat is "...when there is an imbalance of threat (i.e when one state or coalition appears especially dangerous), states will form alliances or increase their internal efforts in order to reduce their vulnerability."²⁸ With this final definition and further clarity on how this thesis will interpret all three theories, we can begin to apply them to the different organizations, beginning with which theory was used by the US to create both NATO and SEATO.

When focusing on the two alliances we cannot ignore the importance of the US in both NATO and SEATO, and how the US approached each of these alliances. It is important to remember that both the approach of the US, as well as its allies may differ completely. For example, while the US may have a balance of power approach, with the purpose of allying with weaker states to combat the great menace, its allies might have joined the US to gain from US action, which it might take against this "menace". In recent history this has proved to be true. According to author Bruno Tertrais, most of the alliances that have been set up by the US were joined by bandwagoning nations - as

²⁵ Schweller, 74

²⁶ Walt, 265

²⁷ Walt, 265.

²⁸ Walt, 263

opposed to nations who either wanted to balance themselves out (either through power or threat). As he states, "... bandwagoning has been the dominant behavior of the majority of states in dealing with the United States and its defense policy since September 11, 2001..."²⁹ Yet, has this been a dominant trend by allied countries when the US tried to form alliances during the Cold War? According to Walt this was true, since the US was a major advocate of bandwagoning, in turn offered weak and isolated nations an incentive to join an alliance.³⁰ Even though officials like Henry Kissinger, who was in favor of balancing alliances to contain the Soviet Union sphere of influence, (thus nations who wanted to stop the spread of Soviet influence) believed that U.S allies were most likely to bandwagon.³¹ This shows that while the US approached multilateral alliance building through the lens of the balance of power, they consequently attracted and offered memberships to countries whom were in all likely cases joining for profit and gain. Furthermore, if the U.S actively pursued bandwagoning (as their foreign policy approach), and thus attracted weak and isolated states, as well as states only wishing to gain from the alliance -if for any reason states could no longer gain from this specific alliance, they would in the most likely case leave it - resulting in the end of such an alliance. However, to observe if this theory is true, we must look at the two different alliances, which are presented in this thesis and find out if the allies of the US approached the alliance through the balance of power, balance of threat or bandwagoning theory, starting with NATO.

NATO, at the time of its creation in 1949 faced an enormous threat from an aggressive Soviet Union, and while the U.S would approach the creation of NATO via the balance of power theory, its European allies would instead join the alliance because of a balance of threat. The reason for this difference is relatively simple. For the US the Soviet Union posed a threat to their influence in Europe, but their approach to NATO would still fall under the balance of power definition. The US allied itself with the weaker and less menacing states (France, Netherlands, and UK), as well as creating an alliance which would prevent a single state from having overwhelming amounts of power (the USSR).

The approach of the European allies to NATO on the contrary to the US balance of power, was a balance of threat approach. Due to the large scale of destruction after

²⁹ Tertrais, Bruno. "The Changing Nature of Military Alliances." *The Washington Quarterly* 27.2 (2004): 133-50. *Project Muse*. Web. 21 Mar. 2015.

³⁰ Walt, 20

³¹ Walt, 20

World War Two, the European nations (not under Soviet control) were unable to properly defend themselves, especially against the large army of the Soviet Union - hence, being far more vulnerable to a communist takeover. Additionally, if we look back at the definition that Walt gave for the balance of threat “when there is an imbalance of threat...states will form alliance in order to reduce their vulnerability”³² it further exemplifies that Europe’s approach to NATO was through the balance of threat. This difference in approach by the US and its allies can also be seen in the second multilateral alliance, SEATO created by the US.

SEATO, which formed on the heels of NATO in 1954, and was quickly followed by CENTO³³, should be categorized as an alliance made up of bandwagoning nations. Similar to NATO, the US approach to SEATO was the same with a balance of power approach intent on creating an alliance in South-East Asia. With the Domino Theory becoming a serious theory (with China becoming Communist in 1949) to the United States, and having fought a major three-year war in Korea against communism, it needed to gather alliances to prevent communism from spreading further. This would suggest why the United States invited nations who may not have had any interest in the alliance from the beginning, but joined to create an intension of profit.

In the 1950’s Thailand, The Philippines, Burma and Pakistan were all the major countries bordering China, and while the US possibly saw aligning with them as an act of balancing against China’s (and later North Vietnam) influence, the other nations saw it as a way of bandwagoning with the US. Referring back to our definition of bandwagoning these nations would both have to be weak and isolated, as well as join SEATO for some sort of gain or profit. In the case of most the nations that eventually joined (those being Thailand, The Philippines, Pakistan, France, and the UK) this was all the case. Although, it will be explored in further detail why these nations were both weak/isolated and willing to join SEATO for gain (in Chapter 3), we can determine that most the countries that joined the alliance were either new, or began to suffer internal struggles - thus having a strong ally to back up their claim would have been of value to these different nations. Furthermore, when only two South East Asia nations joined the

³² Walt, 263

³³ CENTO or the Central Treaty Organization was another similar NATO type organization that was established in 1955 to contain communism in the Middle Eastern Region although it had large scale support from the US it was never formally a member (thus the reason why it will not be discussed in this thesis.)

alliances, the US would not have focused on the actual intent of the other members joining but more of saving SEATO's image. Therefore, although the approach of the US was the same as with NATO, the intent of its member allies was vastly different. Nonetheless, does this different approach between the US and its allies matter when alliances are created and formed? With the simple answer being yes.

Although alliances form under different theories, this also means that alliances fail because of these differences. As this thesis will explore, the theory associated with an organization has a large impact on its survival and failure. For example, under the balance of power (the US approach in both alliances) as defined is an alliance, which is formed when weaker states oppose a specific state from having an overwhelming amount of power. However, what if this balance is tipped and the former state, which might have been on the brink of gaining too much power, is now weak and isolated- what would the purpose of the alliance be? Similarly, under the balance of threat (the US European allies approach to NATO) according to the definition presented is when alliances form to counter the biggest threat. But, what happens when that threat disappears? According to Walt in most cases it should also result in an alliance disappearing as a whole.³⁴ Finally, with bandwagoning as defined as being pursued by weak and isolated states, as well as states who join an alliance when the cost is low and is typically done with an expectation of gain"³⁵ A state will leave an alliance when the opposite happens, when an alliance begins to cost more than it gains, and once states, begin leaving it could mean the end of the alliance as a whole. Thus, what should be considered is that once the theory no longer applies to a certain alliance or changes, it may result in an organization collapsing.

In conclusion to this chapter, a clearly defined definition of all three theories is presented, the different theoretical approaches of both the US and its allies in SEATO and NATO are offered, as well as the reasons why an organizations might fail once this theoretical approach fails or is no longer applicable to an alliances. Although, theory can suggest why an alliance might fail or why it might survive, there are also practical reasons why an organizations is sustained. Hence we begin with looking at the practical reason for NATO's survival.

³⁴ Walt, Stephen. "NATO Owes Putin a Big Thank-You." *Foreign Policy*. Foreign Policy Magazine, 4 Sept. 2014. Web. 08 May 2015.

³⁵ Schweller,93

Chapter 2 –The Survival of NATO

NATO as a military alliance has survived far longer than any alliance in history. Unlike SEATO that collapsed after 20 years or so, the organization still lives on until this day, and has even moved from being a defensive alliance to an offensive military alliance. Nonetheless, why has this organization survived for so many years, and why to this day is it one of the most important military alliances the US has in the world? This chapter will focus on the role of the US in the alliance and the theoretical aspects as to why the organization started; furthermore, this chapter will look at practical reasons for the alliance survival, focusing on the treaties, events and organization of NATO.

With the end of the Second World War, and the increasing tension between the Soviets and the Allies, the United States realized that it needed to balance against Soviet presence in Europe. The USA feared that the USSR would try to conquer most of Western Europe and bring it under its domain, especially after the USSR supported the communist coup that occurred in Czechoslovakia and the Soviets blockaded Berlin. With this fear came the passing of the Vandenberg Resolution in 1948, which allowed the US to join alliances even during peacetime, paving the way for the establishment of NATO.³⁶ From a political perspective this was a huge game change for America, who since 1796 has not had a military alliance during peacetime, and was finally breaking its policy of isolationism.³⁷ From a theoretical perspective, this move was purely a balance of power move to counter the Soviet threat. Moreover as Truman stated in his speech to congress “It is a simple document, but if it had existed in 1914 and 1939, supported by the nations who are represented here today, I believe it would have prevented the acts of aggression which led to two world wars;”³⁸ this statement reinforced the idea that by creating a system of alliance against the Soviet threat it prevented another world war from breaking out, mainly because of a major super power backing smaller weaker nations. (Coinciding with our definition in chapter 1) However, while the US goal might have

³⁶ "The Birth of NATO." *NATO*. NATO, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2015.

³⁷ Staercke, André De. P7

³⁸ Staercke, André De, p8

been a purely balancing one, its European NATO allies viewed the alliance as a way to counter the Soviet threat.

The US European allies, unlike the US approach the alliance from the perspective of the balance of threat (as mentioned before in chapter 1). Being in much closer proximity to the Soviet Union than the US, as well as fearing a large-scale communist invasion the Europeans tried to balance themselves out against the Soviets and with the backing of the US the Europeans felt confident it could. This is further emphasized by the different reasons given as to why European nations joined the NATO alliance. For example, Norway joined the alliance because of a lack of guarantees that it would have received if it had joined the Scandinavian defense association³⁹ - while countries such as Belgium⁴⁰, the Netherlands⁴¹, and Luxembourg⁴² all joined the defense organization only because of a US security guarantee. Another country, which faced much criticism when joining the alliance, was France who faced opposition from the Gaullist movement who saw the move as the US having a strong monopoly of France's armed forces, as well as nuclear capabilities. While the communists in France had a strong national support when France was about to join the alliance they were reluctant to approve of a treaty that could threaten the country from not turning communist. This showed that joining an alliance such as NATO was not just based on security interest but also political interests. However, France eventually joined the alliance out of fear of a re-armed Germany as well as the Soviet threat, especially after the actions that had been taken in Czechoslovakia⁴³ This further promotes Walt's theory of balance of threat, who states that "an imbalance of threat occurs when the most threatening state or coalition is significantly more dangerous than the second most threatening state or coalition. The Degree to which state threatens others is the product of its aggregate power, its geographic proximity, its offensive capability and the aggressiveness of its intentions."⁴⁴ Thus, even though France was untrusting of the US, the aggressiveness/support of the Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia, the fact that the Soviet Union was extremely close from a geopolitical perspective and that the Soviet Union had shown its willingness to use its armed forces

³⁹ Staercke, and Vaerno p87-94

⁴⁰ Staercke and Spaak pg113

⁴¹ Staercke and Van Campen p127

⁴² Staercke and Hommel p140

⁴³ Staercke and Delmas p62

⁴⁴ Walt, 265

to try and gain influence in Europe⁴⁵ made France, as well as these different nations join the NATO alliance. (In France case choosing the weaker and less menacing ally) However, once an alliance had been formed it needed to stay intact for it to be effective, and although theory can only go so far in suggesting why it survived, the practical reasons why the organization survived must also be explored.

With any organization that involves multiple parties a treaty must be established for a legal basis to be formed. Therefore, special focus must be attributed to the treaties, which give them legitimacy. In both the case of NATO, as well as SEATO both documents provide clues as to why it survived or failed. For example, unlike NATO's founding treaty which never mentions a communist threat, and thus has article 5 which states "...an attack on one...(is) an attack on all"⁴⁶ open for interpretation (e.g. an attack does not have to come from a communist country for the treaty to be in effect). SEATO on the other hand has a separate sub-clause, which clarifies the United States interpretation of article 4 that states that "Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack..."⁴⁷ is interpreted by the United States as "The United States of America in executing the present Treaty does so with the understanding that its recognition of the effects of aggression and armed attack and its agreement with reference thereto in Article 4, paragraph 1 apply only to communist aggression..."⁴⁸ This indicates that NATO as a whole has a multi-purpose role, either by intentional or unintentional needs, while SEATO was bound to only respond in case of a communist threat (More on this in Chapter 3). However, besides article 5, the NATO treaty also contains other articles, which give the treaty longer lasting credibility; Article 12 which states "After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or any time thereafter, the Parties shall...consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area..."⁴⁹ This further suggests that the treaty

⁴⁵ For example during the Berlin Blockade of 1948

⁴⁶ "The North Atlantic Treaty." NATO. NATO, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2015.

⁴⁷ "Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Manila Pact);." *The Avalon Project : Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Manila Pact); September 8, 1954*. Yale Law School, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2015.

⁴⁸ Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Manila Pact);." *The Avalon Project*

⁴⁹ The North Atlantic Treaty." NATO. NATO, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2015.

was not only focusing on the Communist threat, but also on any other future threat which may arise within the North Atlantic - giving NATO the unique ability to adapt and change as either the communist threat became greater - or in the latter case completely disappear.

However, the treaty is not the only aspect that kept NATO as an organization surviving. According to Jamie Shea (Deputy Assistant Secretary General for emerging Security Challenges at NATO) NATO has had five aspects, which have kept it together. Those are according to him: The existing foundation, the bureaucratic structure, its multi-functionality, flexibility and values.⁵⁰ While we have already explored how NATO can be flexible and have a multi-purpose functionality due to its treaty, the existing foundation on which it was established is also important, since without it the organization would not have lasted long. According to Jamie Shea, the strong US role in the alliance, as well as the fact that they placed general Eisenhower as the first SACEUR (Supreme Allied Commander Europe) (a man who was both loved and respected for his role during World War Two) gave many European Countries the confidence and support the organization needed.⁵¹ Lawrence Kaplan adds that by having the US create a Medium Term Defense Plan (MDTP), which would expand the defense capabilities of NATO to the Rhine, gave European Nations comfort that the US would intervene with armed soldiers on the ground if an invasion from the Soviet Union were to occur (hence strengthening NATO's foundation more).⁵² Thus, with strong signals of commitment from the US, and a strong general that would lead NATO in Europe, there was no question to US commitments in the area. Nevertheless, although NATO was launched with a strong start, it needed a bureaucratic structure to cement their place in member countries.

This brings us to the second practical reason why the organizations survived, which is mainly due to bureaucracy. Many nations within NATO have some sort of NATO civil building or military organization within their country, which proposes a prolonged interest for them and institutionalizes the organization within a country. For example, Luxembourg is home to the NATO support agency, while the Netherlands is home to the NATO communication and information agency.⁵³ Furthermore, these civilian agencies

⁵⁰ Shea, Jamie. "The Survival of NATO." Personal interview. 16 Mar. 2015.

⁵¹ Shea, "The Survival of NATO"

⁵² Kaplan, P8

⁵³ "NATO Military and Civilian Structure." NATO. NATO, n.d. Web. 03 May 2015.

provide other NATO members with possible jobs for member countries and give countries a sense of importance of what NATO as an organization brings as a whole. Additionally, the military organization and command centers within countries also gives a prolonged interest to governments as it provides both defenses initiatives, jobs, and joint military operations which is beneficial to member states⁵⁴ - especially European Nations who are cutting their defense budget.⁵⁵ Furthermore, by having a bureaucratic structure (within most NATO member nations) allows the presence of the organization to be known, and thus if the organization were to disappear as a whole it would damage each country as well (this is possibly one of the reasons why France although withdrawing its military personnel left its civilian structure in NATO).⁵⁶ Lastly, the establishment of the NATO defense college in September 1998 gave NATO a longer lasting purpose as well – in which according to the NATO review of 1999, the NATO Defense College “...provides a platform for information exchange and consensus-building, and promotes better understanding and cooperation between NATO and our PFP (Partnership for Peace) and Mediterranean partners.”⁵⁷ Therefore, through this defense college NATO had made itself an important actor of military and defense education, both within the NATO structure, as well as outside NATO countries. Additionally, with the creation of the defense college, there also was the establishment of PFP training centers which would help countries outside of NATO’s structure become educated in NATO military doctrine and tactics, as well as provide education for PFP countries who wished to operate in NATO operations.⁵⁸ These training centers which were set up outside of the NATO member countries, including Ukraine, Sweden, Romania, Switzerland and Austria (with the exception of Romania who became a NATO member in 2004), lead to NATO not only becoming an important asset to its member countries, but also for other countries which have their alliances close to that of NATO.⁵⁹ Thus, besides the flexibility of NATO’s mission, and multi-purpose role, its bureaucratic

⁵⁴ For example, Ramstein airbase in Germany provides NATO with transportation capabilities, while in Turkey the Allied Land Command Headquarters provides allies with land capabilities

⁵⁵ However this can be disputed as the US does not want its European Allies to cut their budget

⁵⁶ Shea, “The Survival of NATO”

⁵⁷ Solana, Javier, and Hartmut Olboeter. *NATO Review*. Spring ed. Vol. 1. Brussels, Belgium: NATO Office of Information, 1999. Print. P29

⁵⁸ NATO review, 32

⁵⁹ NATO review, 32

structure has greatly influenced its survival – however, much credit can also be given to the fact that NATO has never faced a major crisis before in its alliance.

Finally, one of the last reasons why NATO survived is due to the fact that it never faced a major crisis before. Although, the organization has been confronted with times of hardship and troubles with certain member states, NATO as Shea claims “...has never faced a so called “meteor” which could threaten the alliances as a whole.”⁶⁰. Although some may point towards France leaving the NATO military command as one of their biggest challenges, nevertheless this in turn revolved out to be a rather beneficial for NATO. According to Kaplan, America no longer had to deal with French obstructionism and because of the panic that occurred when France left the organization, America could use it as an opportunity to encourage other NATO members from increasing their military spending to compensate for the French leaving the organization.⁶¹ Furthermore, Kaplan adds that even though France left the military organization, it still remained heavily involved within the NATO framework. Consequently a major hit towards the organization never happened.⁶² Still, other crises have occurred within NATO but have managed to resolve themselves, such as the Suez Canal crisis between France, the UK and US, the crisis in Bosnia where the US wanted European ground forces while Europe saw it as a civil war and didn’t want to intervene at all. However, throughout all this, the member nations managed to resolve their disputes and put the interest of the organization ahead of their own national interests. This besides its flexibility, multi-functionality, bureaucratic structure has so far allowed the organization to survive as a whole. Bringing us to our conclusions as to why NATO as an organization has survived and if it will survive in the future.

In conclusion, NATO throughout its history has faced many challenges, which could have destabilized the organization, yet it has managed to survive. The strong role of the US, and the fear of a Soviet sphere of influence in Europe (at the beginning of the organization’s history) helped create NATO and balance itself out against the Soviet threat. Furthermore, with strong US leadership taking charge of the organization and a willingness by the US to intervene if a Soviet invasion occurred with the MDTP, it bought a strong start to the organization. Its European allies saw potential in the organization as

⁶⁰ Shea, “The Survival of NATO”

⁶¹ Kaplan, 34

⁶² Kaplan, 34

it provided them with a strong alternative defense organization, led by a country outside Europe and was supported mainly because of the threat by the Soviet Union. Likewise, its long term survival has largely to do with its long term flexibility and multi-functionality in part due to its treaty, its civilian and military structure, which has largely contributed to cementing the organization in member countries, and finally that it has not faced a damaging event which would have put the organization as a whole in jeopardy. However, to answer the question if such an event will not happen in the future is still highly debatable.

For all of NATO flexibility and multi-functionality many have speculated that NATO would fail in one way or another.^{63,64} According to Jamie Shea, NATO has always faced three major challenges: “The first is American willingness to lead NATO, secondly the challenge is the opposition within Europe itself, and finally if there is an enemy/purpose to NATO...”⁶⁵ The last option has been the argument of many academics, including Walt who in an article in *Foreign Policy* commented on how the resurgence of Russia has been a blessing for NATO, where he quotes “If I were really cynical, I’d suspect some bureaucrats at NATO headquarters in Brussels are secretly glad about the crisis in Ukraine...NATO’s survival after the Cold War remains something of an anomaly. Alliances normally arise in response to threats, and many...alliances collapsed quickly once the external danger was gone.”⁶⁶ We will have to wait and see if NATO can survive these future challenges, however, what is clear is that unlike SEATO, or the South East Treaty Organization, NATO has firmly implemented itself in its member states, and many of the alliance’s members will still rely on the organization as a security guarantee for the future.

⁶³ Hanson, Victor. "The End of NATO." *Hoover Institution*. Hoover Institution, 12 Nov. 2014. Web. 06 May 2015.

⁶⁴ "Nato Must Rediscover Its Purpose, or It Will End up Losing a War." *The Spectator*. The Spectator, 03 Sept. 2014. Web. 06 May 2015.

⁶⁵ Shea "The Survival of NATO"

⁶⁶ Walt, Stephen. "NATO Owes Putin a Big Thank-You."

Chapter 3- the failure of SEATO

The South East Asia Treaty Organization or SEATO as it is commonly referred to was a similar organization to NATO with a similar purpose to stop a communist threat from occurring within its alliance borders. However, unlike NATO the organization failed to make a deep lasting impact on the geopolitical scenario in the area, and was ultimately disbanded in 1977. So why did the organization fail and why did NATO survive? This chapter will focus on the SEATO, the theoretical reasons for the establishment of SEATO, the role of the US, the treaty and structure of SEATO and finally the events and geography of the organization before it was eventually disbanded.

Already briefly being explored in Chapter 1, SEATO came into full action after China became a communist nation, at the end of the Chinese civil war. With the ensuing panic caused by the domino theory and the start of the Korean War, the US began looking for alliances within the region as a way to prevent the spread communism in the area, and maintain their influence in the region. According to author John Addis "...American policy at the time was expansionist in the sense of being concerned to expand American influence to areas where that influence had not been dominant before."⁶⁷ This suggests that America was balancing themselves against the spread of communist influence. Furthermore, with the 1954 Geneva Accords, which split up French-Indochina into four separate countries (Cambodia, Laos, North communist Vietnam and South Vietnam), the US believed that the treaty (which they themselves did not ratify) allowed for a Communist foothold to be established in the region, which according to Eisenhower and Dulles would spread across the region.⁶⁸ The US assumed that if it wanted to stop the spread of communism throughout South and South East Asia they would have to set up a contingency plan- in this case SEATO.⁶⁹

To understand why the alliance failed, we need to focus on why nations joined it in the first place. As mentioned before in chapter 1 the US was attempting to balance against the communist threat, while the other member nations saw it as an opportunity to legitimize their government/presence in the region, and needed a superpower to

⁶⁷ Addis, John. "Indochina: An Arena of Conflict." *The Balance of Power in East Asia*. Ed. Michael Leifer. New York: St. Martin's, 1986. 97-106. Print. P99

⁶⁸ Fenton, 25

⁶⁹ Addis, 99

quell their internal difficult (either through military or financial aid). Unlike in the case of NATO where the alliances joined because of a common threat shared among its individual members, SEATO members looked upon their own interest's first by whats happening here ? bandwagoning with the US. For example, The Philippines had only been granted independence by the treaty of manila in 1946, eight years before the creation of SEATO.⁷⁰ Meaning that the state was still fairly weak and trying to consolidate its power - possibly needing to rely on US support in the region to keep it from collapsing. Furthermore, the country had faced a massive communist insurgency between the 1940's and 1950's which through much struggle they eventually defeat (in same year that SEATO was created).

Thailand, on the other hand, had gone through multiple government changes and rulers, was facing a large communist insurgency in its borders, and was extremely concerned about the developments that were happening in the region of Indochina. Thus, it needed the help of the US to resupply its armed forces, and be a protectorate of the country.⁷¹ Those reasons made both The Philippines and Thailand weak and isolated as well as looking to gain help from the US by joining SEATO.

France, which was left weak and isolated in South East Asia after it had lost huge influence in the region due to the Geneva accord, believed that SEATO would allow them to maintain a strong regional, military and cultural role in the countries that had been created. Additionally, France saw SEATO as a way for them to re-enter South East Asia in the future.⁷² Therefore, following the conditions of a bandwagoning that nations bandwagon when they are "...weak and isolated"⁷³ as well as when there is "...expectation of gain"⁷⁴

Besides the three main players in South East Asia, the other members of the organization (those being the UK, Pakistan, Australia and New Zealand) all joined for a variety of different personal reasons, while the US looked upon the alliance as a balancing foundation to fight communism, the other nations outside the scope of the

⁷⁰ Phillipines and United States. U.S Department of States. Bureau of Consular Affairs. *Travel.state.gov*. U.S Department of States, n.d. Web. 23 Mar. 2015. <<http://travel.state.gov/content/travel/english/legal-considerations/international-treaties-agreements/bilateral-consular-conventions/philippines-treaty.html>>.

⁷¹ Fenton, 107-108

⁷² Fenton 103,106

⁷³ Walt 263,

⁷⁴ Schweller, 93

region saw it as a personal way of keeping their own influence and interests in the region. This major difference between NATO and SEATO is one of the main reasons why the organization failed, however the geographical location and the territory, which was defined under the SEATO treaty, also had a large contributing factor to the demise of SEATO.

When the US began to try and create SEATO it sent out invitations to multiple countries asking to join the alliance, especially in South and South East Asia to give it more legitimacy. In all, they only managed to only get two countries from South East Asia and only one country from South Asia. Although this wasn't necessarily a major setback for the creation of the alliance in general it would show that it wasn't as united as the US hoped it would be.⁷⁵ In South East Asia, Thailand and the Philippines still represented a large part of South East Asia territory. Furthermore, French Indochina had been split up into 4 separate countries (all which would become part of the SEATO protectorate states with the exception of North Vietnam), it still contained a large French force which would be needed if it wanted to contain the spread of communism in those areas. Thus having France in the alliance was imperative for it to be successful. Furthermore, in South Asia, while Pakistan itself was not exactly the most suitable candidate for SEATO its province of East Pakistan (known today as Bangladesh) did provide SEATO with a strong base of member countries, which would support SEATO. Thus, the geographic location of the member countries was not necessarily a major downfall for the organization when it was set up, but it did not represent a major success either. However, what the US possibly never envisioned was the rapidly changing political environment that would change the geopolitical outlook of the region as a whole.

With the creation of SEATO also came the mandate in which SEATO would be allowed to operate in. Unlike in NATO where it was explicitly stated where member nations could operate and invoke article 5 (which was in an allied country, or a territory belonging to a NATO member above the Coptic line.)⁷⁶ SEATO took a different approach, fearing that the communists would move in on the weak and isolated states of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, (which were not allowed to join any military alliance according to the Geneva accord) SEATO member countries made them observer states,

⁷⁵ Buszynski, 19

⁷⁶ "The North Atlantic Treaty." NATO. NATO, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2015.

which in turn allowed their treaty mandate to expand to those areas.⁷⁷ Hence, if a communist attack were to ever occur on the borders of Cambodia, Laos or South Vietnam SEATO would be able to intervene militarily in a conflict. However, while the US possibly imagined a large-scale Chinese/North Vietnamese army crossing the border and taking over countries. The organization never predicted massive subversive action occurring in its (protectorate) states and hence never prepared for in SEATO's founding treaty.

The treaty of any organization is the foundation that is meant to keep the organization as stable as possible - nevertheless this was not the case for SEATO. The US envisioned SEATO as a major defense organization which was meant to prevent a communist invasion from taking over nations within the region. Thus, the treaty of SEATO was envisioned and created as such. For example, as mentioned before in Chapter 2, according to Yale Law, the United States was under the impression that article 4 section 1 of the treaty would only involve an armed aggression by a communist actor as opposed to the NATO treaty, which left it open to interpretation.⁷⁸ However, there are also other sections of this article, which made SEATO's foundation relatively weak and not flexible to deal with different and multiple crises.

While the SEATO treaty focused heavily on an armed communist attack within its borders, and according to author Leszek Buszynski article 4 of the SEATO treaty does allow for an armed response after open communist aggression.⁷⁹ The treaty never focused on more subversive measures, which could be taken by communist or other groups. In those cases of subversive action, Article 4 section 2 and article 4 section 3 would be implemented and a response could be formed. However, these two articles can also contradict each other and prevent a response from happening, thus by combining both sections made taking action within their treaty mandate almost impossible. For instance, if a nation under the SEATO treaty was facing subversive action by another group within its country (which was non-violent) Article 4 section 2 called for consultation with other members of SEATO to provide a common response to the

⁷⁷ "Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), 1954 - 1953-1960 - Milestones." *Office of the Historian*. US Department of State, n.d. Web. 12 May 2015.

⁷⁸ Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Manila Pact);" *The Avalon Project*

⁷⁹ Buszynski, 72

threat.⁸⁰ Yet, Article 4 section 3 of the treaty states that “...no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned”⁸¹ Meaning that without unanimous vote or the permission for one of the countries to intervene SEATO could not take any action. This proved to be a fatal part in the treaty of SEATO while its undeveloped structure didn't help the organization much either.

With a flawed treaty in place the organization of SEATO wasn't any better off, SEATO as an organization had a heavy under-developed structure. Unlike NATO, which believed in an integrated military command structure to coordinate its units, SEATO was more focused on political dialogue and joint military exercise. The US, according to Richard Butwell, believed itself to carry the brunt of the military activities within the region and therefore a joint military command structure was not necessary to be set up.⁸² Furthermore, the council of ministers, which is the top organ of the SEATO organization, is seen according to Butwell, as nothing more than a symbol of cooperation between the alliances.⁸³ Additionally, as the author notes due to this lack of any form of military structure, SEATO was not flexible to adapt to crisis such as in Vietnam and Laos, where large overpowering force could not be used to solve a major crisis of insurgencies and subversive tactics.⁸⁴

The SEATO alliance arguable faced their first test as an organization with the crisis in Laos. With the country heading for a civil war, the US attempted to have SEATO intervene militarily in the region - however other members of SEATO, the most prominent of those being Great Britain refused to support such action. Additionally, the organization was completely caught off guard by the crisis and was thus unprepared for the subversive action that was taking place when the crisis occurred in 1959. Furthermore, the Laotian government, fearing a communist intervention if SEATO did intervene within the region never granted SEATO approval that it needed according to

⁸⁰ Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Manila Pact); " *The Avalon Project*

⁸¹ Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Manila Pact); " *The Avalon Project*

⁸² Butwell, Richard. "The Institutional Growth of the South East Asian Treaty Organisation: Circumstance of the Changes." *Asian Studies* 3.2 (1965): 377-90. *Asian Studies*. Asian Studies, 2014. Web. 13 May 2015. P377

⁸³ Butwell, p379

⁸⁴ Butwell, p378

Article 4 section 3.⁸⁵ Despite this issue, SEATO did develop a military assistance plan (known as plan 5) which was approved by all SEATO members and was meant to support the Laos government army in their fight against the communist, by providing “air support, communications, psychological warfare and other special operations”⁸⁶ This plan according to author Damien Fenton would have sufficed allowing for SEATO to play a role in the conflict, and circumventing Article 4 section 3.⁸⁷

When tensions finally exploded in 1960 and the prime minister was overthrown in a coup, direct intervention appeared to be the only solution for SEATO. Plan 5 was scrapped and the US and Thailand looked towards its allies to start direct military intervention. Britain on the other hand was completely against the notion of direct military intervention with the British Ambassador to Laos stating “there has been an absolutely central and fundamental difference of opinion between the American and ourselves on the Laotian policy.”⁸⁸ Furthermore according to David R. Devreux (author of the paper “Britain, SEATO and the Threat of a Regional war in Laos, 1960-1963”) the British saw it as a local civil war which could expand to a larger conflict, while the US saw it as a proxy war.⁸⁹ This caused the British to look for a diplomatic solution, while the US tried to convince it to allow for SEATO action. However, by the time a compromise had been reached the crisis was over. Nevertheless, this divide resulted in the US and Thailand unable to take military action with the “US Office of State” stating, “since SEATO was created to act in circumstances such as that now existing in Laos but has not acted, it casts doubt not only on its own credibility on the reliability of the United States as its originator...SEATO becomes a means by which restraint is import on us by our allies.”⁹⁰

The failure of SEATO to act in this crisis directly resulted in a number of consequences, which destroyed the organization credibility. Thailand which had been most affected by the crisis in Laos began to doubt Britain and France. The US realizing

⁸⁵ Buszynski, p73

⁸⁶ Fenton, p165

⁸⁷ Fenton p163-172

⁸⁸ Nick White, “Macmillan, Kennedy and the Key West meeting: Its Significance for the Laotian Civil War and Anglo-American relations” in *Civil Wars* (Vol. 2, no. 2), Summer 1999, p. 37.

⁸⁹ Devreux, David R. "Britain, SEATO and the Threat of a Regional War in Laos, 1960-63." [Http://www.vietnamconf.org/program.htm](http://www.vietnamconf.org/program.htm). Proc. of The Vietnam Experience, Victoria College, Houston. Vietnam Conference, 13 June 2013. Web. 13 May 2015.

⁹⁰ The Laos Crisis 1960-1963- Milestones." *Office of the Historian*. US Department of State, n.d. Web. 12 May 2015.

Thailand's worry began to focus on unilateral action in South Vietnam⁹¹ as a way for ratifying against the organizations failure in Laos and to show Thailand it was dedicated to the organization and the treaty.⁹² Furthermore, the US also realizing SEATO's ineffectiveness comprehended it could overcome Article 4 of the treaty, if South Vietnam made a separate bilateral treaty with the United States, which it eventually did in November 1961.⁹³ Additionally, the US began creating bi-lateral agreements with Thailand for its protection - thus SEATO's collective response was no longer needed in those cases.⁹⁴ With the US bypassing its own organization and its increase in activity in Vietnam the organization was ready to collapse.

The Vietnam War was the final nail in the coffin for SEATO. The US used the SEATO treaty mandate to legitimize their claims towards their military action against North Vietnam however, it did receive large-scale condemnation from the other member states. France had just lost much of its offensive capabilities in South East Asia after having most of its troops relocated and fighting in the civil war in Algeria. After losing and surrendering the territory, president Charles de Gaulle did not have the motivation to begin another war altogether, and although not withdrawing from the organization it removed most of its military personal from any SEATO activity in 1965.⁹⁵ Pakistan soon followed after, withdrawing from the organization all together in 1973 after SEATO failed to help against the war with India and the loss of East Pakistan.⁹⁶ Finally, British opposition to the War in Vietnam resulted in them removing their military troops from the region as well. With the three main military powers gone (besides the US), SEATO slowly moved into obscurity, the US still used it throughout the Vietnam War to encourage Australia, New Zealand and Thailand to donate troops to the region. However, after the Nixon administration turned towards a policy of "Vietnamization" the US began to pull out of the region, leaving SEATO without the possibility of a major military power within the area, and thus unable to prevent future communist action. With the eventual fall of Saigon in 1975 in Vietnam, the few actively remaining members began to disband the organization. SEATO having been embarrassed for failing to

⁹¹ Which was beginning to face similar communist subversive actions as had occurred in Laos

⁹² Fenton, 179-181

⁹³ Buszynski, 84, 85

⁹⁴ Buszynski, 88

⁹⁵ Fenton 205-208

⁹⁶ Fenton 218

protect the countries of Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam from falling into communist hands and thus unable to uphold their treaty, the member nations thought it best to remove the organization as a whole.⁹⁷

In conclusion, SEATO as an organization had potential but faced a number of challenges and shortcomings, which resulted in its downfall. Starting off with the US attempting to balance against the communist threat, its allies within the region and aboard saw it more as an opportunity to keep their interests within the region or to cement their territorial claims, and thus bandwagoning with the US in the alliance. Furthermore, by only having three members of the alliance in South East Asia was not necessarily a major downfall for the alliance, but it did harm the US credibility in the region by showing that it was not necessarily a united front. The main cracks within the alliance began to appear with its organizational structure and its treaty. The alliance did not have a form of military command structure, and instead relied on other member nations to contribute troops, which were to be put under the leadership of the US, while the main council of SEATO had almost no power and was considered to be merely symbolic. The treaty on the other hand made it almost impossible for the organization to be both flexible and multifunctional, Article 4 of the treaty both limited the organization's response to threats, and prevented it from taking action without the permission of either the country affected or by unanimous vote. Additionally, by including nations such as Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos as protectorate states, which those nations did not want⁹⁸, it prevented the alliance from responding to communist threats and weakened the organizations credibility as a whole. Finally, after the failure of having any impact in Laos, which exposed the cracks in the treaty, and the division within the alliances, SEATO began to move into obscurity. Followed by US unilateral action in South Vietnam, France and Britain's withdrawal of military units, as well as the removal of Pakistan from the organization as a whole. The organization, which had showed at least some promise, became an embarrassment to its members and unlike its more prominent brother NATO, eventually disappeared without having any impact on the geopolitical situation at all.

⁹⁷ Fenton 229

⁹⁸ Both Laos (1960) and Cambodia (1965) requested to be taken out of a SEATO's protectorate status

Chapter 4- Why NATO survived while SEATO failed (conclusion)

During the 1950's both NATO and SEATO were an attempt by the US to create a multirole alliance to prevent the spread of communism in their respective regions. Both at the beginning of their creation achieved some success at forming an alliance but while NATO eventually went on to succeed and remain in existence SEATO on the other hand failed after a mere 20 years in existence. In the previous chapters of this book we explored the individual reasons why an organization survived or why an organization failed. In this chapter we will compare and contrast both NATO and SEATO together and observe the fundamental changes between each organization as well as the events that may have had a larger impact on one organization than the other. We begin with the theoretical reasons for their existence and why they have survived.

A similarity between both NATO and SEATO was that the United States was attempting to balance themselves out against the Communist States, by forming alliances using the balance of power approach. It can be concluded that the US was approaching both alliances via the balance of power, which is further emphasized with the definition presented in chapter 1. In Europe this was done through the creation of NATO to prevent the Soviets from attempting anything in Europe. While in South East Asia, SEATO was mainly created after China had become a communist state in 1949, and was showing its willingness to use force during the Korean War. Most scholars tend to agree that NATO was a balancing act, as mentioned previously by Michael Sheehan who states that "NATO, in fact, far from being an example of collective security, was a classic example of realist balance of power politics."⁹⁹ Likewise, Michael Leifer argues that the US approach to SEATO was done through the balance of power and was viewed by many as defense cooperation against the communist states.¹⁰⁰ However, while the US approach to these alliances was the same for both NATO and SEATO, the approach taken by each of its member nations were vastly different.

The local interpretation by the allies of the US in each of these alliances was vastly different. While the US saw each of the alliances as a form of balancing themselves out against the Communist powers. European NATO members saw it as balancing themselves out against a threat (balance of threat), while SEATO members saw it as an

⁹⁹ Sheehan, 161

¹⁰⁰ Leiffer, 121

opportunity to either consolidate their power or make a gain from joining the alliance. (bandwagoning). This major difference in the perspectives of the alliances is one of the main reasons why NATO succeeded and SEATO failed. As mentioned previously in Chapter 1, when looking at the different theories one can conclude that if a state joins an alliance with a particular theoretical approach (for example France joining NATO to balance out against a Soviet threat) and that approach no longer applied (e.g. the Soviet Union no longer being a threat), the alliance would be at risk of failing.

In NATO's case its allies viewed the alliances as a necessity to combat a very real and dangerous threat that was upon their borders, and viewed the alliances as being a guarantee of their national security against the Soviet Union. Furthermore, even with the collapse of the Soviet Union, NATO's European allies still approached NATO from the balance of threat perspective, while the US remained perceiving NATO as a way for it to keep its influence in the region, and prevent the now new Russian Federation from gaining the power it once had. What must also be mentioned is that although the balance of power and the balance of threat are different from one another, they still share similar aspects with both the European allies, as well as the US having similar view points on issues, and thus making it easier to form a common solution.

SEATO on the other hand was perceived as convenient alliance for many of the US allies. For many members of SEATO it didn't combat any major threat upon their borders (with maybe the possible exception being on Thailand)¹⁰¹ and was mainly used by members to gain something for their interests. For example, according to Addis "...American policy at the time was expansionist in the sense of being concerned to expand American influence to areas where that influence had not been dominant before."¹⁰² Suggesting that America before it began to try and balance out against Communist China had no interest in the region and while countries like France and the UK etc might have had a lot of influence within the region (and China's communist aggression may have been viewed as a threat to their interests), it was not a threat to their sovereignty as a state. Thus, ruling out the possibility for the alliances being built by member nations who took a balance of threat approach. Instead bandwagoning was the main motivation for countries joining this alliance, with France and UK joining to

¹⁰¹ While I do make this statement in my thesis in Chapter 1 I argue that Thailand was a in fact a bandwagoning nation as well.

¹⁰² Addis, p99

gain influence in the region, Philippines and Thailand gaining legitimacy (as well as military and humanitarian aid), while Pakistan gained aid and hoped for support if a war with India ever broke out. However, as analyzed in chapter 1, once this alliance no longer became a convenience, and began to cost more than it gained states began to leave the alliance. This is clearly shown when countries like Pakistan left after it received no support for the troubles it had with India and East Pakistan. Furthermore, France withdrew troops after they no longer had anything to gain in the region, especially after the US began to go against their interests. Additionally, unlike the balance of power and threat, which have many similarities, bandwagoning and the balance of power approaches are vastly different. Hence, once these two different approaches began to clash, no common ground could be found, and resulted in countries leaving SEATO.

This virtual difference between the theoretical bases of each alliance is one of the most important and essential differences to why the organization failed or survived. However, practical reasons also added to its survival and failure, one of those being how the alliances were viewed in the home countries of member nations.

Both alliances were viewed from two major different perspectives. The US while balancing themselves out against the Soviet threat in Europe already had some form of presence within the area and were seen as liberators by the European countries, thus drumming up support of a alliance was a lot easier. Furthermore, by sending figures such as Eisenhower to run NATO military command, sent a strong message to European allies that the US was committed. In South East Asia this was a different case, where the US didn't have a strong presence in the region before. This combined with a region that was going through a period of post-colonialism, SEATO became viewed and accused by many countries as being a new form of colonial imperialism¹⁰³. Furthermore, no high ranking US official ever took charge in the organization which could have also bought some doubt into the organizations members. The two different organizations were viewed in a completely different light, making the gap between NATO and SEATO bigger. Furthermore, the US role in each of the alliance was also extremely different and one of the practical reasons why the organization survived/failed.

In the beginning of each of the alliances the US regarded both of them with equal importance in regards to their foreign policy, however, as new crisis emerged the US

¹⁰³ "Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), 1954 - 1953-1960 - Milestones

began taking a different approach. As we have seen throughout the previous chapters The US role in each of the alliances was vital for its survival in the case of NATO Shea explains that “ ... without US leadership it would have never survived as long as it has or even lifted off the ground.”¹⁰⁴ In NATO’s case the US always came to a compromise with its NATO allies even if it disagreed with its allies approach to a certain situation. It always looked to find a common resolve. In SEATO’s case this was very different, after the whole Laotian crisis (see chapter 3) the US began taking a unilateral approach against the interests of some of its member nations and sidelining the alliance. This was a blow to it in general especially seeing as the alliance (made up of bandwagoning nations) were in the alliance for their interest and could not have its most powerful member go against their interest in the region thus the appeal of the alliance was gone. Furthermore, by taking unilateral action the US showed that the alliance was not an alliance made up for equal nations but of nations dominated by the US. This is further shown in the structure of each of the organizations.

The military and civilian structure of each of the alliances was imperative for their existence as well as the treaties, which governed them. In NATO’s case its civilian structure embedded it in its member nations and institutionalized the organization (thus making it harder for it to disappear). Furthermore, its integrated military command resulted in a strong military structure and able to deal with military challenges. SEATO on the other hand had none of this and relied heavily on the US. As made clear in chapter 3, once the US began to sideline SEATO there was nothing else holding the organization together. Furthermore, by not having an integrated structure as NATO did, SEATO’s member nations had no stake in the organization as a whole. This brings us to the treaties in both organizations, which were vastly different. While NATO’s treaty focused on an alliance, which could have a multi-purpose function and was flexible to change against threats, SEATO’s treaty had one single goal. This made SEATO both inflexible and unable to meet new challenges that it wasn’t prepared for such as in Laos. Finally this brings us to the events that occurred for each organization.

The one final difference between both organizations were the events that unfolded between them and the consequences for both organizations. While both organizations have faced challenges (France leaving the organization and SEATO with

¹⁰⁴ Shea “The Survival of NATO”

the crisis in Laos) SEATO was faced a much greater challenge than NATO ever has. Unlike NATO, whose organization has been relatively stable, it has also never faced a direct and long lasting crisis within its borders, yes it has faced crisis along its borders such as in the former Yugoslavia as well as the current crisis in Ukraine and has invoked article 5 after the 9/11 terrorists attacks but it has yet to face a long last crisis within its borders. SEATO on the other hand had to deal with the crisis in Laos and the Vietnam War both of which were within its treaty border mandate. Furthermore its inability to deal with these crisis resulted in it appearing weak and unimportant eventually leading to its dissolvent.

In conclusion to this thesis, we can establish that NATO was founded on a much more solidified foundation than SEATO. Both from a practical and theoretical perspective NATO succeeded while SEATO failed. This concludes that the United States succeed in Europe for a multiple of different reasons: those including the reasons for its allies joining NATO with a balance of threat approach (while in Asia this was a bandwagoning approach), its organization structure and founding treaty, as well as the events that lead the United States to invest more in NATO than it did with SEATO. In SEATO's case which had two vastly different theoretical approaches, by both the US (balance of power approach), and some of its allies (bandwagoning approach) resulted in an alliance, which could not find a common methodology. This was further enhanced by the organizations weak structure, inflexible treaty, and US interest in SEATO. Finally, with the organizations unable to respond to crises it eventually disappeared.

With all of those reasons combined we can come to a general conclusion that with the failure of SEATO, the US decided to approach each South East Asia nation from a bilateral perspective, while in Europe it still maintains its multilateral alliance. Although, both SEATO and NATO have had an impact on US foreign policy the question remains: Can NATO survive the new geopolitical challenges, especially if one happens within its own borders, and will the US ever attempt to create new multilateral alliances in South and South East Asia?

Bibliography

- Addis, John. "Indochina: An Arena of Conflict." *The Balance of Power in East Asia*. Ed. Michael Leifer. New York: St. Martin's, 1986. 97-106. Print.
- Buszynski, Leszek. *SEATO, the Failure of an Alliance Strategy*. Singapore: Singapore UP, 1983. Print.
- Butwell, Richard. "The Institutional Growth of the South East Asian Treaty Organisation: Circumstance of the Changes." *Asian Studies* 3.2 (1965): 377-90. *Asian Studies*. Asian Studies, 2014. Web. 13 May 2015.
- "Does Nato Have a Purpose Any Longer?" *The Guardian*. *The Guardian*, 12 June 2011. Web. 15 Mar. 2015. <<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/06/12/nato-usa>>.
- Devereux, David R. "Britain, SEATO and the Threat of a Regional War in Laos, 1960-63." [Http://www.vietnamconf.org/program.htm](http://www.vietnamconf.org/program.htm). Proc. of The Vietnam Experience, Victoria College, Houston. Vietnam Conference, 13 June 2013. Web. 13 May 2015
- Fenton, Damien. *To Cage the Red Dragon: SEATO and the Defence of Southeast Asia, 1955-1965*. Singapore: NUS, 2012. Print.
- Hanson, Victor. "The End of NATO." Hoover Institution. Hoover Institution, 12 Nov. 2014. Web. 06 May 2015.
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. *NATO Divided, NATO United: The Evolution of an Alliance*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004. Print
- "Message from President Obama." *NATO Review Magazine*. NATO, 2012. Web. 14 Mar. 2015. <<http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2012/chicago/president-obama/en/index.htm>>.
- Nick White, "Macmillan, Kennedy and the Key West meeting: Its Significance for the Laotian Civil War and Anglo-American relations" in *Civil Wars* (Vol. 2, no. 2), Summer 1999,
- "NATO Military and Civilian Structure." NATO. NATO, n.d. Web. 03 May 2015.
- "Nato Must Rediscover Its Purpose, or It Will End up Losing a War." *The Spectator*. *The Spectator*, 03 Sept. 2014. Web. 06 May 2015.
- Philippines and United States. U.S Department of States. Bureau of Consular Affairs. [Travel.state.gov](http://travel.state.gov). U.S Department of States, n.d. Web. 23 Mar. 2015.

<<http://travel.state.gov/content/travel/english/legal-considerations/international-treaties-agreements/bilateral-consular-conventions/philippines-treaty.html>>.

- Schake, Kurt Wayne. "NATO Divided, NATO United: The Evolution of an Alliance (review)." *The Journal of Military History* 69.1 (2005): 280-81. Taylor and Francis Online. Web. 22 Mar. 2015.
- Schweller, Randall L. "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In." *International Security* 19.1 (1994): 72-107. JSTOR. Web. 09 Apr. 2015.
- Shea, Jamie. "The Survival of NATO." Personal interview. 16 Mar. 2015.
- Sheehan, Michael. *The Balance of Power: History and Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Staercke, André De, Paul Van Campen, Theodore C. Achilles, Clark M. Clifford, Claude Delmas, Olafur Egilsson, Sven Henningsen, Nicolas Hommel, Albano Nogueira, Egidio Ortona, Escott Reid, Alexander Rendel, Olav Riste, Baron Robnert Rothschild, Andre De Staercke, and Grethe Vaerno. *NATO's Anxious Birth: The Prophetic Vision of the 1940s*. Ed. Nicholas Sherwen. New York: St. Martin's, 1985. Print.
- Solana, Javier, and Hartmut Olboeter. *NATO Review*. Spring ed. Vol. 1. Brussels, Belgium: NATO Office of Information, 1999. Print. P29
- "Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Manila Pact);." *The Avalon Project : Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Manila Pact); September 8, 1954*. Yale Law School, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2015.
- "Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), 1954 - 1953–1960 - Milestones." *Office of the Historian*. US Department of State, n.d. Web. 12 May 2015.
- Tertrais, Bruno. "The Changing Nature of Military Alliances." *The Washington Quarterly* 27.2 (2004): 133-50. Project Muse. Web. 21 Mar. 2015.
- "The Birth of NATO." NATO. NATO, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2015.
- "The Laos Crisis 1960-1963- Milestones." *Office of the Historian*. US Department of State, n.d. Web. 12 May 2015.
- "The North Atlantic Treaty." NATO. NATO, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2015.
- Walt, Stephen. "NATO Owes Putin a Big Thank-You." *Foreign Policy*. *Foreign Policy Magazine*, 4 Sept. 2014. Web. 08 May 2015
- Walt, Stephen M. *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1987. Print

- "You Are Either with Us or against Us" CNN. Cable News Network, Nov. 2001. Web. 22 Mar. 2015. <<http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/11/06/gen.attack.on.terror/>>.