



NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

COURSE CODE: INR471

2 CREDIT UNITS

COURSE TITLE: UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

INR 471

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Course Developer/Writer **Dr.SharkdamWapmuk**
Mr.KelechiNwogu
Nigerian Institute of International Affairs
Victoria Island Lagos

Course Editor: **Professor DokunOyeshola**
Department of International Relations
ObafemiAwolowo University
Ile-Ife

Programme Leader: **Dr EbeleUdeoji**
Faculty of Social Sciences
National Open University of Nigeria
Plot 91 Cadastral Zone
NnamdiAzikiwe Expressway
Jabi Abuja

CONTENTS

Introduction	
Course Aims	
Course Objectives	
Working through the Course	
Course Materials	
Study Units	
Textbooks and References	
Assessment Exercises	
Tutor-Marked Assignment	
Final Examination and Grading	
Course Marking Scheme	
Course Overview/Presentation	
What you will Need in this Course	
Tutors and Tutorials	
Assessment Exercises	
How to Get the Most from This Course	
Conclusion	
Summary	

INTRODUCTION

INR 471 US Foreign Policy is a one semester course in the final year of B.Sc. (Hons) degree in International Relations. It is a two unit credit course designed to increase your knowledge on vital issues on American Foreign Policy. The course begins with a brief introductory module which will help you to have a good understanding of what US Foreign Policy entails including the historical overview; explores the contending theories on US Foreign Policy; the course, brings to limelight, various US Foreign Policies as well as the contemporary issues affecting the Global Community. The study units are structured into modules. Each module is structured into 4 units. A unit guide comprises of instructional material. It gives you a brief of the course content, course guidelines and suggestions and steps to take while studying. You can also find self-assessment exercises for your study.

COURSE AIMS

The primary aim of this course is to provide students of international relations with comprehensive knowledge US Foreign Policy across international frontiers. However, the course has specific objectives.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this course are to enable you:

- have understanding of the meaning, type and historical overview of US Foreign Policy;
- familiarize with the contending theoretical perspectives in understanding and analysing US Foreign Policy;
- increase knowledge on the effects or consequences associated with US Foreign Policy across the international boundaries on the Home and Host countries; and
- gain knowledge on the contemporary issues in US Foreign Policy including and its effect on WWI, WWII, Cold War, European Union, the motivation for African countries etc.

The specific objectives of each study unit can be found at the beginning and you can make references to it while studying. It is necessary and helpful for you to check at the end of the unit, if your progress is consistent with the stated objectives and if you can conveniently answer the self-assessment exercises. The overall objectives of the course will be achieved, if you diligently study and complete all the units in this course.

WORKING THROUGH THE COURSE

To complete the course, you are required to read the study units and other related materials. You will also need to undertake practical exercises for which you need a pen, a note-book, and other materials that will be listed in this guide. The exercises are to aid you in understanding the concepts being presented. At the end of each unit, you will be required to submit written assignment for assessment purposes.

At the end of the course, you will be expected to write a final examination.

THE COURSE MATERIAL

In this course, as in all other courses, the major components you will find are as follows:

1. Course Guide
2. Study Units
3. Textbooks
4. Assignments

STUDY UNITS

There are 20 study units in this course. They are:

Module 1: Understanding American Foreign Policy

- Unit 1: US foreign Policy, goals and objectives
- Unit 2: An overview of American History/Government
- Unit 3: Theoretical framework of the US foreign policy
- Unit 4: Evolution of US foreign policy (Doctrines)

Module 2: Major US Foreign Policy Organs

- UNIT 1: The State Department and the Executive Branch in Foreign Policy Making
- UNIT 2: US Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Council
- UNIT 3: US Congress in Foreign Policy
- UNIT 4: Public Opinion and Foreign Policy

Module 3: US Congress and Foreign Policy

- Unit 1: US Foreign Policy Intervention
- Unit 2: US Foreign Policy during the World Wars I and II
- Unit 3: US Foreign Policy during and after the Cold War
- Unit 4: US Foreign Policy towards Africa

Module 4: United States Foreign Policy of Containment and Collective Security

- Unit 1:** United States foreign Policy of Containment and Collective Security
- Unit 2:** United States foreign Policy of Detente and Human Rights
- Unit 3:** United States foreign Policy towards the European Union
- Unit 4:** United States foreign Policy towards China, India and Japan

Module 5: United States Foreign Policy towards the Middle- East

- Unit 1: United States foreign Policy towards the Middle-East (e.g) Iran, Iraq, Israel and Syria
- Unit 2: United States foreign Policy towards Russia
- Unit 3: United States foreign Policy and the Global war on Terrorism
- Unit 4: The Criticism and the future of United States Foreign Policy

As you can observe, the course begins with the basics and expands into a more elaborate, complex and detailed form. All you need to do is to follow the instructions as provided in each unit. In addition, some self-assessment exercises have been provided with which you can test your progress with the text and determine if your study is fulfilling the stated objectives. Tutor-

marked assignments have also been provided to aid your study. All these will assist you to be able to fully grasp the spirit and letters of Europe's role and place in international politics.

TEXTBOOKS AND REFERENCES

At the end of each unit, you will find a list of relevant reference materials which you may yourself wish to consult as the need arises, even though I have made efforts to provide you with the most important information you need to pass this course. However, I would encourage you, as a third year student to cultivate the habit of consulting as many relevant materials as you are able to within the time available to you. In particular, be sure to consult whatever material you are advised to consult before attempting any exercise.

ASSESSMENT

Two types of assessment are involved in the course: the Self-Assessment Exercises (SAEs), and the Tutor-Marked Assessment (TMA) questions. Your answers to the SAEs are not meant to be submitted, but they are also important since they give you an opportunity to assess your own understanding of the course content. Tutor-Marked Assignments (TMAs) on the other hand are to be carefully answered and kept in your assignment file for submission and marking. This will count for 30% of your total score in the course.

TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

At the end of each unit, you will find tutor-marked assignments. There is an average of two tutor-marked assignments per unit. This will allow you to engage the course as robustly as possible. You need to submit at least four assignments of which the three with the highest marks will be recorded as part of your total course grade. This will account for 10 percent each, making a total of 30 percent. When you complete your assignments, send them including your form to your tutor for formal assessment on or before the deadline.

Self-assessment exercises are also provided in each unit. The exercises should help you to evaluate your understanding of the material so far.

These are not to be submitted. You will find all answers to these within the units they are intended for.

FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

There will be a final examination at the end of the course. The examination carries a total of 70 percent of the total course grade. The examination will reflect the contents of what you have learnt and the self-assessments and tutor-marked assignments. You therefore need to revise your course materials beforehand.

COURSE MARKING SCHEME

The following table sets out how the actual course marking is broken down.

ASSESSMENT	MARKS
Four assignments (the best four of all the assignments submitted for marking)	Four assignments, each marked out of 10%, but highest scoring three selected, thus totalling 30%
Final Examination	70% of overall course score
Total	100% of course score

COURSE OVERVIEW PRESENTATION SCHEME

Units	Title of Work	Week Activity	Assignment (End-of-Unit)
Course Guide			
Module 1	Understanding American Foreign Policy		
Unit 1	US foreign Policy, goals and objectives	Week 1	Assignment 1
Unit 2	An overview of American History/Government	Week 1	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Theoretical framework of the US foreign policy	Week 2	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Evolution of US foreign policy (Doctrines	Week 3	Assignment 1
Module 2	Major Us Foreign Policy Organs		
Unit 1	The State Department and the Executive Branch in Foreign Policy Making	Week 4	Assignment 1
Unit 2	US Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Council	Week 5	Assignment 1
Unit 3	US Congress in Foreign Policy	Week 6	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Public Opinion and Foreign Policy	Week 7	Assignment 1
Module 3	US Congress and Foreign Policy		
Unit 1	US Foreign Policy Intervention	Week 8	Assignment 1
Unit 2	US Foreign Policy during the World Wars I and II	Week 9	Assignment 1
Unit 3	US Foreign Policy during and after the Cold War	Week 10	Assignment 1
Unit 4	US Foreign Policy towards Africa	Week 11	Assignment 1
Module 4	United States Foreign Policy of Containment and Collective Security		
Unit 1	United States foreign Policy of Containment and Collective Security	Week 12	Assignment 1
Unit 2	United States foreign Policy of Detente and Human Rights	Week 13	Assignment 1

Unit 3	United States foreign Policy towards the European Union	Week 14	Assignment 1
Unit 4	United States foreign Policy towards China, India and Japan	Week 15	Assignment 1
Module 5	United States Foreign Policy Towards The Middle- East		
Unit 1	United States foreign Policy towards the Middle-East (e.g) Iran, Iraq, Israel and Syria	Week 16	Assignment 1
Unit 2	United States foreign Policy towards Russia	Week 17	Assignment 1
Unit 3	United States foreign Policy and the Global war on Terrorism	Week 18	Assignment 1
Unit 4	The Criticism and the future of United States Foreign	Week 19	Assignment 1
	Revision	Week 20	
	Examination	Week 21 - 22	
	Total	22 Weeks	

WHAT YOU WILL NEED FOR THE COURSE

This course builds on what you have learnt in the 300 Levels. It will be helpful if you try to review what you studied earlier. Second, you may need to purchase one or two texts recommended as important for your mastery of the course content. You need quality time in a study friendly environment every week. If you are computer-literate (which ideally you should be), you should be prepared to visit recommended websites. You should also cultivate the habit of visiting reputable physical libraries accessible to you.

TUTORS AND TUTORIALS

There are 15 hours of tutorials provided in support of the course. You will be notified of the dates and location of these tutorials, together with the name and phone number of your tutor as soon as you are allocated a tutorial group. Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, and keep a close watch on your progress. Be sure to send in your tutor marked assignments promptly, and feel free to contact your tutor in case of any difficulty with your self-assessment exercise, tutor-marked assignment or the grading of an assignment. In any case, you are advised to attend the tutorials regularly and punctually. Always take a list of such prepared questions to the tutorials and participate actively in the discussions.

ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

There are two aspects to the assessment of this course. First is the Tutor-Marked Assignments; second is a written examination. In handling these assignments, you are expected to apply the

information, knowledge and experience acquired during the course. The tutor-marked assignments are now being done online. Ensure that you register all your courses so that you can have easy access to the online assignments. Your score in the online assignments will account for 30 per cent of your total coursework. At the end of the course, you will need to sit for a final examination. This examination will account for the other 70 per cent of your total course mark.

TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

Usually, there are four online tutor-marked assignments in this course. Each assignment will be marked over ten percent. The best three (that is the highest three of the 10 marks) will be counted. This implies that the total mark for the best three assignments will constitute 30% of your total course work. You will be able to complete your online assignments successfully from the information and materials contained in your references, reading and study units.

FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

The final examination for INR 471: US Foreign Policy will be of three hours duration and have a value of 70% of the total course grade. The examination will consist of pen on paper essay type questions. All areas of the course will be assessed. It is important that you use adequate time to revise the entire course. You may find it useful to review your tutor-marked assignments before the examination. The final examination covers information from all aspects of the course.

HOW TO GET THE MOST FROM THIS COURSE

1. There are 20 units in this course. You are to spend one week in each unit. In distance learning, the study units replace the university lecture. This is one of the great advantages of distance learning; you can read and work through specially designed study materials at your own pace, and at a time and place that suites you best. Think of it as reading the lecture instead of listening to the lecturer. In the same way a lecturer might give you some reading to do. The study units tell you when to read and which are your text materials or recommended books. You are provided exercises to do at appropriate points, just as a lecturer might give you in a class exercise.
2. Each of the study units follows a common format. The first item is an introduction to the subject matter of the unit, and how a particular unit is integrated with other units and the course as a whole. Next to this is a set of learning objectives. These objectives let you know what you should be able to do, by the time you have completed the unit. These learning objectives are meant to guide your study. The moment a unit is finished, you must go back and check whether you have achieved the objectives. If this is made a habit, then you will significantly improve your chance of passing the course.
3. The main body of the unit guides you through the required reading from other sources. This will usually be either from your reference or from a reading section.
4. The following is a practical strategy for working through the course. If you run into any trouble, telephone your tutor or visit the study centre nearest to you. Remember that your tutor's job is to help you. When you need assistance, do not hesitate to call and ask your tutor to provide it.

5. Read this course guide thoroughly. It is your first assignment.
6. Organise a study schedule – Design a ‘Course Overview’ to guide you through the course. Note the time you are expected to spend on each unit and how the assignments relate to the units.
7. Important information; e.g. details of your tutorials and the date of the first day of the semester is available at the study centre.
8. You need to gather all the information into one place, such as your diary or a wall calendar. Whatever method you choose to use, you should decide on and write in your own dates and schedule of work for each unit.
9. Once you have created your own study schedule, do everything to stay faithful to it.
10. The major reason that students fail is that they get behind in their coursework. If you get into difficulties with your schedule, please let your tutor or course coordinator know before it is too late for help.
11. Turn to Unit 1, and read the introduction and the objectives for the unit.
12. Assemble the study materials. You will need your references for the unit you are studying at any point in time.
13. As you work through the unit, you will know what sources to consult for further information.
14. Visit your study centre whenever you need up-to-date information.
15. Well before the relevant online TMA due dates, visit your study centre for relevant information and updates. Keep in mind that you will learn a lot by doing the assignment carefully. They have been designed to help you meet the objectives of the course and, therefore, will help you pass the examination.
16. Review the objectives for each study unit to confirm that you have achieved them. If you feel unsure about any of the objectives, review the study materials or consult your tutor. When you are confident that you have achieved a unit’s objectives, you can start on the next unit. Proceed unit by unit through the course and try to space your study so that you can keep yourself on schedule.
17. After completing the last unit, review the course and prepare yourself for the final examination. Check that you have achieved the unit objectives (listed at the beginning of each unit) and the course objectives (listed in the course guide).

CONCLUSION

This is a theory course but you will get the best out of it if you cultivate the habit of relating it to political issues in domestic and international arenas.

SUMMARY

'US Foreign Policy', introduces you to general understanding designed to increase your knowledge on vital issues on American Foreign Policy. All the basic course materials that you need to successfully complete the course are provided. At the end, you will be able to:

- have understanding of the meaning, type and historical overview of US Foreign Policy;
- familiarize with the contending theoretical perspectives in understanding and analyzing US Foreign Policy;
- increase knowledge on the effects or consequences associated with US Foreign Policy across the international boundaries on the Home and Host countries; and gain knowledge on the contemporary issues in US Foreign Policy including and its effect on WWI, WWII, Cold War, European Union, the motivation for African countries etc

List of Acronyms

MAD	-	Mutual Assured Destruction
IMF	-	International Monetary Fund
GATT	-	General Agreement on Tariff & Trade
CJTF-HOA	-	Combined Joint Task Force Horn of Africa
PSI	-	Pan-Sahel Initiative
TSCTI	-	Trans-Sahel Counter Terrorism Initiative
ECHR	-	European Court of Human Right
CIA	-	Central Intelligence Agency
AFRICOM	-	United State Africa Command
AIDS	-	Acquired Immune Deficiency
AME	-	African Liberation Ministry
APEC	-	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
CBI	-	Confederation of British Industry
CENTRO	-	Central Treaty Organization
DHS	-	Department of Homeland Security
ECSC	-	European Coal and Steel Community
EFZs	-	Ecologically Fragile Zones
EIS	-	Environmental Impact Statement
ESDP	-	Common Foreign and Security Policy
EU	-	European Union
FBI	-	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FWW	-	First World War
HIV	-	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICA	-	International Campaign for Africa
ICTs	-	Inter-Corporation Transferees
IDP	-	Internally Displaced Persons
IMET	-	International Military Education and Training
IOM	-	International Organization for Migration
IPCC	-	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LEDC	-	Less Economic Developed Countries
NAFTA	-	North Atlantic Free Trade Area

NATO	-	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NBC	-	National Broadcasting Company
NGOs	-	Non-Governmental Organisations
OECD	-	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
RCA	-	Radio Corporation of America
SEATO	-	South-East Asia Treaty Organization
SWW	-	Second World War
UK	-	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland
UN	-	United Nations
UNHCR	-	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USA	-	United States of America
USSR	-	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
USSR	-	Union of Soviet Socialist Republic
WTO	-	World Trade Organization

Module 1: Understanding American Foreign Policy

Unit 1: US foreign Policy, goals and objectives

Unit 2: An overview of American History/Government

Unit 3: Theoretical framework of the US foreign policy

Unit 4: Evolution of US foreign policy (Doctrines)

Module 2: Major Us Foreign Policy Organs

UNIT 1: The State Department and the Executive Branch in Foreign Policy Making

UNIT 2: US Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Council

UNIT 3: US Congress in Foreign Policy

UNIT 4: Public Opinion and Foreign Policy

Module 3: US Congress and Foreign Policy

Unit 1: US Foreign Policy Intervention

Unit 2: US Foreign Policy during the World Wars I and II

Unit 3: US Foreign Policy during and after the Cold War

Unit 4: US Foreign Policy towards Africa

Module 4: United States Foreign Policy of Containment and Collective Security

Unit 1: United States foreign Policy of Containment and Collective Security

Unit 2: United States foreign Policy of Detente and Human Rights

Unit 3: United States foreign Policy towards the European Union

Unit 4: United States foreign Policy towards China, India and Japan

Module 5: United States Foreign Policy towards the Middle- East

Unit 1: United States foreign Policy towards the Middle-East (e.g) Iran, Iraq, Israel and Syria

Unit 2: United States foreign Policy towards Russia

Unit 3: United States foreign Policy and the Global war on Terrorism

Unit 4: The Criticism and the future of United States Foreign Policy

MODULE 1 DEFINITION OF FOREIGN POLICY

INTRODUCTION

Foreign policy basically is a plan of action adopted by one nation with regards to its diplomatic dealings with other countries. Foreign policy established as a systematic way to deal with issues that may arise with other countries. The United States has a different foreign policy for almost every country, and the policies can vary based on many issues such as trade, security, and economic as well as political interests in addition to many other conditions.

However, it is significant to note that in the early years of United States history, the national policy was isolationism and non-interventionism. The United States' policy of non-intervention was maintained throughout most of the nineteenth century. The first significant foreign intervention by the United States was the Spanish-American War. The United States foreign policy goals revolves around protecting U.S. vital interests, including protecting itself from foreign threats, extending its economic and political influence, securing access to trade routes and natural resources, promoting global trade, and exerting its influence on unstable nations or regions that might threaten global trade. Obviously, the economic, technology and military strength of the U.S. gives it a strategic advantage in the world, which contributes to the animosity many countries hold toward it. In each case, a question presented itself of whether or not to send American forces abroad to accomplish a certain announced (or unannounced) goal relating to national security, economic interests, humanitarian purposes, or terrorism, and in each case the debate between realists and idealists was revived.

Module 1: Understanding American Foreign Policy

Unit 1: US foreign Policy, goals and objectives

Unit 2: An overview of American History/Government

Unit 3: Theoretical framework of the US foreign policy

Unit 4: Evolution of US foreign policy (Doctrines)

UNIT 1 US FOREIGN POLICY, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 3.1 Definition of Foreign Policy
 - 3.2 The Goals of United States foreign policy
 - 3.3 What America shares with the world
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The course is designed to deal with the foreign policy goals of the United States and the way in which it interacts with foreign nations and sets standards of interaction for its organizations, corporations and individual citizens. The officially stated goals of the foreign policy of the United States, including all the Bureaus and Offices in the United States Department of State, as mentioned in the Foreign Policy Agenda of the Department of State, are to build and sustain a more democratic, secure, and prosperous world for the benefit of the American people and the international community (Art, 2009:5). In addition, the United States House Committee on Foreign Affairs states as some of its jurisdictional goals, export controls, including non-proliferation of nuclear technology and nuclear hardware, measures to foster commercial interaction with foreign nations and to safeguard American business abroad, international commodity agreements, international education and protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation. U.S. foreign policy and foreign aid have been the subject of much debate, praise and criticism, both domestically and abroad (Bassani, 2005:17).

However, subject to the advice and consent role of the U.S Senate, the President of the United States negotiates treaties with foreign nations, but treaties enter into force if ratified by two-thirds of the Senate (Boot, 2003: 17). The President is also Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces, and as such has broad authority over the armed forces; however only Congress has authority to declare war, and the civilian and military budget is written by the Congress. The United States Secretary of State is the foreign minister of the United States and is the primary conductor of state-to-state diplomacy. Both the Secretary of State -and ambassadors are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Congress also has power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

It is expected at the end of the lecture students should be able to explain the following:

- I. Identify and explain the goals of US foreign policy,
- 2. Understanding of what U.S. foreign policy is, who makes it, why is it the way it is, and how it affects the rest of the world.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 DEFINITION OF FOREIGN POLICY

Foreign policy refers to actions the United States government takes on behalf of its national interests abroad to ensure the security and well-being of Americans and the strength and competitiveness of the U.S. economy. A secure group of citizens requires protection of recognized national boundaries, a strong economy, and a stable, orderly society. foreign Policy is the use of political influence in order to induce other states to exercise their law- making power in a manner desired by the states concerned: it is an interaction between forces originating outside the country's borders and those working within them (Jentleson, Bruce, 2010:14).

Foreign policy of a state is concerned with the behavior of a state towards other states. It refers to the ways in which the central governments of sovereign states relate to each other and to the global system in order to achieve various goals or objectives. Through its foreign policy it endeavours to persuade others in accordance with one's own ends. It is primarily in proportion to its national power that its persuasive power is effective in this regard. However, even a powerful state cannot afford to enjoy a solo flight in this regard. It has to take into account, not only its own objectives and interests, aspirations and problems, but also those of other states. This process involves intricate processes of diplomacy short of war. It is also based on the observations regarding the traditional behavior of a given state. Moreover, a state while implementing its foreign policy cannot afford to ignore the rules of International law and canons of international morality. The whole essence of this prelude is that the term foreign policy cannot be studied in isolation from the factors that determine it. Indeed Foreign policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete course of action to attain these objectives and preserve interests. Therefore the United State foreign policy can be said to be the bundle of principles and practices that regulate the intercourse of a state vis-a-vis other states (Goldstein, and Pevehouse, 2011:9).Through foreign policy a state seeks to achieve a variety of objectives. The objectives sought to be attained by a state are of different types and categories, yet there are certain objectives which are uniformly pursued by all states i.e. Political independence and territorial integrity, economic wellbeing and, prestige and status of a nation. They have been classified into; Short-range, middle- range, and, long range, objectives (Paterson, Thomas, :2009:22). Foreign Policy Analysis is the systematic study of and research into the processes and theories of foreign policy, according to, Rosati, (2010) is that branch of political science, which deals with the study of and research into the processes and theories of foreign policy. Foreign Policy Analysis involves the study of how a state makes foreign policy. Because Foreign Policy Analysis involves the study of both international and domestic politics, the academic discipline is located at the intersection of international relations theory and public policy. Foreign Policy Analysis also draws upon the study of diplomacy, war, intergovernmental organizations, and economic sanctions, each of which are means by which a state may implement foreign policy. In academia, foreign policy analysis is most commonly taught within the disciplines of Political Science or Political Studies, and International Relations (Rosati, 2010:47).

A United States Presidential doctrine comprises the key goals, attitudes, or stances for United States foreign affairs outlined by a President. Most presidential doctrines are related to the Cold War. Though many U.S. Presidents had themes related to their handling of foreign policy, the

term doctrine generally applies to Presidents such as James Monroe, Harry S. Truman, Richard Nixon, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, Gorge Bush, Bill Clinton all of whom had doctrines which more completely characterized their foreign policy. In terms of the USA foreign policy doctrine is a general statement of foreign policy and belief system through a doctrine (a stated principle of government policy). In some cases, the statement is made by a political leader, typically a nation's chief executive or chief diplomat, and comes to be named after that leader. United States of America President Richard Nixon's justification for the phased withdrawal of the United States from Vietnam, for example, came to be called the Nixon Doctrine. This pattern of naming is not universal, but peculiar to the USA (Woloch, 2011:23).

The purpose of a foreign policy doctrine is to provide general rules for the conduct of foreign policy through decisions on international relations. These rules allow the political leadership of a nation to deal with a situation and to explain the actions of a nation to other nations. Doctrine is usually not meant to have any negative connotations; it is especially not to be confused with dogma (Norton, et al. 2011:23).

3.2 THE AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY GOALS

Generally speaking foreign policy can be said to be a Plan of action adopted by one nation with regards to its diplomatic dealings with other countries. Therefore foreign policies are established as a systematic way to deal with issues that may arise with other countries. The United States has a different foreign policy for almost every country, and the policies can vary based on trade agreements in addition to many other conditions (Brown, 1983: 15). The U.S. Department of State works with foreign governments, international organizations, and people in other countries to bring them together into arrangements to promote peace, prosperity, and democratic governments. The United States of America foreign policy basically has four main goals that it follows to make and carry out foreign policy, which include the following (Jefferson, 2012:7).

- Protect America and Americans;
- Advance economic prosperity, human rights, and other interests of the United States in the world;
- Gain international understanding of American values and policies;
- Support U.S. diplomats and other government officials who work at home and abroad to make all this possible.

These are the primary focus of American foreign policy goals and they are flexible depending the circumstances of time. You'll learn about U.S. policies for dealing with foreign countries and plans for making sure that it have people trained and experienced in the skills that are needed and the formulation and the implementation of its foreign policy objectives.

3.3 WHAT AMERICA SHARES WITH THE WORLD

The United States remains, as it has been, since its founding, a nation of nations. Immigrants and the children of immigrants, representing every nation, nationality, and ethnic group in the world today make up the American population. It is in the same vain that, People from all over the

world have shared and contributed ideas and cultures that make America what it is today. Likewise, Americans share with the rest of the world their values of:

- Democracy;
- Freedom; and
- Human rights.

These values inspire peoples throughout the world. Some countries may criticize America and/or its policies. However, they still respect the ideals of freedom and opportunity that we represent and look to America to defend those values in other nations.

Therefore, as never before, America's links to the world through trade, travel, technology, and communications are very important to the world economy and economic prosperity, just as the prosperity of other nations depends on the openness of U.S. markets and trade. America deals with a number of challenges that cross national boundaries that also affect the international system.

- HIV / AIDS and other infectious diseases that cross all borders;
- The humanitarian needs of migrants and refugees;
- Environmental issues;
- Dangers of illegal drug trafficking and crime;
- Terrorism; and
- The threat of weapons of mass destruction

Therefore, by nations working together and with the United States, these global problems can be dealt with successfully. The entire world especially the US faces a threat from terrorists and from countries supporting terrorists. Terrorists who attacked the United States on September 11, 2001, had no respect for human life or national borders. These terrorists and the countries that support them threaten not only Americans but all peoples who believe in freedom and democracy. They are the enemy of all civilized nations, and they will be defeated only through the united action of nations throughout the world nations that look to the United States for leadership. These goals closely reveal that they are based on cooperation with other nations, although preserving the national security of the United States implies possible competition and conflict.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Which Goal of the American Foreign policy has changed since it was created?

4.0 CONCLUSION

It is important to sum up that because of its dedication to the universal truths of equality and liberty, America has a special role to play in the world, it has a responsibility to uphold the cause of freedom abroad. Only in the United States can we find a wholesale and casual dismissal of the continuities that have shaped its foreign policy in the past. "America's journey through international politics has been a triumph of faith over experience,". "Torn between nostalgia for a pristine past and yearning for a perfect future, American thought has oscillated between isolationism and commitment.

5.0 SUMMARY

In summary the main point of the lecture, however, is to emphasize that America foreign policy must always keep in mind, as its ultimate goal, the peace and security of the people of the United States. Most of its former and present presidents have been imbued with a real determination to keep the country at peace. That is the reason why the last two presidents have put all kinds of political and policy considerations ahead of their interest in liberty and peace. In the United States of America no foreign policy can be justified except a policy devoted without reservation or diversion to the protection of the liberty of the American people, with war only as the last resort and only to preserve that liberty.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT

State and explain the goals of American foreign policy?

7.0 REFERENCES AND FUTHER READING

Art, Robert J. *America's Foreign policy of Grand Strategy and World Politics* New York: Routledge, 2009.

Bassani, Joe. *Saving the World for Democracy: An Historical Analysis of America's Grand Strategy in the 21 st Century*, M.A. thesis, Joint Forces Staff College, USA 2005

Berggren, D. Jason & Rae, Nicole C. "Jimmy Carter and George W. Bush: Faith, Foreign Policy, and an Evangelical Presidential Style." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 36 (2006): 606-

Boot, Max. "The New American Way of War" *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2003). Brooks, David. "Obama, Gospel and Verse" *New York Times*, April 26, 2007. Accessed

April 22, 2013. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/26/opinion/26brooks.html>? Brooks, Jefferson, Smith "Obama Needs a Grand Strategy." *Foreign Policy*, January 23, 2012. Accessed December8, 2012

Brown, Seyom. *The Faces of Power: Constancy and Change in United States Foreign Policy from Truman to Reagan*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

Bush, George W. "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People," Speech, Washington, DC, September 20, 2001.

UNIT 2 AN OVERVIEW OF AMERICAN HISTORY/GOVERNMENT

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 3.1 Explain the History of United States foreign Policy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The course will expose the student to the early history of United States of American foreign Policy which was a brief overview of major trends regarding the foreign policy of the United States from the American Revolution to the present. The major themes are becoming an Empire of Liberty, promoting democracy, expanding across the continent, supporting liberal internationalism, contesting World Wars and the Cold War, fighting international terrorism, developing or exploiting the Third World, and building a strong world economy.

However, after the American Revolution, the foreign policy thrust of the United States focused mostly on regional rather than international issues. Coalescing the various states with diverse interests into a unified nation proved to be a challenge for the new republic. Sectional differences, especially between the northern and southern states, would continue unabated until the American Civil War. Compounding these issues was America's uneasy post-war truce with Great Britain and France. Negotiations for the gradual withdrawal of British forces and France's increasing pressure on the U.S. to repay loans and expenses incurred from the French's support during the war caused relations with both countries to become increasingly strained. When war broke out between the European powers, the United States was pressured to choose sides but instead adopted a policy of neutrality. Indeed, in George Washington's farewell address he cautioned that the new nation should avoid foreign entanglements, stating that Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships, or enmities.

Despite George Washington's warnings, the United States found itself in an undeclared war with France in 1798, mostly due to President John Adams' failed attempts at diplomacy. Although peace with France was achieved in 1800, his presidency and foreign policy never recovered.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the lecture students should be able to:

- I. Explain the History of the United States foreign policy

2. Identify the various issues involved in the History of America foreign policy and;
3. Be conversant with various foreign policy issues associated with the History of American foreign policy.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

In the year 1776-1779, from the establishment of the United States after the American Revolution until the Spanish-American War, U.S. foreign policy reflected a regional, not global, focus, but with the long-term ideal of creating an Empire of Liberty. Morocco was the first Muslim country to formally deal with the United States, as represented by the Moroccan-American Treaty of Friendship in 1786 (Springboard, 2014:33).

The military and financial alliance with France in 1778, which brought in Spain and the Netherlands to fight the British, turned the American Revolutionary War into a world war in which the British naval and military supremacy was neutralized. The diplomats especially Franklin, Adams and Jefferson secured recognition of American independence and large loans to the new national government. The Treaty of Paris in 1783 was highly favorable to the United States which now could expand westward to the Mississippi River.

American foreign affairs from independence in 1776 to the new Constitution in 1789 were handled under the Articles of Confederation directly by Congress until the new government created a department of foreign affairs and the office of secretary for foreign affairs on January 10, 1781 (David, 2009:9). The cabinet-level Department of Foreign Affairs was created in 1789 by the First Congress. It was soon renamed the Department of State and changed the title of secretary for foreign affairs to Secretary of State; Thomas Jefferson returned from France to take the position.

When the French Revolution led to war in 1793 between Britain (America's leading trading partner), and France (the old ally, with a treaty still in effect), Washington and his cabinet decided on a policy of neutrality. In 1795 Washington supported the Jay Treaty, designed by Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton to avoid war with Britain and encourage commerce. The Jeffersonians vehemently opposed the treaty, but Washington's support proved decisive, and the U.S. and Britain were on friendly terms for a decade. However the foreign policy dispute polarized parties at home, leading to the First Party System.

In a Farewell Message that became a foundation of policy President George Washington in 1796 counseled against foreign entanglements, Europe has a set of primary interests, which to US have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations & collisions of her friendships, or enmities. Our detached & distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different agenda (Foster, 2014:23).

By 1797 the French were openly seizing American ships, leading to an undeclared war known as the Quasi-War of 1798-99. President John Adams tried diplomacy; it failed. In 1798, the French demanded American diplomats pay huge bribes in order to see the French Foreign Minister Talleyrand, which the Americans rejected. The Jeffersonian Republicans, suspicious of Adams, demanded the documentation, which Adams released using X, Y and Z as codes for the names of the French diplomats. The Affairs ignited a wave of nationalist sentiment. Overwhelmed, the U.S. Congress approved Adams' plan to organize the navy. Adams reluctantly signed the Alien and Sedition Acts as a wartime measure. Adams broke with the Hamiltonian wing of his Federalist Party and made peace with France in 1800(Goldstein, 2008:43).During the first 50 years of the nation, diplomats were guided by the idea that the United States should observe political isolation from European powers during peacetime and maintain strict neutrality during periods of war. Years before, Benjamin Franklin had summed up this point when he said, a virgin state should preserve its virgin character and not go suitoring for alliances, but wait with decent dignity for the application of others, (Williams, 2002: 17).

In his 1796 Farewell Address, President Washington argued,

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is to have with them as little political as distinct from commercial connection as possible. Europe, he continued, had its own set of interests, and those interests were very different from those of the United States. Fortunately, the state of international relations tended to confer freedom of action upon the nation. Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rival-ship, interest, humour, or caprice? Therefore, it is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world, so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it (Parks, 2014:23).

Although the political views of Thomas Jefferson were very different from those of Washington, Jefferson agreed that isolation and neutrality were the most beneficial course for the United States. In his First Inaugural Address (1801), Jefferson spoke of Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none. Historians have characterized the 31 years after the Civil War as the least active period in American foreign relations, but it was to be the last such period in U.S. history. The Spanish-American War of 1898 brought enormous change in its wake, and American diplomats were forced to adapt an antiquated foreign affairs establishment to the exercise of world leadership. The Jeffersonians deeply distrusted the British in the first place, but the British shut down most American trade with France, and impressed into the Royal Navy about 6000 sailors on American ships who claimed American citizenship. American honor was humiliated by the British attack on the American warship the in 1807.

In the west, Indians supported by Britain (but not under their control) used ambushes and raids to kill settlers, thus delayed the expansion of frontier settlements into the Midwest (Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, especially). In 1812 diplomacy had broken down and the U.S. declared war on Britain. The War of 1812 was marked by very bad planning and military fiascos on both sides. It ended with the Treaty of Ghent in 1815. Militarily it was a stalemate as both sides failed in their invasion attempts, but the Royal Navy blockaded the coastline and shut down American trade (except for smuggling supplies into British Canada). However the British achieved their main goal of defeating Napoleon, while the American armies defeated the Indian alliance that the

British had supported, ending the British war goal of establishing a pro-British Indian boundary nation in the Midwest. The British stopped impressing American sailors and trade with France (now an ally of Britain) resumed, so the causes of the war had been cleared away. Especially after the great American victory: at the Battle of New Orleans, Americans felt proud and triumphant for having won their second war of independence. Successful generals Andrew Jackson and William Henry Harrison became political heroes as well. After 1815 tensions de-escalated along the U.S.-Canada border, with peaceful trade and generally good relations. Boundary disputes were settled amicably. Both the U.S. and Canada saw a surge in nationalism and national pride after 1815, with the U.S. moving toward greater democracy and the British postponing democracy in Canada. After 1780 The United States opened relations with North African countries, and with the Ottoman Empire (Sander, 2015: 12).

In response to the new independence of Spanish colonies in Latin America in the early 19th century, the United States established the Monroe Doctrine in 1823. This policy declared opposition to European interference in the Americas and left a lasting imprint on the psyche of later American leaders. The failure of Spain to colonize or police Florida led to its purchase by the U.S. in 1821. John Quincy Adams was the leading American diplomat of the era. In 1846 after an intense political debate in which the expansionist Democrats prevailed over the Whigs, the U.S. annexed the Republic of Texas. Mexico never recognized that Texas had achieved independence and promised war should the U.S. annex it. President James K. Polk peacefully resolved a border dispute with Britain regarding Oregon, then sent U.S. Army patrols into the disputed area of Texas. That triggered the Mexican-American War, which the Americans won easily. As a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 the U.S. acquired territory that included California, Arizona and New Mexico, and the Hispanic residents there were given full U.S. citizenship.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What was American Foreign policy centred on during (creation) formation?

4.0 CONCLUSION

The triumph of Union forces in 1865 finally ended the dispute over the relative merits of national authority and States rights. The United States of America emerged from the Civil War more powerful and secure than at any time in its history. However because of the balance of power in Europe, the United States would remain largely immune from international dangers for the next 500 years. The United States Foreign Policy Affairs declined in importance toward the end of this period and throughout the 19th century while the nation focused on domestic expansion and internal trade. In conclusion despite the great prestige of the Secretary of State in the early days of the nation, the U.S.A Congress remained tight-fisted throughout the 19th century when allocating money for foreign affairs.

5.0 SUMMARY

In sum the United States of America is a country of liberty and those that created the country have a vision of liberating the human race by promoting democracy, expanding across the continent, supporting liberal internationalism, contesting World Wars and the Cold War (a state of political hostility between countries characterized by threats, propaganda, and other measures

short of open warfare, in particular), fighting international terrorism, developing or exploiting the Third World, and building a strong world economy. The United States of America is using long term foreign policy to achieve its National interests and defend its territory and that is why since its creation America ensure it invests billions of dollars in defence, foreign affairs and as well as home land security. In essence, the basic fundamental human rights are the strong pillars of the USA foreign policy objective the survival of the country is the first primary interest of everybody and that is why every American will also say God bless America.

6.0 TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Give a detail account of the History of American foreign policy in practice.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Springboard, J, *The Early American Foreign Policy*. Washington D.C. Octaviva 2014. ISBN: 0110022494

David West, et al! *What is in American Foreign Policy? A Narrative History*.Z'tEdition. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2009. ISBN: 0066406821

Fester D. *The Becoming of a Nation called America*, Upper Saddle IZj\er. NJ: Prentice Haii, 2014. ISBN: 0208044005

Goldstein, J. *International Relations, 8th edn.*, New York: Pearson Longman, 2008. ISBN: 0020550557

Williams, P. *The United States of America Foreign Policy 2nd edn.*, Boston: Houghton- Mifflin, 2002. ISBN: 0618226478

Parks, B. *American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2014. ISBN: 0293993551

Sander, Monica. *The Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in America at Work* New York: Universe, 2015. ISBN: 0099329448

Mark, A.A *History of the United States*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2011. ISBN: 0099215255

Paterson, Thomas G. *American Foreign Relations: A History*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2009. ISBN: 0547225695

Rosati, J. *The Politics of United States Foreign Policy 5th edn.*, Belmont, CA : Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2010. ISBN: 0495797241

Woloch, N. *USA Foreign policy and the American Experience, 5th edn.*, Boston: McGraw- Hill, 2011. ISBN: 0073385573

UNIT 3 THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 3.1 Realist Tradition in American Foreign Policy
 - 3.2. Liberal Internationalism in American Foreign Policy
 - 3.3 Domestic Determinants to the study of American Foreign Policy
 - 3.4 World System Theory to the study of American Foreign Policy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This course is designed as an introduction to the theory, pattern and process of American foreign policy. It attempts to present as wide a variety of theoretical and historical genres and perspectives as possible. It aims to provide students with different theoretical frameworks and important historical backgrounds in their analyses of current foreign policy issues, particularly American foreign policy toward non-Western, developing countries, which have different cultural and religious traditions, with widely shared resentments of colonialism, and in their volatile stages of difficult transition from premodern to modern, democratic societies. The course also examines theories about how states formulate foreign policy. The focus is on the decision-making process, including theories about individual rationality and cognition, information processing, risk taking, group dynamics, and bureaucratic politics, as well as the influence of domestic societal factors. The various theoretical approaches are applied to historical cases of international crises and intelligence failures, drawn primarily but not exclusively from American foreign policy.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the lecture students should;

1. To learn about major competing theoretical paradigms regarding how to assess other nations foreign policy intentions.
2. To understand the complex nature of U.S. foreign policymaking process.
3. To understand the unique characteristics of U.S. foreign policy deeply ingrained 111 American political culture.
4. To learn about the multi-faceted dimensions of nation-state building and turbulent transition from pre-modern to modern societies in the developing world, and compare them with America's historical, social, and cultural experiences.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 REALIST TRADITION IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

In the discipline of international relations there are contending general theories or theoretical perspectives. Realism, also known as political realism, is a view of international politics that stresses its competitive and conflictual side. It is usually contrasted with idealism or liberalism, which tends to emphasize cooperation. Realists consider the principal actors in the international arena to be states, which are concerned with their own security, act in pursuit of their own national interests, and struggle for power. The negative side of the realists' emphasis on power and self-interest is often their skepticism regarding the relevance of ethical norms to relations among states. National politics is the realm of authority and law, whereas international politics, they sometimes claim, is a sphere without justice, characterized by active or potential conflict among states.

Not all realists, however, deny the presence of ethics in international relations. The distinction should be drawn between classical realism represented by such twentieth-century theorists as Reinhold Niebuhr and Hans Morgenthau and radical or extreme realism. While classical realism emphasizes the concept of national interest, it is not the Machiavellian doctrine "that anything is justified by reason of state" (Bull 1995, 189). Nor does it involve the glorification of war or conflict. The classical realists do not reject the possibility of moral judgment in international politics. Rather, they are critical of moralism abstract moral discourse that does not take into account political realities. They assign supreme value to successful political action based on prudence: the ability to judge the rightness of a given action from among possible alternatives on the basis of its likely political consequences. Realism encompasses a variety of approaches and claims a long theoretical tradition. Among its founding fathers, Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes are the names most usually mentioned. Twentieth-century classical realism has today been largely replaced by neo realism, which is an attempt to construct a more scientific approach to the study of international relations. Both classical realism and neo realism have been subjected to criticism from IR theorists representing liberal, critical, and post-modern perspectives.

Realism is the predominant school of thought in international relations theory, theoretically formalizing the politics of statesmanship of early modern Europe. Although a highly diverse body of thought, it can be thought of as unified by the belief that world politics is, in the final analysis, always and necessarily a field of conflict among actors pursuing power. Crudely, realists are of three kinds in what they take the source of ineliminable conflict to be. Classical realists believe that it follows from human nature, neo realists focus upon the structure of the anarchic state system, and neoclassical realists believe that it is a result of a combination of the two and certain domestic variables. Realists also disagree about what kind of action states ought to take to navigate world politics, dividing between (although most realists fall outside the two groups) defensive realism and offensive realism. Realists have also claimed that a realist tradition of thought is evident within the history of political thought all the way back to antiquity, including Thucydides, Thomas Hobbes and Niccolò Machiavelli.

Realism can be characterized as a spectrum of ideas. Regardless of which definition is used, the theories of realism revolve around four central propositions:

- That states are the central actors in international politics rather than individuals or

International organizations,

- That the international political system is anarchic as there is no supranational authority that can enforce rules over the states,
- That the actors in the international political system are rational as their actions maximize their own self-interest, and
- That all states desire power so that they can ensure their own self-preservation.

Realism is often associated with politics as both are based on the management of the pursuit, possession, and application of power. Politics however, is an older prescriptive guideline limited to policy-making (like foreign policy), while Realism is a particular paradigm, or wider theoretical and methodological framework, aimed at describing, explaining and, eventually, predicting events in the international relations domain.

3.2 LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The concept of liberal internationalism is often associated with former US President Woodrow Wilson, thus sometimes being referred to as 'Wilsonianism' (Hoffman, 1995: 159). Wilson suggested that the cause of instability and conflict was the undemocratic nature of international politics, particularly in regards to foreign policy and the balance of power (Baylis et al. 2008: 111). Having identified the cause of conflict, it is possible to suggest that the aims of liberal internationalism are expanding democratic practices and free trade, defending democracy from its rivals while protecting and promoting human rights (Hoffman, 1995: 159).

This idea of how the world ought to develop appears to have been inspired in part by Immanuel Kant's 'Perpetual Peace'. It can be argued that Kant was advocating a federation of free states governed by the rule of law (Stearns&Pettiford, 200 I. 45). Kant suggested that when states became republics and their citizens are given the opportunity to make decisions, they are less likely to choose to go to war, therefore it is possible to argue that as more states become republics and democracy spreads then the likelihood of war between nations becomes smaller until eventually all nations view war as irrational and peace triumphs over conflict (Kant, 1795; (Baylis et al. 2008). The pursuit of perpetual peace seems to be a key aspect of liberal internationalism. Liberal internationalism can be seen as an approach to international relations aiming to spread liberal democracy throughout the world in order to bring an end to conflicts.

Having defined liberal internationalism, it may be useful to outline the class-based approaches to international relations, which will be used to examine how convincing the liberal internationalist approach is. While liberal internationalism identifies states as the key actor, Marxist thought would argue that social class is the most significant actor (Heywood, 2004). Marxists tend to argue that society, domestically and internationally, is systematically prone to class conflict, whereas liberals assume an essential harmony of interests among the various social groups (Baylis et al. 2008: 146). As previously mentioned, liberal internationalism seeks to expand, defend and promote democracy across the globe in order to maintain stability and peace, Marxist thinkers such as Gramsci would argue that this stability is maintained through the concept of hegemony. Gramsci highlights the significance of ideology in maintaining class rule and suggests that the ruling classes legitimize their power and preserve the status quo presenting their

ideas as the only feasible option (Stears&Pettiford, 2001). This suggests that ruling elites can gain consent for their ideas but crucially, according to Gramsci, their legitimacy is not threatened due to a fear of coercion felt by the exploited and alienated classes (Baylis et al. 2008: 150). It may be possible to argue from a Gramscian point of view that leading powers in the international system have developed a world order suited to their interests and goals, convinced the lower classes that this world order is also in their interests yet continue to exploit them (Baylis et al. 2008). Summed up, class based approaches to international relations do not view states as the most important actors in the international system, with the Gramscian school of thought arguing that ruling classes manipulate the majority of society into the belief that there is only one world order that will produce peace and stability.

Liberal internationalism may be viewed as a convincing approach to international relations as it is possible to argue that this approach has been relatively successful in creating and sustaining stability. Taking each of liberal internationalism's key aims, as outlined previously, it is possible to assess how much success has been gained through this approach to international relations. Firstly, liberal internationalism is praised for speaking up against violations of human rights (Hoffman, (995). Combating human rights violations may be achieved through the use of various international institutions, which have liberal internationalist ideals embedded in their constitutions; examples of such institutions would be the United Nations (UN), European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), (Goldstein et al. 2000). Such institutions give citizens the opportunity to stand up to what Marxists might term the ruling class, an example of this could be the *Siliadin v. France* case submitted to the European Court of Human Rights in 2001 (European Court of Human Rights, 2008). This case claimed that French law was inadequate in preventing 'domestic slavery, thus committing a violation of ECHR's Article 4, the prohibition of slavery and forced labour (European Court of Human Rights, 2008).

This would appear to illustrate that the international institutions put in place to protect the aims of liberal internationalism are fulfilling their goal, however it could be argued that there have been times when promoters of liberal internationalism have been silent on certain human rights violations in order to pursue other objectives. An example of this would be the way in which liberal internationalist leader, America, appeared to ignore the human rights violations occurring in China in order to use the Chinese to help in the fight against the Soviet form of communism (Hoffman, 1995). It is possible then to suggest that Gramscianism trend of thought was correct in assuming that leaders in the international system will pursue their own interests at the expense of others being exploited, also choosing to pursue particular interests at particular points in time.

It is possible to suggest that the protection of human rights comes only when the values of democracy have been accepted. Attention is now turned to liberal internationalism's success in achieving the spread of democratic values, assessing whether or not this approach to international relations is convincing in its attempt to secure global stability. It may be suggested that democracy is the "antidote that will prevent future wars" (Layne, 1994: 5).

Democratic peace theorists appear to argue that democratic states are "no less war-prone than non-democratic states" but generally choose not to engage in war with other democratic states the relationships between democratic states are built on mutual respect, cooperation and interdependence (Layne, 1994: 8). The assumption could then be made that as democracy expands, the tendency to engage in military conflict reduces. Although this appears to be a

convincing way to promote international peace and stability, questions have been asked as to how democracy is spread. It appears that one way in which liberal internationalists spread democracy is through intervening in non-democratic states to replace the governing regime with an alternative democratic one, an example of this would be US and coalition forces involvement in Afghanistan to replace the Islamic Taliban regime with a democratic government. It could be argued that this intervention has been partly successful in that August 2009 saw the first Afghan run elections since international involvement in 2001 illustrating that not only has the undemocratic regime been removed from power but that Afghanistan is capable of holding its own democratic elections (Doucet, 2009). However these elections have come under much criticism and campaigning for a second round is underway following a recount of the initial votes due to claims of fraud (BSe News, 2009). In addition to criticism surrounding the presidential elections, it is possible to suggest that intervention in Afghanistan has not achieved its goal of spreading democracy and peace as the death toll of both military personnel and civilians in the region continues to rise. One figure suggests that there were upwards of 3,000 people killed in violence during 2008 alone (USA Today, 2008). Evidence such as this would appear to demonstrate that when liberal international powers intervene they succeed in promoting democratic reform in the short term but in the long run end up delivering unstable situations (Bueno de Mesquita & Downs, 2006). This appears to suggest that the practice of interventionism is only part of a wider attempt to expand democracy, therefore only being part of the examination of liberal internationalism's success.

Linked to the previous analysis of spreading democracy in order to ensure international peace and stability, it is possible to argue that liberal internationalism is a convincing approach to international relations because the number of liberal democracies has risen throughout the 20th century. Huntington identified three 'waves' of democratization, that is periods of time where the number of states establishing themselves as democracies outnumbered the number of states experiencing democratic breakdown (Diamond, 1996). Diamond suggests that there is between 76 and 117 democracies now operating (ibid.). Although data may show the number of democracies is increasing, has the spread of democracy reduced the number of conflicts thus achieving the liberal internationalist aim of promoting democracy to help ensure stability? In support of liberal internationalism's approach to international relations would be that along with the increased number of democratic states, there has been no violent conflict on the scale of the two world wars.

However, there has continued to be international conflict, notably the 'War on Terror'. Supporters of class-based approaches would perhaps argue that focus should not be placed on conflict between states but rather on the conflicts arising out of class tensions. Drawing on the earlier relationship between the spread of democracy and intervention, advocates of class-based approaches to international relations, particularly those who concerned with the World Systems Theory, appear to suggest that intervening in order to expand democratic practices is merely a way of legitimizing the hegemonic imperialism of liberal internationalist powers (Baylis et al. 2008). It is thus possible to argue that the US and its allies are not engaged in the 'War on Terror' in order to pursue democracy and peace but rather to enforce their own beliefs on seemingly unwilling states while demonstrating their coercive powers in order to keep those on the periphery from becoming part of the core unless they sign up completely to the aims of those already part of the core. In support of this argument would be the idea that if the states or

institutions intervening were truly democratic then they would be peaceful in all relations, whether with fellow democracies or not, pursuing negotiations and peaceful resolutions rather than engaging in violent, military conflict (Layne, 1994).

Although the liberal international approach appears to have been relatively successful in achieving its aim of protecting human rights and spreading democratic practices, it is perhaps possible to argue that this is a more convincing approach to international relations than class-based approaches due to the influence of free trade economics. Gramscian scholars would argue that free trade hinders the economic and social development of those on the periphery (Baylis et al. 2008). However those in support of liberal internationalism would counter this claim by suggesting that free trade creates interdependence between states suggesting that it is to everyone's benefit to have open markets as it rests upon the assumption that transactions between states will be "determined by prices rather than coercion" thus producing a "mutual security" (Doyle, 1986: 1161).

3.3 DOMESTIC DETERMINANTS TO THE STUDY OF U.S.A FOREIGN POLICY

Foreign policy is not immune from the impact of values, ideas, initiatives and upheavals, From the aggressive foreign policies of Nazi Germany to early 20th century American isolationism, history has proven that the external ambitions of the state are far from homogenous, The realm of the foreign is an ideological concept, a product of international dynamics and domestic attributes. For one to suggest otherwise is primitive; there is no denying that international socialization has re-shaped foreign relations, and similarly, the permeation of national politics on the international stage cannot be discredited. Since both factors play a pivotal role in external policy formulation, the domestic and the foreign are easily distinguishable conceptions. But as this essay will argue, foreign policy is primarily generated from within. The influence of the domestic forms the basis of foreign strategy, overshadowing but not discounting remaining elements. The correlation between both policy areas is one of great strength.

Successful politicians mobilize and retain public support as a means of maintaining public office. In other words, democracy encourages choice; political parties argue on a range of policy areas, with emerging governments reflecting the opinions and values of the majority electorate. Whilst the two environments may be different, the relationship between foreign and domestic policy is thus determined on a common level of populism, with the decisions of state leaders reflecting notions of common consensus and agreement. Inevitably, this means that both policy areas share similar ideological aims and ambitions. One example would be Barack Obama's current pursuit of the liberal agenda in the United States. The President's advocating of troop withdrawal from Iraq, together with plans for healthcare reform promotes values of social welfare and responsibility typically found on the left of the ideological spectrum. Furthermore, they embody an overwhelming level of populism, with around 90% of American citizens favoring some kind of healthcare reforming 63% of Americans believing that the dispatch of troops to Iraq was a mistake. In short, domestic opinion plays a pivotal role in shaping governmental action, transcending across internal and external affairs of the state, and often, containing a sub set of differing values in accordance with the state in question. As Michael Medved notes, nationalism is a key factor within modern American society, and the formulation of US foreign policy has been heavily based on this concept throughout history. America's entrance into World War Two, for example, responded to the threatening of national infrastructure established by Japan's attack

on Pearl Harbor. Similarly, the devastating events of 9/11 created a new level of 'islamophobia', with resentment to the Muslim populace becoming a staple, albeit a marginal staple, of national identity. The retaliatory approach within America's domestic society permeated into its domestic political arena, with the passing of the USA PATRIOT Act expanding law enforcement powers as a means of protecting national identity. Contemporary US foreign policy has heavily incorporated such ideals, with aggressive strategies in Afghanistan and Iraq reflecting a need to protect the American populace and American borders. Thus, a fundamental aspect in the relation between domestic and foreign policy is the prominence of national identity and a consistent need to protect such values. The concept of state sovereignty is still the persistent force in the international system, and with the continued persistence of nationalist governments in the global society (such as Austria), international socialization will continue to be an undermined and undervalued resource. Similarly, the prominence of religion in domestic and foreign policy has proved pivotal. The relationship is most apparent within Eastern states like Egypt, where the current government has been accused of "pandering to religious sentiments to consolidate its hold on power. Domestic broadcasting policy has incorporated an increasing amount of religious programming on state television channels, a move designed to "entrench the dominant religious frame of mind in Egypt. As Christopher Hill notes, foreign policy will inevitably be affected by national religious factors because particular moral codes exist within other countries. This is evident from the continuing Israel-Palestine conflict, in which the country recently pledged support for the continued presence of Arab population in East Jerusalem, the notion of this support rests on the defense of Islamic culture within the international society.

The relationship between domestic and foreign is also commonly linked by the influence of domestic culture, with heavy emphasis on social groups and social attitudes within states. Throughout the 20th century, racial division characterized South Africa, with apartheid showing inherent levels of racism by the white minority. Yet South Africa's repression of black civil rights in its domestic sphere was ignored in its foreign policy structure; attempts to strengthen the countries' economy were executed via trade agreements with black African states. Domestic and foreign policy can be distinguished as two separate concepts in International Relations, because a state does not have an homogenized set of aims; in South Africa, it was seen as the country's best interest to preserve elite social structures, but economic strength was vital to ensure the state's stability. However, distinguishing the two concepts was limited by the practicalities of the global society, in particular concerns regarding human rights and morality. Apartheid was condemned across the international spectrum, and as such the boundaries between the state's domestic and foreign policy broke down; external forces did not want to "associate with a system that was historically doomed.

One could argue that international determinants play a vital role in influencing foreign policy. If specific issues are met with common consensus by the international community, a state is placed under pressure to adapt in a similar fashion; otherwise, any foreign ambition it may have will be crippled by external forces. The lack of a rule of law in Zimbabwe, together with the country's human rights abuses have resulted in several economic sanctions, such as those imposed by the European Union in 2002. Zimbabwe's foreign agenda is thus limited, the structure of its domestic and foreign policy blurred in the face of social disorder and disharmony. Problematic domestic

culture reflects on the image of government, overshadowing its internal and external actions: as such, the power of the elite to define its own image and ideology becomes diminished in both domestic and foreign affairs. Perhaps then, it can be concluded that the role of the domestic places constraints on foreign policy makers, a theory also of great prominence in developed states. The interests of French farmers inhibits any wish the Paris government may have in reforming the European Union's Common Agricultural Policy, to lose the support of such an important group would have damaging effects on the French economy, not to mention the diminishment of France's prominent role on the international stage. Similarly, in 2008 an Irish referendum on the Lisbon treaty produced a definitive "No" result, with Irish citizens believing Europe had grown out of touch with domestic interests. Here, the link between domestic and foreign affairs is evident; the domestic provides the connection between elected politicians and the citizens they represent. It stops the political elite from growing out of touch with society, and marginalises the influence of external forces (i.e. other states) in the creation of foreign policy matters.

Another crucial factor is how the foreign realm, similar to its domestic counterpart, is a product of continuity and sustainment despite "the vicissitudes of electoral politics. In the United States, conflictual approaches to foreign policy have been evident for much of 20th and early part of the 21st century, with wars such as Vietnam and Iraq having been executed under both Republican and Democratic presidents. In domestic terms, values of individualism, accountability and self-determination continue to persist in American society despite swings in the two party systems. This can be attributed to the existence of hegemonic class structures that drive the formulation of policy within states. Making up 47% of the population, the middle class are America's largest social strata, mostly consisting of professionals, craftsmen and managers; they desire a need to maintain private enterprise but support government intervention where necessary. As such, the middle class exercise control over the policy agenda, shaping the formulation of ideas and values within government. In domestic terms, President Barack Obama's current healthcare plan is a clear indication of this, instigating basic healthcare provisions for all Americans, but also allowing private health insurance to remain as a viable option. The same can be said for US foreign policy. Intervention has often been viewed with suspicion in American society, demonstrated by American isolationism in the 1930s and the rejection to enter the League of Nations by Congress in 1919. As Noam Chomsky argues, governments must convince their populace that conflictual behavior is necessary, often manufacturing messages through the media. The threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) was a message designed to create hysteria amongst the American people, making entry into Iraq appear as the only possible solution. Thus, there is little to distinguish foreign and domestic policy in the way of political expediency; the tactics used by politicians in democratic states maintains the role of interventional government, but legitimizes such intervention by preserving spheres of individualism and common good.

It should be noted, however, that foreign policy is not immune from the influence of international dynamics, in particular the role of international institutions and global economic policy. Within the European Union, policies such as the Maastricht Treaty (1992) have created common foreign and security values that all member states must follow; a desire to promote international co-operation and respect human rights are cornerstones of the Treaty's agenda, and will inevitably lay the framework to the foreign agenda of countries involved. Within many

states such as the United Kingdom, European law is placed above British law (as established by the 1972 European Communities Act) and so it is impossible to ignore the role of international actors in the formulation of foreign policy. Similarly, considerations must also be paid to the role of globalisation within the international society. The preconception that states operate in complete anarchy can be disclaimed by the movement of multinational corporations (MNCs) throughout the globe, often utilizing labour in developing countries whilst retaining their business structures in developed nations. The conduct of the state on the international stage can no longer operate on purely isolationist terms; in order to survive economically, it is vital that foreign relations are extended to countries across the globe so that the movement of goods and services can be a structured and efficient process. Thus, the relationship between domestic and foreign policy is separable in the sense that global institutionalism plays a major role in the modern global society and the conduct of states in modern international relations.

3.4 WORLD SYSTEM THEORY TO THE STUDY OF U.S.A FOREIGN POLICY

World-systems theory also known as world-systems analysis or the world-systems perspective, a multidisciplinary, macro-scale approach to world history and social change, emphasizes the world-system (and not nation states) as the primary (but not exclusive) unit of social analysis.

World-system refers to the inter-regional and transnational division of labor, which divides the world into core countries, semi-periphery countries, and the periphery countries. Core countries focus on higher skill, capital-intensive production, and the rest of the world focuses on low-skill, labor-intensive production and extraction of raw materials. This constantly reinforces the dominance of the core countries. Nonetheless, the system has dynamic characteristics, in part as a result of revolutions in transport technology, and individual states can gain or lose their core (semi-periphery, periphery) status over time. For a time, certain countries become the world hegemon; during the last few centuries, as the world-system has extended geographically and intensified economically, this status has passed from the Netherlands, to the United Kingdom and (most recently) to the United States of America. World-systems theory traces emerged in the 1970s. Its roots can be found in sociology, but it has developed into a highly interdisciplinary field.

World-systems theory was aiming to replace modernization theory. Wallerstein criticized modernisation theory for three reasons:

1. its focus on the nation state as the only unit of analysis
2. its assumption that there is only a single path of evolutionary development for all countries
3. its disregard of transnational structures that constrain local and national development.

Three major predecessors of world-systems theory are the Annales School, Marxism and dependency theory, The Annales School tradition (represented most notably by Fernand Braudel) influenced Wallerstein to focusing on long-term processes and geo-ecological regions as unit of analysis. Marxism added a stress on social conflict, a focus on the capital accumulation process and competitive class struggles, a focus on a relevant totality, the transitory nature of social forms and a dialectical sense of motion through conflict and contradiction. World-systems theory

was also significantly influenced by dependency theory, a neo-Marxist explanation of development processes. Other influences on the world-systems theory come from scholars such as Karl Polanyi, Nikolai Kondratiev and Joseph Chumpeter (particularly their research on business cycles and the concepts of three basic modes of economic organization: reciprocal, redistributive, and market modes, which Wallerstein reframed into a discussion of mini systems, world empires, and world economies).

The development of the capitalist world economy is detrimental to a large proportion of the world's population; it views the period since the 1970s as an age of transition that will give way to a future world system (or world systems) whose configuration cannot be determined in advance.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are the theories of American foreign policy?

4.0 CONCLUSION

To conclude therefore, the link between foreign and domestic policy is one of great strength despite being clearly distinguished. Politicians govern on a common level of populism, and in doing so they play on a sub set of values in relation to their specific state; embodiment of nationalism and religion can be found across both policy areas. The importance of domestic culture, whether through domestic atrocity or homogenized class structures place important limits on governments and provide a check on their actions. Despite this, the importance of globalization and international institutions continue to shape foreign external relations, limiting the concepts of state sovereignty and isolationism, and making international co-operation inevitability.

5.0 CONCLUSION

In summary, all the theories in the American foreign policy whether realist, liberal internationalism domestic and world system can be seen as a more convincing approach to international relations than its class-based rivals as not only has it experienced success in reaching its aims to spreading democracy, protecting human rights and promoting economic free trade in order to maintain peace, it has also continued to be a dominant force in international relations while class-based approaches have failed to make any lasting and significant impact. However it is also important to note that, the realist or liberal internationalism or domestic and World System theory is not without its internal faults and has appeared to value certain aims over others at various points in history.

6.0 TUTOR - MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss any theory that the USA used in its foreign policy relations

7.0 REERENCES AND FUTHER READINGS

Baylis. J, Smith. S, Owens. P, 2008, *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

BSC News, 2009, Campaigning for Afghan Elections, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/8323708.stm>
Accessed: 30/10/2009

Bueno de Mesquita. B and Downs. G, 2006, 'Intervention and Democracy', *International Organisation*, 60: 3: 627-649

Diamond. L, 1996, 'Is the Third Wave Over?'. *Journal of Democracy*, 7: 3: 20-37

Doucet. L, 2009, Afghanistan's Day of Reckoning, BBC News, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/8205787.stm Accessed: 30/10/2009

Doyle. M, 1986, 'Liberalism and World Politics', *The American Political Science Review*, 80: 4: 1151-1169

European court of Human Rights, 2008, *The European Court of Human Rights: Some Facts and Figures 1998-2008*, http://www.echr.coe.int/INR/IRonlyres/ACF07093-I_93_7-49AF-8BE6-36FEOFEE175910/FactsAndFiguresENG10ansNov.pdf Accessed: 31/10/2009

Goldstein. J, Kahler. M, Keohane. R, Slaughter. A, 2000, 'Introduction: Legalization and World Politics', *International Organisation*, 54: 3: 385-399

Heywood. A, 2004, *Political Theory: An Introduction*, Palgrave MacMillan, Hampshire

Hoffman. S, 1995, 'The Crisis of Liberal Internationalism', *Foreign Policy*, 98: 159-177.

Kant. I, 1795 (2005), *Perpetual Peace*, Cosimo Inc., New York

Layne. C, 1994, 'Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace', *International Security*, 19: 2: 5-49

Stears. J. and Pettiford. L, 2001, *International Relations: Perspectives and Themes*, Pearson Education Limited, Essex

USA Today, 2008, Afghan Death Toll Reaches 500, http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2008-08-07-afghan-war_N.htm Accessed: 31/10/2009

Christopher Hill, *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. (Palgrave Macmillan, 2003): p.

222

UNIT 4 EVOLUTION OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY (DOCTRINES)

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 -Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 3.1 Evolution of United States Foreign Policy
 - 3.2 Monroe Doctrine
 - 3.3 Roosevelt Doctrine
 - 3.4 Truman Doctrine
 - 3.5 Eisenhower Doctrine
 - 3.6 Kennedy Doctrine
 - 3.7 Carter Doctrine
 - 3.8 Reagan Doctrine
 - 3.9 Clinton Doctrine
 - 3.10 Bush Doctrine
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The overall actions taken by the United States of America to promote its national interests, security, and well-being in the world come under the heading of foreign policy. These actions may include measures that support a competitive economy, provides for a strong defense of the nation's borders, and encourage the ideas of peace, freedom, and democracy at home and abroad. Foreign policy may contain inherent contradictions. For example, an aggressive foreign policy with a country whose activities have been perceived as threatening to U.S. security could result in a confrontation, which might undermine freedom and democracy at home. Foreign policy is never static; it must respond to and initiate actions as circumstances change. In his farewell address, George Washington warned the United States to steer clear of foreign entanglements. From the conclusion of the War of 1812 to the Spanish-American War (1898), this advice was largely followed. American foreign policy was isolationist; that is, U.S. leaders saw little reason to get involved in world affairs, particularly outside the Western Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine (1823) stated that the United States would not interfere in European affairs and it would oppose any European attempt to colonize the Americas. The second part of the doctrine was effectively enforced because it reflected British desires as well American energies were applied to settling the continent under the banner of manifest destiny. In this unit we shall examine the definition of foreign policy, how different leaders were able to push their countries interest among the international community, our emphasis is on understanding the meaning of the basic concept in foreign policy.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

It is expected that at the end of the lecture students should be able to:

1. Define and explain what foreign Policy
2. Identify and explain the various foreign Policy doctrines America used to protect its National Interest; and
3. Be conversant with various foreign Policy issues associated with USA.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Evolution of United States Foreign Policy

The main trend regarding the evolution of U.S. foreign policy since the American Revolution is the shift from non-interventionism before and after World War I, to its growth as a world power and global hegemony during and since World War II and the end of the Cold War in the 20th century. Since the 19th century, U.S. foreign policy also has been revolutionized by a shift from the realist school to the idealistic or Wilsonian school of international relations (Cohen, 1995:7).

In the evolution process U.S Foreign policy themes were expressed considerably in George Washington's farewell address; these included among other things, observing good faith and justice towards all nations and cultivating peace and harmony with all, excluding both "inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others", "steering clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world", and advocating trade with all nations. These policies became the basis of the Federalist Party in the 1790s. But the rival Jeffersonians feared Britain and favoured France in the 1790s, declaring the War of 1812 on Britain. After the 1778 alliance with France, the U.S. did not sign another permanent treaty until the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949 (Gries, 2014: 12). During its evolution over time, other themes, key goals, attitudes, or stances have been variously expressed by Presidential 'doctrines', named for them. Initially these were uncommon events, but since WWII, these have been made by most presidents. In general, the United States followed an isolationist foreign policy until attacks against U.S. shipping by Barbary corsairs spurred the country into developing a naval force projection capability, resulting in the First Barbary War in 1801(Hastedt,2004:3).

Despite occasional entanglements with European Powers such as the War of 1812 and the 1898 Spanish-American War, U.S. foreign policy was marked by steady expansion of its foreign trade and scope during the 19th century, and it maintained its policy of avoiding wars with and between European powers. Concerning its domestic borders, the 1803 Louisiana Purchase doubled the nation's geographical area, Spain ceded the territory of Florida in 1819, annexation brought Texas in 1845; a war with Mexico in 1848 added California, Arizona and New Mexico. The U.S. bought Alaska from the Russian Empire in 1867, and it annexed the Republic of Hawaii in 1898. Victory over Spain in 1898 brought the Philippines, and Puerto Rico, as well as oversight of Cuba. The short experiment in imperialism ended by 1908, as the U.S. turned its attention to the Panama Canal and the stabilization of regions to its south, including Mexico(ibidi:5).

In the process of the evolution of the USA foreign policy, the 20th century was marked by two world wars in which the United States, along with allied powers, defeated its enemies and increased its international reputation. President Wilson's Fourteen Points was developed from his idealistic Wilsonianism program of spreading democracy and fighting militarism so as to end any wars. It became the basis of the German Armistice (really surrender) and the 1919 Paris Peace Conference (Herring, 2008: 17). The resulting Treaty of Versailles, due to European allies' punitive and territorial designs, showed insufficient conformity with these points and the U.S. signed separate treaties with each of its adversaries; due to Senate objections also, the U.S. never joined the League of Nations, which was established as a result of Wilson's initiative. In the 1920s, the United States followed an independent course, and succeeded in a program of naval disarmament, and refunding the German economy. New York became the financial capital of the world, but the downside of the '20s was the '29 Crash of 1929 hurled the entire world into the Great Depression. American trade policy relied on high tariffs under the Republicans, and reciprocal trade agreements under the Democrats, but in any case exports were at very low levels in the 1930s (Ikenberry, 2010:8).

The United States adopted a non-interventionist foreign policy from 1932 to 1938, but then President Franklin D. Roosevelt moved toward strong support of the Allies in their wars against Germany and Japan. As a result of intense internal debate, the national policy was one of becoming the Arsenal of Democracy that is financing and equipping the Allied armies without sending American combat soldiers. Roosevelt mentioned four fundamental freedoms, which ought to be enjoyed by people "everywhere in the world"; these included the freedom of speech and religion, as well as freedom from want and fear. Roosevelt helped establish terms for a post-war world among potential allies at the Atlantic Conference; specific points were included to correct earlier failures, which became a step toward the United Nations. American policy was to threaten Japan, to force it out of China, and to prevent its attacking the Soviet Union (McCormick, 2012:4). However, Japan reacted by an attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941, and the United States was at war with Japan, Germany, and Italy. Instead of the loans given to allies in World War I, the United States provided Lend-Lease grants of \$50,000,000,000. Working closely with Winston Churchill of Britain, and Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union, Roosevelt sent his forces into the Pacific against Japan, then into North Africa against Italy and Germany, and finally into Europe starting with France and Italy in 1944 against the Germans. The American economy roared forward, doubling industrial production, and building vast quantities of airplanes, ships, tanks, munitions, and, 'finally, the atomic bomb. Much of the American war effort went to strategic bombers, which flattened the cities of Japan and Germany.

3.2 MONROE DOCTRINE

The Monroe Doctrine, expressed in 1823, proclaimed the United States' opinion that European powers should no longer colonize the Americas or interfere with the affairs of sovereign nations located in the Americas, such as the United States, Mexico, Gran Colombia and others. In return, the United States planned to stay neutral in wars between European powers and in wars between a European power and its colonies. However, if these latter type of wars were to occur in the Americas, the U.S. would view such action as hostile toward itself. The doctrine was issued by President James Monroe during this seventh annual State of the Union address to Congress. It

was met first with doubt, then with enthusiasm. This was a defining moment in U.S. foreign policy.

The doctrine was conceived by its authors, especially as a proclamation by the States of moral opposition to colonialism, but has subsequently been re-interpreted in a wide variety of ways, including by President Theodore Roosevelt as a license for the U.S. to practice its own form of colonialism (known as the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine.)

3.3 ROOSEVELT DOCTRINE

The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine was a substantial alteration (called an amendment) of the Monroe Doctrine by U.S President Theodore Roosevelt in J 904. In its altered state, the Monroe Doctrine would now consider Latin America as an agency for expanding U.S. commercial interests in the region, along with its original stated purpose of keeping European hegemony from the hemisphere.

In essence, Roosevelt's Monroe Doctrine would be the basis for a use of economic and military hegemony to make the U.S. the dominant power in the Western Hemisphere. The new doctrine was a frank statement that the U.S. was willing to seek leverage over Latin American governments by acting as an international police power in the region. This announcement has been described as the policy of speaking softly but carrying a big stick, and consequently launched a period of big stick diplomacy, in contrast with later Dollar Diplomacy. Roosevelt's approach was more controversial among isolationist-pacifists in the U.S

3.4 TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The Truman Doctrine was part of the United States' political response to perceived aggression by the Soviet Union in Europe and the Middle East, illustrated through the communist movements in Iran, Turkey and Greece. As a result, American foreign policy towards the USSR shifted, to that of containment. Under the Truman Doctrine, the United States was prepared to send any money, equipment, or military force to countries that were threatened by the communist government, thereby offering assistance to those countries resisting communism. In U.S. President Harry S Truman's words, it became the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. President Truman made the proclamation in an address to the U.S. Congress on March 12, 1947 amid the crisis of the Greek Civil War (1946-1949). Truman insisted that if Greece and Turkey did not receive the aid that they needed, they would inevitably fall to communism with consequences throughout the region. Truman signed the act into law on May 22, J 947 which granted \$400 million in military and economic aid to Turkey and Greece. However, this American aid was in many ways a replacement for British aid which the British were no longer financially in a position to give. The policy of containment and opposition to communists in Greece for example was carried out by the British before 1947 in many of the same ways it was carried out afterward by the Americans.

The doctrine also had consequences elsewhere in Europe. Governments in Western Europe with powerful communist movements, such as Italy and France, were given a variety of assistance and encouraged to keep communist groups out of government. In some respects. These moves were

in response to moves by the Soviet Union to purge opposition groups in Eastern Europe out of existence.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are the examples of the American foreign policy analysis at the individual levels?

3.5 EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

The Eisenhower Doctrine was announced by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in a message to the United States Congress on January 5, 1957. Under the Eisenhower Doctrine, a country could request American economic assistance and/or aid from U.S. military forces if it was being threatened by armed aggression from another state. Eisenhower singled out the Soviet threat in his doctrine by authorizing the commitment of U.S. forces to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism. The doctrine was motivated in part by an increase in Arab hostility toward the West, and growing Soviet influence in Egypt and Syria following the Suez Crisis of 1956.

In the global political context, the Doctrine was made in response to the possibility of a generalized war, threatened as a result of the Soviet Union's attempt to use the Suez War as a pretext to enter Egypt. Coupled with the power vacuum left by the decline of Great British and French power in the region after their failure in that same war, Eisenhower felt that a strong position needed to better the situation was further complicated by the positions taken by Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, who was rapidly building a power base and using it to play the Soviets and Americans against each other, taking a position of positive neutrality and accepting aid from the Soviets.

The military action provisions of the Doctrine were applied in the Lebanon Crisis the following year, when America intervened in response to a request by that country's president.

3.6 KENNEDY DOCTRINE

The Kennedy Doctrine refers to foreign policy initiative of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, towards Latin America during his term in office. Kennedy voiced support for the containment of Communism and the reversal of Communist progress in the Western Hemisphere.

In his Inaugural address on January 20, 1961, President Kennedy presented the American public with a blueprint upon which the future foreign policy initiatives of his administration would later follow and come to represent. In this address, Kennedy warned let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty. He also called upon the public to assist in a struggle against the common enemies of man, tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself. It is in this address that one begins to see the Cold War, us-versus-them mentality that came to dominate the Kennedy administration.

3.7 CARTER DOCTRINE

The Carter Doctrine was a policy proclaimed by President of the United States Jimmy Carter in his State of the Union Address on January 23, 1980, which stated that the United States would use military force if necessary to defend its national interests in the Persian Gulf region. The doctrine was a response to the 1979 invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union, and was intended to deter the Soviet Union the Cold War adversary of the United States from seeking hegemony in the Persian Gulf. After stating that Soviet troops in Afghanistan posed a grave threat to the free movement of Middle East oil, Carter proclaimed:

“Let our position be absolutely clear: An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force. “

3.8 REAGAN DOCTRINE

The Reagan Doctrine was an important Cold War strategy by the United States to oppose the influence of the Soviet Union by backing anti-communist guerrillas against the communist governments of Soviet-backed client states. It was created partially in response to the Brezhnev Doctrine and was a centerpiece of American foreign policy from the mid-1980s until the end of the Cold War in 1991. Reagan first explained the doctrine in his 1985 State of the Union Address: We must not break faith with those who are risking their lives on every continent, from Afghanistan to Nicaragua to defy Soviet aggression and secure rights which have been ours from birth. Support for freedom fighters is self-defense.

The Reagan doctrine called for American support of the Contras in Nicaragua, the mujahideen in Afghanistan and Jonas Savimbi's UNITA movement in Angola, among other anti-communist groups.

3.9 CLINTON DOCTRINE

The Clinton Doctrine is not a clear statement in the way that many other doctrines were. However, in a February 26, 1999, speech, President Bill Clinton said the following, which was considered the Clinton Doctrine:

It's easy to say that we really have no interests in who lives in this or that valley in Bosnia, or who owns a strip of brush land in the Horn of Africa, or some piece of parched earth by the Jordan River. But the true measure of our interests lies not in how small or distant these places are, or in whether we have trouble pronouncing their names. The question we must ask is, what are the consequences to our security of letting conflicts fester and spread. We cannot, indeed, we should not, do everything or be everywhere. But where our values and our interests are at stake, and where we can make a difference, we must be prepared to do so.

Later statements genocide is in and of itself a national interest where we should act, and we can say to the people of the world, whether you live in Africa, or Central Europe, or any other place, if somebody comes after innocent civilians and tries to kill them en masse because of their race,

their ethnic background or their religion, and it's within our power to stop it, we will stop it, augmented the doctrine of interventionism.

3.10 BUSH DOCTRINE

The Bush Doctrine is the set of foreign policies adopted by the President of the United States George W. Bush in the wake of the September 11 2001 attacks. In an address to the United States Congress after the attacks, President Bush declared that the U.S. would make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbour them, a statement that was followed by the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan. Subsequently, the Bush Doctrine has come to be identified with a policy that permits preventive war against potential aggressors before they are capable of mounting attacks against the United States, a view that has been used in part as a rationale for the 2003 Iraq War. The Bush Doctrine is a marked departure from the policies of deterrence that generally characterized American foreign policy during the Cold War and brief period between the collapse of the Soviet Union and 9/11 terror attack on the USA.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The lecture deals extensively with the broad definitions of what is foreign policy and looked at foreign policy from the United States of America perspectives. It also gave comprehensive details of the various interests that USA used in projecting its foreign interest abroad. The lecture went on to analyze the various doctrines which the United States used in protecting and maintaining its foreign investments. Though many former U.S. Presidents had themes related to their handling of foreign policy, the term doctrine generally applies to Presidents such as James Monroe, Harry S. Truman, Richard Nixon, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, George Bush, Bill Clinton all of whom had doctrines which more completely characterized their foreign policy It also discusses the views of past presidents of the United States of America in formulating a strong foundation for the American foreign policy and National Security interests that led to the emergency of America as the World super power.

5.0 SUMMARY

In summary, foreign policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete course of action to attain these objectives and preserve interests. The whole essence of this prelude is that the term foreign policy cannot be studied in isolation From the Factors that determine it. Indeed Foreign policy can be explained from different perspectives, Therefore the United State foreign policy can be said to be the bundle of principles and practices that regulate the intercourse of a state vis-a-vis other states. Through foreign policy a state seeks to achieve a variety of objectives. It is a universal phenomenon that States cannot run away from. In all it is a specialized area for technical and competent people to run, and also the objectives sought to be attained by a state arc of different types and categories, yet there are certain objectives which are uniformly pursued by all states i.e. Political independence and territorial integrity, economic well being and, prestige and status of a nation.

6.0 TUTOR - MARKED ASSIGNMENT

I. Define Foreign Policy

2. Critically evaluate any America foreign policy doctrine

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Ambrose, Stephen E., and Douglas Brinkley. *Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy Since 1938*. New York: Penguin, 2011. ISBN: 0142004944

Davidson, J. W., et al. *Nation of Nations: A Narrative History of the American Republic, 6th ed.*, Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2007. ISBN: 0073406848

Feagin, J.R. and Feagin, C.B. *Racial and Ethnic Relations, 9th ed.*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2011. ISBN: 0205024995

Goldstein, J.S. and Pevehouse, J.S. *International Relations, 10th ed.*, New York: Pearson Longman, 2011. ISBN: 97205059577

Hirsch E.D, Kett, J.F., and Trefil, J. *The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy 3rd ed.*, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 2002. ISBN: 0618226478

Jentleson, Bruce W. *American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21 st Century*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010. ISBN: 0393933571

Morgan, William D. and Charles Stuart Kennedy *American Diplomats: The Foreign Service at Work*. New York: Universe, 2004. ISBN: 0595329748

Norton, M.B., et al. *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States, 9th ed.*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2011. ISBN: 0495915256

Paterson, Thomas G. *American Foreign Relations: A History*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2009. ISBN: 0547225695

Rosati, J. *The Politics of United States Foreign Policy 5th ed.*, Belmont, CA : Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2010. ISBN: 0495797241

Woloch, N. *USA Foreign policy and the American Experience, 5th ed.*, Boston: McGraw- Hill, 2011. ISBN: 0073385573

MODULE 2 MAJOR US FOREIGN POLICY ORGANS

INTRODUCTION

The prominent approaches to US foreign policy which has been put forth by International Relations scholars to explain and predict the conduct of US foreign policy. American foreign policy refers to the actions taken by the United States abroad to pursue its goals: 'to create a more secure, democratic and prosperous world for the benefit of the American people and the international community'. It is admitted that security, democracy and prosperity have been the lasting values and interests of the United States. The process of making foreign policy to sustain these values and interests are determined by five major categories of sources: the external environment, the societal environment of the nation, the governmental setting, the roles of foreign policymakers, and the individual personalities of foreign policy-making elites.

A critical reading of American foreign policy-making process suggests that no single source category can dictate American foreign policy. These sources collectively influence American foreign-policy outcomes; therefore, they are all essential to get a comprehensive picture of how American foreign decisions are made. The external or systematic sources point out that to understand the behaviour of US foreign policy it is necessary to take into account the events or dynamics taking place in the international system. Like any other country, the US can be affected by what is happening in the realm of world politics, therefore, US government has to take into consideration what is happening in the international system when it decides its foreign policy behavior. Put it simply, the making of US foreign policy is impacted by events in the international politics.

Besides, the formation and implementation of US foreign policy is strongly influenced by its governmental structure, or governmental sources. Power diffusion is a prominent feature of American policy-making process. The high decentralisation means that no single actor can dictate the country's policies. Under the constitution, power is shared between the presidency and a bicameral Congress. The main policy institutions are the departments of State and Defense, the National Security Council (NSC), and the intelligence agencies. Although Presidents play the most important role within the administration, they have to 'contend with an active Congress, oversee a complex executive bureaucracy, and respond to pressures and ideas generated by the press, think tanks, and public opinion.' The sharing and separation of powers between the President and the Congress have invited their struggle for the control of foreign policy. That struggle can be viewed as a brake on 'the overriding force in American foreign affairs', thus guarantees a certain extent of democracy in U.S. foreign policy formulation.

UNIT 1 The State Department and the Executive Branch in Foreign Policy Making

UNIT 2 US Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Council

UNIT 3 US Congress in Foreign Policy

UNIT 4 Public Opinion and Foreign Policy

UNIT 1 THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH IN FOREIGN POLICY MAKING

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 State Department and Executive in Foreign Policy Making
 - 3.2 Duties and Responsibilities of State Department
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The United States Department of State (DOS), often referred to as the State Department, is the United States federal executive department responsible for the international relations of the United States, equivalent to the foreign ministry of other countries. The Department was created in 1789 and was the first executive department established (William, H 190 I: 12). The Department is headquartered in the Harry S Truman Building located at 2201 C Street, NW, a few blocks away from the White House in the Foggy Bottom neighborhood of Washington, D.C. The Department operates the diplomatic missions of the United States abroad and is responsible for implementing the foreign policy of the United States and U.S. diplomacy efforts. The Department is also the depositary for more than 200 multilateral treaties. The Department is led by the Secretary of State, who is nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate and is a member of the Cabinet. The current Secretary of State is John Kerry. The Secretary of State is the first Cabinet official in the order of precedence and in the presidential line of succession.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students are expected to

1. Understand the specific role of the State Department as concerns USA foreign relations as well as,
2. Do an analysis of the duties and responsibilities of the State and Executive Department in the making of the United States of America foreign policy.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 STATE DEPARTMENT AND EXECUTIVE IN FOREIGN POLICY

The U.S. Constitution, drafted in Philadelphia in 1787 and ratified by the 13 states the following year, gave the President the responsibility for the conduct of the nation's foreign relations. It soon became clear, however, that an executive department was necessary to support the President in the conduct of the affairs of the new federal government. The House of Representatives and Senate approved legislation to establish a Department of foreign Affairs on July 21, 1789, and President Washington signed it into law on July 27, making the Department of Foreign Affairs the first federal agency to be created under the new Constitution. This legislation remains the basic law of the Department of State. In September 1789, additional legislation changed the name of the agency to the Department of State and assigned to it a variety of domestic duties (George, 2003:6).

These responsibilities grew to include management of the United States Mint, keeper of the Great Seal of the United States, and the taking of the census. President George Washington signed the new legislation on September 1st. Most of these domestic duties of the Department of State were eventually turned over to various new Federal departments and agencies that were established during the 19th century. However, the Secretary of State still retains a few domestic responsibilities, such as being the keeper of the Great Seal and being the officer to whom a President or Vice-President of the United States wishing to resign must deliver an instrument in writing declaring the decision to resign. On September 29, 1789, President Washington appointed Thomas Jefferson of Virginia, then Minister to France, to be the first United States Secretary of State. John Jay had been serving in as Secretary of Foreign Affairs as a holdover from the Confederation since before Washington had taken office and would continue in that capacity until Jefferson returned from Europe many months later. (Bush 2010:4).

3.2 DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STATE DEPARTMENT

The Executive Branch and the U.S. Congress have constitutional responsibilities for U.S. foreign policy. In the USA within the Executive Branch, the Department of State is the lead U.S. foreign affairs agency, and its head, the Secretary of State, is the President's principal foreign policy advisor, though other officials or individuals may have more influence on their foreign policy decisions. The Department advances U.S. objectives and interests in the world through its primary role in developing and implementing the President's foreign policy. The Department also supports the foreign affairs activities of other U.S. Government entities including the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Homeland Security, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the U.S. Agency for International Development. It also provides an array of important services to U.S. citizens and to foreigners seeking to visit or immigrate to the U.S.

All foreign affairs activities U.S. representation abroad, foreign assistance programs, countering international crime, foreign military training programs, the services the Department provides, and more are paid for by the foreign affairs budget in USA. The followings are the main responsibilities of the State Department;

- Protecting and assisting U.S. citizens living or travelling abroad;
- Assisting U.S. businesses in the international marketplace;
- Coordinating and providing support for international activities of other U.S. agencies(local, state, or federal government), official visits overseas and at home, and other diplomatic efforts;
- Keeping the public informed about U.S. foreign policy and relations with other countries and providing feedback from the public to administration officials;
- Providing automobile registration for non-diplomatic staff vehicles and the vehicles of diplomats of foreign countries having diplomatic immunity in the United States. (Joel Mowbray 2003:9)

The Department of State conducts these activities with a civilian workforce, and normally uses the Foreign Service personnel system for positions that require service abroad. Employees may be assigned to diplomatic missions abroad to represent The United States, analyze and report on political, economic, and social trends; adjudicate visas; and respond to the needs of US citizens abroad. The U.S. maintains diplomatic relations with about 180 countries and maintains relations with many international organizations, adding up to a total of more than 250 posts around the world. In the United States, about 5,000 professional, technical, and administrative employees work compiling and analyzing reports from overseas, providing logistical support to posts, communicating with the American public, formulating and overseeing the budget, issuing passports and travel warnings, and more.

In carrying out these responsibilities, the Department of State works in close coordination with other federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Commerce. As required by the principle of checks and balances, the Department also consults with Congress about foreign policy initiatives and policies.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

The role of the security agencies are becoming critical in the formulation of the American foreign policy explain?

4.0 CONCLUSION

In conclusion the Department of State promotes and protects the interests of American citizens by Promoting peace and stability in regions of vital interest creating jobs at home by opening markets abroad, helping developing nations establish investment and export opportunities and 'Bringing nations together and forging partnerships to address global problems, such as terrorism, the spread of communicable diseases, cross-border pollution, humanitarian crises, nuclear smuggling, and narcotics trafficking. The State Department states the best way to counter international terrorist attacks is to work with international partners to cut funding, strengthen law-enforcing institutions and eliminate terrorist safe havens.

5.0 SUMMARY

The United States of America Secretary of State has responsibility for ensuring that diplomacy and development are effectively coordinated and mutually reinforcing in the operation of USA foreign policy. To: 'Advance freedom for the benefit of the American people and the

international community by helping to build and sustain a more democratic, secure, and prosperous world composed of well-governed states that respond to the needs of their people, reduce widespread poverty, and act responsibly within the international system.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Explain the duties and responsibilities of the State Department in relation to USA foreign policy.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

William, H(1901). *History of the Department of State of the United States: Its Formation and Duties, Together With Biographies of Its Present Officers and Secretaries From the Beginning*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1901, p. 12.

George, 1-1(2003) *The State Department and the Management of US Interest and World Peace*, Heritage Publisher NY, USA.2003.P 6.

Bush Cole (2010) *The Foreign Policy of America and Role and Responsibilities of the State Department*, Washington DC Publisher, USA 2010.P4.

Joel Mowbray. (2003.) *Dangerous Diplomacy: How the State Department Threatens America's Security*, Regnery Publishing, p.9. ISBN 9780895261106.

Burke, Lee H. and Patterson, Richard Sharpe (1977) *Homes of the Department of State,1774-1976: The Buildings Occupied by the Department of State and ItsPredecessors*. Washington, D.C.: US. Government Printing Office, 1977, p. 27.

Plischke, Elmer. *U.S. Department of State: A Reference History*. Westport, Conn.:Greenwood Press, 1999, p. 45.

UNIT 2 US CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Role of the CIA in Foreign Intelligence
 - 3.2. The National Security Council
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is a civilian foreign intelligence service of the U.S. Government, tasked with gathering, processing and analyzing national security information from around the world, primarily through the use of human intelligence. As one of the principal members of the U.S. Intelligence Community, the CIA reports to the Director of National Intelligence and is primarily focused on providing intelligence for the President and his Cabinet (Combs 2008).

The Central Intelligence Agency's primary mission is to collect, evaluate, and disseminate foreign intelligence to assist the president and senior US government policymakers in making decisions relating to the national security. The CIA does not make policy; it is an independent source of foreign intelligence information for those who do. The CIA may also engage in covert action at the president's direction in accordance with applicable law.

In the USA unlike the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), which is a domestic security service, CIA has no law enforcement function and is mainly focused on overseas intelligence gathering, with only limited domestic collection. Though it is not the only U.S. government agency specializing in human intelligence, CIA serves as the national manager for coordination and de confliction of human intelligence activities across the entire intelligence community. Moreover, CIA is the only agency authorized by law to carry out and oversee covert action on behalf of the President, unless the President determines that another agency is better suited for carrying out such action. It can, for example, exert foreign political influence through its tactical divisions, such as the Special Activities Division (CIA 2014).

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students are expected to

Know the role of the central intelligence agency and the national Security Council in the formation of American foreign policy.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 THE ROLE OF THE CIA IN FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE

The Central Intelligence Agency was created on 26 July 1947, when Harry S. Truman signed the National Security Act into law. A major impetus for the creation of the CIA was the unforeseen attack on Pearl Harbor. In addition, towards the end of World War II the U.S. government felt the need for a group to coordinate intelligence efforts.

The CIA has increasingly expanded its roles, including covert paramilitary operations. One of its largest divisions, the Information Operations Center (IOC), has shifted focus from counter-terrorism to offensive cyber-operations. While the CIA has had some recent accomplishments, such as locating Osama bin Laden and taking part in the successful Operation Neptune Spear, it has also been involved in controversial programs such as extraordinary rendition and enhanced interrogation techniques.

The role and functions of the CIA are roughly equivalent to those of the United Kingdom's Secret Intelligence Service (the SIS or MI6), the Australian Secret Intelligence Service (ASIS), the Egyptian General Intelligence Service, the Indian Research and Analysis Wing (RAW), the Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), and Israel's Mossad. While the preceding agencies both collect and analyze information, some like the U.S. State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research are purely analytical agencies.

The closest links of the U.S. to other foreign intelligence agencies are to Anglophone countries: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. There is a special communications marking that signals intelligence-related messages can be shared with these four countries. An indication of the United States' close operational cooperation is the creation of a new message distribution label within the main U.S. military communications network. Previously, the marking of NOFORN (i.e., No Foreign Nationals) required the originator to specify which, if any, non-U.S., countries could receive the information. A new handling caveat, used primarily on intelligence messages, gives an easier way to indicate that the material can be shared with Australia, Canada, United Kingdom, and New Zealand.

In the USA until the 2004 reorganization of the intelligence community, one of the services of common concern that the CIA provided was Open Source Intelligence from the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS). FBIS, which had absorbed the Joint Publication Research Service, a military organization that translated documents, moved into the National Open Source Enterprise under the Director of National Intelligence. During the Reagan administration, Michael Sekora (assigned to the DIA), worked with agencies across the intelligence community, including the CIA, to develop and deploy a technology-based competitive strategy system called Project Socrates. Project Socrates was designed to utilize open source intelligence gathering almost exclusively. The technology-focused Socrates system supported such programs as the Strategic Defense Initiative in addition to private sector projects.

As part of its mandate to gather intelligence, the CIA is looking increasingly online for information, and has become a major consumer of social media (ibid).

3.2 THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

The National Security Council was established by the National Security Act of 1947 (PL 235 - 61 Stat. 496; U.S.C. 402), amended by the National Security Act Amendments of 1949 (63 Stat. 579; 50 U.S.C. 401 et seq.). Later in 1949, as part of the Reorganization Plan, the Council was placed in the Executive Office of the President.

The National Security Council (NSC) is the President's principal forum for considering national security and foreign policy matters with his senior national security advisors and cabinet officials. Since its inception under President Truman, the Council's function has been to advise and assist the President on national security and foreign policies. The Council also serves as the President's principal arm for coordinating these policies among various government agencies (NSC 2012).

The NSC is chaired by the President. Its regular attendees (both statutory and non-statutory) are the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, and the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the statutory military advisor to the Council, and the Director of National Intelligence is the intelligence advisor. The Chief of Staff to the President, Counsel to the President, and the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy are invited to attend any NSC meeting. The Attorney General and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget are invited to attend meetings pertaining to their responsibilities. The heads of other executive departments and agencies, as well as other senior officials, are invited to attend meetings of the NSC when appropriate (J. Peck 2006).

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain the role of the National Security Council (NSA) in the United States foreign policy?

4.0 CONCLUSION

The CIA and the NSC are primarily established to aid the United States' foreign policy, as a result of her position in world politics vis-a-vis its rise to prominence after the World War II to defend her nation from external invasion. The agencies are established to curtail, gather and disseminate information to the US government as regards issues concerning national security and foreign policy matters. It should be noted that the sole purpose to the establishment of the CIA was to create a clearinghouse for foreign policy intelligence and analysis, likewise the NSC which is a part of the President's executive arm was established to consider national security and foreign policy matters with senior national security advisors and cabinet officials.

5.0 SUMMARY

The role and functions of the CIA vis-a-vis the NSC are roughly equivalent to their other European counterparts such as the United Kingdom Secret Intelligence Service (SIS or M 16), the Australian Secret Intelligence Service (ASIS) and so on, however the CIA and the NSC are saddled with more responsibilities than any other intelligence service as a result of the United States position in world politics. Be that as it may, the two bodies have been criticized for using torture, funding and training of groups and organizations that would later participate in killing of civilians and other non-combatants and would try to overthrow democratically elected

governments, human experimentation, targeted killings and assassinations. However one fact that cannot be taken away is that the CIA and the NSC form a major part of the United States of America foreign policy cabinet.

6.0 TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What role does the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) play in foreign policy?

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Jerald A. Combs (2008). *The History of American Foreign Policy: To 1920*. M.E. Sharpe. pp.21-23

Ibid.

History of the Central Intelligence Agency, CIA Official website. Cia.gov Retrieved March 28,2014. Assessed on June 8,2016

National Security Council; The White House. www.whitehouse.gov. Retrieved 4 April 2012.

James Peck (2006). *Washington's China: The National Security World, the cold war and the Origins of Globalism*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

UNIT3 US CONGRESS IN FOREIGN POLICY

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
- 3.1 Role of the Congress in Foreign Policy Decision Making
- 3.2 The United States Congress and Foreign Policy Formulation and Implementation
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit will examine the role of the United State Congress in foreign policy decision making. It will also critically examine the congress's role in the area of foreign policy formulation and implementation. The United States Congress is the bicameral legislature of the federal government of the United States, consisting of two houses: the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Congress has extensive constitutional power to shape foreign policy, though its influence on foreign policy and congressional activism is being modified over time. The makers of the law rarely interact directly with other nations on policy, but the passed law and treaties by the congress and nominations which the Senate approves, can influence U.S. interactions with other countries.

2.0 OBIECTIVES

At the end of the unit, students should be able to:

1. Understand the role of the United States Congress in Foreign Policy.
2. Explain the Congress's role in the formulation and implementation stage.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 ROLE THE CONGRESS PLA YS IN FOREIGN POLICY MAKING

Congress plays a crucial role in the decision making process of U.S. foreign policy. While the President by necessity takes the lead, the President and the Congress under the Constitution are co-equal branches of government, and the support of Congress on foreign policy is often essential to ensuring that a policy will succeed. If, by contrast, the Congress does not support a President's policy, or even is lukewarm in its support, it undercuts the policy and limits its success. The allocation of foreign policy powers is only vaguely sketched in the Constitution. The Senate has the power to approve all treaties negotiated by the President, and must confirm ambassadors and other senior foreign policy officials. Congress retains control over foreign policy funding, and, of course, the power to raise and equip the military, and the power to declare war. These formal powers serve primarily as a starting point for Congress's participation because of the significance of foreign policy decisions, which often involve the potential for sending U.S. troops into combat. Congress over the years has carved out a more informal

"oversight" role, part of the "checks and balances" that are central to the "shared power" among the three branches in the constitutional system.

Besides being largely informal, congressional power in foreign policy is not always exercised with the same degree of intensity. At times of relative peace on the world scene, such as the present, Congress's involvement can often be modest. At other times, such as during the Persian Gulf War, or during the conflicts in Central America during the 1980s, Congress is likely to get more actively involved, especially if there is significant disagreement with the President over policy.

Congress's role in approving or disapproving U.S. involvement in overseas military conflicts is significant when considering the Congress's foreign policy powers. The decision to send U.S. troops into harm's way should never be made by the President alone; the views of the American people should be expressed through their elected representatives in Congress. Congress does not always want to have the responsibility for such momentous decisions; however, Presidents in the modern era have contended that their power as "Commander in Chief" vested them with unfettered power to take the country to war. Thus did President G. W. Bush when he took the country to war in Iraq in 2003.

3.2 THE U.S. CONGRESS IN FOREIGN POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

The foreign policy of the United States is the way in which it interacts with foreign nations and sets standards of interaction for its organizations, corporations and individual citizens. The officially stated goals of the foreign policy of the United States, including all the Bureaus and Offices in the United States Department of State, as mentioned in the Foreign Policy Agenda of the Department of State, are "to build and sustain a more democratic, secure, and prosperous world for the benefit of the American people and the international community." Events have confirmed that together the President and Congress make foreign policy, but they have not resolved the question of which branch originates or finally determines policy. The two branches share in the process and each plays an important but different role. The question of who makes foreign policy does not have a more precise answer for several reasons. First, U.S. foreign policy is not created in a vacuum as some sort of indivisible whole with a single grand design. Rather, making foreign policy is a prolonged process involving many actors and comprising dozens of individual policies toward different countries, regions, and functional problems. Second, the complex process of determining foreign policy makes it difficult to decide who should be credited with initiating or altering any particular foreign policy. The two branches constantly interact and influence each other. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to trace an idea back to its origin, determine when a proposal actually influences policy, and decide when a modification creates a new policy.

Third, the roles and relative influence of the two branches in making foreign policy differ from time to time according to such factors as the personalities of the President and Members of Congress and the degree of consensus on policy. Throughout American history there have been ebbs and flows of Presidential and congressional dominance in making foreign policy, variously defined by different scholars. One study classified the period 1789-1829 as one of Presidential

initiative; 1829-1898 as one of congressional supremacy, and 1899 through the immediate post World War II period as one of growing Presidential power.

Another study defined three periods of congressional dominance, 1837-1861, 1869-1897, and 1918-1936, with a fourth one beginning toward the end of the Vietnam War in 1973. During the Reagan and Bush Administrations the pendulum swung back toward Presidential dominance, reaching its height in 1991 during Operation Desert Storm against Iraq. In the post-Persian Gulf war era, both President and the Congress are confronted with issues in foreign policy that may well define which branch of government will play the dominant role during the first half of the twenty-first century.

However, congress can make foreign policy through resolutions and policy statements, legislative directives, legislative pressure, legislative restrictions/funding denials, informal advice, congressional oversight. In these circumstances, the executive branch can either support or seek to change congressional policies as it interprets and carries out legislative directives and restrictions, and decides when and whether to adopt proposals and advice. The practice illustrated above indicates that making U.S. foreign policy is a complex process, and the support of both branches is required for a strong and effective U.S. foreign policy.

Even when Congress establishes foreign policy through legislation, the administration continues to shape policy as it interprets and applies the various provisions of law. This is illustrated in arms sales policy. Congress has established the objectives and criteria for arms sales to foreign countries in the Arms Export Control Act, and it has required advance notification of major arms sales and provided procedures for halting a sale it disapproves. But the executive branch makes the daily decisions on whether or not to sell arms to specific countries and what weapons systems to provide. As an example, on September 14, 1992, President Bush notified Congress of his intention to sell 72 F-15 fighter aircraft to Saudi Arabia, and after the 30-day congressional review period expired, the sale proceeded.

Congress has found it necessary to maintain close supervision to prevent sales, particularly to Middle Eastern countries that it did not approve. In some cases its actions had the effect of halting sales, and it has frequently brought about changes in proposed arms sales packages. In 1985 Congress passed a joint resolution (P.L. 99162) prohibiting a proposed sale of certain advanced aircraft and air defense systems to Jordan prior to March 1, 1986, unless direct and meaningful peace negotiations between Israel and Jordan were underway. After the date passed, the Administration did not propose the sale, apparently in the belief it would be disapproved by Congress. In 1986 both Houses passed a joint resolution disapproving a sale of advanced missiles to Saudi Arabia, and the President vetoed the resolution; the Senate sustained the veto by a 66-34 vote, but only after the Administration removed Stinger (handheld) missiles from the package.

Since the 1980s various Administrations have used their authority to establish regulatory guidelines for the export of U.S.-origin dual-use technologies. In the case of exports to China since the 1989 Tiananmen Square crackdown, U.S. law has required that China cannot obtain commercial satellites or related technology from the United States unless the President issues a waiver of this restriction, on a case-by-case basis, on the grounds that such a transaction is in the U. S. national interest or because China has made reforms in its human rights or political

practices. In March of 1996, President Clinton transferred authority for issuing export licenses from the State Department to the Commerce Department. Subsequently, when it was discovered that two U. S. companies had shared technical information regarding the cause of an explosion of a Chinese rocket launching a U.S. commercial satellite, without having secured a license to do so from the State Department, a Justice Department investigation was launched. In the wake of the controversy over this transfer of technical information regarding satellites to China and charges that insufficient scrutiny was being given to security issues involved in such prospective transfers, Congress by an amendment to the FY 1999 National Defense Authorization Act (P.L. 105-261), transferred authority to license commercial satellite and related data exports from the Commerce Department back to the State Department, effective in March 1999.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain in details the role of the USA congress in the making of foreign policy?

4.0 CONCLUSION

From the above discourse, Congress plays a crucial role in the decision making process of the United States foreign policy but it possesses no sole authority over the entire foreign policy process. It plays a complimentary role to the executive and other organs of government that are saddled with the responsibility of U.S. foreign policy. However, the congress possesses some powers that influence foreign policy such as funding, foreign aid, treaties and trade, human rights and trade etc. it also makes foreign policy through resolutions and policy statements, legislative directives, legislative pressure, legislative restrictions/funding denials, informal advice, congressional oversight.

5.0 SUMMARY

Foreign policy has been a source of tension through the years between Capitol Hill and the White House, especially over issues such as sanctions and foreign aid, trade, and human rights. The 113th Congress, which took office in January 2013, has already signaled a continuation of policy push and pull. Events have confirmed that together, the President and Congress make foreign policy, but they have not resolved the question of which branch originates or finally determines policy. However, the congress's main objective is to ensure that U.S. foreign policy "build and sustain a more democratic, secure, and prosperous world for the benefit of the American people and the international community."

6.0 TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Briefly explain the Constitutional role of Congress In the decision making 01' U. S. foreign policy.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Senator Biden, J. (2000) *A Democratic Viewpoint: Congress and Foreign Policy*; in an Electronic Journal of the U.S. Department of States. (2000) *The Making of U.S. Foreign Policy*, Vol. 5, No. 1

McCormick, J. (2009) *American Foreign Policy and Process*.

Russell, R. "American Diplomatic Realism": A Tradition Practised and Preached by George F. Kennan," *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Nov 2000, Vol. 11, No.3.

Senator Gordon, S. (2000) *A Republican Viewpoint: Congress and Foreign Policy*; in an Electronic Journal of the U.S. Department of States. (2000) *The Making of U.S. Foreign Policy*, Vol. 5, No.1

UNIT 4 PUBLIC OPINION AND FOREIGN POLICY

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Domestic Environment
 - 3.2 Public Opinion on American Foreign Policy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The domestic environment has significant influence on foreign policy. Foreign policy makers operate not in a political vacuum but in the context of the political debates in their society. In all states, societal pressures influence foreign policy, although these are aggregated and made effective through different channels in different societies.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

1. Examine the impact of the Public Opinion on U.S Foreign Policy

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 DOMESTIC ENVIRONMENT

In pluralistic democracies, interested parties influence foreign policy through interest groups and political parties. Public opinion has greater influence on foreign policy in democracies than in authoritarian governments. Because of the need for public support, even authoritarian governments spend great effort on propaganda to win public support for foreign policies. The most dominant domestic influence on foreign policy is the national interest, which foreign policy is expected to project to the outside world. The national interest is a country's goals and ambitions whether economic, military, or cultural. The concept is an important one in international relations where pursuit of the national interest is the foundation of the realist school. The national interest of a state is multi-faceted. Among the core values of national interest are the protection of territorial integrity of a state and the lives of all its citizens against external aggression; the protection of political, economic, religious or social institutions; and the defence of the territorial integrity of allies. Many states, especially in modern times, regard the preservation of the nation's culture as of great importance. Also important is the pursuit of wealth and economic growth and power. Foreign policy geared towards pursuing the national interest is the foundation of the realist school of international relations. The range of state's objectives and the priority accorded to them has significant influence on the foreign policy of a state.

Another important domestic influence on foreign policy is public opinion. This is the aggregate of individual attitudes or beliefs held by the adult population. Public opinion can also be defined as the complex collection of opinions of many different people and the sum of all their views. While scholars are divided about the extent of the influence of public opinion on foreign policy,

it is believed that some decision-makers obey the dictates of public opinion while others strive to 'mould and re-orientate it' (Reynolds 1982:81). When foreign issues like war or peacekeeping result in human casualties and increase in government's spending, the general public tends to take interest and voice their opinions for or against government's actions. In democracies, where governments must stand for election, an unpopular war can force a leader or party from office, as happened to Lyndon Johnson of US in 1968 over the Vietnam War and George Bush in 2008 over Iraqi war. Similarly, a popular war can help secure a government's mandate to continue in power, as happened to Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain after the 1982 Falkland War.

Occasionally, a foreign policy issue is decided directly by a referendum of the entire citizen. In 2005, referendums in France and the Netherlands rejected a proposed constitution for the European Union, despite the support of major political leaders for the change. Governments sometimes adopt foreign policies for the specific purpose of generating public approval and hence gaining domestic legitimacy.

3.2 PUBLIC OPINION ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Since the end of the Cold War, a strong bipartisan consensus has emerged in favor of frequent American military intervention. Even President Obama, who came into office calling for greater restraint than his predecessor, expanded the "war on terror," engaged in regime change in Libya, and decided against withdrawing U.S. troops from Afghanistan. Facing vocal critics who seek to increase American intervention not just in the Middle East but also in conflicts throughout the world, President Obama was unable to implement many of the more restrained policies he advocated.

Given this environment, the next president should know that there is a significant "restraint constituency" among Americans, despite the interventionist tendencies found on both right and left. This constituency — which cuts across party lines and represents roughly 37 percent of the public — exhibits a reliable disposition toward foreign policy restraint, opposing the use of military force in all but a few cases. That constituency contrasts with an "interventionist constituency," which represents about a quarter of the public and supports much more aggressive efforts to promote American interests abroad. Since neither constituency's core followers represent a majority, the deciding voice between intervention and restraint in foreign policy debates belongs to the 40 percent of the public that falls somewhere between the two camps.

Though the restraint constituency enjoys an advantage on many important foreign policy issues, public fears about terrorism and other global conflicts will continue to be a significant challenge for restraint-minded policymakers. Framing world events as "other people's business," reminding the public of the costs of major war, and pursuing an active noninterventionist counterterrorism strategy can help policymakers encourage public support for a more restrained foreign policy.

A Restraint Constituency

In the broadest sense most Americans agree that the United States should play some sort of role in world affairs. The best-known poll question on this topic asks whether the United States should "take an active part" in or "stay out" of world affairs. The proportion of respondents who say "take an active part" has ranged between 60 percent and 70 percent since the mid-1980s. What such surveys do not communicate clearly, however, is what exactly people mean when

they answer them. In the case of military intervention, taking an “active part” could mean anything from contributing to a peacekeeping mission to supporting frequent full-scale regime change of a hostile regime, while “stay out” could mean anything from cutting ties with allies to rejecting responsibility for resolving foreign conflicts.

We can develop a more complete picture by assessing people’s beliefs on two key fundamental questions regarding intervention and the use of force. The first question concerns how much effort the United States should make to solve the world’s problems. The second concerns how often the United States should turn to military force to promote national interests.

With these answers in hand we can begin to identify competing predispositions toward foreign policy. Some Americans — those labeled here the restraint constituency — feel that the United States should not seek to take the leading role among all nations to solve the world’s problems and believe that the United States should rarely use military force. Those who answer the opposite — labeled here the interventionist constituency — believe the United States should take the leading role and support the frequent use of military force to promote American interests.

The American public is divided over the fundamental questions facing the nation regarding foreign policy. The restraint constituency is the largest single bloc at around 37 percent, while the interventionist constituency comprises a smaller but still significant 24 percent. The remainder of the population holds views that are neither consistently restrained nor consistently interventionist.

These predispositions toward restraint and intervention are just that — under certain conditions, even restrainers will support intervention and interventionists will not. At any particular moment, Americans’ opinions reflect not only these predispositions but also information coming from political leaders and the news media about the world. More recent polling on the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS), for example, illustrates that support for an aggressive response has risen considerably across all groups as concerns about the threat posed by ISIS have grown.

The Politics of Restraint Today

The shifting context of international security and domestic politics provides both opportunities and challenges to policymakers trying to chart a restrained path in foreign policy. Today, three major factors work in favor of restraint. The first is war fatigue. Large majorities remain convinced that both the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq were mistakes. With over 7,000 U.S. military personnel killed and tens of thousands more wounded, and trillions of dollars spent killing terrorists and “exerting influence” in the Middle East and elsewhere, many Americans are simply convinced it is time to focus more on domestic concerns. Along these lines, a 2016 Pew survey found that 70 percent of the public wants the next president to focus on domestic issues compared with just 17 percent who want to see a focus on foreign policy. One possible interpretation of this finding is that a growing number of Americans see little connection between military intervention and American security, especially given how few terrorist attacks have occurred on American soil since 9/11. As a result, fewer may now believe such efforts are worth the high costs in lives and money and the lack of attention paid to domestic issues. Such poll findings establish a high burden of proof for future intervention. Those seeking to repeat a troop-intensive intervention in the Middle East will have to not only explain why the security risk justifies such an action but also reassure the public that the next ISIS will not emerge in its aftermath.

Second, the American public continues to find serious military intervention justified in relatively few situations. Majority of the public opposes most potential uses of U.S. ground troops, with two key exceptions: humanitarian intervention (including preventing genocide) and preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons. Taken together, those two factors suggest that a president advocating a restraint-based foreign policy is likely to enjoy substantial popular support.

At the same time, however, the emergence of ISIS clearly represents a significant challenge to a restraint-minded president. The group's barbarism and military success, along with the attacks in Paris and San Bernardino, have driven public support for an aggressive response to levels not seen since the early days after 9/11. Drawing on the Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2015 survey,

Finally, looking beyond the temporary effects of global events, the situation today reflects generational shifts in public opinion. The data reveal that the restraint constituency has been growing as younger and less intervention-minded Americans start to replace older, more interventionist Americans. The millennial generation, born between 1980 and 1997, is the most restrained yet, with both Democratic and Republican millennials more likely to fall into the restraint constituency.

The Road Ahead: Priming the Restraint Constituency

Continued clashes between the restraint and interventionist constituencies are inevitable. Both camps can rely on a core of followers to support their positions, and both have illustrated the ability — on different issues — to command majority support. Thus, the key questions are these: Under what conditions will the restraint constituency win the day? And how can policymakers help make that happen? Restraint-minded policymakers can make the strongest case possible in various ways.

Most important, policymakers should assert a “civil conflict” frame when discussing the situation in places like Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, and any future failed or troubled state. Historically, the restraint position has been most compelling when Americans believe they are being asked to intervene to resolve other nations' internal problems, while interventionist arguments have been strongest when Americans are asked to take action against a group or nation that poses a direct threat to the United States. In reality, of course, public perception often depends in large part on how the president, other political leaders, and the media frame the issue in the first place.

The Syrian civil war provides an excellent illustration of this dynamic. In 2013, the popular perception was that, although tragic, the situation was above all a civil war and primarily Syria's problem. As a result, 68 percent of the public told pollsters that the United States did not bear responsibility for Syria and a similar majority opposed sending troops or even providing aid to the rebels fighting Assad. Yet by 2015, a large percentage of the public saw Syria not as a civil war but as a battlefield on which to confront the threat of terrorism, largely because of the attacks in Paris and San Bernardino.

Restraint-minded policymakers should also invoke the length and cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, along with the chaos that both created, including the birth of ISIS. Even as Americans indicate a desire to move more aggressively against ISIS, they remain extremely wary of a full-scale ground war. To the extent that political leaders can keep the public focused on the dangers of any military engagement, they can reduce the appeal of calls for more intervention.

CONCLUSION

Finally, policymakers, especially the president, should emphasize noninterventionist strategies for counterterrorism. It is clear that the fear of terrorism is the most likely cause of future American intervention abroad in the near to medium term. And though nothing can completely eliminate calls from the interventionist constituency to play whack-a-mole abroad to combat terrorist groups, the majority of the public traditionally prefers exploring nonmilitary means of solving problems over the use of force. If policymakers highlight an active program of nonmilitary counterterrorism efforts, calls for military intervention are not likely to garner public support.

SUMMARY

When foreign issues like war or peacekeeping result in human casualties and increase in government's spending, the general public tends to take interest and voice their opinions for or against government's actions. In democracies, where governments must stand for election, an unpopular war can force a leader or party from office, as happened to Lyndon Johnson of US in 1968 over the Vietnam War and George Bush in 2008 over Iraqi war

TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

How does public opinion affect foreign policy?

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

<https://www.cato.org/cato-handbook-policymakers/cato-handbook-policy-makers-8th-edition-2017/public-opinion-us-foreign>

MODULE 3 US CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Constitution gives Congress extensive powers to shape foreign policy though congressional activism and influence on foreign policy has varied over time. Lawmakers seldom interact directly with other nations on policy, but the laws that Congress passes, or treaties and nominations the Senate approves, can influence U.S. interactions with other countries. Foreign policy has been a source of tension through the years between Capitol Hill and the White House, especially over issues such as sanctions and foreign aid, trade, and human rights. After WWII, the US's foreign policy was characterized by interventionism, which meant the US was directly involved in other states' affairs. Therefore, the United States took a policy of interventionism in order to contain communist influence abroad. Such forms of interventionism included giving aid to European nations to re-build, having an active role in the UN, NATO, and police actions around the world, and involving the CIA in several coup take overs in Latin America and the Middle East. The US was not merely non-isolationist (i.e. the US was not merely abandoning policies of isolationism), but actively intervening and leading world affairs.

Throughout the history of American foreign policy, particularly after World War II, essential strategic and moral questions have circulated concerning the use of American power. Rarely is there a strong oppositional voice when the United States is under imminent threat, self-defense is the prerogative of any state but beyond such attacks as Pearl Harbor, the rightness of intervention is in the eye of the beholder. Some protested the Korean War in the 1950s and an even larger number protested the Vietnam War, particularly after 1967. Ronald Reagan's raid on Grenada, George H.W. Bush's invasions of Panama and Iraq, Bill Clinton's belated intervention in the Balkans, Clinton's failure to quell the Rwandan genocide, the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya in the past decade.

Unit 1 US Foreign Policy Intervention

Unit 2 US Foreign Policy during the World Wars I and II

Unit 3 US Foreign Policy during and after the Cold War

Unit 4 US Foreign Policy towards Africa

UNIT 1 US FOREIGN POLICY OF INTERVENTION

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Concept of U.S. foreign Policy of Interventionism democracy as goal
 - 3.2 The Arguments on the United States Foreign Policy of Interventionism
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The 1930s were a difficult time for most Americans, they were faced with colossal economic hardships which were unprecedented in American history, and many Americans turned inward to focus on the worsening situation at home. The United States became increasingly insensitive to the obliteration of fellow democracies at the hands of brutal fascist leaders like Hitler and Mussolini. The U.S. was determined to stay out of war at all costs even if its allies were in trouble; Americans believed that they were immune from Europe's problems as long as they refused to get involved. However, as the "free" countries fell, one by one, to the Nazi war machine, Americans began to realize the folly of their foolish optimism and clamored for increasing involvement in foreign affairs. American foreign policy changed in the years 1930-1941 as Americans realized that fascism would likely conquer Europe unless Americans acted quickly. Ultimately, it was fear of the fascist threat to American democracy that triggered the end of American isolationism and inaugurated the era of American interventionism.

In United States foreign policy history, critics have charged that presidents have used democracy to justify military intervention abroad. Critics have also charged that the U.S. helped local militaries overthrow democratically elected governments in Iran, Guatemala, and in other instances. Studies have been devoted to the historical success rate of the U.S. in exporting democracy abroad. Some studies of American intervention have been pessimistic about the overall effectiveness of U.S. efforts to encourage democracy in foreign nations. Until recently, scholars have generally agreed with international relations professor Abraham Lowenthal that U.S. attempts to export democracy have been "negligible, often counterproductive, and only occasionally positive. Other studies find U.S. intervention has had mixed results, and another by Hermann and Kegley has found that military interventions have improved democracy in other countries.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the unit, students should be able to:

- Understand the concept and the dynamics of United States Foreign Policy of Interventionism.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 THE CONCEPT OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY OF INTERVENTIONISM

DEMOCRACY AS GOAL

When embarking on a policy of intervention in another nation's affairs, the promotion of democracy may only be one of a number of competing foreign policy goals. Furthermore, it may not even be a consideration in many of these operations, especially those conducted during the Cold War when other nations' foreign policies were more important than their form of government. Therefore, it is hypothesized that when presidents pronounce the promotion of democracy as a goal of an intervention, the target nation should be more likely to make democratic progress. This variable is coded as if the president made a public statement to the effect that the United States sought to preserve or create democratic governance in a target nation, and otherwise. In *Supporting of the Target Population Act* (1991) argues that in some cases military intervention in the promotion of democracy can be successful if the local population supports US aims. Determining the extent to which the inhabitants of a nation invaded by the US military welcome the imposition of democracy has not been attempted on any systematic basis. We can, however, look for evidence of opposition to US intervention. While it may take many forms, there does exist information in the use of force data sets described previously on violence directed against US citizens and US property by non-governmental groups or individuals preceding the US intervention. When such violence occurs, it is argued that the likelihood of military intervention furthering the cause of democracy should diminish.

US Relationship with Target Regime

It is also important to determine the relationship between the US government and the regime it seeks to influence. If the United States is on friendly terms with the government in place at the time of the intervention, a president wishing to promote democracy would probably try to encourage reform (e.g., Vietnam). If the United States does not support the current regime, promoting democracy probably would require compelling change (e.g., Grenada and Panama). The former would probably require time, patience, and institution-building expertise, to which military force would be ill-suited, while the latter would require quick, decisive action, for which the military is equipped. Therefore, it is hypothesized that when the United States is opposed to the regime in place at the time of the intervention, democratic change should occur more frequently.

The success or failure of U.S intervention is likely to be tremendously important to the promotion of democracy. Military operations that end in defeat are hardly likely to result in the achievement of democratic progress, while successful operations may help create the political conditions from which democracy might grow. It is believed that successful interventions ought to be more likely to leave behind more democratic governments than unsuccessful interventions. Measuring the success of a military intervention is quite problematic, however, since there is both multiple foreign policy goals involved in interventions and multiple factors which may affect the outcome of an intervention. Therefore, determining foreign policy success or failure is often a subjective and risky enterprise.

3.2 THE ARGUMENT ON THE U S FOREIGN POLICY OF INTERVENTIONISM

To understand why the United States might wish to promote democracy through force of arms or diplomacy, it is necessary to examine the emerging findings on the relationship between democratic regimes and conflict. Yet, if, as most scholars agree, the prospects for universal peace increase with the number of democratic regimes (although see Gleditsch&Hegre, 1995 for a modification of this thesis), there might very well be an incentive for democratic nations to spread their form of government through the use of military force. Indeed, Secretary of State, George Marshall once argued:

Governments which systematically disregard the rights of their own people are not likely to respect the rights of other nations and people and are likely to seek their objectives by coercion and force in the international field. (Department of State Bulletin, 19, (October 3, 1948J, 432)

This might then explain both why democracies wage war against autocratic states and why scholars have not conclusively demonstrated that democratic regimes are more peaceful over-all. The opinion that U.S. intervention does not export democracy Professor Paul W. Drake argued that the U.S. first attempted to export democracy in Latin America through intervention from 1912 to 1932. Drake argued that this was contradictory because international law defines intervention as "dictatorial interference in the affairs of another state for the purpose of altering the condition of things." The study suggested that efforts to promote democracy failed because democracy needs to develop out of internal conditions, and cannot be forcibly imposed. There was disagreement about what constituted democracy; Drake suggested American leaders sometimes defined democracy in a narrow sense of a nation having elections; Drake suggested a broader understanding was needed. Further, there was disagreement about what constituted a "rebellion"; Drake saw a pattern in which the U.S. State Department disapproved of any type of rebellion, even so-called "revolutions", and in some instances rebellions against dictatorships. Historian Walter LaFaber stated, "The world's leading revolutionary nation (the U.S.) in the eighteenth century became the leading protector of the status quo in the twentieth century."

Mesquita and Downs evaluated 35 U.S. interventions from 1945 to 2004 and concluded that in only one case, Colombia, did a "full-fledged, stable democracy" develop within ten years following the intervention. Samia Amin Pei argued that nation building in developed countries usually unraveled four to six years after American intervention ended. Pei, based on study of a database on worldwide democracies called Polity, agreed with Mesquita and Downs that U.S. intervention efforts usually don't produce real democracies, and that most cases result in greater authoritarianism after ten years.

Professor Joshua Muravchik argued U.S. occupation was critical for Axis power democratization after World War II, but America's failure to encourage democracy in the third world "prove " that U.S. military intervention is not a sufficient condition to make a country democratic." The success of democracy in former Axis countries such as Italy were seen as a result of high national per-capita income, although U.S. protection was seen as a key to stabilization and

important for encouraging the transition to democracy. Steven Krasner agreed that there was a link between wealth and democracy; when per-capita incomes of \$6,000 were achieved in a democracy, there was little chance of that country ever reverting to an autocracy according to analysis of his research in the Los Angeles Times. The opinion that U.S. intervention has mixed results, Turesson examined 228 cases of American intervention from 1973 to 2005, using Freedom House data. A plurality of interventions, 96, caused no change in the country's democracy. In 69 instances, the country became less democratic after the intervention. In the remaining 63 cases, a country became more democratic. However this does not take into account the direction the country would have gone with no U.S. intervention. The opinion that U.S. intervention effectively exports democracy Hermann and Kegley found that American interventions designed to protect or promote democracy increased freedom in those countries. Peceny argued that the democracies created after military interventions are still closer to an autocracy than a democracy, quoting Przeworski "while some democracies are more democratic than others, unless offices are contested, no regime should be considered democratic." Therefore, Peceny concludes, it is difficult to know from the Hermann and Kegley study whether U.S. intervention has only produced less repressive autocratic governments or genuine democracies.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Define interventionism and its relations to the American Foreign Policy?

4.0 CONCLUSION

The success or failure of a military intervention is likely to be tremendously important to the promotion of democracy. Military operations that end in defeat are hardly likely to result in the achievement of democratic progress, while successful operations may help create the political conditions from which democracy might grow. Measuring the success of a military intervention is quite problematic, however, since there is both multiple foreign policy goals involved in interventions and multiple factors which may affect the outcome of an intervention. Therefore, determining foreign policy success or failure is often a subjective and risky enterprise.

5.0 SUMMARY

Interventionism is a term for a policy of non-defensive (proactive) activity undertaken by a nation-state, or other geo-political jurisdiction of a lesser or greater nature, to manipulate an economy and/or society. The most common applications of the term are for economic interventionism (a state's intervention in its own economy), and foreign interventionism (a state's intervention in the affairs of another nation as part of its foreign policy).

6.0 TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Briefly explain the arguments on the United States foreign policy of interventionism

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Valentino, B. (2011) *The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention, The Hard Truth aka lit a Noble Notion.*

Meernik, J. (2011). *United States Military Intervention and the Promotion a/Democracy. Sage Publications, Ltd.*

Plantamura, P. (2013) *Impacts of U.S. Foreign Policy and Intervention on Guatemala: Mid-20th Century.*

Morgenthau, J. (J 978) *Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace, ew York, Knopf. 5th Edition, Revised*

Larry, D. (1992) 'Promoting Democracy,' *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 87, Summer, pp25-46.

UNIT 2 US FOREIGN POLICY DURING THE WORLD WARS I AND II

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 United States Foreign Policy during World War I
 - 3.2 United States Foreign Policy during World War II
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

3.1 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY DURING WORLD WAR I

It is important to note that before the outbreak of World War I, there was the idea of a balance of power and collective security that could prevent any future wars from occurring. There was a feeling that war had somehow gone out of style and that civilized society no longer needed war to settle differences. With so many powerful and highly sophisticated countries in Europe, how could Europe ever revert back to the barbarism of unrestricted warfare (CW. Appleman 1959).

As a matter of fact, World War I came swiftly and almost silently as an assassination in Austria set off an irreversible chain of events. One declaration of war had entangled all of Europe into war. The world quickly learned that a balance of power only works when there are more than two sides.

The Twentieth century foreign policy in the United States began with imperialism. By the turn of the century, the United States had completed its westward expansion and ran into the Pacific coast. There were no more frontiers to occupy, unless we wanted to risk attacking Canada or Mexico. The American frontier had only fed imperialist desire to take more land and resources so we took to the seas.

It is important to state that under President McKinley the United States picked a fight with Spain, who was already weak, and the war resulted in American presence in the Philippines, Guam, and Cuba. The Spanish-American war raised questions as to what role the United States should play in the world. Should we model ourselves after the British Empire and attempt to colonize and civilize the world? Or should we condemn colonization as immoral and concentrate on domestic issues?

One major argument for imperialism was that the United States needed to become a naval power in order to become a world power. In order to have powerful and far-reaching navy, colonies were needed to serve as ports for refueling.

United States believe that colonizing countries for ports was unnecessary and immoral. Colonization only happened because the American mindset at the time was that non- Caucasian peoples were inferior in both culture and technology. Countries do not need to own a port to use

it. It only makes it more convenient to own something rather than borrow it. Instead of colonizing a country, the United States could have formed friendships or alliances with them to allow access to resources. It might be human nature that a country takes something for nothing when given the chance, but that does not make it right. United States imperialism continued through the aggressive administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt came into power at a time when the United States had already demonstrated itself to be a world power. It was Roosevelt who began the notion of the United States being a sort of "world police".

He supported a revolution in Panama in order to make room for the Panama Canal. His Roosevelt Corollary gave the United States the job of enforcing foreign laws in the Americas. He even won a Nobel Prize for mediating the war between Russia and Japan. This was a different kind of imperialism. Roosevelt's imperialism was of power and not land.

After Roosevelt came William Taft, who left no notable foreign policy legacy. Taft held the presidency during the calm before the storm of World War 1. It was Woodrow Wilson who picked up foreign policy where Roosevelt left off.

Woodrow Wilson's first demonstration of foreign policy was his intervention in the Mexican Revolution when he refused to recognize Victoriano Huerta as the President of Mexico, even when it served American business interests to do so. Here was another example of the United States flaunting its power over weaker countries.

It can be argued that it was beneficial to national security to keep bordering countries weak, or even that we were promoting democracy for the good of Mexico, but people never want to have a weak puppet of a foreign country as a leader. Instead of trying to force Mexico into submission, Wilson should have recognized Huerta as a leader and then kept armed watch over Mexico. By intervening with armed forces in Mexico, Wilson only made more unprovoked enemies.

Wilson's intervention with Mexico was interrupted by the outbreak of World War I in Europe. Wilson had ignored the war earlier, but now German U-boats were sinking American ships. When it appeared that the Germans would win the war and divert their attention to conquering the United States, Wilson finally declared war. World War I for the United States was relatively short, though over three hundred thousand American lives were lost. Overall it was a victory because Germany was defeated and the United States profited greatly from selling munitions to the Allied forces. It was after the war when Wilson's foreign diplomacy became very prominent.

After Germany was defeated in World War I, Wilson delivered his Fourteen Points at the Versailles peace conference. Wilson had many ideas about how to create a lasting world peace, but they proved too idealistic to be effective. President Wilson's crowning achievement was the League of Nations, which set the foundation for the modern United Nations, but failed to prevent World War II.

The most important aspect of World War I was its consequences. The war was so grisly and depleting that most Americans became xenophobic and isolationist afterwards. The war shocked America so greatly that later presidents made efforts to disarm the world, severely restrict immigration, and even outlaw war itself.

Despite President Wilson's warnings, Germany was severely punished and humiliated after the war. That coupled with the Great Depression of the 1930's allowed many strong aggressive leaders to come to power. Hitler, Stalin, Churchill, Tojo, and Franklin Roosevelt all gained influence in the years following World War I.

The final important result of World War I that I will discuss here was the issue of war debts. The United States emerged from World War I as the most powerful country in the world, mostly because we profited from the war for a long time before entering at the end. The Allied forces paid dearly in both men and money. At the end of the war the Allies owed the United States huge sums of money that they weren't rushing to pay back. The Allies argued that they had already paid in both men and money, so the United States should absolve them of debt. Many American investors had loaned the money to European interests during the war effort, so it would have benefited American businesses if Europe were forced to pay back its debts.

The United States to absolve Europe of its debts. Loans are in reality very similar to investments. The lender must assume the responsibility of deciding whether the borrower will be able to repay the debts. In the case of World War I, it would have ruined the Allies economically if they were forced to repay all of their war debts. The United States had already gotten rich from the tragedy of war, and asking for any more would have simply been greed. All of the issues presented here eventually led to or impacted World War II. World War II was in a large part the product of the mistakes and unresolved issues of World War I. From this perspective, the decisions made by leaders during the World War I era may have been the most important foreign policy decisions of the twentieth century (Dobson & Alan 1995).

3.2 THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Analysis of post-World War I isolationism suggests that U.S. membership in the League of Nations would not have done much to change the course of 20th-century history. More significant in the long run was German resentment at having to swallow a harsh settlement. Far from the "peace without victory" that Wilson envisioned, the Treaty of Versailles forced Germany to acknowledge guilt for starting the war and pay a massive bill for reparations. Significant changes occurred in the international balance of power during the war years. In 1917 the October Revolution in Russia overturned a short-lived parliamentary government and established a Communist government. In the Far East, Japan's growing power and ambitions continued to threaten stability. For two decades following World War I, the United States remained largely aloof of world affairs, and foreign policy focused on promoting disarmament schemes that sought to avoid future wars. The Washington Conference of 1921 and 1922 set limits on naval armaments with a view toward checking Japan's power in the Pacific. The interwar years were also marked by a failed disarmament conference at Geneva and the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact, which naively sought to negate the danger of conflicts by declaring war to be illegal. The United States also distanced itself from the world economically, and protectionism ruled the day with the 1930 Hawley-Smoot Tariff, which imposed the highest import duties in U.S. history. As tensions began to rise in Europe and Asia, planting the roots for World War II (1939-1945), President Herbert Hoover focused on repairing an economy hit hard by the Great Depression and worsened by the tariff. The president rejected Secretary of State

Henry Stimson's proposal to counter the Japanese incursion and establishment of a puppet state in Manchuria.

In September 1939 World War II began after Germany invaded Poland. The Roosevelt presidency carefully charted a course of assisting the Allies without entering the war. Roosevelt articulated his design for the U.S. contribution in his Four Freedoms speech of 1941. Unlike Wilson, Roosevelt did not try to pretend neutrality in the conflict. Roosevelt's concerns led to efforts such as the Lend-Lease program, which allowed for the transfer of military materials, vehicles, and arms, and the movement of 50 aging U.S. warships to British bases in the North Atlantic to help both U.S. defenses and the survival of the British government. By this time, the Nazi troops of German leader Adolf Hitler extended westward to the English Channel and pushed the Eastern Front deep into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). In August 1941 Roosevelt met with Winston Churchill, the British prime minister, on a ship off the coast of Newfoundland. Roosevelt stopped short of promising direct American involvement in the fighting, but the meeting resulted in the Atlantic Charter, which established a blueprint for Allied conduct. The two leaders agreed that in the event of victory the Allies would not seek to extend their borders or impose a system of government on the defeated powers (Jerald Combs 2008).

The United States officially entered World War II against Germany, Japan and Italy in December 1941, following the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. This time the U.S. was a full-fledged member of the Allies of World War II, not just an associate as in the first war. During the war, the U.S. conducted military operations on both the Atlantic and Pacific fronts. After the war and devastation of its European and Asian rivals, the United States found itself in a uniquely powerful position due to the lack of damage to its domestic industries. Furthermore it found itself in direct competition with a growing power, the Soviet Union. In the aftermath of the European campaign, the United States enacted Marshall Plan which supplied its European allies with 13 billion dollars in reconstruction aid. After 1945, the isolationist pattern characterizing the inter-war period had ended for good. The end of World War II led to the establishment of the United Nations with the support of the United States. The U.S., Soviet Union, Britain, France and China became permanent members of the Security Council with veto power. The Idea of the U.N. was to promote world peace through consensus among nations with boycotts, sanctions and even military power exercised by the Security Council (Samuel Bemis, 1934).

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain American Foreign Policy during World War II

4.0 CONCLUSION

Throughout much of United States history the pendulum of American foreign policy has swung between the extremes of isolationism and active engagement in world affairs. American foreign policy developed in response to a number of factors, including popular sentiments within the United States, international events, and the opinions of American thinkers and policymakers.

5.0 SUMMARY

The United States remained largely detached from affairs of the rest of the world both as a result of its geography and its desire to focus on domestic concerns. As the country's population and economic power grew, political and commercial concerns extended beyond U.S. borders. By the late 19th century, U.S. foreign policy began to display some characteristics of political realism, also known as *realpolitik*, an approach that acknowledges the constant possibility of ruthless international competition and war. During the first half of the 20th century, the United States preferred to maintain a mostly isolationist stance and entered international disputes reluctantly, long after the other primary actors. Foreign policy developed in response to the requirements of national self-interest, focusing on the maintenance of security and open commerce within the Western Hemisphere.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Justify the American Foreign Policy during World War II

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Williams, William Appleman. *The tragedy of American Diplomacy* (1959).

Dobson, Alan P. *Anglo-American Relations in the Twentieth Century* (1995)

Jerald A. Combs (2008). "The History of American Foreign Policy"; M.E. Sharp. Pp. 21- 25

Samuel Flagg Bemis (1934). "Washington'S Farewell Address: A Foreign Policy of Independence" *American Historical Review*, vol. 39, no.2.

UNIT 3 US FOREIGN POLICY DURING AND AFTER THE COLD WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 3.1. United States Foreign Policy during the Cold War
 - 3.2. United States Foreign Policy after the Cold War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

During World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union fought together as allies against the Axis powers. However, the relationship between the two nations was a tense one. Americans had long been wary of Soviet Communism and concerned about Russian leader Joseph Stalin's tyrannical rule of his own country. For their part, the Soviets resented the Americans' decades-long refusal to treat the USSR as a legitimate part of the international community. After the war ended, these grievances ripened into an overwhelming sense of mutual distrust. Postwar Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe fueled many Americans' fears of a Russian plan to control the world. Meanwhile, the USSR came to resent what it perceived as American official confrontational rhetoric, arms buildup, and interventionist approach to international relations.

Most American officials agreed that the best defense against the Soviet threat was a strategy called "containment." In 1946, a diplomat George Kennan explained this policy: The Soviet Union, he wrote, was "a political force committed fanatically to the belief that with the U.S. there can be no permanent agreement between parties that disagree"; as a result, America's only choice was the "long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies." President Harry Truman (1945-1953) agreed. "It must be the policy of the United States ... to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation... by outside pressures." This way of thinking shaped American foreign policy for the next four decades (1950s-1990s).

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the unit, students should be able to:

1. Have a basic understanding of the US foreign policy during and after the cold war.
2. Explain the differences in both policies.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY DURING THE COLD WAR.

After the Second World War, the U.S. rose to become the dominant non-colonial economic power with broad influence in much of the world, with the key policies of the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine. Immediately, the world witnessed division into broad two camps; one side was led by the U.S., and the other by the Soviet Union, but the situation also led to the establishment of the Non-Aligned Movement and this was the beginning of the cold war. The period lasted until almost the end of the 20th century, and is thought to be both an ideological and power struggle between the two superpowers. A policy of containment was adopted by the US to limit Soviet expansion, and a series of proxy wars were fought with mixed results. It is pertinent to note that all of America's presidents during the Cold War era, from Harry S. Truman to Ronald Reagan, used some aspects of the strategy of containment, as a foreign policy approach to counter the spread of Communism by the Soviet Union. Initially it was understood as an ideological containment consistent with Kennan's doctrine of communism through provision of economic aid (Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan) and diplomacy but which eventually became more militarized (i.e. NATO and the National Security Council). Throughout the Cold War the administrations chose quite varied methods within different contexts in containing Soviet/communism, but they were all increasingly reliant on covert counterinsurgency as a means of containment in which the US intervened militarily to restrain and/or overthrow communist influence. Consequently, containment can be defined as a US policy to contain or halt Soviet communism by all means necessary short of total war; ideological, political, economic and military (Rees, 1967). Below are the US foreign policy objectives during the cold war;

- Containment of the spread of communism, and thereby the influence of the U.S.S.R., by supporting governments or rebel groups that opposed communism. This was accomplished by supplying aid, weapons and sometimes troops, such as in the Korean and Vietnam Wars.
- Deterring nuclear war through the policy of Mutual Assured Destruction, often called MAD, where any nuclear attack would be met with a counterattack of a magnitude ensuring the complete destruction of everyone and everything. The idea was to make nuclear war so devastating that no one would dare push the button.
- Support of free trade and international economic institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the World Bank.

In 1991, the Soviet Union dissolved into separate nations, and the Cold War formally ended as the United States gave separate diplomatic recognition to the Russian Federation and other former Soviet states. With these changes to forty-five years of established diplomacy and military confrontation, new challenges confronted U.S. policymakers. American foreign policy is characterized by the protection of its national interests.

3.2 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AFTER THE COLD WAR.

The 1990s is often regarded as the long decade in international affairs, since in theory it began with the collapse of communism and the end of the cold war in late 1989, and did not end until the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001. Throughout this period, United States foreign policy had to undergo some fundamental changes as the bi-polar world became a more uncertain, multi-polar order. The biggest change was the end of the once mighty Soviet Union, and thus the U.S. relationship with the Russian Federation and the surrounding region had to alter to something entirely different, with new states springing up as independent entities in Eastern Europe, and the relationship with Russia as an emerging democracy.

Post-Cold War U.S. foreign policy includes;

- Maintenance of U.S. global dominance often referred to as U.S. global hegemony. Pursuit of free trade and development of international economic institutions, such as the World Trade Organization.
- Encouraging the spread of democracy and peace.
- Use of military troops and equipment to support humanitarian missions, such as providing aid and support to victims of natural disasters.
- Punishing and isolating rogue states, like North Korea and Iran, who are perceived to be violating international law and threaten international peace and stability.

In the 21st century, the principal aim of U.S. foreign policy is to integrate other countries and organizations into arrangements that will sustain a world consistent with U.S. interest and values, and thereby promote peace, prosperity, and justice as widely as possible. Integration of new partners into U.S. efforts will help deal with traditional challenges of maintaining peace in divided regions as well as with transnational threats such as terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It will also help bring into globalized world those who have previously been left out. In this age, the fate of U.S. is intertwined with the fate of others, so her success must be shared success.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain briefly the U.S. foreign policy during the Cold War and Post-Cold War era.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Throughout the Cold War, the purpose of U.S. foreign policy revolved around the maintenance of the U.S. and the West as the principal military, political and economic force in the World. The post-Cold War era changed the U.S. foreign policy and thus the U.S. relationship with the Russian Federation and the surrounding region had to alter to something entirely different, with new states springing up as independent entities in Eastern Europe, and the relationship with Russia as an emerging democracy. In the 21st century, the principal aim of U.S. foreign policy is to integrate other countries and organizations into arrangements that will sustain a world consistent with U.S. interest and values, and thereby promote peace, prosperity, and justice as widely as possible.

5.0 SUMMARY

The Cold War was not one event, but rather a series of events connected together by the rivalry and polarization between the communist and capitalist systems. The Cold War was fought by third parties in developing lands and by scientists and heroes in a race for the moon. The United States foreign policy during the Cold War was geared towards undermining the power and spread of the Soviet/communism while the post-Cold War policies of U.S. were tailored towards the maintenance of peace and security of the international system.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

List the foreign policy objectives under each era.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Herring, C (2008) *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776*

Cameron F. (2005) *Us.Foreign Policy after Cold War*.Routledge and Francis Group. London.

Suri, J. (2009) *American Grand Strategy from the Cold War's End /0 9/11*. Orbis-article-fall.

Meernik, J.(1996). "United States Military Intervention and the Promotion of Democracy".
Journal of Peace Research vol.33, No.4: pp391-402.

George, Kennan F. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs* July 1947.

http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Sources_of_Soviet_Conduct (Accessed June 17, 2016)

UNIT 4 US FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS AFRICA

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 3.1 Origin of U.S. Foreign Policy towards Africa
 - 3.2 Contemporary U.S. Foreign Policy towards Africa
 - 3.3 U.S. -Africa Policy under President Obama's Administration
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The United States is far freer from commitments in Africa than in any other region of the world. Everywhere else American policy operates in a setting of old-established friendships and understandings, supplemented in postwar years by a network of alliances such as those creating NATO, CENTO AND SEATO; and American bases are scattered about the globe. In Africa to an unprecedented degree the United States is not bound by established positions or traditions, by fixed agreement or vested interests. While in any given situation it may find itself hemmed in by extra-African considerations and by the particular circumstances of the case, it still has a unique freedom, indeed a necessity, constantly to create policies to meet the issues presented by what for American diplomacy is virtually a new continent. However, the current U.S. regime under President Barack Obama believes in and is committed to Africa's future in the area of strengthening African Governments, economic progress, health related issues, conflict management, transnational challenges etc.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the unit, students should be able to:

1. Understand and explain the origin and contemporary foreign policy of United States towards Africa.
2. Understand U.S. foreign policy under Obama's administration.
3. Differentiate U.S. foreign policy towards Africa in each phase.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 ORIGIN OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS AFRICA

When U.S. economic and political interests in Africa are compared with U.S. interests in the Middle East, they are minimal (Rothchild& Keller 2006). During the Cold War, U.S. foreign policy towards Africa was driven by ideology and containment of Soviet expansion, and U.S. policy makers seldom showed interest in African countries (Clough, 1992). After the end of Cold

War and during the 1990s, U.S. interests in Africa declined and the region was seen as an experimental battle ground for democracy (Gordon et al. 1998).

Though the United States had minimal economic interest in Africa during the Cold War period and its policies were largely shaped by its wider Cold War politics, its foreign policy towards African oil states could still have been shaped by the need for energy security. The 1970s oil crisis made energy security a priority in U.S. foreign policy, and its policies towards the Middle East were largely shaped by that. In order to stabilize oil states, the United States worked with authoritarian regimes in the Middle East. In Africa, did the United States work with authoritarian regimes to stabilize energy sources as it did in the Middle East, or did the United States pursue wider political agendas, such as containment of Soviet expansion during the Cold War and promotion of democracy after the Cold War?

The increase in oil production in some African states and the discovery of new oil fields have made U.S. policy-makers recognize the importance of Africa, and particularly West African oil, to the growing need of the United States. U.S. growing interest in African oil is reflected in its increased military assistance to some African oil producers. Lynn Frederickson of Amnesty International, in a testimony to congress in 2007, indicated that Equatorial Guinea which is the fourth largest oil producer in Sub-Saharan Africa was the fourth largest beneficiary of U.S. foreign direct investment (mainly in oil and gas) in Sub-Saharan Africa. Despite the known human rights abuses and corruption that is in the country, she pointed that the U.S. Government chosen to provide military assistance to Equatorial Guinea and the President's request for FY08 foreign operations appropriations include \$45,000 in International Military Education and Training (IMET) funding (Frederickson2007). Frederickson's concern was echoed by other human rights and environmental advocates, such as Oxfam and Catholic Relief.

Scholars have indicated that the rise U.S. military involvement in Africa is partially attributed to oil. The creation of AFRICOM by many is seen as a tool that the United States can use to secure its interests in West Africa (Lubecketal2007). The U.S. Army War College annual war game, or also called "Unified Quest," for the first time in 2008 included scenarios in Africa. One of the scenarios was a test of how AFRICOM would respond to a crisis in Nigeria if the Nigerian government collapsed, and rival factions and rebels fought for control of the oil fields in the Niger Delta. The increase in U.S.-Africa business relations has also been a concern for the prospect of democracy and human rights in the region, as it is believed that when the United States has economic interests, it relinquishes democracy promotion. Many African oil states are considered authoritarian regimes, and Freedom House ranked six of the eight oil states as Not Free.

The prospect of these countries moving towards democracy becomes deemed with a strong political and military support from the United States. And U.S. behavior of courting suppressive African oil regimes has been seen as a policy driven by oil (Duffield 2008, 151; Gary & Karl 2003, 53-54).

3.2 CONTEMPORARY U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS AFRICA

Contemporary U.S. engagement with Africa is likely to be defined in terms of the perceived increase in U.S. interests in the region as a result of international terrorism, increased dependence on African oil, and the dramatic engagement of China with the continent in recent

years. Although the September 2002 National Security Strategy (NSS) asserts that "America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones," the implications of this for Africa appears relatively modest. With respect to the threat of international terrorism, the NSS pledges to work with European allies to "help strengthen Africa's fragile states, help build indigenous capability to secure porous borders, and help build up the law enforcement and intelligence infrastructure to deny havens for terrorists."

In practice, this policy has taken two distinct forms: the deployment of the Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA) in December 2002 and the Pan-Sahel Initiative/Trans-Sahel Counter Terrorism Initiative, which also began in late 2002. CJTF- HOA, staffed by about 1500 troops, has the mission of "detecting, disrupting and ultimately defeating transnational terrorist groups operating in the region--denying safe havens, external support and material assistance for transnational terrorism in the region." Initially, it was driven by concerns that terrorists fleeing from Afghanistan would be attracted to the 'vast ungoverned spaces' of the Horn of Africa. When such a mass influx failed to materialize, and the local terrorist threat proved to be relatively limited, CJTF-HOA began giving greater emphasis to its role in preventing terrorism by providing humanitarian assistance and waging a hearts and minds campaign.

The Pan-Sahel Initiative (PSI) was a more indirect effort to boost the border defense capabilities of countries to the West of the Horn: Chad, Niger, Mali, and Mauritania. With a tiny budget of \$8.4 million, it trained at least one rapid reaction force of about ISO soldiers in each of the four countries in 2003 and 2004. Clearly the budget of PSI was too small for it to have much of an impact on the recipient countries, but the Administration was sufficiently satisfied with the program to create an expanded follow-up on Trans-Sahel Counter Terrorism Initiative (TSCTI). Under the TSCTI, the program expanded to include Algeria, Morocco, Nigeria, Senegal, and Tunisia (in addition to the original four countries) and gave more emphasis to regional cooperation. The budget for TSCTI was initially proposed to be \$100 million a year for five years, but it is funded at the level of \$16.75 in its first year of budgeted funding.

The resources devoted to both efforts are far below what would be required to achieve the stated goals of strengthening states in general, and their policing and intelligence capabilities in particular. Furthermore, the fact that these state/border strengthening initiatives stretch across the continent, essentially tracing the boundary between Sub-Saharan Africa and North Africa, which is much more integrated with the Middle East, suggests that the underlying goal is to insulate Africa from threats to U.S. interests emanating from elsewhere, rather than to engage Africa itself. Beyond this specific counterterrorism strategy, the NSS sets out three interlocking strategies for Africa: giving "focused attention" to anchor states such as South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya, and Ethiopia, coordinating with European allies and international institutions for constructive conflict mediation and peace operations, and strengthening Africa's capable reforming states and sub-regional organizations as the primary means of addressing transnational threats, which adds up essentially to more 'African solutions to African problems.'

3.3 U.S. -AFRICA POLICY UNDER OBAMA ADMINISTRATION

President Obama has a strong interest in Africa and has prioritized Africa among its top foreign policy concerns. This has been evident in areas such as; Strengthening African Governments President Obama promised to work with African governments, the international community, and

civil society to strengthen democratic institutions and protect the democratic gains made in recent years in many African countries. A key element in Africa's transformation is sustained commitment to democracy, rule of law, and constitutional norms. Some African states have made significant progress in this area but progress in this area must be more wide spread across Africa.

Economic Progress Africa's future success and global importance are dependent on its continued economic progress. Working alongside African countries to promote and advance sustained economic development and growth is another Obama administration priority. Africa has made measurable inroads to increase prosperity. Countries like Mauritius, Ghana, Rwanda, Botswana, Tanzania, Uganda, and Cape Verde have made significant economic strides. Yet Africa remains the poorest and most vulnerable continent on the globe. To help turn this situation around, U.S. Government in partnership with African States must work to revitalize Africa's agricultural sector, which employs more than 70 percent of Africans directly or indirectly. The U.S. is also committed to supporting a new Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative, focusing predominantly on reducing hunger, poverty and under nutrition in the continent. **Health-Related Issues** Historically the United States has focused on public health and health-related issues in Africa. President Obama's foreign policy is committed in achieving this objective. He promised to work side-by-side with African governments and civil society to ensure that quality treatment, prevention, and care are easily accessible to communities throughout Africa especially on diseases such as HIV/AIDS and malaria.

Conflict Prevention and Management in Africa, The U.S. is committed to working with African states and the international community to prevent, mitigates, and resolves conflicts and disputes. Conflict destabilizes states and borders, stifles economic growth and investment, and robs young Africans of the opportunity for an education and a better life. Conflict sets back nations for a generation. Throughout Africa, there has been a notable reduction in the number of conflicts over the past decade.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly explain U.S. foreign policy objectives under President Barack Obama's administration.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Africa has always been marginal to U.S. interest and policies in the world. However, U.S. Africa relations may be approaching a critical juncture due to the current trend of events in the international system. U.S. policy evolve toward engaging Africa on its own terms for mutual benefit and this is evident in its commitment to Africa's future in the area of strengthening African Governments, economic progress, health related issues, conflict management, transnational challenges etc.

5.0 SUMMARY

Though the United States had minimal economic interest in Africa during the 20th century but the politics of oil changed its foreign policy towards Africa which shaped the need for energy security. However, its contemporary foreign policy engagement with Africa is likely to be defined in terms of the perceived increase in U.S. interests in the region as a result of China with the continent in recent years.

6.0 TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Differentiate and explain U.S. foreign policy towards Africa in each phase.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Schraeder, P. (1994) *United States Foreign Policy toward Africa: Incrementalism, Crises and Change*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Agwu, F. (2013) *Themes and Perspectives on Africa's International Relations*. Ibadan: University Press Pic.

Akinterinwa, B. (2014) *Reflections on Nigeria in a Pluriverse World of Decline and Incline*. Lagos: NIIA.

Lawson, L. (1999) "External Democracy Promotion in Africa: Another False Start? Commonwealth and Comparative Politics.

Alden, C. (2000) "From Neglect to 'Virtual Engagement ': The United States and IfS New Paradigm for Africa," *African Affairs*.

Council on Foreign Relation, (2006) "More than Humanitarianism: A Strategic u.s. Approach toward Africa," *Independent Task Force Report*, No. 56.

John, G. (ed.), *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays* (6th ed. Wadsworth, 2010), p. 640; essays by scholars

MODULE 4 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY OF CONTAINMENT AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY

INTRODUCTION

The United States engaged in an aggressive collective security approach in Europe that directly led to the escalation of tensions, causing the Cold War. Following the Second World War, the United States adopted policies of containment that rejected former ideas of isolation in order to maintain global peace. Because World War II was seen as a "good war", policy makers were encouraged to keep up collective security mandates in Europe with little regard to the reaction of neighboring countries, especially the Soviet Union.

Collective security may be defined as a plan for maintaining peace through an organization of sovereign states, whose members pledge themselves to defend each other against attack. The idea emerged in 1914, was extensively discussed during World War I, and took shape rather imperfectly in the 1919 Covenant of the League of Nations and again in the Charter of the United Nations after World War II. The term has subsequently been applied to less idealistic and narrower arrangements for joint defense such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The policies of economic aid in Europe, collectively referred to as the Marshall Plan, were intentionally created to divide East and West Europe into warring states, which was an aggressive move against communist expansion and led to increased tensions that caused the Cold War. This was the primary aggressive action that the United States took against Soviet Communism in Eastern Europe. Truman's intention in implementing the plan was to draw Western countries away from the power that the Soviet Union had, directly undermining Soviet powers in the region. By having "strings attached" to the financial aid packages that they provided to Europe, the United States maneuvered to have a larger control over the domestic and foreign policies of Western European countries. Many of these strings directly dealt with implanting collective security in Western Europe, as seen with the subsequent Mutual Security Programme, an extension of the Marshall Plan that dealt directly with installing security programs in Western European states. By conducting such a policy, the United States provoked the Soviet Union to respond, as seen in the tightening of control in the Soviet satellite. Suddenly, previously free countries were placed underneath a harsher rule by the USSR. Therefore, those economic policies led to a poisoned environment, precipitating the formation of the Cold War.

UNIT 1 United States foreign Policy of Containment and Collective Security

UNIT 2 United States foreign Policy of Detente and Human Rights

UNIT 3 United States foreign Policy towards the European Union

UNIT 4 United States foreign Policy towards China, India and Japan

UNIT 1 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY OF CONTAINMENT AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 USA Foreign Policy of Containment
 - 3.2 USA Foreign Policy of Collective Security
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, we shall examine the US foreign policy of Containment and Collective Security with a view of understanding them, as well as understanding the underlying factors necessitating such policies. This unit will also examine the US foreign policy of Containment and Collective Security as key features of the overall US foreign policy. Containment is a military strategy to stop the expansion of an enemy. On the other hand, the notion of Collective security can be defined as a plan for maintaining peace through an organization of states, whose members pledge to defend each other against attack.

The US foreign policy on Containment sought to prevent the spread of communism abroad through the use of a multiplicity of strategies. A component of the Cold War, this policy was a response to the expansionist moves by the Soviet Union to enlarge its communist sphere of influence in Eastern Europe, China, Korea, and Vietnam. The US policy of Collective Security is a core aspect of its foreign policy in which the US has security arrangements and formal alliances with several countries of the world with a view to achieving strategic security objectives.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the lecture students should be able to:

1. Have a basic understanding of the US foreign policy of Containment and Collective Security.
2. Be familiar with the broad framework of US foreign policy and its national security imperatives.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY OF CONTAINMENT

The US policy of Containment which became the foreign policy bedrock of President Truman's administration and the United States strategy for fighting the Cold War (1947- 1989) with the

Soviet Union was formulated by George Kennan, a career Foreign Service Officer. It is regarded as the US foreign policy strategy that was created and executed by the US after World War II in response to the Soviet Union's goal of exporting Communism to countries. On 22 Feb 1946, Kennan argued in his "Long Telegram" that the Soviets well: waging an everlasting war against the capitalist West, and did so by aggressively advancing their own communist model (Kennan, 1947). The U.S. used this strategy during the Cold War to prevent the Soviet Union from spreading Communism by providing either military support, economic and/or technical assistance to noncommunist countries. The US saw communism as a slave state that control the private life and thoughts of its citizens. A threat that violated both democratic rights and civil liberties of its citizens and therefore required the continued efforts of America to make sure that it did not spread to the United States and other nations that have not yet moved politically towards Soviet Union communism. Initiated by the Truman Administration, the Truman Doctrine was the early basis of containment, the Truman administration embarked on the use of massive economic and military aid to prevent Soviets expansionism (Freeland, 1972). Consequently the US created strategic alliances and support to help weak countries to resist Soviet advances. These included the Marshall Plan or European Recovery Program and the creation in 1949 of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), a military alliance between the US and Western European countries for the defence of Western European nations against communist influence. However, the Soviet Union's first nuclear test in 1949, the communist revolution in China in 1949 and the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950 prompted the National Security Council to formulate a comprehensive security doctrine and containment strategy which provided the trigger for the militarization of containment, which had hitherto been an ideological one (Pedersen, 2013).

It is instructive to note that all of America's presidents during the Cold War era, from Harry S. Truman to Ronald Reagan, used some aspects of the strategy of containment, as a foreign policy approach to counter the spread of Communism by the Soviet Union. Initially it was understood as an ideological containment - consistent with Kennan's doctrine - of communism through provision of economic aid (Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan) and diplomacy but which eventually became more militarized (i.e. NATO and the National Security Council 68). Throughout the Cold War the administrations chose quite varied methods - within different contexts - in containing Soviet/communism, but they were all increasingly reliant on covert counterinsurgency as a means of containment in which the US intervened military to restrain and/or overthrow communist influence. Consequently, containment can be defined as a US policy to contain or halt Soviet communism by all means necessary short of total war; ideological, political, economic and military (Rees, 1967).

3.2 USA FOREIGN POLICY OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Collective security has been defined as a notion in which an attack on anyone country is tantamount to an attack on all other countries, whose duty is to oppose the attack. It refers to "an arrangement arrived at by some nations to protect their vital interests, safety or integrity, against a probable threat or menace over a particular period, by means of combining their powers."(Chaturvedi, 2006), The concept of collective security has been described as a sort of social contract among states which is aimed at achieving stability and peace (Blin&Marin,2009). Hence, any state contemplating aggression would face the sure prospect of struggle not simply

with the prospective victim, but with all other members of the system, who would make any necessary sacrifice to save the state attacked (Ebegbulem, 2011).

Rourke and Boyer (1998) have argued that collective security is based on four principles: first, all countries forswear the use of force except in self defence second, all agree that peace is indivisible, an attack on one is an attack on all; third, all pledge to unite to halt aggression and restore the peace; and fourth, all agree to supply whatever material or personnel resources that are necessary to form a collective security force associated with the United Nations or some IGO to defeat aggressors and restore the peace. The League of Nations which failed was the first attempt by the international community in achieving collective security. It was however flawed and failed to achieve its objectives because its membership did not include all the great powers including the United States (Goldstein, 2005). The failure of the League of Nations to prevent the 2nd World War led to the creation of the United Nations as its successor to promote collective security. The creation of the UN in 1945 was spearheaded by the US which is one of the victors of the 2nd World War and a member of the permanent members of the Security Council; others being France, China, Britain and Russia.

The United States foreign policy on collective security can be said to be channeled through several mechanisms including through the United Nations. Within the UN collective security mechanism of the Security Council, the US is seen as the hegemon and predominant player, with its military spending outpacing that of the other countries. Although, the UN is the font of legitimate international authority, the USA has unparalleled capacity for the maintenance of international peace and security, sometimes result in the superpower breaking the rules and treating the rules as inapplicable to it (Anderson, 2009). A case in point is the unilateral invasion of Iraq by the US and Britain. In addition the United States foreign policy on collective security is also executed through regional organizations such including the Organisation of American States(OAS), and the North Atlantic treaty Organisation (NATO). Established in 1949, it was envisioned as a US commitment to help defend Western Europe against the Soviet Union(Goldstein, 2005), and the US continues to play a leading role in its affairs. It currently comprises of 28 countries including United States, Canada, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, The Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Turkey, Poland, The Czech Republic, Hungary, Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia (NATO.org). Article Y, considered the heart of NATO, asks members to come to the defense of a fellow member under attack(Goldstein, 2005).

Treaties and agreements are powerful foreign policy tools that the United States uses to build and solidify relationships with partners and to influence the behavior of other states (Simmons, 1998). To this end, the US has several bilateral alliances with states such as the US-Japanese Security Treaty(Goldstein, 2005). Established after World War II, the U.S.-Japan security alliance has served as one of the region's most important military relationships and as an anchor of the U.S. security role in Asia. Revised in 1960, the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security grants the United States the right to military bases on the archipelago in exchange for a U.S. pledge to defend Japan in the event of an attack (Xu, 2014).

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain the reasons for the US adoption of policy of containment?

4.0 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be noted that the United States foreign had as part of its major planks, the notion of containment and collective security, one can say that both are also interconnected. Although the US foreign policy of containment emerged in the Cold War to repel the Soviet Union's expansionism, the US foreign policy of collective security to a large extent also is predicated on the halting of the Soviet Union in its bid to politically and militarily spread communism to other countries. A major example is the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation which is a key mechanism for collective security. It was founded in 1949 to oppose and deter Soviet power in Europe. According to Goldstein (2005), it was envisioned as a US commitment to help defend Western Europe against the Soviet Union.

5.0 SUMMARY

In summary therefore, it is important to note that US foreign policy of containment prevalent during the Cold War and its policy of collective security are two major foreign policy mechanisms used by the US in achieving its strategic foreign policy objectives. In the post-World War II years, the United States was shouldered with an inescapable responsibility for world affairs. With an end to its isolationist policy, and allied with countries devastated by war, as well as the Soviet Union's expansionist aspirations, the United States shouldered the dual burden of facilitating the restoration of a world economic order and arresting the spread of the Soviet Union's peculiar brand of totalitarianism and communism.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Define collective security, and give two examples of such arrangements.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Anderson, Kenneth (2009), "United Nations Collective Security and the United States Security Guarantee in an Age of Rising Multipolarity: The Security Council as Talking Shop of the Nations." *Chicago Journal of International Law* 10, no. 1.

Boundless.(2016), "The Cold War and Containment." *Boundless Political Science* .Retrieved from <https://www.boundless.com/political-science/textbooks/boundless-political-science-textbook/foreign-policy-18/the-history-of-american-foreign-policy-II-the-cold-war-and-containment-586-4260/>

Chaturvedi, A. K. (2006) "Dictionary of Political Science". New Delhi: Academic Publishers.

Ebegbulem, I.C (2011), "The Failure of Collective Security in the Post World Wars I and II International System" *Transcience Journal*(2011) Vol. 2, Issue 2.

Freeland, R. M. (1972). *The Truman Doctrine and McCarthyism*. New York, US: Knopf.

Goldstein, J(2005), "International Relations", India:Dorling Kindersley & Pearson Education

Kennan G. F. (1947). *The Sources of Soviet Conduct*. *Foreign Affairs*, 25(1),556-582.

Pedersen, J.A(2013), "American Foreign Policy"

Rees, D. (1967). *The Age of Containment: The Cold War 1945-1965*. London, UK: Macmillan, St. Martin's Press.

Roland N. Stromberg (ND) "Collective Security" *Encyclopedia of the New American Nation*. Available on Retrieved on 20th May 2016 from <http://www.americanforeignrelations.com/A-DjCollective-Security.html> Rourke, J. and Boyer, M. (1998) *World Politics: International Politics on the World Stage, Brief*. U.S.A.: Dushkin/McGraw Hill

Simmons, Beth A., "Compliance with International Agreements," *Annual Review of Political Science* 1. 1 (1998): 75-93.

Xu, Beina (2014), "The US-Japan Security Alliance". *Council of Foreign Relations*. Retrieved from <http://www.cfr.org/japan/us-japan-security-alliance/p31437> on 14/5/2016.

UNIT 2 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY OF DETENTE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 United States Foreign Policy of Detente
 - 3.2 United States Foreign Policy of Human Rights
 - 3.3 United States Foreign Policy Tools of Human Rights
- 4.0 Summary
- 5.0 Conclusion
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The United States foreign policy of detente and human rights can be regarded as mechanisms through which the United States achieves its strategic foreign policy objectives. While detente was one of the foreign policy flanks of the United States that existed during the Cold War, the use of Human rights by the US as a foreign tool of influencing states behavior and a precondition for granting or withholding foreign aid to countries continues till date. Detente can be defined as the period of relaxation of the frosty relations between the United States and Soviet Union during the Cold War. The US has actively pursued human rights as a foreign policy goal since the late 1970s when President Jimmy Carter made it a major foreign policy goal.

In this unit we shall examine the United States foreign policy of detente and human rights.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the lecture students should be able to:

1. Understand the United States foreign policy of Detente and Human Rights
2. Appreciate and identify the factors necessitating such foreign policy approaches

3.0 MAIN CONTENTS

3.1 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY OF DETENTE

Detente is defined as a "period of reduced tension between military adversaries in which the risk of war is reduced (originally referring to the relaxed position of a crossbow" (Schmid, 2000). It is a term used to characterize American-Soviet relations in the period from 1970s through the 1980s. This period falls within the fourteen years beginning with the onset of the presidency of Richard Nixon and his call for replacement of a period of confrontation through negotiation in pursuit of peace, to the midterm of Ronald Reagan's repudiation of detente and a vowing again of a strategy of "direct confrontation"(Gathoff, 1982). According to Kissinger, the United States adopted detente as its foreign policy approach during the Cold War as a way or "managing the

emergence of Soviet power" into world politics in an age of nuclear parity. Additionally, the United States adopted this foreign policy approach on realizing the advantage of peaceful relations with Soviet Union rather than the massive weapon production and maintaining huge armed forces.

This period 1973-89 saw many changes to US foreign policy. The cold war certainties which had dictated the policies of successive presidents from a Truman to Johnson began to be eroded. When Nixon came to power in 1973 he was determined to learn from the mistakes of his predecessors some of whom had lost the favour of the electorates. Therefore, Nixon committed himself to a policy of Vietnamization i.e. transforming the ARVN (the army of South Vietnam) into a well-supported, effective fighting force and withdrawing American soldiers from the conflict. This strategy was part of the wider Nixon Doctrine- a plan to supply military aid, but not troops, to countries fighting communist expansion. He hoped to achieve 'peace with honour' at the Paris Peace talks, but this uneasy peace between North and South Vietnam only lasted until 1975 when soviet backed north Vietnamese troops overran the country.

Another significant detente era of US foreign policy was the improvement in US-Sino relations. During this period, US foreign policy towards China a communist country changed from largely ignoring China to opening up diplomatic relations with it. To this end, President Nixon first sent his foreign policy advisor Henry Kissinger and later visited China himself. He did this for three reasons; to boost his election prospects, improve foreign trade and play the USSR and PRC against each other (though they were both communist, there was an intense rivalry between Russia and China). This policy of detente with China worked extremely well by forcing Soviet Union to the negotiating table, this further led to the visit of Leonid Brezhnev to Washington in 1973, and the first major arms reduction agreement between the US and the USSR; SALT 1 (Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty).

Wallenstein (1985) has argued that for the USA and the USSR the purpose of detente seems to have been the same: to avoid nuclear war between the two, thus, both countries sought to manage the crisis without risking an unintended nuclear war. Consequently, both countries made several efforts to achieve this including: improving direct communication between them (the hot line agreement of 1963), followed by agreements on reducing confrontations by mistake (the naval agreement of 1972, the basic principles agreement of 1972, the agreement on avoidance of nuclear war of 1973) and some confidence building measures in Europe (the Helsinki Final Act 1975).

It is noteworthy that detente as a US foreign policy approach brought considerable achievements, including of course the improved US-Soviet relations underscored by the visit of Brezhnev the Premier of the Soviet Union to Washington. In addition was the joint space experiment by three American astronauts and two Russians that resulted in technical co-operation the two countries. Likewise, the period of detente also contributed to improved trade relations between the two countries underscored by the vast shipment of grain annually from the United States to Soviet Union. However, several events began to undermine it. In the middle of the 1970s there began to exist a decreasing interest and skepticism of detente spreading in the United States. However, it was the 1979 Soviet intervention in Afghanistan that undercut detente"(Gathoff, 1982). In addition, the crises over Poland and over the deployment of new missiles in Europe further worsened the US-Soviet relations such that by the end of 1984 the relations between the two

major powers had thus arrived at a stage of neither detente nor a Second Cold War (Wallenstein, 1985).

3.2 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Human right remains a core aspect of United States foreign policy, and this has been a major factor in her relations with countries of the world. Human rights have always played a role in foreign policy throughout American history largely as a result of the country's constitution and bill of rights that is premised on freedom and individual liberties. The US State Department has actively pursued human rights since the late 1970s when President Jimmy carter made human rights a major goal of US foreign policy (Goldstein, 2005).

Human rights as a foreign policy direction of the US originated with the US Congress, spearheaded by the public including human rights groups, lawyers associations, church groups, labor unions, scientists, academics and others. In a 1974 report by subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, entitled "Human Rights in the World Community: A Call for US Leadership." It recommended that the Department of State raise the priority of human rights in foreign policy, arguing that the prevailing attitude had led the US "into embracing governments which practice torture and unabashedly violate almost every human rights guarantee pronounced by the world community."(Cohen, 2008). In the report, the subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee called for forceful private diplomacy, public statements, the active raising of human rights at the United Nations and other international fora, and the restriction of military and economic aid to governments that consistently violated human rights. Congress then enacted legislation that required human rights reports on every country receiving US aid, and prohibited military and economic assistance to governments consistently violating human rights unless national security or humanitarian aid considerations warranted the assistance. To this end, annual US government report assesses human rights in different countries of the world, with the US withholding aid from states or the armed forces of states where human right abuses are severe (Liang-Fenton, 2004).

3.3 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOOLS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The United States employs different categories of tools in its foreign policy with countries of the world. Some of these include: Private Diplomacy: The raising of serious human rights violations and high interest individual cases in bilateral discussions with foreign governments. Past administrations including the Carter and Clinton Administration focused on countries with which the US had military and economic ties, while later administrations used private diplomacy with countries with which the US had aid relationships as well as to promote democracy and freedom in the Middle East. Public Statements: Public statements are made to make US positions on human rights clear. They serve as notices to foreign governments or sometimes as a restraining influence and encourage domestic human rights proponents in the country. Public statements by the US on human rights issues began to be loudly heard during the Carter Administration in regional and international fora, such as the United Nations and the Helsinki Forum with the Soviet bloc Symbolic Gestures. These could range from a reduction in military-to-military contacts in a country to a US presidential letter to a dissident. President Bush's presentation of a Congressional Gold Medal to the Dalai Lama is a good example of a symbolic gesture targeting China. Positive Measures: The US channels economic aid, sells technology or other products to

governments working to improve their records. Also, the President may visit a country in recognition of human rights improvements or on the understanding that there would be human rights reforms. The US also provides grants to governments for projects in support of civil and political freedoms. During the Reagan era, the State Department and AID made a grant to Togo to help it establish a national human rights commission. In 2006, the State Department spent \$23 million on projects to promote the rule of law and civil society in China. (Cohen, 2008). The United States also applies sanctions, such as reductions in military aid or trade to disassociate the US from governmental practices and human rights abuses. Examples include the US reduction in military assistance to Egypt after the coup against President Morsi in 2013.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain what you understand as the US policy of detente

4.0 CONCLUSION

In conclusion the United States foreign policy of detente and human rights are major foreign policy directions of the US that has major bearing on its relations with other countries of the world. While the US foreign policy of detente was prevalent during the Cold War symbolized by the relaxing and thawing of the relations between the US and the Soviet Union. Human rights as a core foreign policy aspect of the United States relations remains till date a key factor in her relations with countries. To achieve this foreign policy objective, the US employs a number of tool include sanctions, public statements, symbolic measures etc.

5.0 SUMMARY

In summary, it is pertinent to say that the United States foreign policy of detente employed during the Cold War defined the US-Soviet relations at that time through its relaxation of the frosty relations between the two countries. Scholars have argued that it was employed by the US in a bid to prevent a catastrophic nuclear war from taking place between both countries. However, the US foreign policy of human rights till date remains a core aspect and guides US relations and dealings with countries.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Give three tools used by the United States as a foreign policy tool in achieving human rights globally.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Cohen, Roberta (2008), "Integrating Human Rights in US Foreign Policy: The History, the Challenges, and the Criteria for an Effective Policy" The Brookings Institution -University of BernProject on Internal Displacement

Garthoff, Raymond L.(1982,"Detente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan". Brookings Institution Report

Goldstein, J. (2005), "International Relations", India:Dorling Kindersley & Pearson Education

Schmid, Alex P. (2000) "Thesaurus and Glossary of Early Warning and Conflict Prevention Terms" United Kingdom: Forum on Early Warning and Early Response

Liang-Fenton, D. (2004), "Implementing U.S Human Rights Policy: Agendas, Policies, and Practices" Hendon V A: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Wallensteen, P.(1985), American-Soviet Detente: What Went Wrong? Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 22, No. I (Mar., 1985), pp. 1-8

UNIT 3 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE EUROPEAN UNION

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 3.1 Emergence of United States Foreign Policy towards the European Union
 - 3.2 united States - European Union Cooperation
 - 3.3 Challenges to US-EU Relations
- 4.0 Summary
- 5.0 Conclusion
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The United States and Europe go a long way in history. The richness and diversity of American society owes much to the successive waves of immigration from practically every European country during the past 500 years. And this to a large extent accounts for the shared values and close cultural, economic, social and political ties between Europeans and Americans (EU Commission, 2006). However, the post World War I & II events and the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 to repel the spread of Soviet Union's communism formalized the US-EU alliance (Goldstein, 2005).

The United States and Europe's common values, overlapping interests, and shared goals have been described as the foundation of the "transatlantic partnership" between them. Many observers stress that in terms of security and prosperity the United States and Europe have grown increasingly interdependent. Both sides of the Atlantic face a common set of challenges, including a broad range of economic concerns as well as terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and armed conflict or other forms of instability in many parts of the world. Both sides are proponents of democracy, open societies, human rights, and free markets

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the unit, students should be able to:

1. Understand and explain the origin of US-European relations
2. Explain the United States policy to the European Union

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 EMERGENCE OF U. S FOREIGN POLICY TO THE E.U

Relations between the US and the European Union can be traced back in history especially to the Marshall Plan for the development of Europe and the US quest to ward off the Soviet Union's communist agenda using the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). The U.S entered diplomatic relations with the European Community (a predecessor of the European Union) '111 1953 when the first U.S. observers were sent to the European Coal and Steel Community

(ECSC). In 1961, the US mission to the European Communities - now the European Union - was established in Brussels. In 1990, the relations of the U.S. with the European Community were formalized by the adoption of the Transatlantic Declaration. A regular political dialogue between the U.S. and the EC was thereby initiated at various levels, including regular summit meetings. The cooperation focused on the areas of economy, education, science and culture. The New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA), which was launched at the Madrid summit in 1995, carried the cooperation forward. The NTA contains four broad objectives for U.S.-EU collaboration: promoting peace and stability, democracy and development around the world; responding to global challenges; contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic relations; and building bridges across the Atlantic.

3.2 U.S.-E.U. COOPERATION

The extensive cooperation between the United States and the European Union on several global issues has earned the relationship the term "transatlantic partnership". Although, the 1990 Transatlantic Declaration marked the beginning of deep cooperation and consultation between the EU and the US; however the emergence of a European common foreign and security policy (CFSP) and the European security and defence policy (ESDP), as well as a need for a joint US-EU response to a number of global issues including threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, fragile peace process in the Middle East, and the need to safeguard economic growth and employment necessitated a deeper US-EU cooperation beyond the transatlantic declaration. Consequently, in 1995, at the EU-US summit in Madrid, European Commission President, President of the European Council, and then US President Clinton signed the new transatlantic agenda (NTA), which provided for joint action in four major fields.

- Promoting peace and stability, democracy and development around the world;
- Responding to global challenges;
- Contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic relations;
- Building bridges across the Atlantic

Within the framework of the NTA, a new initiative, creating the transatlantic economic partnership (TEP) was launched at the EU-US summit on 18 May 1998 in London, and more recently, in 2005 EU-US economic summit launched the 'EU-US initiative to enhance transatlantic economic integration and growth. This covers cooperation on a broad spectrum of areas including the promotion of further economic integration across the Atlantic and maximizing the potential for economic growth. Kordos (2014) argues that in 2010 the EU and the US together account for 37% of world trade and bilateral investment flows between the two economies are worth around €1.5 trillion. The US - EU economic relationship dominates the world economy by the sheer size of their combined economies. The United States and the EU member countries are of roughly equivalent levels of economic development and are among the most advanced in the world. As a group they include the world's wealthiest and most educated populations. The United States and the EU, with a few exceptions, are major producers of advanced technologies and services. As a result the US - EU trade tends to be intra-industry trade; that is trade in similar products, such as cars and computers, dominate two-way trade flows. Furthermore, the United States and the EU have advanced and integrated financial sectors

which facilitate large volumes of capital flows across the Atlantic (Cihelkova., cited in Kordos 2014).

3.3 CHALLENGES OF US-EU RELATIONS

The US-EU relation is predicated on a wide ranging and extensive cooperation bestriding several areas including climate change, terrorism and migration. And this has resulted in the increasing interdependence by both parties, and common values have grown over the years. However this transatlantic partnership does seem bedeviled by some challenges, and several factors act as a strain to it. According to Jovanovic (2005), the European business is being increasingly affected by the growing US national security restrictions. The EU recognizes that there are security issues to be resolved relating to trade and investment, particularly in the aftermath of 9111, but has long expressed concern about excessive use which could be interpreted to be a disguised form of protectionism. Andoura,S, Behr, T and Ricard-Nihoul, G. (2010) have identified globalisation as another challenge to the US-EU relations. The initial favourable phase of globalisation, which translated into sustained growth and the emergence of new solidarities between international partners, was upset by a series of highly disruptive events that included natural disasters, the failure of the international financial system, nuclear proliferation and the risk of global pandemics, and this has negatively impacted on the US-EU relations.

The shift away from Europe to Asia as the driving force behind globalization, with China in the lead is noteworthy. Consequently, the 2008 economic crisis further strengthened Asia's position in the global economic ranking, with China becoming the dominant regional power and the US's leading trading partner. Different interpretations have been attributed to the rise of Asia, but five aspects have been highlighted to be of significance to the US policy to the EU. It can be seen as an economic phenomenon, a strategic challenge, a global power shift, a recognition of the re-emergence of China and India, and an acknowledgement of the many "middle powers" in the region. All five interpretations are likely to influence and act as a challenge to the US-EU relations

Additionally, the United States global power status, as well as its military and economic superiority has been identified as capable of breeding resentment, even among its friends. A growing perception that Washington cares only about its own interests and is willing to use its muscle to get its way has fueled a worrisome gap between U.S. and European attitudes. Cultural differences are obscuring continued interdependence in trade and complicating cooperation on climate change, globalization, migration, and terrorism. (Lindsay, 2003).

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly highlight the emergence of the US-EU relations

4.0 CONCLUSION

The foreign policy of the United States to the European Union remains a key aspect of the United States foreign relations. The US - EU economic relationship dominates the world economy by the sheer size of their combined economies. Developing the Transatlantic Agenda is a response to the desire to strengthen the relationship between the United States and the

European Union in order to enhance and maintain world stability. In the era of globalization, a historic responsibility falls to the United States and the European Union to propose the creation of a new world order based on collective responsibility, risk sharing and effective multilateral decision-making structures able to take action.

Another key factor straining the US-EU relations is the complex Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TIIP) negotiations that seems stalled over disagreements on genetically modified food, industrial safety standards, and fears of unregulated competition. In addition is the U.S. wiretapping program that eavesdropped on French president Francois Hollande, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, and senior EU officials.

5.0 SUMMARY

Despite the strain on the US EU relations there remain a number of issues on which both parties can be said to shared interest. And this includes amongst others: U.S. and European relations with Russia have become more adversarial in the context of Russia's annexation of Crimea and its actions destabilizing Ukraine. The United States and the European Union (EU) have imposed sanctions that, combined with low oil prices, have harmed the Russian economy. The United States and European countries have been cooperating in efforts to counter the Islamic State and seek a political solution to the conflict in Syria. The United States and Europe remain central actors in negotiations seeking to reach an agreement that ensures that Iran's nuclear program can be used solely for peaceful purposes.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Identify the challenges affecting the US foreign policy to the EU.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Andoura,S, Behr, T and Ricard-Nihoul, G. (2010), "Reshaping EU-US Relations:A Concept Paper" Notre Europe

European Union Commission(2006), "The European Union and the United States Global Partners, Global Responsibilities". European CommissionEN.

Goldstein, J(2005), "International Relations", India.Dorling Kindersley & Pearson Education.

Jovanovic, M. N. (2005). "The Economics of European Integration".USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kordos, M.(2014), "Issues and Challenges of The US - EU Economic Relations" Economics and Management Journal. 19 (1).

Lindsay, J.M. (2003), "The Globalization of Politics: American Foreign Policy for a New Century" Brookings Review. Available on <http://www.cfr.org/world/globalization-politics-american-foreign-pol-icy-new-century/p6330>

UNIT4 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS CHINA, INDIA AND JAPAN

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 3.1 United States Foreign Policy towards China
 - 3.2 United States Foreign Policy towards India
 - 3.3 United States Foreign Policy towards Japan
- 4.0 Summary
- 5.0 Conclusion
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The foreign policy of the United States to Asia of which China, India and Japan falls into can be said to be one of realistic engagements, and key aspects of US bilateral relations. A US- China relation which is the relations between a major world power and a rising global power remains a major aspect of the 21st century development. After forty-four years of "engagement," the United States and China have a closer relationship that was unimaginable several years ago. The bilateral relationship between the U.S. and the People's Republic of China (PRC) is vitally important, touching on a wide range of areas including, among others, economic policy, security, foreign relations, and human rights. The US-India relations have moved largely from Cold War dictates to that of constructive engagement between both countries. The long history of strained relations between the two countries have been replaced by closer ties and cooperation on several fronts including climate change, trade and investments, terrorism and Information Communication Technology (ICT). Likewise the United States also has bilateral relations with Japan, which extends over several areas including military, trade and investments.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the unit, students should be able to

1. Understand the United states foreign policy to China
2. Understand the United states foreign policy to India
3. Understand the United states foreign policy to Japan

3.0 MAIN CONTENTS

3.1 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS CHINA

For several decades, U.S. policy toward China (and Taiwan) remained rooted in the strategic interests that led Nixon to Beijing during the Cold War. This policy has commonly been known as "engagement." Through engagement, China's relationship with the United States was

transformed from one characterized by near constant antagonism to one of dialogue and cooperation. The normalization of U.S.-China relations during the Carter administration helped create an international environment conducive to the launch in the late 1970s of China's economic reforms under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping. Engagement helped integrate China into the ambit of multilateral organizations, including the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Regional Forum (ARF), and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum etc which empowered China to become a player on the world stage. However, human rights issues as remained as a strain on US-China relations. When China's government brutally suppressed protesters in Tiananmen Square in June 1989, the United States responded by severing its security ties to Beijing and placing human rights concerns prominently on the agenda in U.S.-China relations. The bilateral relationship between the U.S. and the People's Republic of China (PRC) is wide ranging touching on a wide range of areas including, among others, economic policy, security, foreign relations, and human rights.

Economically, the United States and China have become symbiotically intertwined. China is Thesecond-largest U.S. trading partner, with total U.S.-China trade in 2008 reaching anestimated\$409 billion.(Dumbaugh, 2009).At the same time, China's own substantial levels of economic growth have depended heavily on continued U.S. investment and trade, making China's economy highly vulnerable to a significant economic slowdown in the United States.

Despite the largely friendly relations between the US and China, there several other challenges between both parties which difficulties over the status and well-being of Taiwan, ongoing disputes over China's failure to protect U.S. intellectual property rights, the economic advantage China gains from not floating its currency, and growing concerns about the quality and safety of products exported by China. China's more assertive foreign policy and continued military development also have significant long-term implications for U.S. global power and influence. (Dumbaugh: 2009). Successive US administrations have however sought to manage the US-China relation in a way that is beneficial to both parties. During the Bush Administration, the U.S. and China cultivated regular high-level visits and exchanges of working level officials, resumed military-to-military relations, cooperated on anti-terror initiatives, and worked closely on the Six Party Talks to restrain and eliminate

North Korea's nuclear weapons activities

Under the Obama Administration, there has been repeated assurance by the US to Beijing that the United States "welcomes a strong, prosperous and successful China that plays a greater role in world affairs," and that the United States does not seek to prevent China's re-emergence as a great power.(Lawrence,20 13). Issues of concern for Washington include the intentions behind China's military modernization program, China's use of its paramilitary forces and military in disputes with its neighbors over territorial claims in the South China Sea and East China Sea, and its continuing threat to use force to bring Taiwan under its control. Washington has struggled to convince Beijing that the U.S. policy of rebalancing toward the Asia Pacific is not intended to contain China. The two countries have however cooperated, with mixed results, to address nuclear proliferation concerns related to Iran and North Korea.

3.2 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS INDIA

The strategic distancing of the United States and the leadership of what was to become free India took place several years before the onset of the Cold War, when neither Americans nor Indian nationalists saw a close relationship as vital (Cohen, 2000). The US-India relation during the Cold War was one of estrangement resulting from the geopolitics of that era. Kronstadt & Pinto (2012) have argued that the end of the Cold War and the opening of India's economy, has resulted in the world's largest democracy emerging as an increasingly important player on the global stage. India dominates the geography of the now strategically vital South Asia region, and its vibrant economy, pluralist society, cultural influence, and growing military power have made the country a key focus of U.S. foreign policy attention in the 21st century. During the Cold War years, the United States and India had a fraught relationship. The United States saw itself as the leader of the free world, and India, despite its democracy, positioned itself as a leader of the Non-Aligned Movement. The end of the Cold War brought about a new relationship between US with India. In 2005, Washington and New Delhi overturned decades of mistrust with the initial announcement of G civil nuclear agreement. The process established a new strategic partnership. Many in the United States began to see India as a U.S. ally, a natural partner with shared values, including democracy, pluralism, and freedom of speech. India's shift away from nonalignment remains incomplete, but continued geopolitical changes around the world, the importance of economics, and China's rise have all created a landscape in which Indian and U.S. interests are in a process of structural realignment (Kaye, Nye Jr & Ayres; 2015).

Successive U.S. administrations have seen India's rise and its emerging capabilities as squarely aligned with U.S. national security interests. India now matters to U.S. interests in virtually every dimension of geopolitics. India's growing military capabilities can help protect the sea lanes and deliver humanitarian assistance quickly throughout the region, as its leading response to the Nepal earthquake and the evacuations from Yemen demonstrated this year. India's long-standing stability anchors the volatile Indian Ocean region and helps ensure that no single power dominates the Asia Pacific, leading to a stable balance of power. There has however been a call for closer ties between the United States and India, as the Obama administration has been accused of placing greater importance in developing ties with China over India. Although the States and India have dramatically expanded the range of areas in which they collaborate over the past decade and substantially overcome legacy problems, the relationship still has enormous room for enhancement. Problems during 2013 and 2014, particularly over trade and the arrest of an Indian diplomat in the United States revealed continued fragilities.

Consequently, the United States and India have developed the U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue for their burgeoning relationship, which is structured around cooperation on issues of Democracy and values, economic development and poverty alleviation, policies toward China and defense cooperation, Counterterrorism, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, global governance, nuclear cooperation and nonproliferation, trade, climate change and the UN Security Council (Perkovich, 2010).

3.3 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS JAPAN

The U.S.-Japan relationship is broad, deep-seated, and stable. Globally, the two countries cooperate on scores of multilateral issues, from nuclear nonproliferation to climate negotiations

(Chanlett-Avery et.al, 2014). Japan is a significant partner for the United States in a number of foreign policy areas, particularly in U.S. security priorities, which range from hedging against Chinese military modernization to countering threats from North Korea. The U.S.-Japan alliance, forged in the U.S. occupation of Japan after its defeat in World War II, provides a platform for U.S. military readiness in Asia. Under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security, about 53,000 U.S. troops are stationed in Japan, providing the major U.S. forward logistics base in the Asia-Pacific. In exchange, the United States guarantees Japan's security. Security challenges in the region, particularly nuclear and missile tests by North Korea and increased Chinese maritime activities have reinforced U.S. - Japan cooperation in recent years (Chanlett-Avery & Rinehart, 2016). In addition to serving as hub for forward-deployed U.S. forces, Japan provides its own advanced military assets, many of which complement U.S. forces in missions like anti-submarine operations. The asymmetric arrangement of the U.S.-Japan alliance has however moved toward a more balanced security partnership in the 21st century. Unlike 25 years ago, the Japanese military is now active in overseas missions, including efforts in the 2000s to support U.S.-led coalition operations in Afghanistan and the reconstruction of Iraq. Japanese military contributions to global operations like counter-piracy patrols relieve some of the burden on the U.S. military to manage every security challenge.

Japan remains an important economic partner of the United States, but its importance has been eclipsed by other partners, notably China. Japan is one of the United States' most important economic partners. Outside of North America, it is the United States' second-largest export market and second-largest source of imports. Japanese firms are the United States' second-largest source of foreign direct investment, and Japanese investors are the second-largest foreign holders of U.S. treasuries. On the economic front, the United States is seeking to build trade and strategic connections to the Asia-Pacific through the proposed 12-country Trans-Pacific Partnership free trade agreement. Japan, the United States, and 10 other countries are participating in the TPP free trade agreement (FTA) negotiations. If successful, the negotiations could reinvigorate a bilateral economic relationship that has remained steady but stagnant, by addressing long-standing, difficult issues in the trade relationship.

Chanlett-Avery et.al, (2014) have argued that despite some outstanding issues, tensions in the U.S.-Japan bilateral economic relationship have been much lower than was the case in the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s as a result of some of the under listed factors:

- Japan's slow, if not stagnant, economic growth, which began with the burst of the asset bubble in the latter half of the 1990s and continued as a result of the 2008-2009 financial crisis and the 2011 disasters, has changed the general U.S perception of Japan from one as an economic competitor to one as a humbled economic power;
- the rise of China as an economic power and trade partner has caused U.S policymakers to shift attention from Japan to China as a source of concern;
- the increased use by both Japan and the United States of the WTO as a forum for resolving trade disputes has de-politicized disputes and helped to reduce friction;
- shifts in U.S. and Japanese trade policies that have expanded the formation of bilateral and regional trade agreements with other countries have lessened the focus on their bilateral ties; and

- the rise of China as a military power and the continued threat of North Korea have forced U.S. and Japanese leaders to give more weight to security issues within the bilateral alliance.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain the challenges confronting the US-China relations.

4.0 CONCLUSION

This unit has examined the United States foreign policy to Asia, with particular reference to China, India and Japan. Consequently, the US foreign policy towards these countries can be termed to be one of constructive engagement. Although US foreign policy to these countries are varied and based on multiple assumptions and mechanisms, the end goal of the US in engaging with these countries essential rests on the need for the S to achieve its strategic economic and security objectives.

5.0 SUMMARY

It is worthy of note that the United States bilateral relations with China, India and Japan can be regarded as constructive. However, the United States continue to face challenges on its relations with these countries, and there remains strains and irritants that threaten the relations. These ranges from the human rights issues and the expansionist tendencies of China, the not to close relations with India and Japan's political crisis. However, the Obama administration has called for a "rebalancing" in the Asian Pacific promises to be one of a rejuvenated US relation with countries in the region.

6.0 TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What are the reasons for the security alliance between the US, India and Japan.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS.

Chanlett-Avery eLal.(2014), "Japan-LI.S. Relations: Issues for Congress" Washington: Congressional Research Service.

Chanlett-Avery, I. and Rinehart,I(2016), "The U.S.-Japan Alliance" Washington: Congressional Research Service.

Dumbaugh, K. (2009). "China-U.S. Relations: Current Issues and Implications for U.S. Policy". Washington: Congressional Research Service.

Konstatdt, K and Pinto, S.(20 12), "India-U.S. Security Relations: Current Engagement" Washington: Congressional Research Service.

Kaye, C.R, Nye, J& Ares, A(2015), "Working With a Rising India:A Joint Venture for the New Century", Independent Task Force Report NO 73. US: Council on Foreign Relations.

Lawrence, S.V (2013), "U.S.-China Relations: An Overview of PolicyIssues" Washington:Congressional Research Service.

Perkovich, George (2010), "Toward Realistic U.S.-India Relations" Washington De: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

MODULE 5 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE MIDDLE- EAST

INTRODUCTION

The United States has both real and perceived interests in the Middle East. These include economic, political, and militaristic concerns that are vital to the United States. The most blatant tangible interest is oil. Pure and simple oil is beyond plentiful in the region. Underneath the desert sand of Iraq, Kuwait, Iran, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and many more lies the largest concentration of oil. Of course the use of oil is everywhere. It enables transportation, electricity, and heating. Without it the world and all its components would be paralyzed and left nearly useless. The most serious, in the eyes of the United States, would be the crippling of the armed forces. This would make the nation vulnerable both foreign and domestically. Therefore a prime concern for the United States is that the region's oil supply is well guarded and maintained. It is noteworthy to acknowledge that the armed forces have stockpiled a substantial amount of oil in the event that the oil market collapses as it did in the mid-seventies or a hostile invasion shifts the balance of power as seen with Iraq.

Security is another critical interest. This is more of a fuzzy area as the definition of security is vague. It could mean any number of things, but in this case it means the absence of conflict, including war and terrorism both within and outside the borders of the United States.

United States foreign policy in the Middle East has its roots as early as the Barbary Wars in the first years of the U.S.'s existence, but became much more expansive after World War II. American policy during the Cold War tried to prevent Soviet Union influence by supporting anti-communist regimes and backing Israel against Soviet-sponsored Arab countries. The U.S. also came to replace the United Kingdom as the main security patron of the Persian Gulf states in the 1960s and 1970s, working to ensure Western access to Gulf oil. Since the 9/11 attacks of 2001, U.S. policy has included an emphasis on counter-terrorism. The U.S. has diplomatic relations with all countries in the Middle East except for Iran, whose 1979 revolution brought to power a staunchly anti-American regime. Recent priorities of the U.S. government in the Middle East have included resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict and limiting the spread of weapons of mass destruction among regional states.

The underlying continuity that nevertheless exists is partly a reflection of, and a sensible response to, constancy in fundamental U.S. interests and in the constraints the country faces in pursuing those interests. That's good. But it also partly reflects adherence to certain familiar beliefs, themes, and objectives simply because those beliefs, themes, and objectives have always been there, at least in living memory, and it would be difficult and politically costly to challenge them. And that's not good.

That latter pattern certainly has been true of U.S. policy toward the Middle East, a region of especially costly U.S. involvement. Modern U.S. involvement in the area could be said to have been launched with Franklin Roosevelt's meeting with King Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud, the founder of today's Saudi Arabia, on a U.S. warship in the Great Bitter Lake during the closing months of World War II. The involvement enlarged as the United States displaced the United Kingdom as the principal outside power in the area while the British shed their obligations "east of Suez". American attitudes and assumptions toward the Middle East, and thus U.S. policies toward the Middle East, have ever since been weighed down by accumulating historical baggage

Unit I United States foreign Policy towards the middle-east (e.g) Iran, Iraq, Israel and Syria
Unit 2 United States foreign Policy towards Russia
Unit 3 United States foreign Policy and the Global war on Terrorism
Unit 4 The Criticism and the future of United States foreign Policy

UNIT 1 U.S FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE MIDDLE- EAST (e,g) IRAN, IRAQ, ISRAEL AND SYRIA

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 3.1 Emergence of United States Foreign Policy towards the Middle East
 - 3.2 United States Foreign Policy towards the Middle East
 - 3.3 United States Foreign Policy towards the Middle East Sub-Region
- 4.0 Summary
- 5.0 Conclusion
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

United States foreign policy in the Middle East has its roots as early as the Barbary Wars in the first years of the U.S.'s existence but became much more expansive after World War II. American policy during the Cold War tried to prevent Soviet Union influence by supporting anti-communist regimes and backing Israel against Soviet-sponsored Arab countries. The U.S. also came to replace the United Kingdom as the main security patron of the Persian Gulf states in the 1960s and 1970s, working to ensure Western access to Gulf oil. Since the 9/11 attacks of 2001, U.S. policy has included an emphasis on counter-terrorism. The U.S. has diplomatic relations with all countries in the Middle East except for Iran, whose 1971 revolution brought to power a staunchly anti-American regime. Recent priorities of the U.S. government in the Middle East have included resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict and limiting the spread of weapons of mass destruction among regional states (Takeyh& Simon 2016).

The United States of America's foreign policy in the middle cannot be addressed without pointing to the attractive nature of the Middle East which is "OIL". Middle Eastern oil has enchanted global capital since the early 20th century. Its allure has been particularly powerful for the United States. The American romance began in earnest in the 1930s when the geologists working for Standard Oil of California discovered commercial quantities of oil on the eastern shores of Saudi Arabia. In the years that followed enchantment turned into obsession. On August 8, 1944, the Anglo-American Petroleum Agreement was signed, dividing Middle Eastern oil between the United States and Britain. Consequently, political scholar Fred H. Lawson remarks, that by the mid-1944, U.S. officials had buttressed their country's position on the peninsula by concluding an Anglo-American Petroleum Agreement that protected "all valid concession contracts and lawfully acquired rights" belonging to the signatories and established a principle of "equal opportunity" in those areas where no concession had yet been assigned (Lawson 1989) Furthermore, political scholar Irvine Anderson summarizes American interests in the Middle East in the late 19th century and the early 20th century noting that, "the most significant event of the period was the transition of the United States from the position of net exporter to one of net importer of petroleum.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the unit, students should be able to:

1. Understand and explain the origin of U.S-Middle East relations
2. Explain the United States policy to the Middle East
3. Explain the United States policy to the Middle East Sub-Region

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 EMERGENCE OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE MIDDLE EAST

In order to understand the U.S-Middle East foreign policy, it is imperative to trace and understand its origin and emergence; this will give an insight and in-depth knowledge of the study. The United States' relationship with the Middle East prior to World War I was limited, although commercial ties existed even in the early 19th century. President Andrew Jackson established formal ties with the Sultan of Muscat and Oman in 1833 because the Sultan saw the U.S. as a potential balance to Britain's overwhelming regional influence. Commercial relations opened between the U.S. and Persia in 1857 after Britain persuaded the Persian government not to ratify a similar agreement in 1851 (W. Taylor 2008). Scholars and experts of the study of U.S-Middle East foreign relations generally agrees that tangible relation started between the U.S and Middle East in the 19th century, though there have been contact between them before the 19th century regarding the U.S involvement in the Barbary Wars but the relationship then was limited until the 19th century. However, the end of the World War II marked the collapse of the great Ottoman Empire which had ruled the Middle East for over four centuries. This collapse paved way for the beginning of a new era for the Middle East that is Colonial Rule. In 1918, the European powers namely Britain and France gained control of the region until the mid-1900s when the Middle Eastern states gained their independence (Aboushi 1970). In comparison to European powers such as Britain and France which had managed to colonize almost the entire Middle East region after defeating the Ottoman Empire in 1918, the United States was "popular and respected throughout the Middle East". Indeed, "Americans were seen as good people, untainted by the selfishness and duplicity associated with the Europeans" (Fawcett .L. 2005).

3.2 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE MIDDLE EAST

Despite the physical distance between the United States and the Middle East, U.S influence has been felt in every country within the region. Throughout the 20th century, strategic interests including a longstanding competition with the Soviet Union have provoked a variety of U.S. interventions ranging from diplomatic overtures of friendship to full-blown war. American economic interests particularly in assuring access to Middle Eastern oil have long motivated presidents and lawmakers to intervene in the region. In addition strong cultural ties bind American Jews, Arab Americans. Iranian Americans and Turkish Americans among others, to

the area and these interest groups seek to make their voices heard in the U.S. foreign policy arena (Rugh 2005).

It should be stressed that the U.S. has made itself a key player by using its diplomatic, economic and military power in support of its national interests. Literally "The U.S. never engages her foreign policy just for humanitarian sake, her national interest and gains remain her *primus-inter- pares*". In 1919, in an effort led by President Woodrow Wilson, the League of Nations (a precursor to the current United Nations) was formed and the effort laid out the colonial boundaries of the Middle East in the territories of the now defunct Ottoman Empire. These boundaries continue to shape many of the region's political realities. The U.S. enjoyed a generally positive reputation in the region at the end of World War I with President Woodrow Wilson citing a fourteen point proposal for ending the war which enshrined the principle of self-determination in justifying their demands for self-representation which was the nationalistic movement among the Middle Easterners. Immediately after the war the U.S. sent a commission to the region to ask local populations what political arrangement they would prefer and their response was that they all wanted "Complete Independence" but if that was impossible, they hoped for supervision by the U.S. rather than by the British and French mandatory powers that were actually installed as a result of the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916. As a result, the U.S. began to involve itself more deeply in regional politics in the late 1940s. It acted to support what it saw as its national interests, the most important being fighting the Communists during the cold war and ensuring a steady supply of oil, and making sure that no single power dominated the region, more recently, it added fighting terrorism. By the end of the Second World War, the United States had come to consider the Middle East region as "the most strategically important area of the world" and "one of the greatest material prizes in world history". For that reason, it was not until around the period of World War II that America became directly involved in the Middle East region. At this time the region was going through great social, economic and political changes and as a result, internally the Middle East was in turmoil. Politically, the Middle East was experiencing an upsurge in the popularity of nationalistic politics and an increase in the number of nationalistic political groups across the region, which was causing great trouble for the English and French colonial powers.

No wonder History Scholar Jack Watson reiterated that, "Europeans could not hold these lands indefinitely in the face of Arab nationalism". Watson then continues, stating that "by the end of 1946 Palestine was the last remaining mandate, but it posed a major problem" (Watson 1981). In truth, this nationalistic political trend clashed with American interests in the Middle East, which were, as Middle East scholar Louise Fawcett argues, "about the Soviet Union, access to oil and the project for a Jewish state in Palestine" (Fawcett 2005). Hence, Arabist Ambassador Raymond Hare described the Second World War. as "the great divide" in United States' relation with the Middle East, because these three interests would later serve as a backdrop and reasoning for a great deal of American interventions in the Middle East and thus also come to be the cause of several future conflicts between the United States and the Middle East.

3.3 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TO THE MIDDLE EAST SUB- REGION

It is pertinent to explicitly analyze the U.S. foreign policy to the Middle East sub-region because many nations make up the Middle East region and the same foreign policy measures are not viable to all the nations in the region.

U.S.-EGYPT RELATIONS, U.S.-Egypt relationship has been of high intensity it should be stressed that Egypt is not situated in the middle-east yet it has been a major player in the middle-east. The United States was distrustful of the regime of GamalAbdal-Nasser after the Egyptian Revolution deposed King Faruq. The U.S. under President Dwight Eisenhower and secretary of state John Foster Dulles expressed distaste for the government of Nasser and his policies of non-alignment and Arab socialism. After Washington turned down his request for assistance to build the Aswan High Dam, Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal in 1956 to pay for the dam construction which was met by a joint attack on the canal and Sinai Peninsulaby Britain, France and Israel but they were forced to withdraw by the United Nations with U.S. and Soviet support. Egypt turned toward the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc to build the Aswan High Dam, buy arms and import wheat. U.S.-Egyptian relations suffered until President Anwar Sadat ousted the Soviet advisors and began orienting his economic and foreign policies toward West. After the historic Camp David Accords ("Camp David Accords, framework for peace in the Middle East signed by United States president Jimmy Carter, Egyptian president Anwar al-Sadat, and Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin on September 17, 1978, in Washington, D.C. Although the accords led to a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, they did not result in peace between Israel and other Arab states. For their efforts to resolve their long-standing conflict, Sadat and Begin received the 1978 Nobel Peace Prize") resulted in a treaty between Egypt and its neighbor Israel, the U.S. rewarded President Sadat's peace initiative with a substantial long-term aid package which was a diplomatic approach in order to reinstate their presence and build a more socio-political vis-a-vis economic ties with the sub-region.

THE U.S.-IRAN RELATIONS As a result of the growing Soviet influence in Iran during the Cold War, the U.S. toppled the regime of Iran's elected Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadeq who intended to nationalize the Iranian oil industry. The U.S. backed coup against Mossadeq in 1953 and reinforced the power of the young Mohammed Reza Shah of Iran. However the Pro-Western Shah was seen as increasingly autocratic and oppressive with the help of his secret police SA V AK to silence opposition voices. A 1979 Islamist Revolution brought in an Islamic state into power, the popular hatred of Shah also tarred his American supporters and the revolution's anti-American passion led to the storming of the U.S. Embassy Tehran where 53 hostages were held for more than a year.

THE U.S.-IRAQI RELATIONS History records that the U.S. supported Iraq's Saddam Hussein during the Iran-Iraq War (1980-1988), when Iran's new post-revolutionary Islamic regime appeared to be the region's biggest threat. This rapport with Hussein soon turned sour when he invaded Kuwait in 1990 which led to the Gulf War in an effort to control more of the region's oil. Hussein's known desire to develop weapons of mass destruction is also a concern, with all these power greed displayed by Hussein; the U.S. began bombing Iraqi targets during the Gulf War and continues to enforce a no-fly zone. The U.S. in her frantic effort led economic embargo on Iraq with the intention to force Hussein from power and keep Iraq from rearming and further developing weapons of mass destruction which has had a devastating impact on the health and

living conditions 01 the Iraqi people and sympathetic Arabs hold this grievance against the United States.

THE U.S.-ISRAELI AND THE PALESTINIAN RELATIONS, The Zionist movement that began before the turn of the century caused uproar and set the Middle East ablaze with world powers coming against one another and also increasing the tension of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union with the former supporting the creation of the Israeli nation while the latter was responsible for the supply of arms to ward off the Israelites. Israel was intended to be a national home for Jews and a place for them to return to their roots, both spiritually and physically. Many including nearly 75,000 European Jews escaping persecution from Nazi Germany, found refuge there. But its creation came at a price. In addition to the many Jews who died struggling to create the new state, many Arabs were killed and hundreds of thousands of Arabs were either displaced by Jewish settlers from areas where they had been living or became unwilling citizens of Israel. U.S. made her support for the Israeli nation known immediately after the Jewish state 1948 declaration of independence and the U.S. support for Israel has varied in form and intensity over time, but this support has remained a pillar of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East, U.S. support for Israel is based on several factors which are;

- A commitment to one of the few democratic states in the region
- A need for stable allies
- A sense of a shared Judeo-Christian religious tradition
- A market for the products of the American defense industry

U.S. made aircraft were critical to the Israeli victory in the 1967 six-day war that pitted Israel against an alliance of Arabs power and during the Kippur War of 1973 that threatened the Jewish state, a massive U.S. airlift of war material was crucial to Israel's survival in the conflict. Recently the U.S. has backed Ariel Sharon and his Likud government in Israel, even as Sharon has authorized military strikes against the Palestinian Authority and militant groups in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza strip. The unconditional U.S. support for the Jewish state in its struggle with the Palestinians has challenged American relationships with nations long considered allies, like Egypt and Saudi Arabia. These Arab allies argue that American principles like human rights and freedom of the press are not promoted in Israel in the same way that Americans push for reform elsewhere.

Despite the love the U.S. had for Israel making Scholars of U.S.-Middle East relations such as Fawcett depict that 'Israel is the apple of the United States' eye in the Middle East", the U.S. has been active in its attempt to broker peace between Israel and Palestine even to her neighbours in the Middle East because in as much as the U.S. enjoy a cordial relationship with Israel, it has an eye on the oil in the region. Notable among the attempt is the Oslo interim peace agreement that established a framework for negotiating peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians and set in motion the process for achieving a Palestinian state. But because of the support the U.S. have given the Israel since their declaration of independence, supporter of the Palestinians believe that U.S has not done all that it can to bring about peace and supports such as military aid, American economic support and American jobs are tied to continually upgrading Israeli army. The Palestinian supporters concluded that the U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East is too committed

in its support for Israel to make unbiased decisions and is unwilling to pressure the Israelis to negotiate a fair peace.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Critically analyze the emergence of United States of America's foreign policy towards the Middle East

4.0 CONCLUSION

Despite the U.S.'s claims that her foreign policy interest lie in promoting the creation of democratic governments around the world, that is partially not the case in the Middle East as the U.S. power at times supported oppressive regimes in the Middle East. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, U.S. dollars and military assistance continue to flow to regimes cited by human rights monitors for violations of human rights or lack of democracy. Recently, the U.S. also supported the transfer of power in Syria from the late Hafez al-Asad to his son despite Syria's supposedly republican form of government.

5.0 SUMMARY

It will be a sacrilege if one fails to appreciate the contributions of the U.S. to the Middle East, drawing from the quote of President Jimmy Carter during the state of the union address in 1980,

"let our position be clear: an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary including military force".

The fore-going quote clearly depicts that the Persian Gulf is a region of vital interest to the United States of America and as such will do anything to defend her interest. It should therefore be asserted that in all foreign policy measures, one's national interest remains the *primus-inter- pares*. Though the U.S. foreign policy took diverse measures towards the Middle East sub-region, yet it comprises of all the features of the United States of America's foreign policy these include; The U.S. global strategy for maintaining hegemony and their constant aim to establish a U.S. dominated new international order, anti-terrorist strategic focus and campaign urging other world powers to wage war on terrorism, human rights, the assertion and control over the manufacturing of the weapon of mass destruction and finally the promotion of democracy and freedom worldwide vis-a-vis international security.

6.0 TOTAL-MAKEDASSJGNMENT

Examine two of the U.S.-Middle East sub region relations

7.0 REFERENCE AND FURTHER READINGS

Ray Takeyh & Steven Simon (2016) *"The Pragmatic Superpowers" International Journal of Middle East Studies Volume 19, p. 19*

Lawson F.R. (August 1989) *"The Iranian Crisis of 1945-1946 and the Spiral Model of International Conflict" International Journal of Middle East Studies Volume 21, p. 310*

Fain W. Taylor (2008) *"American Ascendance and British Retreat in the Persian Gulf Region"* Palgrave Macmillan p. 17- 18

Abboushi W.F. (1970) *"Political Systems of the Middle East in the 20th Century"* Mead & Company p. 5

Fawcett L. (2005) *"The International Relations of the Middle East"* UK Oxford University Press p. 284-285

Rugh W.A. (2005) *"American Encounters With Arabs: The Soft Power of us. Public Diplomacy in the Middle East"* Praeger Publishers Inc p. 25

Watson J.B. (1981) *"Success in Twentieth Century World Affairs Since 1919 Norwich"* John Murray Publishers Ltd p.295

UNIT 2 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS RUSSIA

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Emergence of United States Foreign Policy towards Russia
 - 3.2 United States Foreign Policy towards Russia
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The United States of America and Russia have shared a multi-faceted diplomatic relationship for more than 200 years, at one point even sharing a land border when Russia had a settlement at Fort Ross, California. Over this period, the two countries have competed for political and economic influence and cooperated to meet mutual global challenges. However the Russia- United States relations became a bilateral relationship between the United States and Russia, the main successor state to the Soviet Union when it collapsed in 1991. In 2007 private and government organizations in the United States and Russia mark the bicentennial of diplomatic relations with events that illustrate the depth and history of the relationship. Since the end of the Cold War, the U.S. has not had a coherent, comprehensive strategy toward Russia. As the Russian invasion of Ukraine demonstrates, the U.S. has paid a price for this failure and, of course, many of Russia's neighbors have paid far higher prices. At the core of the U.S. failure has been an unwillingness to assess the nature of the Russian regime realistically and to base its policy on that assessment. Too often, the U.S. has relied on wishful thinking (James et al). Russia and United States maintain diplomatic and trade relations, conditions were warm under President Boris Yeltsin (1991-1999) but have fluctuated greatly under Vladimir Putin since then. In 2014, already strained relations greatly deteriorated due to the Russian intervention in Ukraine and its annexation of Crimea. Severe economic and financial sanctions imposed in 2014 continue to weaken the Russian economy. Relations in 2016 remain cold, and are complicated by sharp differences regarding Russian military intervention in the Syrian Civil War.

2.0 OBJECTIVE

At the end of the unit, students should be able to:

- I. Understand and explain the origin of U.S-Russia Relations
- 2. Understand and explain the United States foreign policy towards Russia

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 EMERGENCE OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS RUSSIA

In 1780, Francis Dana a prominent member of the Continental Congress and secretary to the American legation at Paris was appointed Minister to Russia; however, the Russian Government refused to accept his credentials when he arrived in St. Petersburg in August 1781. Dana nevertheless remained in Russia as a private citizen for two years to promote the American revolutionary cause. In 1795, the Russian Government again declined to receive officially an appointed representative of the United States, when it refused to accept the credentials of John Miller Russell as American Consul at St. Petersburg. Russia recognized the United States on October 28, 1803, when Czar Alexander I issued a ukase declaring his decision to recognize Levett Harris as American Consul at St. Petersburg. This was followed by the Russia's sale of Alaska to the U.S. Government in the mid-19th century which marked an active period that included commercial joint ventures and Russian support for the United States during the American Civil War. The early 20th century saw sometimes tense relations, but the two countries continued to talk and, at times, cooperate. Although the United States did not recognize the Soviet Union until 1933, Russia provided humanitarian assistance to the victims of the 1921-1923 famine. Despite the differences, the Soviets and the Americans united against a common enemy during World War II, and the Soviet Union participated in the Lend-Lease program under which the United States provided the Allies with supplies. That period ended with the onset of the Cold War, even though the U.S.-Russia military alliances opposed each other in Europe and across the globe. Nevertheless, cultural, sports, scientific, and educational exchanges, and summits that led to important arms control treaties, kept the lines of communication open. U.S. and Soviet astronauts even ventured into space together in the 1975 Apollo-Soyuz mission (Kennedy & Stuart 1990).

After the break-up of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the end of the Cold War, the U.S.-Russian relationship took on a new dimension, and contacts between their citizens expanded rapidly in number and diversity. Russians and Americans work together on a daily basis, both bilaterally and multilaterally, in a wide range of areas, including combating the threats of terrorism, nuclear arms proliferation, HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases vis-a-vis other global challenges. Not surprisingly, there remain issues on which the two governments do not agree. Even after 200 years, the U.S.-Russia relations continue to evolve in both expected and unexpected ways. "The United States and the Russian Federation established diplomatic relations on December 31, 1991, when Russian President Boris Yeltsin responded positively to President Bush's proposal to do so".

3.2 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS RUSSIA

When one evaluates U.S. policy toward Russia, an additional layer of complexity has to be added: the weight of history. The United States and the Soviet Union were at loggerheads for the four decades of the Cold War. Although bipolarity was stable, the residual enmity from such an enduring rivalry can last for generations. Differing interpretations of the post-Cold War era also complicate matters. Americans think of the post-Cold War interregnum as a time of stability and prosperity. Russians view the same period as a time of suffering humiliation and condescension by the West in general and the United States in particular with the twentieth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, a raft of new books and articles revived old controversies (Daniel 2010). The American Legation in St. Petersburg was established on November 5, 1809, when U.S. Minister to Russia John Quincy Adams presented his credentials to Emperor Alexander I. The

American Legation in St. Petersburg was raised to an Embassy on February 11, 1898, when Ethan A. Hitchcock was appointed Ambassador to Russia (Kenneth Waltz 1979). Normal diplomatic relations were interrupted following the November 7, 1917, Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. After the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II during the February Revolution earlier that year, Ambassador to Russia, David R. Francis, had informed the new Provisional Government that the United States recognized the new government and would maintain diplomatic relations with Russia. On December 6, 1917, following the Bolshevik October Revolution that overthrew the Provisional Government, President Woodrow Wilson instructed all American diplomatic representatives in Russia to refrain from any direct communication with representatives of the Bolshevik Government. Although diplomatic relations with Russia never were formally severed, the United States refused to recognize or have any formal relations with the Bolshevik/Soviet governments until 1933. (The Russian Ambassador accredited to the United States by the defunct Provisional Government, Boris A. Bakhmeteff, remained in the United States until June 30, 1922, at which time he resigned his position on the rationale that the government that had accredited him no longer existed and he had, to the extent possible, liquidated pre-Bolshevik Russian government debts.) During the presidencies of Vladimir Putin, who assumed the top office on the last day of 1999, and U.S. president George W. Bush, the U.S. and Russia began to have serious disagreements. Under Putin, Russia became more assertive in international affairs; under Bush, the U.S. took an increasingly unilateral course in its foreign policy in the wake of the September 11 attacks. Nevertheless, Putin and Bush were said to have established good personal relations.

In 2002, the U.S. withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in order to move forward with plans for a missile defense system. Putin called the decision a mistake. Russia strongly opposed the 2003 invasion of Iraq, though without exercising its veto in the United Nations Security Council. Russia has regarded the expansion of NATO into the old Eastern Bloc, and U.S. efforts to gain access to Central Asian oil and natural gas as a potentially hostile encroachment on Russia's sphere of influence (BBC). Between 2007 and 2009, U.S.-Russia's relations became intense, it was a period of nuclear threat, it should be recalled that the United States opposed the manufacturing or testing of weapon of mass destruction (WMD) and atomic bombs. Furthermore in Syria the United States and Russia also had a face-off, while the U.S. agitated for Assad to quit, Russia has refused to support such moves. In March 2012, a bipartisan group of 17 U.S. senators called on the Department of Defense to stop doing business with Russian state-controlled arms exporter Rosoboronek sport over its arming of the Syrian government. In March 2012, with the election of Putin back to presidency, White House spokesman Jay Carney said U.S.-Russian cooperation is based on mutual interests. He also said it is a policy based on an approach based on U.S. national interests and the areas where the U.S. can reach an agreement with Russia on issues like Iran, on trade and other matter (Angela 2014)

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain the emergence of United States foreign policy towards Russia.

4.0 CONCLUSION

U.S.-Russian Relations is one of the most sophisticated relations in the world, their national interests been the reason behind their re-occurring face-off. Though not all U.S. bilateral programs with Russia are inherently bad, from 1991 until 2012, the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program worked constructively to reduce the threat of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan. In 2013, Russia allowed the agreement authorizing Nunn-Lugar to expire, with Putin stating that Russia's non-proliferation priority was not cleaning up after the Soviet Union, but opposing U.S. missile defense programs in Europe intended to prevent attacks from Iran. In 2012, Russia also expelled the U.S. Agency for International Development, having withdrawn from participation in the Peace Corps in 2003. The Obama Administration's main bilateral initiative was the U.S.-Russian Bilateral Presidential Commission, created in 2009 as part of the "reset" of relations with Russia. The commission created working groups across a range of issues, but the effort was premised on the assertion that the U.S. and Russia had "many common national interests" and would embody "friendship, cooperation, openness, and predictability." In practice, those hopes were completely falsified. In April 2014, a number of the commission's bilateral projects were suspended, and the funds were given to Ukraine (James et al).

5.0 SUMMARY

The Russian-American relationship has experienced a dramatic shift since the end of the cold war. In 1943, Winston Churchill, frustrated by years of Soviet complaints, perverted accusations of bad faith, and maltreatment, decided he had enough. As he put it, "Experience has taught me that it is not worth while arguing with Soviet people. One simply has to confront them with the new fact and await their reactions. "

The U.S.-Russia relations from 1991 when the Soviet Union was dissolved under the administration of Presidents Yeltsin and Bill Clinton started on a friendly note, both agreeing on terms and jointly executing foreign missions and policies; it was seen as the best kind of relationship. However since the election and assumption of Vladimir Putin to office as the Russian President, the relationship has turned sour and highly intensified, he sees the U.S. as the major threat to Russia and he vehemently opposed the U.S. on policies that tend to tilt against its national interest not in a diplomatic manner but in a militarized way. Furthermore Putin is opposed to the U.S. Unipolarity claiming the fact that political power cannot be concentrated in the hand of a single nation. United States on the other hand sees Russia as a wounded lion since the end of the cold war and the psychological defeat suffered by Russia as a result of dissolution of the Soviet Union. George W. Bush opined that *'the United States of America and Russia will continually be at loggerheads until Russia is no longer seen as threat to U.S. foreign policy'* Central European countries have long understood the security risks posed by Russia. In January 2015, the United States announced \$500 million in further European base closures and consolidations, removing troops from approximately 15 bases, mostly in the United Kingdom and Portugal. The U.S. and NATO also suffer from a lack of forward-deployed resources. Despite repeated calls by many central European member states, NATO does not have any permanent basing in the region.

Vladimir Putin has managed a remarkable feat. He has successfully fooled two successive Presidents of the United States—who could not have had more different personalities and political beliefs—into believing that he was, or could become, a reliable, and possibly even a democratic, partner with the United States. In both cases, the U.S. ultimately became disillusioned, but reality did not dawn until well into each President's second term. The United States cannot afford to be fooled a third time. Nor can it afford to approach Russia, and the problems it is creating, as though they are separate and unrelated. Naturally, no solution can address every problem. But at the heart of all these problems is a single one: the nature of the Russian regime. Clarity in U.S. comprehensive strategy toward Russia begins with understanding that Russia is not on a rocky road to democracy. It is an autocracy that justifies and sustains its hold on political power by force, fraud, and a thorough and strongly ideological assault on the West in general and the U.S. in particular. The U.S. needs to approach Russia as Russia actually is, not as the U.S. wishes Russia might be.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss the United States foreign policy towards Russia.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

James et al (2015), *"U.S. Comprehensive Strategy towards Russia" special report* \01 173

Kennedy, Charles Stuart (1990), *The American Consul: A History of the United States Consular Service 1776-1914* Nell' York, Greenwood Press.

Daniel D. Drezner(2010), *"American Foreign Policy toward Russia: Is a U-turn or Any-turn possible?"*

Kenneth Waltz (1979), *Theory of International Politics* New York, Mcgraw Hill.

Bush and Putin: "Best of Friends "BBC Report 2001.

Angela E. Stent (2014), *"The Limits of Partnership, U.S.-RUSSIAN Relations in the Twenty-First Century, p. 282-293.*

UNIT 3 UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND THE GLOBAL WAR ON

TERRORISM

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objective
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Understanding Terrorism
 - 3.2 United States Foreign Policy and the Global War on Terrorism
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Terrorism is transnational in nature and defeating it will require international collaboration, including a strong partnership between the United States and other nations. As President Barack Obama emphasized in his state of the union address, we need to work together as partners to "disrupt and disable" terrorist networks. The war on terror is a term commonly applied to an international military campaign by the United States and the United Kingdom with the support from other countries after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. The phrase "War on Terror" was first used by U.S. President George W. Bush on 20 September 2001. The Bush's administration and the Western media have since used the term to denote a global military, political, legal and ideological struggle targeting organizations designated as terrorist and regimes accused of supporting them. It was typically used with a particular focus on Al-Qaeda and other militant Islamists (Pillar, 2001).

2.0 OBJECTIVE

At the end of the unit, students should be able to:

- I. Understand Terrorism
- 2. United States foreign policy and global war on terrorism

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 UNDERSTANDING TERRORISM

Terrorism is the deliberate creation and exploitation of fear for bringing about political change. All terrorist acts involve violence or equally important the threat of violence. These violent acts are committed by nongovernmental groups or individuals that is, by those who are neither part of nor officially serving in the military forces, law enforcement agencies, intelligence services, or other governmental agencies of an established nation-state.

The word terrorism was first used in France to describe a new system of government adopted during the French Revolution (1789-1799). The regime de la terreur (Reign of Terror) was intended to promote democracy and popular rule by ridding the revolution of its enemies and

thereby purifying it. However, the oppression and violent excesses of the *terreur* transformed it into a feared instrument of the state. From that time on, terrorism has had a decidedly negative connotation. The word, however, did not gain wider popularity until the late 19th century when it was adopted by a group of Russian revolutionaries to describe their violent struggle against tsarist rule. Terrorism then assumed the more familiar antigovernment associations it has today. Terrorist groups generally have few members, limited firepower and comparatively few organizational resources. For this reason they rely on dramatic, often spectacular, bloody and destructive acts of hit-and-run violence to attract attention to themselves and their cause. Through the publicity generated by their violence, terrorists seek to obtain the leverage, influence, and power they otherwise lack. Terrorists attempt not only to sow panic but also to undermine confidence in the government and political leadership of their target country. Terrorism is therefore designed to have psychological effects that reach far beyond its impact on the immediate victims or object of an attack. Terrorists mean to frighten and thereby intimidate a wider audience, such as a rival ethnic or religious group, an entire country and its political leadership, or the international community as a whole.

Terrorists typically attempt to justify their use of violence by arguing that they have been excluded from, or frustrated by, the accepted processes of bringing about political change. They maintain that terrorism is the only option available to them, although their choice is a reluctant even a regrettable one. Whether someone agrees with this argument or not often depends on whether the person sympathizes with the terrorists' cause or with the victims of the terrorist attack. The aphorism "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" underscores how use of the label terrorism can be highly subjective depending upon one's sympathies. At the same time terrorist acts including murder, kidnapping, bombing and arson have long been defined in both national and international law as crimes. Even in time of war, violence deliberately directed against innocent civilians is considered a crime. Similarly, violence that spreads beyond an acknowledged geographical theater of war to violate the territory of neutral or noncombatant states is also deemed a war crime. The United States federal statute defines terrorism as "violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that ... appear to be intended (i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping." This definition appears in United States Code, Title 18, Section 2331 (18 USC 2331). In broad terms the causes that have commonly compelled people to engage in terrorism are grievances borne of political oppression, cultural domination, economic exploitation, ethnic discrimination, and religious persecution. Perceived inequities in the distribution of wealth and political power have led some terrorists to attempt to overthrow democratically elected governments. National governments have at times aided terrorists to further their own foreign policy goals. So-called state-sponsored terrorism, however, falls into a different category altogether. State-sponsored terrorism is a form of covert (secret) warfare, a means to wage war secretly through the use of terrorist surrogates (stand-ins) as hired guns. The U.S. Department of State designates countries as state sponsors of terrorism if they actively assist or aid terrorists, and also if they harbor past terrorists or refuse to renounce terrorism as an instrument of policy. State sponsorship has proven invaluable to some terrorist organizations by supplying arms, money, and a safe haven, among other things. In doing so, it has transformed ordinary groups, with otherwise limited capabilities, into more powerful and menacing opponents. State sponsorship can also place at terrorists' disposal the resources of

an established country's diplomatic, military, and intelligence services. These services improve the training of terrorists and facilitate planning and operations. Finally, governments have paid terrorists handsomely for their services. They thereby turn weak and financially impoverished groups into formidable, well-endowed terrorist organizations with an ability to attract recruits and sustain their struggle.

The U.S. Department of State has designated seven countries as state sponsors of terrorism: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Cuba, North Korea, and Sudan. In the year 2000, it named Iran as the most active supporter of terrorism for aid to groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and Palestine Islamic Jihad. Although the former Taliban government in Afghanistan sponsored al-Qaeda, the radical group led by Saudi exile Osama bin Laden, the United States did not recognize the Taliban as a legitimate government and thus did not list it as a state sponsor of terrorism (Bruce 1998).

3.1- UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND GLOBAL WAR 0 TERRORISM

The events of September 11, 2001, have no precedent in the history of terrorism. On that day 19 terrorists belonging to bin Laden's al-Qaeda organization hijacked four passenger aircraft shortly after they departed from airports in Boston, Massachusetts; Newark, New Jersey; and Washington, D.C. The first plane crashed into the north tower of the World Trade Center in New York City shortly before 9:00 am. About 15 minutes later, a second aircraft struck the south tower. Shortly afterward, a third plane crashed into the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia. A fourth aircraft crashed into a field in rural Pennsylvania after its passengers, hearing by cell phone of the other hijackings, attempted to take control of the plane from the hijackers before they could strike another target. Before September 11, terrorists had killed no more than about 1,000 Americans, in the United States and abroad, during the modern era of international terrorism, which began in 1968. Approximately three times that number perished on September 11.

The origin of al-Qaeda as a network inspiring terrorism around the world and training operatives can be traced to the Soviet war in Afghanistan (December 1979-February 1989).

The United States supported the Islamists mujahedeen guerillas against the military forces of the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. In May 1996 the group World Islamic Front for Jihad against Jews and Crusaders (WIFJAJC), sponsored by Osama bin Laden and later reformed as al-Qaeda started forming a large base of operations in Afghanistan, where the Islamist extremist regime of the Taliban had seized power that same year. [In February 1998, Osama bin Laden as the head of al-Qaeda signed a fatwa declaring war on the West and Israel and later in May of that same year, al-Qaeda released a video declaring war on the U.S. and the West.

On 20 September 2001 in the wake of the 11 September attacks, George W. Bush delivered an ultimatum to the Taliban government of Afghanistan to turn over Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda leaders operating in the country or face attack. The Taliban demanded evidence or bill Laden's link to the 11 September attacks and if such evidence warranted a trial, they offered to handle such a trial in an Islamic Court. The U.S. refused to provide any evidence as it is against the modus operandi of the U.S. to negotiate with terrorist. Subsequently in October 2001, the official invasion began with British and U.S. forces conducting airstrike campaigns over enemy targets. Kabul the capital of Afghanistan fell by mid-November. The remaining al-Qaeda and Taliban remnants fell back to the mountains of eastern Afghanistan.

After the invasion of Afghanistan, the U.S. launched an air campaign on Iraq, it should be noted that Iraq had been listed as a state sponsor of Terrorism by the U.S. since 1990 when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. Iraq was also on the list from 1979-1982; it had been removed so that the U.S. could provide material support to Iraq in its war with Iran. Hussein's regime proved a continuing problem for the U.N. and Iraq's neighbors due to its use of chemical weapons against Iranians and Kurds. In October 2002, a large bipartisan majority in the United States Congress authorized the president to use force if necessary to disarm Iraq in order to prosecute the war on terrorism. After failing to overcome opposition from France, Russia and China against a United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolution that would sanction the use of force against Iraq and before the U.N., The United States assembled a "Coalition of the Willing" composed of nations who pledge support for its policy of regime change in Iraq. The Iraq war began in March 2003 with an air campaign, which was immediately followed by a U.S.-led ground invasion. The Bush administration stated that the invasion was the serious consequences spoken of in the UNSC Resolution 1441. The Bush administration also stated that the Iraq war was part of the "War on Terror" a claim that was later questioned.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain in details the term terrorism.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Past Administrations have employed a range of measures to combat international terrorism, from diplomacy and international cooperation and constructive engagement to economic sanctions, covert action, protective security measures, and military force. The application of sanctions is one of the most frequently used anti-terrorist tools of U.S. policymakers. Governments supporting international terrorism (seven such countries are listed by the Department of State) are prohibited from receiving U.S. economic and military assistance. Export of munitions to such countries is foreclosed, and restrictions are imposed on exports of "dual use" equipment such as aircraft and trucks. Presence of a country on the "terrorism list," though, may reflect considerations such as its pursuit of WMD or its human rights record or U.S. domestic political considerations that are largely unrelated to support for international terrorism.

5.0 SUMMARY

Terrorism is evolving constantly to overcome governmental countermeasures designed to defeat it. Terrorism thus involves an ongoing search for new targets and unidentified vulnerabilities in its opponents. This quest also raises the possibility that terrorists may pursue unconventional means of attack, such as chemical, biological, or radiological (radioactivity-spreading) weapons, or nuclear weapons. Future terrorist tactics could include cyber-terrorism (sabotage using computers to destroy computer networks or systems) or electronic warfare that targets critical infrastructure, such as communications and power facilities, or societies in general.

Generally, U.S. anti-terrorism policy from the late 1970s to the mid-1990s focused on deterring and punishing state sponsors as opposed to terrorist groups themselves. The passage of the landmark Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-132) signaled an important shift in policy. The Act, largely initiated by the Executive Branch, created a legal

category of Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs) and banned funding, granting of visas and other material support to such organizations. The USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 (P.L.107-56) extended and strengthened the provisions of that legislation. As 01 October 2002, 35 groups were designated by the Secretary of State as FTOs. The Bush Administration's global diplomatic, military and economic assault against Al Qaeda and its affiliates epitomized the new U.S. focus on rooting out and dismantling self-supporting terrorist entities. At the same time, the Clinton and Bush Administrations have tried selectively to improve relations with state sponsors. The State Department's Patterns 2000 contained promising language about the possible removal of North Korea and Sudan from the terrorism list, and Patterns 200 I indicates that Libya and Sudan have made significant headway in renouncing terrorism (Chossudovsky, 2005).

The United States foreign policy handled the war on terrorism as a multidimensional campaign of almost limitless scope. Its military dimension involved major wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, covert operations in Yemen and elsewhere, large-scale military- assistance programs for cooperative regimes, and major increases in military spending. Its intelligence dimension has comprised institutional reorganization and considerable increases in the funding of America's intelligence-gathering capabilities, a global program of capturing terrorist suspects and interning them at Guantanamo Bay, expanded cooperation with foreign intelligence agencies, and the tracking and interception of terrorist financing. Its diplomatic dimension includes continuing efforts to construct and maintain a global coalition of partner states and organizations and an extensive public diplomacy campaign to counter anti-Americanism in the Middle East. The domestic dimension of the U.S. war on terrorism has entailed new antiterrorism legislation, such as the USA PATRIOT Act; new security institutions, such as the Department of Homeland Security; the preventive detainment of thousands of suspects; surveillance and intelligence-gathering programs by the National Security Agency (NSA), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and local authorities; the strengthening of emergency-response procedures; and increased security measures for airports, borders, and public events (Jackson 2014).

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Critically analyze the United States foreign policy and global war on terrorism.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Paul R. Pillar (200 I) "Terrorism and American Foreign Policy": Brookings Institution Press, P.9.

Bruce Hoffman (1998) "Inside Terrorism" Columbia University Press U.S P. 75-90.

Michel Chossudovsky (2005) "America's War on Terrorism" Global Research: 2nd Edition, P.278.

Richard Jackson (2014) "War on Terrorism": United States Army History Resources for Global War on Terrorism. Retrieved on 16-06-2016.

UNIT4 THE CRITICISM AND THE FUTURE OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY.

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Contents
 - 1.1 The Criticism of United States Foreign Policy
 - 3.2 The Future of United States Foreign Policy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References and Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

These days, both proponents and critics of America's omnipresent role in the world tend to portray U.S. foreign policy as the single most important factor driving world affairs. For defenders of global activism, active U.S. engagement (including a willingness to use military force in a wide variety of situations) is the source of most of the positive developments that have occurred over the past 50 years and remains critical to preserving a "liberal" world order. By contrast, critics of U.S. foreign policy both at home and abroad tend to blame "U.S. imperialism," the "Great Satan," or mendacious Beltway bungling for a host of evil actions or adverse global trends and believe the world will continue to deteriorate unless the United States mends its evil ways. Both sides of this debate are wrong. To be sure, the United States is still the single most influential actor on the world stage. Although its population is only about 5 percent of humankind, the United States produces roughly 20 to 25 percent of gross world product and remains the only country with global military capabilities. It has security partnerships all over the world, considerable influence in many international organizations, and it casts a large cultural shadow.

There is a partly-held sense in America which views America as qualitatively different from other nations and therefore cannot be judged by the same standards as other countries; this belief is sometimes termed American exceptionalism and can be traced to the so-called Manifest destiny. American exceptionalism has widespread implications and transcribes into disregard to the international norms, rules and laws in U.S. foreign policy. For example, the U.S. refused to ratify a number of important international treaties such as Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and American Convention on Human Rights; did not join the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention; and routinely conducts drone attacks and cruise missile strikes around the globe. American exceptionalism is sometimes linked with hypocrisy; for example, the U.S. keeps a huge stockpile of nuclear weapons while urging other nations not to get them, and justifies that it can make an exception to a policy of non-proliferation (Bacevich 2008).

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, students should be able to:

- I. The criticisms of the United States foreign policy
2. The future of the United States foreign policy

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 THE CRITICISMS OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

The complexity of the United States foreign policy is the focal point of its criticisms. It bends its rules against itself in order to curtail the excesses of the nations it relates with. This to some of the nations is seen as domineering while to some other, it is seen as act of generosity. Despite occasional entanglements with European Powers such as the War of 1812 and the 1898 Spanish-American War, U.S. foreign policy was marked by steady expansion of its foreign trade and scope during the 19th century, and it maintained its policy of avoiding wars with and between European nations. From its founding, many of the leaders of the young American government had hoped for a non-interventionist foreign policy that promoted "commerce with all nations, alliance with none." However, this goal quickly became increasingly difficult to pursue, with growing implicit threats and non-military pressure faced from several powers, most notably Great Britain. The United States government was drawn into several foreign affairs from its founding and has been criticized throughout history for many of its actions, although in many of these examples it has also been praised. The U.S. has been criticized for making statements supporting peace and respecting national sovereignty, but while carrying out military actions such as in Grenada, fomenting a civil war in Colombia to break off Panama, and Iraq. The U.S. has been criticized for advocating free trade but while protecting local industries with import tariffs on foreign goods such as lumber and agricultural products. The U.S. has also been criticized for advocating concern for human rights while refusing to ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The U.S. has publicly stated that it is opposed to torture, but has been criticized for condoning it in the School of the Americas. The U.S. has advocated a respect for national sovereignty but has supported internal guerrilla movements and paramilitary organizations, such as the Contras in Nicaragua. The U.S. has been criticized for voicing concern about narcotics production in countries such as Bolivia and Venezuela but doesn't follow through on cutting certain bilateral aid programs. The U.S. has been criticized for not maintaining a consistent policy; it has been accused of denouncing alleged rights violations in China while supporting alleged human rights abuses by Israel. However, some defenders argue that a policy of rhetoric while doing things counter to the rhetoric was necessary in the sense of real politics and helped secure victory against the dangers of tyranny and totalitarianism. The U.S. is advocating that Iran and North Korea should not develop nuclear weapons, while the US, the only country to have used nuclear weapons in warfare, maintains a nuclear arsenal of 5,113 warheads.

However, this double-standard is legitimated by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), to which Iran is a party. Since beginning its war on terrorism more than a decade ago, the U.S. government has launched several hundred missile strikes from pilotless aircraft called drones to target extremists in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia and elsewhere such attacks are extremely unpopular. With the U.S. foreign policy preaching democracy, her foreign policy has been criticized for supporting against what it preaches in some nations. The U.S. has been criticized for supporting dictatorships with economic assistance and military hardware. Particular dictatorships have included Musharraf of Pakistan, the Shah of Iran, Museveni of Uganda, warlords in Somalia, Fulgencio Batista of Cuba, Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines, Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam, Park Chung-hee of South Korea, Generalissimo Franco of Spain, Mele Zenawi of Ethiopia, Augusto Pinochet in Chile, Alfredo Stroessner of Paraguay, Efraim Rios Montt of Guatemala, Jorge Rafael Yidela of Argentina, Suharto of Indonesia, Georgios Papadopoulos of Greece, and Hissenel-labre of Chad (Immerman 2010).

3.2 THE FUTURE OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

U.S. foreign policy works best when it puts diplomacy first and views the use of force as a last resort. Its military power is often very effective at deterring large-scale aggression and especially when vital U.S. interests are obviously engaged. As the 1991 Gulf War showed, the United States can also be effective at reversing aggression, especially when it combines force and diplomacy and has clear and feasible political goals. The United States can sometimes promote human rights and other liberal values, but success is more likely when the United States is patient and works in tandem with local forces (as it did in South Korea, the Philippines, or Myanmar).

The 21st century began with a very unequal distribution of power resources. With 5% of the world's population, the United States accounted for about quarter of the world's economic output, responsible for nearly half of global military expenditures and had the most extensive cultural and educational soft-power resources. All this is still true but the future of U.S. foreign policy is hotly debated. The 2008 global financial crisis can be regarded as the beginning of American decline though the National Intelligence Council, for example has projected that in 2025 the U.S. will remain the preeminent power but that American dominance will be much diminished.

The U.S. foreign policy has come under increasing attack from those opposed to its values and even from Americans too. A 2013 poll from Pew Research found that *"52% of Americans wanted the U.S to mind its own business internationally, up from just 20% in the 1960s at the height of the Cold War"* (Pew Research 2013). Three years later this poll was taken, the temptation to lean towards isolationism is still very much evident. The economic, political and security strategy that the U.S. has pursued for more than seven decades under Democratic and Republican administrations alike is today widely questioned by large segments of the American public and is under attack by leading political candidates in both parties, the liberal world order that is in large part shaped by U.S. foreign policy has not been without its problem, it has also reduced huge benefits for many people. Though the successes of the U.S. foreign policy cannot be over-emphasized, in the past seven decades the world has experienced an unprecedented

growth in prosperity, lifting billions out of poverty and enhancing democratic government which has spread to over 100 nations and above all peace among the great powers has been preserved.

The future of the U.S. foreign policy remains an unending dialogue among scholars across the world. The powerful status of the United States in the world politics placed them ahead of other nations but the rhetorical question is "*for how long will the United States be able to hold on to power*", Power is the ability to attain the outcomes one wants and the resource, that produce it vary in different contexts. Spain in the 16th century took advantage of its control of colonies and gold bullion, the Netherlands in the 17th century profited from trade and finance, France in the 18th century benefited from its large population and armies and the United Kingdom in the 19th century derived power from its primacy in the industrial revolution and its navy. This century is marked by a burgeoning revolution in information technology and globalization and to understand this revolution, certain pitfalls need to be avoided. In the case of the United States, the future of her foreign policy depends greatly on her ability to revolutionize with the changing factors and phases in a more connected, keenly contested and densely complex world (Chomsky & David 2005).

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain the criticisms of the United States foreign policy.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Since the end of World War II, the United States has risen among other nations as a force to reckon with, while much has been achieved over the last seven decades regarding her foreign policy, today an arc of instability surrounds her foreign policy and its future. Further afield is the rise of other nations such as China and India amongst others vis-a-vis the complex nature of the world politics. While terrorism, economic instability and immigration harbor the risk of more conflicts among nations, at the same time global growth, interdependence and technological progress enable ever more nations to relate with each other for a course to solving the threat of terrorism and charting the world towards becoming a better place to live. The United States foreign policy without doubt has risen to this challenge and has taken it upon itself to transform the world. With successes recorded so far, criticisms has also been accorded to the course, the criticisms centered of the fact that the United States foreign policy has acted against what her foreign policy preaches as a result of her greedy nature or perhaps selfish interest which is seen as domineering, this has placed the future of the United States foreign policy in jeopardy, intense threat and the relinquishing of their powerful status to a rising nation with China seen as a potential successor going by the fact that no empire or nation can forever hold on to power.

5.0 SUMMARY

As scholars of international politics generally agrees that the technological advantages of the United States will likely help her maintain the position as a leader of the international community, the evolution of the world politics vis-a-vis the rising nations tends to jeopardize the status of the United States in years to come. Power today is distributed in a pattern that resembles a complex three dimensional chess game. On the top chessboard, military power is largely unipolar and the United States is likely to retain primacy for quite some time, this factor is the major criticism of the U.S. foreign policy regarding it as the domineering factor in oppressing

other nations. On the middle chessboard, economic power has been multipolar for more than a decade with the United States, Europe, Japan and China as the major players and others gaining in importance, the economic factor have placed China as the potential successor to U.S. The bottom chessboard is the realm of transnational relations. It includes non-state actors as diverse as bankers who electronically transfer funds, terrorists who traffic weapons, hackers who threaten cyber-security and challenges such as pandemics and climate change. On this bottom board, power is widely diffused and it makes no sense to speak of unipolarity, multipolarity or hegemony. It is currently fashionable to compare the United States power to that of the United Kingdom a century ago and to predict a similar hegemonic decline. Some Americans react emotionally to the idea of decline but it would be counterintuitive and a historical to believe that the United States will have a preponderant share of power resources in her foreign policy forever (Nye Jr20 15).

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Appraise the future of the United States foreign policy.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

Bacevich Andrew J (2008) "The Limits of Power ": The End of American Exceptionalism; New York Metropolitan Books. P 11-i2

Immerman Richard H (2010) "Empire for Liberty, A History of American imperialism From Benjamin Franklin to Paul Wolfwitz " Princeton University Press. P. 87-92

Pew Research Center (20 I 3) "Survey on the Future of us.Foreign Policy".

Chomsky Noam and David Barsamian (2005) "imperial Ambitions: Conversations on the Post-9Iii World; New York Metropolitan Books. P. 79-85

Joseph S. Nye Jr (2014) "The Future of American Power: Dominance and Decline in Perspective" Council on Foreign Relations Inc. New York

REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Abboushi W.F. (1970) "Political Systems of the Middle East in the 20th Century" Mead & Company p. 5
- Agwu, F. (2013) "Themes and Perspectives on Africa's International Relations". Ibadan: University Press Pic.
- Akinterinwa, B. (2014) "Reflections on Nigeria in a Pluriverse World of Decline and Incline". Lagos: NIIA.
- Alden, C. (2000) "From Neglect to 'Virtual Engagement ': The United States and IfS New Paradigm for Africa," African Affairs.
- Ambrose, Stephen E, and Douglas Brinkley. "Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy Since 1938". New York: Penguin, 2011. ISBN: 0142004944
- Anderson, Kenneth (2009), "United Nations Collective Security and the United States Security Guarantee in an Age of Rising Multipolarity: The Security Council as Talking Shop of the Nations." Chicago Journal of International Law 10, no. 1.
- Andoura, S, Behr, T and Ricard-Nihoul, G. (2010), "Reshaping EU-US Relations: A Concept Paper" Notre Europe
- Angela E. Stent (2014), "The Limits of Partnership, U.S.-RUSSIAN Relations in the Twenty-First Century, p. 282-293.
- April 22, 2013. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/26/opinion/26brooks.html?> Brooks, Jefferson, Smith "Obama Needs a Grand Strategy." Foreign Policy, January 23, 2012. Accessed December 8, 2012
- Art, Robert J. "America's Foreign Policy of Grand Strategy and World Politics". New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Bacevich Andrew J (2008) "The Limits of Power ": The End of American Exceptionalism; New York Metropolitan Books. P 11-i2
- Bassani, Joe. "Saving the World for Democracy: An Historical Analysis of America's Grand Strategy in the 21st Century", M.A. thesis, Joint Forces Staff College, USA 2005
- Baylis, J, Smith, S, Owens, P, 2008, "The Globalization of World Politics", Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Berggren, D. Jason & Rae, Nicole C. "Jimmy Carter and George W. Bush: Faith, Foreign Policy, and an Evangelical Presidential Style." Presidential Studies Quarterly 36 (2006): 606-
- Boot, Max. "The New American Way of War." Foreign Affairs (July/August 2003). Brooks, David. "Obama, Gospel and Verse." New York Times, April 26, 2007. Accessed
- Boundless.(2016), "The Cold War and Containment." Boundless Political Science .Retrieved from <https://www.boundless.com/political-science/textbooks/boundless-political-science-textbook/foreign-policy-18/the-history-of-american-foreign-policy-II> Ozthe-cold-war-and-containment-586-4260/
- Brown, Seyom. "The Faces of Power: Constancy and Change in United States Foreign Policy from Truman to Reagan". New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Bruce Hoffman (1998) "Inside Terrorism" Columbia University Press U.S P. 75-90.

- BSC News, 2009, "Campaigning for Afghan Elections", <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/8323708.stm>
Accessed: 30/10/2009
- Bueno de Mesquita. B and Downs. G, 2006, 'Intervention and Democracy', *International Organisation*, 60: 3: 627-649
- Burke, Lee H. and Patterson, Richard Sharpe (1977) *Homes of the Department of State, 1774-1976: The Buildings Occupied by the Department of State and Its Predecessors*. Washington, D.C.: US. Government Printing Office, 1977, p. 27.
- Bush and Putin: "Best of Friends "BBC Report 2001.
- Bush Cole (2010) *The Foreign Policy of America and Role and Responsibilities of the State Department*, Washington DC Publisher, USA 2010.P4.
- Bush, George W. "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People," Speech, Washington, DC, September 20, 2001.
- Cameron F. (2005) "US. Foreign Policy after Cold War. Routledge and Francis Group". London.
- Chanlett-Avery eLal.(2014), "Japan-LI.S. Relations: Issues for Congress" Washington: Congressional Research Service.
- Chanlett-Avery, I. and Rinehart,I(2016), "The U.S.-Japan Alliance" Washington: Congressional Research Service.
- Chaturvedi, A. K. (2006) "Dictionary of Political Science". New Delhi: Academic Publishers.
- Chomsky Noam and David Barsamian (2005) "imperial Ambitions: Conversations on the Post-9/11 World; New York Metropolitan Books. P. 79-85
- Christopher Hill, "The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy". (Palgrave Macmillan, 2003): p. 222
- Cohen, Roberta (2008), "Integrating Human Rights in US Foreign Policy: The History, the Challenges, and the Criteria for an Effective Policy".The Brookings Institution -University of BernProject on Internal Displacement
- Council on Foreign Relation, (2006) "More than Humanitarianism: A Strategic u.s. Approach toward Africa," Independent Task Force Report, No. 56.
- Daniel D. Drezner(2010), "American Foreign Policy toward Russia: Is a U-turn or Any-turn possible?
- David West, et al. "What is in American Foreign Policy?, A Narrative History". 2nd Edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2009. ISBN: 0066406821
- Davidson, J. W., et al. "Nation of Nations: A Narrative History of the American Republic", 6th ed., Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2007. ISBN: 0073406848
- Diamond, L, 1996, 'Is the Third Wave Over?'. *Journal of Democracy*, 7: 3: 20-37
- Dobson, Alan P. "Anglo-American Relations in the Twentieth Century" (1995)
- Doucet, L, 2009, Afghanistan's Day of Reckoning, BBC News, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/8205787.stm Accessed: 30/10/2009
- Doyle. M, 1986, 'Liberalism and World Politics', *The American Political Science Review*, 80: 4: 1151-1169

Dumbaugh, K. (2009). "China-U.S. Relations: Current Issues and Implications for U.S. Policy". Washington: Congressional Research Service.

Ebegbulem, I.C (2011), "The Failure of Collective Security in the Post World Wars I and II International System" *Transcience Journal*(2011) Vol. 2, Issue 2.

Electronic Journal of the U.S. Department of States. (2000) *The Making of U.S. Foreign Policy*, Vol. 5, No. 1

European court of Human Rights, 2008, *The European Court of Human Rights: Some Facts and Figures 1998-2008*, http://www.echr.coe.int/INR/IRonlyres/ACF07093-I_93_7-49AF-8BE6-36FEOFEE175910/FactsAndFiguresENG10ansNov.pdf Accessed: 31/11/2009

European Union Commission(2006), "The European Union and the United States Global Partners, Global Responsibilities". European Commission EN.

F. Kennan, "Diplomacy and Statecraft, Nov 2000, Vol. 11, No.3.

Fain W. Taylor (2008) "American Ascendance and British Retreat in the Persian Gulf Region" Palgrave Macmillan p. 17- 18

Fawcett L. (2005) "The International Relations of the Middle East" UK Oxford University Press p. 284-285

Feagin, J.R. and Feagin, C.B. *Racial and Ethnic Relations*, 9th ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2011. ISBN: 0205024995

Fester D. *The Becoming of a Nation called America*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2014. ISBN: 0208044005

Freeland, R. M. (1972). *The Truman Doctrine and McCarthyism*. New York, US: Knopf.

Garthoff, Raymond L. (1982), "Detente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan". Brookings Institution Report.

George, J. (2003) *The State Department and the Management of US Interest and World Peace*, Heritage Publisher NY, USA. 2003. P 6.

George, Kennan F. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs* July 1947.

Goldstein, J (2005), "International Relations", India. Dorling Kindersley & Pearson Education.

Goldstein, J. *International Relations*, 8th edn., New York: Pearson Longman, 2008. ISBN: 0020550557

Goldstein, J.S. and Pevehouse, J.S. *International Relations*, 10th ed., New York: Pearson Longman, 2011. ISBN: 97205059577

Goldstein, J, Kahler, M, Keohane, R, Slaughter, A, 2000, 'Introduction: Legalization and World Politics', *International Organisation*, 54: 3: 385-399

Herring, C (2008) *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776*

Heywood, A, 2004, *Political Theory: An Introduction*, Palgrave MacMillan, Hampshire

Hirsch E.D, Kett, J.F., and Trefil, J. *The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy*. 3rd ed., Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 2002. ISBN: 0618226478

History of the Central Intelligence Agency, CIA Official website. [Cia.gov](http://cia.gov) Retrieved March 28, 2014. Accessed on June 8, 2016

http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Sources_of_Soviet_Conduct (Accessed June 17, 2016)

Hoffman, S, 1995, 'The Crisis of Liberal Internationalism', *Foreign Policy*, 98: 159-177.

<https://www.cato.org/cato-handbook-policymakers/cato-handbook-policy-makers-8th-edition-2017/public-opinion-us-foreign>

Immerman Richard H (2010) "Empire for Liberty, A History of American imperialism From Benjamin Franklin to Paul Wolfowitz " Princeton University Press. P. 87-92

"Independence" *American Historical Review*, vol. 39, no.2.

James et al (2015), "U.S. Comprehensive Strategy towards Russia" special report \01 173

James Peck (2006). *Washington's China: The National Security World, the cold war and the Origins of Globalism*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Jentleson, Bruce W. *American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21 st Century*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010. ISBN: 0393933571

Jerald A. Combs (2008). "The History of American Foreign Policy"; M.E. Sharp. Pp. 21- 25

Joel Mowbray. (2003.) *Dangerous Diplomacy: How the State Department Threatens America's Security*, Regnery Publishing, p.9. ISBN 9780895261106.

John, G. (ed.), *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays* (6th ed. Wadsworth, 2010), p. 640; essays by scholars

Joseph S. Nye Jr (2014) "The Future of American Power: Dominance and Decline in Perspective" Council on Foreign Relations Inc. New York

Journal of Peace Research vol.33, No.4: pp391-402.

Jovanovic, M. N. (2005). "The Economics of European Integration".USA: Edward Eglar Publishing.

Kant, I, 1795 (2005), *Perpetual Peace*, Cosimo Inc., New York

Kaye, C.R, Nye, J& Ares, A(2015), "Working With a Rising India:A Joint Venture for the New Century", Independent Task Force Report NO 73. US: Council on Foreign Relations.

Kennan G. F. (1947). *The Sources of Soviet Conduct*.*ForeignAffairs*, 25(1),556-582.

Kennedy, Charles Stuart (1990), *The American Consul: A History of the United States Consular Service 1776-1914* Nell' York, Greenwood Press.

Kenneth Waltz (1979), *Theory of International Politics* New York, Mcgraw Hill.

Konstatdt, K and Pinto, S.(20 12), "India-U.S. Security Relations: Current Engagement" Washington: Congressional Research Service.

Kordos, M.(2014), "Issues and Challenges of The US - EU Economic Relations" *Economics and Management Journal*. 19 (1).

Larry, D. (1992) 'Promoting Democracy,' *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 87, Summer, pp25-46.

Lawrence, S.V (2013), "U.S.-China Relations: An Overview of PolicyIssues" Washington:Congressional Research Service.

Lawson F.R. (August 1989) "The Iranian Crisis of 1945-1946 and the Spiral Model of International Conflict" *International Journal of Middle East Studies* Volume 21, p. 310

- Lawson, L. (1999) "External Democracy Promotion in Africa: Another False Start? Commonwealth and Comparative Politics.
- Layne, C, 1994, 'Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace', *International Security*, 19: 2: 5-49
- Liang-Fenton, D. (2004), "Implementing U.S Human Rights Policy: Agendas, Policies, and Practices" Hendon V A: Uruted States Institute of Peace Press.
- Lindsay, J.M. (2003), "The Globalization of Politics: American Foreign Policy for a New Century" Brookings Review. Available on <http://www.cfr.org/world/globalization-politics-american-foreign-pol-icy-new-century/p6330>
- Mark, A.A History of the United States, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2011. ISBN: 0099215255
- McCormick, 1.(2009) American Foreign Policy and Process.
- Meernik, J. (2011). United States Military Intervention and the Promotion a/Democracy. Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Meernik, J.(1996). "United States Military Intervention and the Promotion of Democracy".
- Michel Chossudovsky (2005) "America's War on Terrorism" Global Research: 2nd Edition, P.278.
- Morgan, William D., and Charles Stuart. Kennedy. American Diplomats: The Foreign Service at Work. New York: Universe, 2004. ISBN: 0595329748
- Morgenthau, J. (J 978) Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace, New York, Knopf. 5th Edition, Revised
- National Security Council; The White House. www.whitehouse.gov. Retrieved 4 April 2012.
- Norton, M.B., et al. A People and a Nation: A History of the United States, 9th ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2011. ISBN: 0495915256
- Parks, B. American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2014. ISBN: 0293993551
- Paterson, Thomas G. American Foreign Relations: A History. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2009. ISBN: 0547225695
- Paul R. Pillar (200 I) "Terrorism and American Foreign Policy": Brookings Institution Press, P.9.
- Pedersen, J.A(20 13), "American Foreign Policy"
- Perkovich, George (2010), "Toward Realistic U.S.-India Relations" Washington De: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Pew Research Center (20 I 3) "Survey on the Future of us.Foreign Policy".
- Plantamura, P. (2013) Impacts of U.S. Foreign Policy and Intervention on Guatemala: Mid- 20th Century.
- Plischke, Elmer. U.S. Department of State: A Reference History. Westport, Conn.:Greenwood Press, 1999, p. 45.
- Ray Takeyh& Steven Simon (2016) "The Pragmatic Superpowers" International Journal of Middle East Studies Volume 19, p. 19

Rees, D. (1967). *The Age of Containment: The Cold War 1945-1965*. London, UK: Macmillan, St. Martin's Press.

Richard Jackson (2014) "War on Terrorism": United States Army History Resources for Global War on Terrorism. Retrieved on 16-06-2016.

Roland N. Stromberg (ND) "Collective Security" Encyclopedia of the New American Nation. Available on Retrieved on 20th May 2016 from <http://www.americanforeignrelations.com/Collective-Security.html>

Rourke, J. and Boyer, M. (1998) *World Politics: International Politics on the World Stage*, Brief. U.S.A.: Dushkin/McGraw Hill

Rosati, J. *The Politics of United States Foreign Policy*. 5th ed., Belmont, CA : Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2010. ISBN: 0495797241

Rugh W.A. (2005) "American Encounters With Arabs: The Soft Power of us. Public Diplomacy in the Middle East" Praeger Publishers Inc p. 25

Russell, R. "American Diplomatic Realism": A Tradition Practised and Preached by George Samuel Flagg Bemis (1934). "Washington's Farewell Address: A Foreign Policy of Sander, Monica. *The Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in America at Work*. New York: Universe, 2015. ISBN: 0099329448

Schmid, Alex P. (2000) "Thesaurus and Glossary of Early Warning and Conflict Prevention Terms" United Kingdom: Forum on Early Warning and Early Response

Schraeder, P. (1994) *United States Foreign Policy toward Africa: Incrementalism, Crises and Change*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Senator Biden, J. (2000) *A Democratic Viewpoint: Congress and Foreign Policy*; in an

Senator Gordon, S. (2000) *A Republican Viewpoint: Congress and Foreign Policy*; in an

Simmons, Beth A., "Compliance with International Agreements," *Annual Review of Political Science* 1. 1 (1998): 75-93.

Springboard, J, *The Early American Foreign Policy*. Washington D.C. Octaviva. 2014. ISBN: 0110022494

Steans, J. and Pettiford, L, 200 I, *International Relations: Perspectives and Themes*, Pearson Education Limited, Essex

Suri, J. (2009) *American Grand Strategy from the Cold War's End /0 9/11*. Orbis-article-fall.

USA Today, 2008, Afghan Death Toll Reaches 500, http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2008-08-07-afghan-war_N.htm Accessed: 31 110/2009

Valentino, B. (2011) *The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention, The Hard Truth* aha lit a Noble Notion.

Wallensteen, P.(1985), *American-Soviet Detente: What Went Wrong?* *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 22, No. I (Mar., 1985), pp. 1-8

Watson J.B. (1981) "Success in Twentieth Century World Affairs Since 1919 Norwich" John Murray Publishers Ltd p.295

William, H(1901). *History of the Department of State of the United States: Its Formation and Duties, Together With Biographies of Its Present Officers and Secretaries From the Beginning*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 190 I, p. 12.

Williams, P. The United States of America Foreign Policy. 2nd edn., Boston: Houghton- Mifflin, 2002. ISBN: 0618226478

Williams, William Appleman. The tragedy of American Diplomacy (1959).

Woloch, N. USA Foreign policy and the American Experience, 5th ed., Boston: McGraw- Hill, 20 II. ISBN: 0073385573

Xu, Beina (2014), "The US-Japan Security Alliance". Council of Foreign Relations. Retrieved from http://www.cfr.org/japan/us-japan-security-alliance/p3_1437 on 14/5/2016.