

Chapter 1 : US foreign policy | Us-news | The Guardian

Business was able to drive a good deal of foreign policy because of unique features of American society. Corporate leaders, lawyers, and investment bankers were able to move in and out of the highest levels of government.

The United States exercises its foreign policy through economic aid. For example, famine relief in North Korea provides not only humanitarian assistance but also a foothold for the development of democratic ideals and institutions. If isolationism has become outdated, what kind of foreign policy does the United States follow? In the years after World War II, the United States was guided generally by containment – the policy of keeping communism from spreading beyond the countries already under its influence. With the collapse of the Soviet Union in , containment no longer made sense, so in the past ten years, the United States has been redefining its foreign policy. What are its responsibilities, if any, to the rest of the world, now that it has no incentive of luring them to the American "side" in the Cold War? Do the United States still need allies? What action should be taken, if any, when a "hot spot" erupts, causing misery to the people who live in the nations involved? The answers are not easy.

The economic side of containment: Foreign Policy Goals To investigate the nature of current United States foreign policy, the logical source is the State Department, whose job it is to define and direct it. Foreign policy goals include the following: Preserving the national security of the United States Promoting world peace and a secure global environment Maintaining a balance of power among nations Working with allies to solve international problems Promoting democratic values and human rights Furthering cooperative foreign trade and global involvement in international trade organizations Examining these goals closely reveals that they are based on cooperation with other nations, although "preserving the national security of the United States" implies possible competition and conflict.

Who Makes Foreign Policy? He was a key figure in articulating U. As with all policy making, many people and organizations have a hand in setting United States foreign policy. The main objective of foreign policy is to use diplomacy – or talking, meeting, and making agreements – to solve international problems. They try to keep problems from developing into conflicts that require military settlements. The President almost always has the primary responsibility for shaping foreign policy. Presidents, or their representatives, meet with leaders of other nations to try to resolve international problems peacefully. According to the Constitution, Presidents sign treaties with other nations with the "advice and consent" of the Senate. So the Senate, and to a lesser extent, the House of Representatives, also participate in shaping foreign policy. The Secretary of State and many other officials of the State Department play major roles in setting foreign policy. The Foreign Service consists of ambassadors and other official representatives to more than countries. Ambassadors and their staffs set up embassies in the countries recognized by the United States and serve as an American presence abroad. The embassies are part of the State Department, and they protect Americans overseas and are responsible for harmonious relationships with other countries. Presidents can play a prominent role in the formation of foreign policy by brokering negotiations between disputing parties. The National Security Council, as part of the Executive Office of the President, helps the President deal with foreign, military, and economic policies that affect national security. The National Security Adviser – who coordinates the Council – sometimes has as much influence as the Secretary of State, depending on his or her relationship with the President. The Central Intelligence Agency CIA , one of the best-known agencies that sets foreign policy, gathers, analyzes, and transmits information from other countries that might be important to the security of the nation. Although the CIA is notorious for its participation in "spy" work and "top secret" investigations, much of its work is public and routine. Although Americans always pay attention to the advice of their revered founder, the world is of course not the same. The many people that shape American foreign policy today accept the fact that the United States is a member of a world community that cannot afford to ignore the importance of getting along. Find out not only how the Secretary of State and the Foreign Service represent America abroad, but also how they help formulate and disseminate U. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations No legislation pertaining to foreign relations can be passed without going through this powerful Senate committee chaired by Senator Jesse Helms. Try your hand at codebreaking, meet the K-9 corps, learn about famous people from CIA history, and

see spy gadgets from the past at this entertaining website. Voice of America With its radio, television, and Internet broadcasts, the Voice of America is an effective medium for the government to spread democratic ideals across the globe. Choose a broadcast in English or one of 52 other languages and experience how the rest of the world hears America. A former Joint Chief of Staff under two Presidents from different parties. The son of immigrants, a kid from the Bronx. Take a look at Colin Powell, from his biography to his statements about U.

Chapter 2 : Foreign policy of the United States - Wikipedia

Since foreign trade was considered essential to continued domestic prosperity,¹ the major international economic problems which concerned the American business community in the s were tariff policy and foreign loans and investments, along with the related issues of intergovernmental debts and German reparation payments.

Were the Founding Fathers somehow to return, they would find it impossible to recognize our political system. War has warped our constitutional order, the course of our national development, and the very mentality of our people. The process of distortion started about a century ago, when certain fateful steps were taken that in time altered fundamentally the character of our republic. One idea of America was abandoned and another took its place, although no conscious, deliberate decision was ever made. Eventually, this change affected all areas of American life, so that today our nation is radically different from the original ideal, and, indeed, from the ideal probably still cherished by most Americans. The turning point was signaled by a series of military adventures: Together, they represented a profound break with American traditions of government. Until the end of the nineteenth century, American foreign policy essentially followed the guidelines laid down by George Washington, in his Farewell Address to the American people: James Madison, the father of the Constitution, expressed this understanding when he wrote: Of all enemies to public liberty, war is, perhaps, the most to be dreaded, because it comprises and develops the germ of every other. War is the parent of armies; from these proceed debts and taxes; and armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few. History taught that republics that engaged in frequent wars eventually lost their character as free states. Hence, war was to be undertaken only in defense of our nation against attack. This was the position not only of Washington and Madison, but of John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and the other men who presided over the birth of the United States. For over a century, it was adhered to and elaborated by our leading statesmen. It could be called neutrality, or nonintervention, or America first, or, as its modern enemies dubbed it, isolationism. The great revisionist historian Charles A. Beard called it Continental Americanism. In concrete terms, the words mean non-intervention in the controversies and wars of Europe and Asia and resistance to the intrusion of European or Asiatic powers, systems, and imperial ambitions into the western hemisphere [as threatening to our security]. An important implication of this principle was that, while we honored the struggle for freedom of other peoples, we would not become a knight-errant, spreading our ideals throughout the world by force of arms. John Quincy Adams, secretary of state to James Monroe and later himself president of the United States, declared, in *But she does not go abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own.* John Quincy Adams was the real architect of what became known as the Monroe Doctrine. In order to assure our security, we advised European powers to refrain from interfering in the Western Hemisphere. In return, however, we promised not to interfere in the affairs of Europe. The implied contract was broken and the Monroe Doctrine annulled in the early twentieth century by Theodore Roosevelt and, above all, Woodrow Wilson. This noninterventionist America, devoted to solving its own problems and developing its own civilization, became the wonder of the world. The eyes and hopes of freedom-loving peoples were turned to the Great Republic of the West. But sometimes the leaders of peoples fighting for their independence misunderstood the American point of view. This was the case with the Hungarians, who had fought a losing battle against the Habsburg monarchy and its Russian allies. Their cause was championed by many sectors of American public opinion. When the Hungarian patriot Louis Kossuth came to America, he was wildly cheered. He was presented to the president and Congress and hailed by the secretary of state, Daniel Webster. But they all refused to help in any concrete way. No public money, no arms, aid, or troops were forthcoming for the Hungarian cause. Kossuth grew bitter and disillusioned. He sought the help of Henry Clay, by then the grand old man of American politics. Clay explained to Kossuth why the American leaders had acted as they did: By the policy to which we have adhered since the days of Washington. Far better is it for ourselves, for Hungary, and the cause of liberty, that, adhering to our pacific system and avoiding the distant wars of Europe, we should keep our lamp burning brightly on this western

shore, as a light to all nations, than to hazard its utter extinction amid the ruins of fallen and falling republics in Europe. Similarly, in 1831, when Russia crushed a Polish revolt with great brutality, the French Emperor invited us to join in a protest to the Tsar. The American people must be content to recommend the cause of human progress by the wisdom with which they should exercise the powers of self-government, forbearing at all times, and in every way, from foreign alliances, intervention, and interference. Throughout these decades, trade and cultural exchange flourished, as American civilization progressed and we became an economic powerhouse. The only thing that was prohibited was the kind of intervention in foreign affairs that was likely to embroil us in war. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, however, a different philosophy began to emerge. In Europe, the free-trade and noninterventionist ideas of the classical liberals were fading; more and more, the European states went in for imperialism. In the United States, this imperialism found an echo in the political class. Soon translated into many foreign languages, it was used by imperialists in Britain, Germany, Japan, and elsewhere to intensify the naval arms race and the scramble for colonies. In America, a young politician named Theodore Roosevelt made it his bible. In spite of themselves, the American people would have to be dragged to greatness by their leaders. Often, the imperialists put their case in terms of the allegedly urgent need to find foreign markets and capital outlets for American business. But this was a propaganda ploy, and American business itself was largely skeptical of this appeal. And a golden opportunity presented itself: The year was a landmark in American history. Aside from a few scant periods of retrenchment, we have been embroiled in foreign politics ever since. Starting in the 1890s, a group of Cubans agitated for independence from Spain. Like many revolutionaries before and after, they had little real support among the mass of the population. The Spanish authorities responded with harsh countermeasures. Some American investors in Cuba grew restive, but the real forces pushing America towards intervention were not a handful of sugarcane planters. Politicians on the lookout for publicity and popular favor saw a gold mine in the Cuban issue. As bad or worse was being done by Britain, France, Germany, and others all over the globe in that age of imperialism. Spain, aware of the immense superiority of American forces, responded to the interference from Washington by attempts at appeasement, while trying to preserve the shreds of its dignity as an ancient imperial power. The leaders of the war party camouflaged their plans by speaking of the need to procure markets for American industry, and were even able to convince a few business leaders to parrot their line. Like similar cliques in Britain, Germany, Russia, and elsewhere at the time, their aim was the enhancement of the power and glory of their state. In order to escalate the pressure on Spain, the battleship U.S.S. Maine. On the night of February 15, the Maine exploded, killing 266 men. The press screamed for vengeance against perfidious Spain, and interventionist politicians believed their hour had come. McKinley, anxious to preserve his image as a cautious statesman, bided his time. He pressed Spain to stop fighting the rebels and start negotiating with them for Cuban independence, hinting broadly that the alternative was war. The Spaniards, averse to simply handing the island over to a terrorist junta, were willing to grant autonomy. On April 11, he delivered his war message to Congress, carefully omitting to mention the concession of an armistice. A week later, Congress passed the war resolution McKinley wanted. This he did, bringing along Emilio Aguinaldo and his Filipino independence fighters. In the Caribbean, American forces quickly subdued the Spaniards in Cuba, and then, after Spain sued for peace, went on to take over Puerto Rico, as well. In three months, the fighting was over. It was a victory, people believed, for American ideals and the American way of life against an Old World tyranny. Our triumphant arms would guarantee Cuba a free and democratic future. Against this tidal wave of public elation, one man spoke out. He was William Graham Sumner-Yale professor, famed social scientist, and tireless fighter for private enterprise, free trade, and the gold standard. Now he was about to enter his hardest fight of all. He knew that the assembled Yalies and the rest of the audience were brimming with patriotic pride. Sumner threw down the gauntlet: We have beaten Spain in a military conflict, but we are submitting to be conquered by her on the field of ideas and policies. Expansionism and imperialism are nothing but the old philosophies of national prosperity which have brought Spain to where she is now. Sumner proceeded to outline the original vision of America cherished by the Founding Fathers, radically different from what prevailed among the nations of Europe: They would have no court and no pomp; nor orders, or ribbons, or decorations, or titles. They would have no public debt. There was to be no grand diplomacy, because they

intended to mind their own business, and not be involved in any of the intrigues to which European statesmen were accustomed. This had been the American idea, our signature as a nation: As foreign affairs became more important, power would shift from communities and states to the federal government, and, within that, from Congress to the president. An ever-busy foreign policy could only be carried out by the president, often without the knowledge of the people. Immortal glory is not nothing, as the Spaniards well knew. That way had been more modest, more prosaic, parochial, and, yes, middle class. It was based on the idea that we were here to live out our lives, minding our own business, enjoying our liberty and pursuing our happiness in our work, families, churches, and communities. America was choosing the path of world power, and Sumner had little hope that his words could change that. Why was he speaking out then? But suddenly the imperialists had problems of their own:

Chapter 3 : Foreign Policy | American University, Washington, DC

The foreign policy of the United States is its interactions with foreign nations and how it sets standards of interaction for its organizations, corporations and system citizens of the United States.

A Brief History A central function of the U. A nation is a sovereign country, and as such, possesses the highest authority over its territories. All sovereign states are theoretically equal. Foreign policy determines how America conducts relations with other countries. It is designed to further certain goals. National interest shapes foreign policy and covers a wide range of political, economic, military, ideological, and humanitarian concerns. Protected by the Atlantic Ocean, its major foreign policy, as typified by the Monroe Doctrine, was to limit European attempts of further colonization of the Western Hemisphere. Through the 19th century, America concentrated on creating a nation that spanned the continent, and it avoided foreign entanglements. Once industrialized and more prosperous, it began looking for foreign markets and colonies. By the turn of the 20th century, the United States had become a minor imperial power, fighting a war with Spain for Cuba and the Philippines and annexing Hawaii and several other territories. World War I engaged the United States in European affairs, but after the war, a wave of isolationist feeling swept the country. Refusing membership in the League of Nations, America turned inward once again. Absorbed by the prosperity of the s and the Great Depression of the s, America let its military strength erode. It was not prepared for war when the Japanese struck the U. It took the lead in founding the United Nations. It invested billions of dollars through the Marshall Plan to help strengthen war-devastated European democracies. During the Cold War, the United States and its allies competed with the Soviet Union and its allies militarily, economically, and ideologically. Both sides created massive military forces and huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Although the two superpowers never went to war, the policy of containment led the United States into the bloody Korean and Vietnam wars. The Cold War ended when the Soviet Union, economically exhausted from competing with the West, disintegrated. This left the United States the only remaining superpower in a world no longer ruled by the logic of containing the Soviet Union. Through time, various constitutional principles and values have shaped American foreign policy. American foreign policy has favored the self-determination of nations for independence. Based on our commitment to constitutional government, we often favor and support nations that practice democracy. These principles, however, sometimes have conflicted with the goals of national security, economics, or the realities of international politics. In certain cases, America has supported dictatorial governments or intervened to curtail popular political movements. It includes establishing and maintaining diplomatic relations with other countries and international organizations such as the United Nations and the Organization of American States. It includes peacekeeping functions such as working with allies to assure regional and international security and arms-control efforts. It covers a range of international economic issues including trade, travel, and business. It involves foreign aid and disaster relief. As a superpower, the United States has also taken a leadership role in peacemaking around the globe by trying to negotiate treaties and agreements to end regional conflicts. Also, as a world leader, the United States has a longstanding role in trying to address international economic and environmental problems. The president and the executive branch have the most significant role in making foreign policy and are responsible for carrying it out. With the advice and consent of the Senate, the president makes treaties and appoints ambassadors. The president can hold summit meetings with world leaders. As commander in chief of the military, the president can, by executive order, rapidly project U. The secretary of state heads the U. State Department and often represents the president abroad. The State Department carries out foreign policy decisions and helps develop foreign policy for every region of the world. Attached to the State Department is the U. Foreign Service, or diplomatic corps. It sets quotas on immigration, chooses which countries will benefit for most-favored-nation status in trade agreements, votes on foreign aid, and sets the defense budget. But Congress is usually in the role of accepting, changing, or rejecting policies proposed by the president. The Supreme Court plays a limited role in foreign policy. It has jurisdiction over cases involving treaties, admiralty and maritime law, and ambassadors and other public ministers. It also is charged with deciding disputes between states and foreign

states and their citizens and subjects. At different times, tensions have arisen between the branches in the conduct of foreign policy. Presidents sometimes favor treaties that the Senate does not want to approve. Presidents have committed American armed forces to major conflicts such as the Korean, Vietnam, and Gulf wars without a declaration of war by Congress. The public also plays a role in influencing foreign policy. Advocacy groups for foreign countries often try to influence Congress and the president about issues. Business associations lobby the government about international economic and trade issues. Groups and individuals with strong views on certain foreign policy issues, especially military intervention, often organize protests or other political actions to influence decisions. What is foreign policy? How would you characterize American foreign policy during most of the 19th century? At the beginning of the 20th century? Following World War II? What do you think accounts for the differences? What role do the three branches of government have in creating American foreign policy? What tensions sometimes arise between the branches over foreign policy? Who else influences foreign policy? What principles and values have helped shaped American foreign policy?

Chapter 4 : History of United States foreign policy - Wikipedia

The Economics of US Foreign Policy. U.S. foreign policy can help support the American economy, writes Ambassador M. Osman Siddique. . her work as a spokeswoman for American business is a less.

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Foreign Loan Supervision, The nationalist-internationalist split which occurred within the business community over tariff policy was also evident with respect to other economic foreign policy issues, such as loans and investments and the related problems of intergovernmental debts and German reparation payments. The average domestic businessman , however, was much less concerned with these questions than he was with the tariff controversies of the decade. Sometimes this lack of interest was due to a sense of inadequacy , but more often it represented apathy. In at least one case, a steel manufacturer on the Pacific Coast refused to consider the suggestion of the American Manufacturers Export Association for an "international conference of businessmen to make suggestions and recommendations to their various governments concerning the inter-Allied debt. According to a NAM committee report, "the great majority " of its members did not give any "serious attention to foreign trade possibilities or the influence of that trade on their own industrial activities. The sharpest controversies over all economic foreign policy issues, with the exception of the tariff, were found within the ranks of that segment of the business community whose affairs were worldwide. It was not uncommon for business internationalists who had been united in opposition to high tariff duties and in favor of an Open Door commercial policy, to disagree over loan, investment, debt, and reparation policies. More than any other single fact, this internecine conflict proved disastrous for their dreams of establishing a world economic community. With respect to loans and investments it has already been pointed out that banking and financial internationalists had divided into two camps by As the postwar depression of subsided, however, so did the disagreement between the House of Morgan, backed by the investment bankers across the country, and the commercial banking and export manufacturing interests headed by the National City Bank and Frank A. Their reconciliation was to be expected on this issue since both groups hoped to make New York the international financial center of the world. They simply had been temporarily unable to agree upon how such a common goal was to be achieved in the economically unstable years immediately following the armistice. International trade was generally sluggish through This was due to the uncertainty of exchange markets with so many nations having gone off the gold standard, to frozen credits, and to a temporary shortage of investment capital following the war. One result was a decline in number of the foreign branches of American banks which had been established between and under facilities provided for by the Federal Reserve System. The greatest loss in this period came in Latin America, where 37 percent of the foreign branches had been established. The number of branches declined from seventy-two and three agencies to forty-five and one agency. Where there had been thirty-two American banks represented in eight Latin American countries in , there were only twenty-six banks in seven countries by There was, however, no corresponding drop in the expansion of capital investment abroad because manufacturing corporations had begun to invest in Europe and other parts of the world by establishing their own foreign subsidiaries. This method of direct investment and independent financing further decreased the need for foreign bank branches and freed at least the giant companies from their traditional reliance upon American bankers. By large American companies constituted a strong third partner in the international financial system of the United States, along with the You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 5 : Project MUSE - American Business and Foreign Policy

With increasing world economic interdependence and a new position as a creditor nation, the American business community became more actively and vocally concerned with foreign policy after World War I than ever before.

Continue to article content Former Exxon CEO Rex Tillerson is an unorthodox choice for secretary of state, but as his Senate confirmation hearing revealed, he is a pragmatist about engaging with the world as it is, rather than waiting for it to magically evolve into what grandstanding idealists from either the left or the right want it to be. Now that he is confirmed, he has an opportunity to re-anchor America into a stable world role after nearly two decades of foreign policy flailing. Already Tillerson has the backing of Henry Kissinger, who has also been informally counseling Trump. American foreign policy has indeed failed. It failed to prevent the rise of a peer competitor such as China, failed to entrench democracy in Arab and Latin American transition societies, and failed to integrate regional powers such as Russia and Iran into a liberal order. Barack Obama came into office seeking to change course from George W. Bush, but reluctantly remained a wartime president. Trump has professed admiration for Nixon and George H. Bush, two conservative but constructive realists who capitalized on fateful opportunities to engineer strategic shifts. As he enters the White House, there is no shortage of chances for him to follow in their footsteps. In fact, modern American diplomacy has its roots in commercial expansion worldwide just over a century ago. By the late 19th century, Standard Oil of New Jersey already dominated the oil refinery markets of Latin America and Asia and had 60, employees. Meanwhile, the State Department had a grand total of 1, employees, mostly in Washington. Standard Oil and its successors including Exxon were thus strong supporters of an enhanced American presence abroad, which in any case became essential after World War I. Indeed, as American businesses expanded worldwide, the Foreign Service itself was only created in They have a legitimate interest in engaging, making deals and shaping relations with countries around the world. They are not an accoutrement or nuisance to American diplomacy. Properly understood, they are the better part of what American diplomacy is. The same is true between most other countries. Corporate diplomacy—airline connections, telecoms tie-ups, oil and gas deals and consumer goods sales—drives how relations among billions of people are structured. Governments and companies look nearby and abroad acquire supplies and meet demand. They think in terms of pragmatic complementarity, not moralizing conditionality. For most countries most of the time, economic diplomacy is diplomacy. But for the United States, public-private relations are often hostile rather than collaborative. They appeal to the logic of supply and demand rather than holding regimes and their citizens as synonymous. Under the radar, American diplomacy has in fact been shifting clearly in this direction. In recent years, embassies around the world have been tasked with better assessing and promoting the role of American business abroad, setting up investment tours and showcasing how U. Even without a former oil company executive heading the State Department, energy diplomacy would undoubtedly play a crucial role in the Trump administration. Under Tillerson, Exxon made big bets on Russian gas on the far east island of Sakhalin and with state-owned Rosneft in the Arctic—but so too have countries from Norway to Japan. Indeed, it is precisely because major economic powers such as Germany and China have circumvented sanctions and maintained a variety of trade and investment ties that the sanctions regime on Russia has been panned by Trump and Tillerson as useless. In a world of multi-alignment, every country has a lifeline. The Western sanctions imposed on Russia in simply forced it into a disadvantageous, hostage-like contract for long-term gas sales to China. The gradual de-Americanization of the global financial infrastructure in favor of bilateral and regional arrangements means the U. Greater connectivity can provide this: Sanctions can still impose pain on countries—unfortunately, more on people than their governments—but their ability to change actual policy is dubious. Countries that are less connected are more belligerent because they have less stake in the international system. Either the West can connect more to Russia to shape it, or the East will. Containing China is a Soviet idea, not an American one. Today, however, the roles are very much reversed. Russia, meanwhile, provides evidence of how the less connected a state is, the less incentive it has to play by the rules of the international system. Russia only joined the WTO in , but between sanctions, falling oil prices and corruption, Russians have yet to

feel the large scale benefits of the global integration that nominally began a quarter century ago with the Soviet collapse. There is still much unsettled business from the Soviet era. Border adjustments such as Crimea are part of the continuous remapping of the post-Soviet space, with some areas such as the Baltics being absorbed by the West as EU and NATO members, and others, such as Ukraine, Georgia or Moldova still caught in limbo. The overwhelming strategic priority for the United States is to prevent a strong anti-Western coalition from forming under Chinese leadership, and Russia can become an important player in that effort. Russia remains structurally weak. Its supposed return to the global stage is little more than shrewd opportunism, with tactical moves exploiting Western lapses or errors in Ukraine or Syria. But nothing Russia does today makes it a pillar of the future balance of power. Rather, its strategic relevance lies in which direction it leans between West and East. Faced with this choice, the West should not be isolating Russia but buying it. Trade alone does not transform societies, especially rentier economies dependent on a single export. Rather, greater foreign investment builds more durable bonds that change geopolitical calculations. This should pave the way for far greater Western influence rather than the present hostility. Trump thinks in terms of deals. But to really change Russia and other recalcitrant states, the West needs to put its money where its mouth is, and think really big. It is a reminder that the West can only positively influence Russia if it is more connected to it. A similar logic applies to China. While some adjustments on trade policy may be necessary to counter unfair practices, American companies still depend on exports to China for their immediate and long-term growth. Rather than risk reciprocal and escalating tariffs, the smarter strategy would be to use the growing presence of Chinese multinationals around the world as a lever on the Chinese government. This is the kind of deal-based engagement that is more likely to constructively shape China than sparking a trade war. To take a related example, former CIA director James Woolsey, who until recently advised Trump on national security matters, has advocated that the U. There is no way the U. Tillerson also has the opportunity to find a new equilibrium in the Middle East. But further bombing ISIS into submission is not a substitute for encouraging a regional security architecture in which the legitimate interests of Iran and Saudi Arabia are recognized. Under Bush and Obama, U. Saudi Arabia is likely to have to shoulder a greater share of the burden for Gulf defense, but this should foster greater collaboration with its big-spending GCC neighbors Qatar and the UAE. Should the Sunnis better punch their weight in Syria and Iraq, they could eventually oust Assad in Syria while shoring up Iraqi nationalism, assuaging concerns about Iranian regional designs. If Trump can talk to North Korea, as he has vaguely intimated he might do, then he can also take Iranian relations to the next level and recognize how helpful Iran can be as it was in the aftermath of the invasion of Afghanistan in in stabilizing Afghanistan and Pakistan through infrastructure projects and gas pipelines. Trump and Tillerson might also help midwife the birth of a new Middle Eastern country whose time has come: Meanwhile, Israel has strongly backed Kurdistan as a stable proto-state on the other side of Arab rivals and bordering Iran. As civil wars and ISIS blur away the boundaries between Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Jordan, Turkey too has come around to begrudgingly supporting a KRG capable of combating Sunni Arab militancy even as it steps up its campaign against the PKK and other Kurdish militant groups operating on Turkish soil , especially since an independent Kurdistan would still depend on exporting its oil via Turkey. While this would only be one part of a new Middle Eastern cartography, it nonetheless would represent a constructive break from the ambiguity of the past two administrations. Parag Khanna is author, most recently, of *Technocracy in America: Rise of the Info-State and Connectography: Mapping the Future of Global Civilization*. This article tagged under:

Chapter 6 : How Do You Say "Fake News"™ in Russian? " Foreign Policy

*American Business and Foreign Policy: Cases in Coffee and Cocoa Trade Regulation (Routledge Library Editions: International Trade Policy) (Volume 1) [Joseph Short] on www.nxgvision.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Developing countries have for many decades waged a campaign for the global regulation of trade in primary products through international commodity agreements.*

International relations, " ; American Revolution ; American Revolutionary War ; Diplomacy in the American Revolutionary War ; and Diplomatic service of John Adams From the establishment of the United States after regional, not global, focus, but with the long-term ideal of creating an "Empire of Liberty. 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 was highly favorable to the United States which now could expand westward to the Mississippi River. Historian Samuel Flagg Bemis was a leading expert on diplomatic history. According to Jerold Combs: It emphasized the danger of American entanglement in European quarrels. European diplomacy in the eighteenth century was "rotten, corrupt, and perfidious," warned Bemis. Franklin, Jay, and Adams had done just this during the Revolution and as a consequence had won the greatest victory in the annals of American diplomacy. Bemis conceded that the French alliance had been necessary to win the war. Yet he regretted that it had brought involvement with "the baleful realm of European diplomacy. 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. However the foreign policy dispute polarized parties at home, leading to the First Party System. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. By the French were openly seizing American ships, leading to an undeclared war known as the Quasi-War of " President John Adams tried diplomacy; it failed. In , 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 XYZ Affair ignited a wave of nationalist sentiment. 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 War of [edit] Main article: 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 sailors on American ships who claimed American citizenship. American honor was humiliated by the British attack on the American warship the Chesapeake in The War of was marked by very bad planning and military fiascoes on both sides. It ended with the Treaty of Ghent in 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. After tensions de-escalated along the U. Boundary disputes were settled amicably. 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. John Quincy Adams was the leading American diplomat of the era. Mexico never recognized that Texas had achieved independence and promised war should the U. Polk peacefully resolved a border dispute with Britain regarding Oregon, then sent U. 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 the U. The result was a vast American expansion. The discovery of gold in California in brought a heavy demand for passage to the gold fields, with the main routes crossing Panama to avoid a very long slow sailing

voyage around all of South America. A railroad was built that carried , despite the dangerous environment in Panama. A canal in Nicaragua was a much more healthier and attractive possibility, and American businessmen gained the necessary permissions, along with a U. Britain had long dominated Central America, but American influence was growing, and the small countries look to the United States for protection against British imperialism. However the British were determined to block an American canal, and seized key locations on the mosquito coast on the Atlantic that blocked it. The Whigs were in charge in Washington and unlike the bellicose Democrats wanted a business-like peaceful solution. The Whigs took a lesson from the British experience monopolizing the chokepoint of Gibraltar, which produced no end of conflicts, wars, and military and naval expenses for the British. Tensions escalated locally, with small-scale physical confrontations in the field. To avert an escalating clash It focused on a Nicaragua Canal that would connect the Pacific and the Atlantic. The three main Treaty provisions stated that neither nation would build such a canal without the consent and cooperation of the other; neither would fortify or found new colonies in the region; if and when a canal was built, both powers would guarantee that it would be available on a neutral basis for all shipping. However, disagreements arose and no Nicaragua canal was ever started, but the treaty remained in effect until By , London dropped its opposition to American territorial expansion. Americans lost interest in canals and focused their attention on building long-distance railways. The British, meanwhile, turned their attention to building the Suez Canal through Egypt. London maintained a veto on on American canal building in Nicaragua. In s, the French made a major effort to build a canal through Panama, but it self-destructed through mismanagement, severe corruption, and especially the deadly disease environment. By the late s Britain saw the need for much improved relations with the United States, and agreed to allow the U. The choice was Panama. That marked a major diplomatic achievement for Secretary Seward and the Lincoln Administration. France therefore encouraged Britain in a policy of mediation suggesting that both would recognize the Confederacy. The British textile industry depended on cotton from the South, but it had stocks to keep the mills operating for a year and in any case the industrialists and workers carried little weight in British politics. Knowing a war would cut off vital shipments of American food, wreak havoc on the British merchant fleet, and cause the immediate loss of Canada, Britain, with its powerful Royal Navy, refused to go along with French schemes. Diplomats had to explain that United States was not committed to the ending of slavery, but instead they repeated legalistic arguments about the unconstitutionality of secession. Confederate spokesman, on the other hand, were much more successful by ignoring slavery and instead focusing on their struggle for liberty, their commitment to free trade, and the essential role of cotton in the European economy. In addition, the European aristocracy the dominant factor in every major country was "absolutely gleeful in pronouncing the and American debacle as proof that the entire experiment in popular government had failed. European government leaders welcomed the fragmentation of the ascendant American Republic. Large scale trade continued in both directions with the United States, with the Americans shipping grain to Britain while Britain sent manufactured items and munitions. Immigration continued into the United States. British trade with the Confederacy was limited, with a trickle of cotton going to Britain and some munitions slipped in by numerous small blockade runners. The Confederate strategy for securing independence was largely based on the hope of military intervention by Britain and France, but Confederate diplomacy proved inept. With the announcement of the Emancipation Proclamation in September , it became a war against slavery that most British supported. Public opinion in the Union called for war against Britain, but Lincoln gave in and sent back the diplomats his Navy had illegally seized. They were staffed by sailors and officers on leave from the Royal Navy. Navy captured one of the fast blockade runners, it sold the ship and cargo as prize money for the American sailors, then released the crew. A Confederate victory, on the other hand, would have meant a new birth of slavery, not freedom. Historian Fergus Bordewich, following Doyle, argues that: Confederate independence, on the other hand, would have established An American model for reactionary politics and race-based repression that would likely have cast an international shadow into the twentieth century and perhaps beyond. Confederation came in , in part as a way to meet the American challenge without depending on British armed forces. The Fenians movement collapsed from its own incompetence. The first ministry of William Gladstone withdrew from all its historic military and political responsibilities in North America. It

brought home its troops keeping Halifax as an Atlantic naval base , and turned responsibility over to the locals. That made it wise to unify the separate Canadian colonies into a self-governing confederation named the Dominion of Canada. Blaine[edit] James G. Blaine , a leading Republican and its losing candidate for president in was a highly innovative Secretary of State in the s. By , Blaine had completely abandoned his high-tariff Protectionism and used his position as Secretary of State to promote freer trade, especially within the Western Hemisphere. Secondly, he believed that by encouraging exports, he could increase American prosperity. At the same time, Blaine hoped to negotiate a peace in the War of the Pacific then being fought by Bolivia , Chile , and Peru. Blaine sought to expand American influence in other areas, calling for renegotiation of the Claytonâ€”Bulwer Treaty to allow the United States to construct a canal through Panama without British involvement, as well as attempting to reduce British involvement in the strategically located Kingdom of Hawaii. This all changed to , with the result of American ownership of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and a dominant role temporarily in Cuba. By the early s, the United States had a small army stationed at scattered Western forts, and an old fashioned wooden navy. By the U. In the business community in Kingdom of Hawaii overthrew the Queen and sought annexation by President Harrison , who forwarded the proposal to the Senate for approval. But the newly elected President Cleveland withdrew the proposed annexation; Hawaii formed an independent Republic of Hawaii. Unexpectedly foreign-policy became a central concern of American politics. Historian Henry Graff says that at first, "Public opinion at home seemed to indicate acquiescence His biographer Alyn Brodsky argues he was deeply adverse to an immoral action against the little kingdom: Just as he stood up for the Samoan Islands against Germany because he opposed the conquest of a lesser state by a greater one, so did he stand up for the Hawaiian Islands against his own nation. He could have let the annexation of Hawaii move inexorably to its inevitable culmination. But he opted for confrontation, which he hated, as it was to him the only way a weak and defenseless people might retain their independence.

Chapter 7 : American Foreign Policy: The Turning Point, News: The Independent Institute

The Russian media is obsessed with the American civil war. No, not the one that erupted in over the secession of the South—the civil war that's coming with the next U.S. presidential.

This is more than an academic exercise: Conservatives, for example, rank Ronald Reagan among our great presidents, which irritates the sensibilities of liberals. So too, conservatives scoff at the notion that Democrat Woodrow Wilson was anything other than a fuzzy headed internationalist who ended his life by relying on his wife to do the governing. Harding the poker playing near criminal, Richard Nixon the criminal who sometimes played poker and Calvin Coolidge, who served a single four-year term after succeeding Harding. When told that Coolidge had died, Dorothy Parker - the satirist and poet - issued the perfect descriptive: Yet even some of our worst presidents, Coolidge among them, understood and connected with the country. In January, in the midst of "the Roaring Twenties," the normally reticent Coolidge told a group of newspaper editors that "the business of America is business. Nowhere has the centrality of American business interests been more evident than in Syria and Egypt - nations in the throes of revolutionary changes wrought by the Arab Spring. In both countries, the U. In the immediate aftermath of the Syrian uprising in March of, the U. But the longer Assad held on, the more the U. In the aftermath of the coup, the Obama Administration struggled to find a proper response to the overthrow of the Mohamed Morsi government, engaging General Abdel-Fattah el-Sisi in a series of telephone conversations aimed at reassuring him of American support. At the same time, American policymakers pushed Sisi to shape a transition that would return the country to democracy. The messages were, in fact, contradictory: The incoherence of American policy on Syria and Egypt has provided fertile ground for White House critics, who condemn the president for caving in to ruthless dictators Assad, while snuggling up to selfproclaimed messiahs Sisi. Which is why, most recently, the Obama Administration has been following policies shorn of American ideals, while strengthening those that are pragmatic, feasible - and help the American economy. When Obama announced that the U. Egypt is 53rd, while Syria is th - behind the Maldives. We depend on Saudi oil while they depend on American weapons. Then too, the critics have it wrong. Even a cursory study of American economic interests helps to explain why, most recently, the Obama Administration has strengthened its relationship with Turkey our 10th largest agricultural export market and with whom we maintain a trade surplus and pursued an opening to Iran - whose economic growth, were it to be loosed, would likely dwarf that of any of its neighbors.

Chapter 8 : Foreign Policy: What Now? [www.nxgvision.com]

American Business & Foreign Policy the small or medium-sized enterprises across the country than was internationalist opinion. The sharpest controversies over all economic foreign policy.

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Chapter Seven Manifestations of the Open Door, After the end of World War I, the United States pursued the Open Door policy in a greater variety of geographical locations than it did the Closed Door because of the greater economic and political competition that existed outside the Western Hemisphere. In the case of the Far East the Open Door was invoked in response to general economic and political considerations, some of which dated back to at least, but all of which finally fell victim to the Manchurian crisis of In the other areas mentioned above, however, Washington officials went out of their way to apply the Open Door concept to aid the development of a single and relatively new industry. This was the petroleum industry, whose rapid postwar expansion created two general problems for the American government. One involved mediating domestic disputes between the large, vertically integrated oil companies and the small independent producers over such issues as tariff and transportation rates, conservation and leasing practices, and the stabilization of prices for crude oil. Both problems reached crisis proportions following World War I because of an exaggerated fear of an oil shortage between and, and then a lingering suspicion among many government officials and businessmen for the rest of the decade that Open Door the oil reserves in the United States and Mexico were rapidly being depleted. Although neither condition materialized, both critics of and apologists for the industry contended that everything, from modern civilization and world peace to national security and the new standard of living represented by the automobile, depended upon the efficient as well as sufficient extraction of oil from domestic and foreign sources. His closest adviser on oil matters was a personal friend and fellow engineer from California, Mark L. Accordingly Requa confided to oilman J. Howard Pew in, "It is up to industry. I do not believe in undue or unnecessary government interference or tinkering. The result was rampant competition and overproduction at home and abroad by the end of the decade. The ABA Journal explained this apparent industrial insanity by noting the obvious: It consisted of an understanding between government officials, engineers, military personnel, and conservationists in regard to those resources considered essential to the national interest. It was based on a relatively simple thesis which emphasized the necessity of standardizing costs and of employing new methods to discover, develop, and conserve oil and other strategic raw materials within the United States, while exploiting those same resources abroad behind the banner of the Open Door. National defense and security constituted, therefore, the major rationale behind the conservation of the domestic oil fields. Even though the board was created on the You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 9 : The business of American foreign policy - Daily Sabah

Washington And The World. America Needs a Corporate Foreign Policy. How Donald Trump and Rex Tillerson can bring business savvy and order to the messy task of running the world.

Senate, the President of the United States negotiates treaties with foreign nations, but treaties enter into force only if ratified by two-thirds of the Senate. Both the Secretary of State and ambassadors are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The United States Secretary of State acts similarly to a foreign minister and under Executive leadership is the primary conductor of state-to-state diplomacy. Powers of the Congress[edit] Main articles: Constitution gives much of the foreign policy decision-making to the presidency, but the Senate has a role in ratifying treaties, and the Supreme Court interprets treaties when cases are presented to it. Congress is the only branch of government that has the authority to declare war. Furthermore, Congress writes the civilian and military budget, thus has vast power in military action and foreign aid. Congress also has power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. These policies became the basis of the Federalist Party in the 1790s, but the rival Jeffersonians feared Britain and favored France in the 1800s, declaring the War of 1812 on Britain. After the alliance with France, the U.S. Initially these were uncommon events, but since WWII, these have been made by most presidents. Jeffersonians vigorously opposed a large standing army and any navy until attacks against American shipping by Barbary corsairs spurred the country into developing a naval force projection capability, resulting in the First Barbary War in 1801. The short experiment in imperialism ended by 1823, as the U.S. It became the basis of the German Armistice which amounted to a military surrender and the Paris Peace Conference. In the 1920s, the United States followed an independent course, and succeeded in a program of naval disarmament, and refunding the German economy. Operating outside the League it became a dominant player in diplomatic affairs. New York became the financial capital of the world, [8] but the Wall Street Crash of 1929 hurled the Western industrialized 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. Winston Churchill, 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. 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. President Richard Nixon, After the war, the U.S. Almost immediately, however, the world witnessed division into broad two camps during the Cold War; one side was led by the U.S. This 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 to limit Soviet expansion, and a series of proxy wars were fought with mixed results. 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. In domestic politics, foreign policy is not usually a central issue. In 1964 the Democratic Party took a strong anti-Communist line and supported wars in Korea and Vietnam. Then the party split with a strong, "dovish", pacifist element typified by presidential candidate George McGovern. Many "hawks", advocates for war, joined the Neoconservative movement and started supporting the Republicans especially Reagan based on foreign policy. Taft, and an internationalist wing based in the East and led by Dwight D. Eisenhower defeated Taft for the nomination largely on foreign policy grounds. Since then the Republicans have been characterized by a hawkish and intense American nationalism, and strong opposition to

Communism, and strong support for Israel. Substantial problems remain, such as climate change, nuclear proliferation, and the specter of nuclear terrorism. Foreign policy analysts Hachigian and Sutphen in their book *The Next American Century* suggest all five powers have similar vested interests in stability and terrorism prevention and trade; if they can find common ground, then the next decades may be marked by peaceful growth and prosperity. The *New York Times* reported on the eve of his first foreign trip as president: For foreign leaders trying to figure out the best way to approach an American president unlike any they have known, it is a time of experimentation. Embassies in Washington trade tips and ambassadors send cables to presidents and ministers back home suggesting how to handle a mercurial, strong-willed leader with no real experience on the world stage, a preference for personal diplomacy and a taste for glitz. Keep it short – no minute monologue for a second attention span. Do not assume he knows the history of the country or its major points of contention. Compliment him on his Electoral College victory. Contrast him favorably with President Barack Obama. Do not get hung up on whatever was said during the campaign. Stay in regular touch. Do not go in with a shopping list but bring some sort of deal he can call a victory. The chief diplomat was Secretary of State Rex Tillerson. His major foreign policy positions, which sometimes are at odds with Trump, include: Treaties are formal written agreements specified by the Treaty Clause of the Constitution. The President makes a treaty with foreign powers, but then the proposed treaty must be ratified by a two-thirds vote in the Senate. For example, President Wilson proposed the Treaty of Versailles after World War I after consulting with allied powers, but this treaty was rejected by the Senate; as a result, the U.S. While most international law has a broader interpretation of the term treaty, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the power to make treaties under the U.S. Constitution is a power separate from the other enumerated powers of the federal government, and hence the federal government can use treaties to legislate in areas which would otherwise fall within the exclusive authority of the states. Executive agreements are made by the President “in the exercise of his Constitutional executive powers” alone. Congressional-executive agreements are made by the President and Congress. A majority of both houses makes it binding much like regular legislation after it is signed by the president. The Constitution does not expressly state that these agreements are allowed, and constitutional scholars such as Laurence Tribe think they are unconstitutional. Further, the United States incorporates treaty law into the body of U.S. law. As a result, Congress can modify or repeal treaties afterward. It can overrule an agreed-upon treaty obligation even if this is seen as a violation of the treaty under international law. *Covert*, as well as a lower court ruling in *Garcia-Mir v. United States*. Further, the Supreme Court has declared itself as having the power to rule a treaty as void by declaring it “unconstitutional”, although as of now, it has never exercised this power. Generally, when the U.S. However, as a result of the *Reid v. Covert* decision, the U.S. International agreements [edit] The United States has ratified and participates in many other multilateral treaties, including arms control treaties especially with the Soviet Union, human rights treaties, environmental protocols, and free trade agreements. The United States is also member of: