

**People's Democratic Republic of Algeria**

**Mohammed Kheider University- Biskra**

**Faculty of Arts and Foreign Languages**

**Department of Foreign Languages**

**Section of English**

A Dissertation Submitted in a Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements  
for the Master Degree in Civilization and Literature

**American Fault Lines along the  
Development of US Foreign Policy and the  
World Order**

**Submitted by:**

Salah Djeddi

**Supervised by:**

Mr. M. Touati

Academic year

2012/ 2013

**Abstract**

The present dissertation looks into the development of American fault lines along within US diplomacy. It is an attempt to discuss the “fault lines” that have always shaped the American foreign policy especially within the fall of the rival ideology in 1990. World events have changed and a requirement to build new concepts through which the US foreign policy has to meet those changes. Moreover, the research attempts to unveil the motives, goals and nature of US fault lines in the post Cold-War era during the presidency of George Bush Sr. till the end of Bush Jr. During the entire work, there is an emphasis on how did those fault lines have shifted from era to another in accordance to the new global power balances and the nation’s growth. The first chapter demonstrates how war and territorial expansion have been a US central policy to the formation of the new nation and how Americans came to protect those nation’s borders that represented the early US fault lines and which by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century extended to result in a total US hegemony on the Western Hemisphere. The second chapter tries to shed light on the shift in US fault lines that was re-directed to the protection of US Western allies, US liberalistic ideology and interests during the Cold War (1945-1990). The last chapter then focuses on the post-Cold War American foreign policy and the new American vision to their new world order where they are the sole remaining superpower after the Soviet collapse. Under this new order, Americans moved ahead to determine new enmities on the level of the security agenda as well as to reconstruct the old fault lines and to give birth to a new ones by setting new concepts whose main goal is a US total global hegemony.

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is lovingly dedicated to my Mother

*“Mahdjoub Berguella”*

Her support, encouragement, and constant love

have sustained me throughout my life.

To my Father **“Bachir”** for his devotion to my education

and to my family for their patience

To all my brothers and my sisters

I love you Mom thank you for everything you gave to me

## **Acknowledgements**

At the outset, I have to express my sincere gratitude to Allah. Then, first of all, I would like to express my extreme thanks to my supervisor and teacher Mr. Mourad Touati for his perfect sense of understanding, for being kind enough to accept directing this work with all his academic engagements and for his support and guidance. He was an immeasurable source of insightful advice.

I would also similarly to thank the jury members who accepted to read and appraise this work and for any remarks they would make to refine it.

I am likewise immensely grateful to all those who have taught and trained me here at Mohamedd Kheidar University of Biskra

I am especially thankful to my friends and colleagues who helped me with references particularly to Miss.Daouia. A great gratitude goes to my friend Mr. Badreddine Chebhi for his great help.

Special and endless thanks to my parents, my brothers; Mustapha, Sahnoune, Lahcen and Bouzid as well as my sisters; Hayat, Ghania, Razika and Saliha.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	i
Dedication .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	iii
List of Abbreviation .....	vii
Introduction .....	1
 <b>I. Chapter One : American Foreign Policy during the First Isolationist Age</b>	
I.1. George Washington Proclamation of Neutrality.....	6
I.2. The Monroe Doctrine .....	7
I.3. Theodore Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine.....	9
I.4. The Open Door Policy .....	10
I.5. The Dollar Diplomacy.....	11
I.6. Wilson Attempt to Maintain Neutrality before the Great War .....	12
I.7. The USA during WWI.....	14
I.8. Post War Wilsonian Idealism in Making Peace.....	15
I.9. A Return to Isolationism.....	16
I.10. The Good Neighbor Policy.....	17
I.11. American Fault Lines during the First Age of US Foreign Policy .....	19

## **II. Chapter Two: American Foreign Policy during the Cold War Era (1945-1990)**

II.1. The Rise of Dictatorships.....	24
II.2.The USA at War again .....	26
II.3. East-West Rivalry and the Cold War.....	28
II.4. Containment Policy.....	29
II.4.1. Truman Doctrine.....	30
II.4.2. Marshal Plan.....	31
II.4.3. N.A.T.O Formation.....	33
II.5. American Fault Lines during the Cold War Era (1945.1990) .....	34
II.5.1. US and Europe.....	34
II.5.2. US and the Middle East.....	35
II.5.3. US and Asia.....	38
<b>III. Chapter Three : Post-Cold War American Foreign Policy</b>	
III.1. Collapse of the Soviet Union.....	41
III.2. A New World Order.....	43
III.3. A New Cultural Fault Lines.....	47
III.4. Islamic Rivalry as a New Ideological Fault Line.....	49
III.5. China as a New Economic Fault Line.....	52
III.6. The Preventive War, the Potential Enemy and the War on Terror .....	54

III.7. The Project For a ‘New Middle East’ and the Creative Anarchy .....	57
Conclusion .....	61
Bibliography .....	65

## **List of Abbreviations**

**USA:** United States of America.

**USSR:** Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

**PRC:** People's Republic of China.

**NATO:** North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

**UN:** United Nations.

**IMF:** International Monetary Fund.

**NSC:** National Security Council.

**NSC-68:** National Security Council Resolution 68.

**WMD:** Weapons of Mass Destruction.

**PNAC:** Project for the New American Century.

**BTO:** Brussels Treaty Organization.

**ERP:** European Recovery Program.

**WTO:** World Trade Organization



## **Introduction**

The American foreign policy underwent different changes considering the world environment and the nation's growth. America's instability after independence led the new nation to adopt a strict isolationist policy along which the USA stuck to neutrality because it was newly founded. It tried to avoid any collision with any superpower so that not to put its fate in at risk with the existing European imperial powers. Isolationism then tended to preserve American freedom and independence by staying aloof from political commitments in the Old World.

However, factors whether internal or external changed and hence the national security and interests as concepts changed totally. Along decades, the Americans moved ahead determining new fault lines, new adversaries and therefore an urgent need to back these ideological and cultural convictions. As a consequence, the concept that followed successively; Monroe doctrine, Corollary policy, Open Door policy, Dollar diplomacy, isolationism, interventionism and finally globalism are only concepts to unveil the US policy and reconstruction of the fault lines.

The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 heralded the closure of the long ideological confrontation with communism. It was the end of the Cold War that dominated the international relations for about four decades and a half and that divided the globe into two ideological camps that are communism and capitalism. The fall of the Communist Bloc and the end of the Cold War era were a turning point in the traditional World Order where two blocs used to influence, to compete, to collide, or even to wage wars by proxy. It was also the end of an old order characterized by a bipolar world on which the international system was built upon its balance of power and terror.

In fact the Cold War ended in a peaceful and it way meant other things to the Americans. It meant that they have actually won the war and generated in their minds the idea that their ideology of democratic liberalism has triumphed globally and hence was universally valid. Being the sole winner meant to the Americans they deserved the booty of war and world leadership.

Moreover, such a fall of a rival paved the way to the American to consider themselves as a unique leader for international politics, to create a New World Order from a position of unrivalled power and as a matter of duty to reorganize the world allies and to fix new fault lines and new enmities that may hamper Americans in expanding their hegemony.

The term 'Fault Lines' which the whole research is centered on is a concept developed by Huntington in his 1997 book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* to denote the limiting edges and intolerable breaches of any nation or individual to American interests, vital environment and security.

The main question with which this dissertation deals is what fault lines Americans have tended to reconstruct and consider since they found themselves free of rivalry and to what extent Americans have shaped the new concepts to meet such a change and what new enmity to divert Americans attention .

The main motive behind this research is the fact that I am a student in US studies and I have some inclination to foreign political events that are mostly initiated whether by Americans or their allies. In addition, I feel a certain plan to study the development of American foreign policy in contemporary time without forgetting these metamorphoses that have preceded nowadays politics.

The research is an attempt to discuss the “fault lines” that have always shaped the American foreign policy especially within the fall of rivalries. It is of great importance because it sheds the light on a momentous and modern global political issue that came to overshadow and shape the international politics after 1990. It aimed to inquire into the fault lines of US foreign policy in the post-Cold War era, its motives, goals and nature.

Due to the scarcity of useful and authentic resources, I have faced certain hindrances that could delay our research added to the time factor.

For the sake of answering this question, I would opt for a descriptive approach, so for anything to be valued as core to the study along my reading is to be described and analyzed. The nature of the topic under study dictates on any researcher to follow the criteria of a descriptive approach. All data (gathered information) would be included and acknowledged through my descriptive work.

The following study would be expanded through three chapters. The first one is devoted to a description of the first stage of development of US foreign policy that is isolationism. In this chapter, I am going to shed light on the origins of US isolationism that was initiated by Washington and reinforced by Monroe.

Understanding the main US diplomacy’s aspects helps study the present American foreign policy stance and provides us with the major guidelines which are influencing the American political thought to this day. The chapter examines the geographical and economic expansion of the USA under the different concepts; Monroe Doctrine, the Corollary policy, the Open Door and the Dollar diplomacy by which the US could exert on the Western Hemisphere as the first vital environment of US fault lines, and then gradually on a world scale .

The chapter ends with the main element discussing the major fault lines that shaped that era and which were mainly centered on the preservation of American freedom and independence that were in permanent threats from the European imperial powers mainly Britain . The second major fault line was represented in the security of US interests in that Western Hemisphere through the Monroe Doctrine that denied any further European extension and made the Americas an American sphere of influence and established the ideological basis for US hegemony on the region by following on energetic pattern of expansion .

Expansionism was a fundamental policy in the new nation's ideology and the acquisition of all continental areas of the country beyond the original colonies is a dramatic evidence of expansionism, that is, in other words was the expansion of US fault lines.

The second chapter is devoted to study the era of US interventionism between 1945 and 1990. The coming of the Second World War witnessed the end of the American isolationist policy, which seemed impractical and no longer appropriate to safeguard American interests and dominance over the world. The new policy involved a direct US involvement in world affairs and was characterized by a severe Cold War between the capitalist camp led by the USA and the communist one led by the USSR during which each side accused the other of seeking to expand its version of ideology. Thus, US fault lines witnessed a noticeable shift, there was a subsequent change according to new global challenges presented mainly in the communist threat. US fault lines therefore came to be focused on two dominant issues ; bringing security to US Western allies mainly in Europe, Asia and the Middle East, and the preservation, promotion and spread of its liberal democratic ideology in a severe war of ideologies with communism. Thus, US

policy makers thought the only way to do so was by controlling the communist expansion through the containment policy. The protection of US interests particularly in the oil- rich Middle East constituted also another major fault line that hold a top priority.

The last chapter then deals with the last decade of the late twentieth century and the fall of ideological rival. Such a fall of rival paved the way to the Americans to consider themselves as the sole winner and henceforth deserve the world leadership and to be a unique leader for international politics and as a matter of duty to reorganize the world allies through one socio-politico-economic ideology where the new map of the world would drafted by the sole winner. In accordance, Americans moved ahead determining new fault lines and new adversaries to maintain their global leading position.

Reconstruction of the old fault lines therefore presented the main idea of this chapter dealing with the era that 1990 till 2010 during which new cultural, ideological and economic measures were taken into consideration. In this context, the chapter examines the way America came to define threats to its own security and interests coming mainly from Islam as a new rival and China as an economic challenge. It deals also with the new concepts that America has set in order to lead such hegemony and meet the new changes and challenges so that to remain a world unique leader.

## **I. Chapter One: American Foreign Policy during the First Isolationist Age**

### **Introduction**

Because any study of any current foreign policy issue of the present American empire should better commence by some understanding of its major historical aspects that help explains the way how it has evolved to such status, the first chapter is a brief description of America's isolationist foreign policy beginning from the early days of the republic to the outbreak of the Second World War. American isolationism was firstly initiated by Washington and reinforced by Monroe, the policy aimed at preserving the political and economic stability of the country newly established. The chapter highlights the diplomatic weight of the successive concepts undertaken during that era and explains its motives, objectives and factors contributing to each option. It also gives a brief insight into US economic and territorial expansion in the Western Hemisphere.

At the end of chapter, special emphasis is given to the fault lines that shaped the whole era represented mainly in the preservation of American independence, freedom and territorial integrity threatened by the existing European imperial powers. Insisting US hegemony in the Western Hemisphere through the Monroe Doctrine and protecting US economic interests through the Open Door Policy in China represented then the second top priority. The two doctrines enlarged US fault lines and made the Western Hemisphere and east-Asia an American vital environment.

#### **I.1. George Washington Proclamation of Neutrality**

The origins of American isolationism could be traced back to the early US President George Washington's Proclamation of Neutrality in April 1793 when the war between France and Britain broke out. The outbreak of European war between the two

giants put the US officials in a dilemma. America was still an ally of France under the 1778 Treaty of Alliance according to which the USA was formally bound in case of war to help defend France. After an official meeting with his Cabinet members, Washington wanted to avoid any kind of war. However, France used the treaty as an effective Cause to get America's help. As a response, Washington following his prominent Cabinet member Hamilton's advice issued a Presidential Proclamation of Neutrality in April 1793 in which he declared the USA a neutral state saying that the treaty of Alliance of 1778 was signed with the king of France ,Monarchy, not with the republic and now the monarchy exists no more (M. Jones 82 – 83).

Washington's decision of neutrality was proclaimed because stability was needed to the young country, he made sure that a new war would certainly weaken the newly formed nation. Moreover, the American political opinion about with whom the USA would side was divided. The Republicans led by a Francophile, Thom as Jefferson, Wanted to side with France, and the Federalists led by an Anglophile, Alexander Hamilton, wanted to side with Britain by abrogating the 1778 Treaty with France. So, Washington skillfully solved the problem through his proclamation of neutrality (Akis and Streich 3).

## **I.2. The Monroe Doctrine**

Following the path of George Washington, President James Monroe reinforced the diplomatic policy of isolation in conducting the nation's foreign affairs through his message to congress on December 2, 1823 in which he warned the European powers not to intervene in Latin American, Western Hemisphere, and in return, the USA would never involve itself in the European events and affairs. According to Bardes, this policy is

regarded as the cornerstone that paved the way to the establishment of American isolationist policy along the eighteenth century (532).

During the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, much of Latin American's nations were under the Spanish control. By 1820, the American independence movements were spreading and revolting against their colonizers. Meanwhile, Spain demanded the military help of European nations in order to gain back its former Latin American rebellious colonies. Those events sounded unpleasantly and aroused anxiety in the USA since the rebellious colonies were American's neighboring ones, Americans became very concerned. As a reaction, President Monroe refused to tolerate with any farther extension of European domination in the Americas and stated that the American continents were no longer open to colonization by European powers. He warned that any kind of intervention in any Western Hemisphere country would be a dangerous step, "The American Continents are henceforth not be considered as subjects for future colonization by European powers." He added, "We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." (qtd. in O'Callaghan 85) . Monroe's words from that time have been a key stone to the American foreign policy, they came to be called the Monroe Doctrine (85).

According to Joy, the Monroe's policy that was introduced to Latin America was interpreted by foreign policy scholars in two major ways. On the one hand, there had been the classical traditional vision that asserted that the USA by doing so was behaving ethically by preserving and freeing the newly independent Latin republics from European domination by means of warning them to stay out of the continent's affairs. On the other one, there had been another completely different view that claims that such act was an aggression and considered it an attempt to dominate the continent and to exert US



hegemony on Latin America in which European participation was unwelcome. Like so, the Monroe Doctrine was the first American overseas commitment that established the ideological basis for US hegemony in the Western Hemisphere and therefore was a unilateral declaration made by the US government on this region of the world (40).

### **I.3. Theodore Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine**

Under the Theodore Roosevelt's administration, the Monroe Doctrine was interpreted and reinforced to justify the intervention of the United States in the domestic affairs of Latin America's nations through strengthening Monroe's doctrine. T.Roosevelt's aim was to bring more security and stability to the Latin American continent and to prevent any European possibility of intervention in there. He claimed that his country would intervene there whenever the situation urged that. Accordingly, the Roosevelt administration by this corollary justified subsequent American interventions in the area and made of Latin America's region a US sphere of influence where American troops were often sent only to serve the US interests and strategy. Eventually, American intervention there was frequently resented by the Latin Americans (O' Callaghan 85).

The Dominican Republic was heavily indebted to various European nations in 1904 which threatened to use force to collect payments. In order to prevent such an action, President Roosevelt issued to Congress his famous 'corollary' announcing:

Chronic doing ... may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrong doing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power. (qtd. in Akis and Streich 60)

This amplification to the Monroe Doctrine became known as the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe doctrine. Roosevelt's new concept was firstly applied in the Dominican Republic when the USA has intervened there and has took over its customs collections to pay its foreign debts. The corollary was again used to defend and justify US intervention in Cuba, Nicaragua, Mexico, and Haiti (60).

#### **I.4. The Open Door Policy**

The open Door Policy was a concept within the American foreign policy that was introduced in 1899 by US Secretary of State John Hay concerning trade in China, the new diplomatic concept was in the form of circular notes sent to the major European trading powers in China urging Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy as well as Japan to respect the principle of equal access privilege of trade in China. The notes states that all European nations and the United states were allowed to trade within China without restriction by other countries but only in support of the national Chinese territorial and administrative unity. However, this principle had already been shaped and stipulated in the previous Anglo –Chinese Treaties of trade by which Britain took the lion's share of interests more than any other power. Moreover, US' main fear was the fact that China was about to become largely broken up into economic segments dominated by various imperial powers where the USA is completely ignored. In his important notes, Hay clearly opposed the European step of sending military troops to North China in an attempt to suppress the Boxer Rebellion and consider that as a danger to the safety of China's territorial and administrative unity since every side seemed to exercise its absolute power on its occupied sphere. As a response, many European powers agreed on the idea that later on has become a trading – law in the far – East China.

The Open Door Policy was accompanied with several important events in US history; the Economic Depression of the 1890's stressed the need for new international markets where the US could export its production. Meanwhile the USA had just gained new areas such as the Philippines, Guam and Hawaii after the Spanish – American war and turned its attention to China. In such a way the Open Door Policy agreement was so significant and remained the cornerstone of US foreign policy towards China until the rise of the communist regime in 1949 (“Open Door Policy”).

### **I.5. The Dollar Diplomacy**

During the presidential term of William Howard Taft in the early 1900's, a new diplomatic policy was established known as ‘Dollar Diplomacy’ that accordingly American foreign policy makers encouraged American bankers and businesses to invest abroad. The new policy involved investing in foreign nations especially those which have great strategic importance to the USA such as Latin American. Taft administration's main goal was to strengthen the US political position. In other words, this diplomacy had more political significance and was therefore a big demonstration of the close connection between the American foreign policy and American business interests that itself was interpreted in new way known as “Dollar Diplomacy”. Beneficiaries of Dollar Diplomacy were in a difficult position, sometimes they shafted at being ordered around by the USA and claimed that American firms and companies that were brought into their borders have used their powerful economic position only to serve their homeland's political and economic interests rather than the countries where they are working. However, other times, those foreign leaders looked at the American investments as a way by which their countries had greatly benefited from the experience and services of those American firms

in the way that they have brought with them new jobs, new technology and more than that they have noticeably improved their people's living conditions (O' Callaghan 87) .

### **I.6. Wilson Attempt to Maintain Neutrality before the Great War**

In August 1914, the entire continent of Europe was brought to a huge and disastrous war that marked the starting point of a conflict which lasted for more than four years. The Great War as it was called resulted in the death of millions, it was one of the most violent and destructive wars that played a major role in changing the world's history. The conflict involved two coalitions of European countries, the first coalition known as the Allies included France, Great Britain and Russia. The Central powers, which opposed them, were Germany and Austria (O' Callaghan 88). Americans were shocked out of insular complacency when the great powers suddenly declared war on one another, they believed that the war would be short and sharp. However, as a reaction, the US following its foreign policy traditions of isolationism since the time of George Washington declared US Neutrality in the conflict that later on came to be called the World War I through the Proclamation of Neutrality that was issued by President Wilson in August 1914. Both American administration and public opinion thought that the war was not their cause and that they should not involve themselves. Wilson argued that the fighting would be far away and seemed to threaten no vital interests when he said, " The European war was one which we have nothing to do, whose causes cannot touch us," (qtd. in M. Jones 412).

However, in reality as the war progressed, Wilson's neutrality was challenged by some factors. The first challenge was the public opinion, though Americans wanted to keep out of the conflict, but not for long because emotionally they were not neutral. They sympathized with the Allies for three reasons. First, Germany was behaving in an

extraordinary cruelty and ruthlessness especially towards the neutral Belgian civilians. Second, a vast number of the American population had strong ties of blood with England, they saw the war as one that was launched against their ancestors and their race. Third, there was a widespread political affinity between the US and the allies and both of them were parliamentary democracies whereas the Central Powers were military autocracies and this meant that the war was one between democracies and despotism. Moreover, the challenge to neutrality was that of profit, the US had greatly benefited by shipping vast supplies of munitions to the Allies and any stoppage would mean automatically a victory of the central powers countries since the Allies were not able enough to provide their needs for the war comparing to the massive German arms industries. The last challenge to neutrality was represented in the new German powerful weapon of war that was U-boats, a submarine that had frequently made destructive attacks on American merchant ships in the Seas (Whithfield 20).

In addition to the Proclamation of Neutrality, President Wilson tried to convince his public to be neutral in thought as well in actions and as the war progressed, Americans tried hard to stay apart from the European conflict. The allies cleverly exploited the American prejudices and Germans led an extensive propaganda campaign but none could alter the American attitude. Moreover, Germany was committing acts against the American shipping in High Seas brought sharp protest from the Wilson's administration but Wilson still remained aloof from the European conflict. On the contrary, the American President continued his efforts to convince the main countries fighting the war to work for peace as he called a "peace without victory" because victory "would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed on the vanquished," said Wilson. But Neither the Allies nor the Central Powers gave importance to his advice.

On the contrary they were confident that they could achieve a military victory (M. Jones 417- 20).

### **I.7. The USA during WWI**

Although the USA remained neutral along the first three years of the war, both Britain and Germany did not respect the neutral right for Free Trading in the Sea, Freedom of the Seas, because of the lack of international laws to protect the rights of neutrals during wartimes. On the one hand, Britain blockaded Germany and declared that the North Sea and the English Channel were 'military areas' aiming at restricting American trade with the Central Powers, it seized and searched neutral American ships and examined mail passing between the USA and Germany . As a reaction, the US protested against to what it called a 'palpable violation' of American neutral right. However, no severe action was ensued. On the other one, Germany was determined to stop the flow of American munitions and products to the allies and claimed that such an action itself is a big demonstration of US partiality to the allies. The climax came when a German leader, Bernstorff, informed the US administration that after the first February Germany would destroy and sink all merchant vessels armed or unarmed within the military zone around the British Isles and the Mediterranean. This declaration did not sound well in America and Wilson asked the Germans not to commit such a folly and aggressive step. Therefore, the diplomatic relations between the two countries quickly worsened, Wilson called for an "armed neutrality". A month later, the German submarines torpedoed five American merchant vessels and sank the big British passenger ship "Lusitania" and more than 1.000 passengers died among which more than one hundred Americans. At this point, President Wilson realized that an American intervention had become necessary and that it was time

to declare war and this he came to realize before in 1916 when he warned his countrymen that in order to preserve the national honor, America might participate in the war noting:

I know that you're depending on me to keep this nation out of the war ... therefore there may at any moment come a time when I cannot preserve both honor and the peace of the USA .Do not exact of me an impossible and contradictory thing. ( qtd. in Morison and Commager 467).

In addition to, the German declaration, in 1917, America announced 'Zimmerman Note' that Claimed that the German government has sent a telegram to Mexicans trying to persuade them to join an alliance with Germany and to declare war on the US and in return they will receive their lost territories that were once acquired by the US including Texas, New Mexico and Arizona.

In America, it was so clear that time for war had come, and Wilson made sure that time for neutrality was over. "The United State entered the war," Wilson said. On April 2, 1917, the President appeared before Congress and read his famous war message.

In fact, this decision had been later on condemned as a mistake and Wilson was referred to as a man with a lack of far vision into the future. His critics viewed that he has broken the nation's long traditions of isolationism for the first time in America's history and it was confirmed at the end that the war brought nothing to the US but debts and disappointments and favored the allies to win the war, but that victory was not sealed by a just peace (466- 470).

### **I.8. Post War Wilsonian Idealism in Making Peace**

President Wilson had frequently insisted his justification to the US entrance to the war by stressing the idea that the American intervention to the struggle was not directed

against the German people but against their cruel and autocratic government's leaders (O' Callaghan 91) . By the end of the war, Europe seemed vastly devastated and Wilson's speeches about peace and global justice that were laden with lofty idealism made him a very popular man, he soon won the hearts of millions. The most important of all was Wilson's Fourteen Points Program that was accepted by the German government as a basis for peace negotiations and therefore played a major role in ending the long struggle by bringing the German to sign the armistice. But things did not go as Wilson wished, European imperial powers continued to behave wrongly and this truth become apparent in 1917 when the Bolshevik Russian Government managed to disclose secret treaties among the allies aiming at dividing their enemies colonies. President Wilson in a memorable speech to Congress on January 8,1998 outlined the war aims and embodied a set of 14 proposales known as the 'Fourteen Points 'for maintaining a peace following the war in which he stated his global vision to what would make the world safe and democratic. The fourteen points required nations to stop making secret diplomacy by following an open covenants, freedom of the seas in peace and war, the removal of international economic barriers and the establishment of equality and free trade between all nations, a reduction of military forces and armaments and the most important point of all was the creation of an international association of nations whose main goal is to establish international peace and to guarantee political independence and territorial integrity as well as to promote the principles of collective security and this what came to be known later on as the League of Nations (Reeves 74-75).

### **I.9. A Return to Isolationism**

The post-World War I period saw a real return to the traditional line of isolation in the American foreign policy by withdrawing from the international stage. The period was



often referred to as the most isolationist time in American history during which the USA refused to join the membership of the League of Nations that President Wilson himself made great efforts to set up in the Versailles Treaty (Kalaitzidis and Streich 96). Isolationism during this era seemed to be exceptional since it was not limited to the diplomatic and political area but also to the economic and even moral issues. There seemed to exist a total economic boy-cott with the external world when many leaders dallied with the notion of economic self sufficiency by ignoring the international spread of American trade and investments. Moreover, in addition to the political and economic isolationism, there was a wide spread belief that the USA was morally superior to the Old World's nations. American foreign policy makers had determined that their country could better safeguard its moral superiority if it would not be involved in the contamination with the Old World secret politics, wars racial hatred and decadent cultures (Morison and Commager 643).

#### **I.10. The Good Neighbor Policy**

The two post WWI decades witnessed practically and to a far extent a real modification to the traditional American foreign policy that once came to be called the 'Monroe Doctrine' and which was at a time adopted towards Latin America and the far East. The policy that lasted for more than a century seemed tenable and no longer appropriate to safeguard American vital interests. American policymakers realized that foreign diplomacy that was one day issued by Monroe could be better maintained if it would be modified into a new simpler and acceptable way using new means so that to meet the new changes and challenges In the Latin continent . Accordingly, the Philippine Independence Act, the abrogation of the Platt amendment in 1934, the repudiation of Dollar Diplomacy in the Caribbean, the abandonment of the Roosevelt Corollary and

finally the encouragement of Pan-American guarantee to the Monroe Doctrine had well illustrated and shaped the new American foreign political approach that came to exist. However, that did not refer to a failure to the previous traditional approach rather than a necessity to adopt a new one.

It was the Wilson's administration that theoretically had already broached this new conception which involved a modification to the conception of Monroe when promising for a new better Latin America and supporting a Pan-American League of Nations that would encourage the importance principle of cooperative work and policies that would affect the Western Hemisphere . The new diplomacy aimed mainly at what President Franklin Delano Roosevelt called a 'Good Neighbor Policy' (Morison and Commager 510 -14).

In his first inaugural address on March 4, 1933, President Roosevelt indicated that his administration was eager to adopt a new policy toward Latin America saying:

In the field of world policy, I would dedicate this nation to the Policy of the good neighbor, the neighbor who resolutely Respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others, the neighbor who respects his obligation and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors. (qtd. in Schlesinger et al. 286).

The new policy was in its profound meaning a policy of restraints toward Latin America and there force constituted a real break with the past, however, it made the US a more powerful friend and protector of the Western Hemisphere and created good relations with nations of Latin America. By doing so, President Roosevelt tried to put an end to what his predecessors called 'the Big Stick Policy' and established the good neighbor policy. The Roosevelt administration acted in accordance with this principle

when American troops were removed from Cuba in 1922 and from Santo Domingo in 1924. The new diplomacy also resulted in a new strategic agreements with Latin American nations that encouraged a trade without barriers, president F.D Roosevelt wanted to enforce in practice the idea that the USA would no longer intervene in Latin America to protect private American properties and interests (M. Jones 481 - 83).

### **I.11. American Fault Lines during the First Age of US Foreign Policy**

From the early days of the American Republic, fault lines have always been shaping its foreign policy issues, the first of these lines was the American independence which came as the top priority for the nation under the colonial British control (Martel 1). American founding fathers declared on July 2, 1776, “these United States are and of right ought to be free and independent states.” The declaration of independence issued on July 4 is regarded as the most important document in America’s history that was engineered by one of those prominent leaders named ‘Thomas Jefferson’. It gave birth to the new nation and highlighted the American independence as well as it has paved the way to the establishment of the new nation’s ideology which was one day created by those great Western thinkers such as John Lock who insisted on the need to democratic representatives chosen by people (O’Callaghan 29-30 ).

The USA which from a small colony planted in the seventeenth century in the North Continent grew to be a world power that became by the twentieth century an empire in its own right. From 1776 to 1815 , Americans tended to preserve their independence, protect their commerce and secure their territorial integrity that were in permanent threat induced by the imperial powers represented mainly in the former colonial Britain which even after its abandonment of its thirteen colonies control continued to practice an extreme containment on the newly established republic by

monopolizing its natural and maritime resources, the thing that resulted in a second war known as the American British War of 1812 that confirmed at the end the US supremacy and dominance on its territorial borders and the continent . The war of 1812 in fact was fought to secure the nation's territory against belligerents (Martel 2-3).

However, it was obvious that from the very beginning the USA has followed an energetic pattern of expansion. The first successful implementation of this was the 1803 Louisiana Purchase from France which was probably the most valuable event in America's history that doubled the size of the nation. Florida was then the next step to be gained from the weakened Spain under duress in 1819. In the 1840's, James Polk was America's President and with him emerged the ideology of 'Manifest Destiny' which was later on the national justification of all expansionist occupations. Polk wanted in fact to spread America's culture and democratic ideals (11). In accordance, the US waged a war with Mexico in 1848, with the end of that war, the US could easily join almost half of Mexico's territory as a price of peace including; New Mexico, California, Oregon and Texas. In 1867, America had bought Alaska from Russia ( 3 ).

By the late of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Americans realized that the real economic force was in the establishment of foreign colonies and markets. European imperialism over parts of the globe influenced America and a new spirit began to enter American foreign policy. Americans could find security, prosperity and protection of their interests only by expansion (O'Callaghan 84). Senator Orville Platt in 1893 said, "we are the most advanced and powerful nation on earth and our future demands an abandonment of the policy of isolation. It is the ocean our children must look as they once looked to the boundless West."(qtd. in 84). Many Americans including politicians, businessmen, newspaper editors and missionaries agreed with Platt on the idea that 'the Anglo-Saxon

race' by which they meant America and Northern Europe had a duty to bring and spread the Western civilization to the rest of the world (85). In April 1898, US President McKinley demanded that Spain had to withdraw from Cuba after a public rebellion that was suppressed cruelly, Spain refused and it was just few days the two went to war. The Spanish-American or a 'Splendid War' as it came to be called marked a turning point in American history and brought about a total revision of American foreign policy. It was the starting point of US imperialism. When the war ended most of Spain's overseas empire was acquired by the USA including; the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Guam Island, the same year witnessed the annexation of Hawaii. In less than a year, the USA exercised an extreme colonial power (85). "I am proud of my country," said a minister in New England, he added :

Patiently teaching people to govern themselves and enjoy the blessing of a Christian civilization, surely this Spanish war has not been a grab for empire, but an heroic effort to free the oppressed and teach millions of ignorant, debased human beings how to live. (qtd. in 86).

As noted earlier, the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 and its Corollary in 1904 were America's overseas commitment that came to announce a new fault line that eventually established the ideological basis for US hegemony on the Western Hemisphere. they came to eliminate the French presence in Mexico and to force Britain withdraw from Latin America territories, they came also to deny any further European expansion in the Americas and to declare that the region was henceforth America's vital environment where no other power would be allowed to exist . The doctrines reserved a self proclaimed right to intervene in Latin America whenever US 'interests and security'

deemed it necessary, they made Central America and the Caribbean, in effect, an American sphere of influence.

In East Asia, as has been discussed, the Open Door policy worked as the guiding doctrine that claimed the equal trading access of US to China's market. It expended the US vital environment of interests that was threatened by European imperial ambitions and came to form them 'what is yours is ours' (Martel 7).

On the other behalf of the word where Europe stationed, US policy was guided throughout two doctrines. First, Freedom of the Seas was basically an attempt to protect US access to European markets in time of European hostility among each other; it demonstrated Europe's importance to the US economy. While Freedom of the Seas aimed at keeping the Atlantic Ocean open to US trade, the second doctrine, Isolationism, sought to keep a separating wall between the USA and the aggressive imperial Europe. Isolationism aimed at concentrating US power in what is called 'national security state' (10).

## **Conclusion**

While proclaiming isolationism from world affairs, America built its own empire. With a massive belief in Manifest Destiny, the Americans followed an energetic pattern of military, political and economic expansion along the first century of the Republic in the Western Hemisphere and East-Asia. It was in fact, an expansion of US fault lines against all non-Americans as President Roosevelt expressed one day, "of course, our history is an expansionist one." As the chapter shows, US fault lines had been shaping the US foreign policy from the early days of the republic, we realized that the preservation of US independence and freedom held the lion's share by denying any

further European extension in the Western Hemisphere and then to a less degree the protection of US interests in the Americas and East-Asia.

## **II. Chapter Tow: American Foreign Policy during the Cold War Era (1945-1990)**

### **Introduction**

This chapter portrays the US fault lines in the aftermath of WW II and shows the radical shift from isolationism to a full involvement in world affairs. It stresses the global role that USA had played in containing the communist expansion during the era of the Cold War (1945-1989 ) during which the two blocs used to influence, to compete, to collide and even to wage wars by proxy as in North Korea and Vietnam . East-West rivalry overshadowed US foreign policy during the whole era and shaped all US actions and reactions then. As with chapter one, this chapter examines the shift in US fault lines that was dictated by the new global circumstances and challenges induced by the Soviet expansionist threat. They came to be centered on three major issues; the preservation and spread of US ideology of democratic liberalism, the security of US Western allies against the Red Army and finally the protection of Israel and US geo-strategic and economic interests in the oil-rich Middle East.

### **II.1. The Rise of Dictatorships Unleashed WWII**

Though the US has followed a strict isolationist policy that was its official position throughout the twenties and well into the thirties, however, its isolationism was challenged somewhere in the world. President Roosevelt' successful domestic policy of the new deal was soon overshadowed by a new danger induced by the expansionist instincts and ambitions of the new totalitarian regimes in Japan, Italy and Germany where spokesman for nationalism and imperialism had come to the front driven by the hatred resulting from inferior treatment of the Versailles treats and the economic hardships of the Great Depression. In 1931, Japan invaded Manchuria and crushed the Chinese resistance



and a year later set up the Puppet State of Manchukuo resulting in sharp protest from the League of Nations as well as the US that refused totally to recognize that state.

Fascist Italy enlarged its boundaries in Libya and in 1935-36 reduced Ethiopia to subjection as well as Somalia under Presidency Benito Mussolini who had already declared in 1927 that 1935 would be a turning point in the European history. Mussolini was to a certain degree confident that he would recapture those glorious days of the Roman Empire.

Germany, in its turn, reoccupied the Rhineland and undertook large scale rearmament. Nazi Germany led by Adolf Hitler hold a great belief in a New Order that would be dominated by Germany on a global scale in which the the German people are supposed to be the Master Race. Hitler in 1936 had called into existence the 'Rome – Berlin Axis' and an anti-communist alliance that would involve Japan, Italy, Spain, and Hungary .Austria was penetrated and was officially announced as a German region on March 11, 1937 and later in 1930 Hitler demanded the immediate cession of the Sudetenland, a region that belonged to Czechoslovakia and located along the German borders in which more than three million Germans live, resulting in a new crisis . The answer to that came soon at the Munich conference of 29-30 September 1938 and Hitler was the ultimate winner. However, this step was a purely big failure to the democratic nations. Chamberlain, the British prime minister said, "I bring yon peace with honour." But Churchill said, "Britain and France had to choose between war and dishonour. They choose dishonour. They will have war." The diagnosis war correct, the prophecy was true. Few days after the conference, President Roosevelt in an address noted friends abroad as well at home expressed that peace by fear has not higher as more enduring quality than peace by the sword.

As Hitler thundered against Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium and France, the Americans were shocked but still were against getting involved in the fighting. President Roosevelt said in his message to the nation, “when peace has been broken anywhere, the peace of all countries anywhere is in danger.” Roosevelt then, called for a moderate program of rearmament and asked Congress to repeal the arms embargo in order to enable belligerents to buy American munitions on cash-and-carry basis. This action was obviously not neutral but seemed as a sufficient one to assure western needs without further American involvement.

The new state of affairs promoted a strong debate between interventionists, who claimed that national security needed aid to Britain, and isolationists who claimed that Roosevelt was leading the country into an endless war. But once reelected for a third term, Roosevelt was more determined to help Britain. Accordingly, on January 10, 1941, the lend-lease bill was introduced in congress that authorized the president to sell, transfer, exchange, lend and lease arms and other equipment to any country whose defence was necessary to that of the United States. While the nation was in debate, the war intensified in Europe. American aid was now vital and the lend-lease brought deep American involvement (Morison and Commager 643 - 68).

## **II.2. The United States at War Again**

Most importantly, after the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, Japan withdrew from the League of Nations and invaded China next year. As a reaction, the USA enforced an oil embargo on Japan, American relations with Japan worsened. In December 1941, Japan planes attacked Pearl Harbor and destroyed much of the American fleet ( Lind 109 ). The Japanese surprising attack sank 21 American warships, destroyed 165 planes and brought death to 2338 military and civilian personnel. President

Roosevelt called that day ‘a date which live in infamy’ and asked Congress for a war declaration against Japan which was approved. On their turn, Japan’s friends, Germany and Italy declared war on the USA. Japan also turned its attention to the Philippines, Guam, Midway Island and British Malaya and Hong Kong. The ‘sneak attack’ as it was called on Pearl Harbor ranged the entire nation behind the war efforts and shown that never had Americans been more determined or more united in taking up arms than in December 1941 ( Reeves 125-6 ).

On the European front, in November 1942, Anglo-American soldiers landed in Morocco and Algeria and were joined by some French so that to fight against Axis countries. After a fierce fighting, they succeed to drive the German troops out of North Africa as well as the Italian ones.

In August 1942, Anglo-American air forces started an extensive military campaign of air-bombardment on Germany destroying whole cities and devastating much of the country’s factories and infrastructures. The allis enjoyed a complete control of the air, the thing that paved the way to the preparation of a French-liberating operation. In June 6, 1944, the “D-Day” or “the longest day” as many preferred to call, the Allies succeeded to swarm into French Normandy under the American commander Dwight D. Eisenhower and eventually could liberate Paris and the whole of France on 25 August (10).

In the pacific, the Japanese continued to advance and to conquer new countries including the Philippines where American troops were surrendered. But with an extensive American counter-attack they were stopped, by 1943, both the Americans and their allies had put a serious military plan to defeat Japan, they agreed on a three – pronged attack. Allies began to work in accordance to this plan; they succeeded to take control of the

most important strategic islands around Japan itself. American bombers had vastly devastated large cities but the invasion never came. On August 6 and 9, two American atomic bombs were dropped on the Japanese cities Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was then President Truman who ordered to use that kind of weapons, he believed that doing so would save more lives and more efforts (O' Callaghan 107 ).

### **II.3. East-West Rivalry and the Cold War**

If communism is allowed to absorb the free nations then we should be isolated from our sources of supply and detached from our friends. Then we would have to take defense measures which might really bankrupt our economy and change our way of life so that we couldn't recognize it as American any larger. President Harry Truman 1945 (qtd. in Lind 112).

The United States emerged from the Second World War as a bona fide world empire with unprecedented economic and military power and unmatched worldwide influence; it was then the only country with nuclear weapons. Meantime, another world superpower was coming to exist from the ruins of the war, that nation was the Soviet Union which intended on sharing in the dominance of world power. The Soviets then were the masters of Eastern Europe. So, the end of the World War did not bring stability to the globe, yesterday' allies, the USA and the Soviet Union who fought together against Hitler's Germany have become today' enemies. The seeds of another conflict were sowed between two blocs that eventually divided the world into two ideological camps, Winston Churchill spoke of an 'Iran Curtain' across Europe that separated the Eastern European communist ruled-nations from the Western ones. The Soviet actions in Western Europe showed to Truman, the new American President, that the Soviets were planning to a total-global communist domination. In his turn, Soviet leader Stalin was aware that Americans

hated their country's communist way of life. Though the two giants actually were not fighting one another, people began to speak about a new struggle that came to be called the 'Cold War'. The new conflict was characterized by mutual distrust, suspicion, and misunderstanding by both the United States and the Soviet Union. The United States accused the soviet union of seeking to expand their version of communism throughout the world. The soviets, meanwhile, charged the united states with practicing imperialism (O' Callaghan 116).

East-West rivalry was centered on Eastern and Central Europe where Americans hoped for a democratic and capitalistic world. However, the principles of Soviet power originated from the belief that the capitalist system was totally bad; the Soviets then should destroy it in order to take power. It is clear that the US could not expect in the future to enjoy political intimacy with the Soviet regime; it must continue to consider the Soviet Union as a rival, not as a partner in the political arena (H. Jones 243).

#### **II.4. Containment Policy**

The term 'containment' was coined first of all by an American diplomat whose name was George Kennan who worked as a director of the newly established State Department Policy Planning Staff. He published in July 1947 his famous so-called long telegram in foreign affairs, it was an elaboration entitled '*The sources of soviet conduct*' in which he has proposed to his government a new strategy to limit the Soviets with their communistic vision and to prevent them from spreading their communist ideology, Kennan wrote, " Soviet pressure against the free institutions of the Western World is something that can be contained by the adroit and vigilant application of counter-force at a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points." (qtd. in Dobson and Marsh 26). Kennan thought that the USA as a leading power of the Western World

should strictly followed a new political approach so that to “contain” the Soviet influence , that is, to stop it from spreading, he noticed that the world was dominated by a five key existing industrial centers : the US , Britain , Germany, Central Europe, Japan and the Soviet Union . Four were in West and one was in the East, and this was the way things should remain Kennan believed (26).

#### **II.4.1 The Truman Doctrine**

Containment policy was henceforth seen as a new departure in the American foreign policy, it was then the Truman administration that first undertook this policy and committed itself to resisting any further extension of Soviet power and influence. The first successful application of the containment policy was in Turkey and Greece where there was a huge Soviet influence by supporting communist led guerilla in the Greek Civil War and trying to share Turkey in the control of the Dardanelles. As an urgent reaction to these Soviet ambitions, American President Truman asked Congress to approve on 400 \$ millions as economic and military aids to both countries so that they would be able to resist and to prevent a real communist domination, the Truman decision came to be known as the ‘Truman Doctrine’ that was approved by American Congress in March 2, 1947 (M. Jones 519). This event marked the end of British presence in the area and even the world and the ascent of the new American supremacy .In Truman’s point of view, those countries that used to belong to the Western vital environment such as in our case, Greece and Turkey, are also USA’s vital environment, according to him they constituted the new fault lines of the USA that the Soviet Union would never be allowed to exceed. Greece according to Truman used to be a part of the Western World and its defense against communism does mean the defense of the USA against the Soviet Union, he said:

Support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures ... I believe That our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid, which is essential to economic stability and orderly political Processes. (qtd. in Kalaitzidis and Streigch 131).

After the Second World War, Europe witnessed one of the worst times in its history, the whole continent was suffering from the aftermath of the war. The spread of communist parties seemed to threaten not only Eastern Europe but also the Western World led by the USA. The problem seemed ideal, and the responsibility fell upon America to rescue the continent from starvation, dictatorships domination and communist cruelty. As a matter of duty, the USA had to do something otherwise it would never be forgiven if it stood to watch the disaster happening. President Harry Truman undertook the containment policy with the Soviet Union instead of the policy of coexistence. American foreign policy makers believed in the Domino theory, a situation in which one event causes a series of other similar successive events that meant then: if both Greece and Turkey were left to fall to communists, the whole of Europe would be without a doubt the next step. As a matter of duty, concepts such as freedom, global security and economic development were seen as American duties (Brogan 591).

#### **II.4.2 The Marshal Plan**

In May 1947, William Clayton who worked as an Under-Secretary of State for economic affairs reported that Europe was obviously in total economic distress and expected that this would lead to social and political disasters unless something would be done. Just after a month, General George Marshall, the new Secretary of State outlined a European recovery program 'E.R.P' which was in the form of financial assistance that helped to rebuild European nations devastated by the war. This became known as the

'Marshall Plan', the program provided Europe with over 13\$ billion of massive economic aids to rescue it from disasters and from a possible communist subversion (Dobson and Marsh 24).

By 1952, the time the Marshall Plan ended, Western Europe could recover from its wounds and was back on its feet and entered a new era of prosperity after being in a great trouble just few years ago when millions of people were without work, food and descent homes and after being threatened by communist political parties which were about to dominate many countries (O'Callaghan 117). The Marshall Plan proved astonishingly successful, Jones argued, "It brought about a swift and massive economic revival in Western Europe, thus restoring political stability and diminishing communism's appeal." (M. Jones 520).

The program reached a perilous climax in June 1948 when USA, France and Britain declared that they had a plan to rebuild the Federal West German Republic whom they announced it would be a part of the European recovery Program. The Russians were furious, they have already attacked the American plan and confirmed that that was clearly a step to convert West Germany as well as the whole continent into a base for expanding the influence of American imperialism. As a reaction intending to abandon the scheme, the Soviets stopped all traffic between West Germany and West Berlin resulting in what is known as the 'Berlin Blockade', they even blocked all roads, real way lines and canals. President Truman did not risk by sending armies to face the powerful Soviet army but with the support of Britain and France had ordered a gigantic airlift to rescue the Berlin city by sending them everything they needed. The operation proved effective, by the spring of 1949, the Soviets knew they were beaten and the Russians stopped the blockade (520).



### **II.4.3 NATO Formation**

The Berlin blockade demonstrated that Joseph Stalin, the Soviet leader, would be determined to challenge the powerful American presence in Western Europe. European nations which have just received the economic Marshall aids believed that these aids are not enough to secure them from the Soviet ambitions, they wanted to share a collective defense system but only under the American umbrella. Uncle Sam was the only power who could effectively be able to adopt that vision, they succeeded to form a military alliance in early 1948 under the leadership of the USA that came to exist in April 1949 as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO (McCauley 36).

The original purpose of NATO was the defense of its Western members against any possible attack from the communist bloc led by the Soviet Union. Other main issues of NATO were aiming at creating collective stability and freedom of its members. At the beginning, the main ratifiers of the treaty were twelve that included the USA as a main contributor, however, with time the number of the members was extended and more nations joined the alliance which was of permanent duration. Combined with the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall plan, NATO succeeded to bring order and stability to the continent but only under the American vision. These three plans resulted in a total US hegemony on Western Europe and therefore constituted an extreme expansion of US fault lines as well as they created a new vital American environment where the USA had vital interests. Senator Vandenberg considered NATO as the most important step in American foreign policy since the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine. (H. Jones 266).

## **II.5. American Fault Lines during the Cold War Era (1945.1990)**

### **II.5.1 US and Europe**

US foreign policy in Europe after the Second World War was totally different from that existed before, new standards and new fault lines had to be reconstructed to meet the new changes in the continent where a new severe struggle with communism emerged. Along the Cold War era, American new fault lines were mainly centered on two dominant issues represented in bringing security to US Western allies against the 'Red Army' and to a large extent promotion and spread of its liberal democratic ideology as well as the protection of US interests . Without a doubt, post-Second World War Western Europe was noticeably a supplicant to US security along the Cold War era, especially for nuclear guarantee, they were concomitantly under the US maintenance of American economic and security systems. By being secured under the US umbrella, European states wanted also to frighten Germany that might one day declared a revenge war. The Anglo-French Dunkirk Treaty signed in 1947 and the creation of the 1948 BTO was in fact a designation of US security guarantee for Europe. Though West European nations were almost all democracies, their cultural, historical, social and economic differences made it difficult to the US to control it. The first US commitment in Europe was the Western European military security throughout NATO that became the principal hard security organization.

The other most major step that had to be undertaken because of the European vulnerability to communist subversion was economic in its nature. The Truman and Marshal Administrations tended to remake Europe in American mode by encouraging European integration. Kelleher, an American diplomat, has argued, " the existence of a Europe like us was a pre-condition to the establishment of an international order

conductive to American political and economic interests.” (qtd. in Dobson and Marsh 74). It is very clear that Kelleher was speaking from ideological departures. Changing the basic structure of West European politics was an American monopoly and was henceforth a real extension of US fault lines. The Americans succeeded to establish a new united Europe based on their federal model that eventually enabled Europe to embrace the American ideology of democracy and free markets principles but only by keeping Europe’s cultural, political and historical diversity. The US played the role of the major sponsorship of European integration by asserting the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine by which the US has become the sole and dominant player in the Western Europe scene and therefore holding the leading role in shaping the post war Europe, it played the role of ‘protector’ of the free nations as it preferred to call from communism.

Eventually, the US could establish its liberal policy and capitalistic economic hegemony over Western Europe via these projects that succeeded to rebuild the continent on the ideological basis of representative democracy and marked capitalism. Western Europe as a result, contributed greatly to scene the dual containment of Germany and the USSR. During the Cold War era , relations between Americans interests and security in the European region was obvious where American troops were stationing permanently, the USA deployed vital arms including the deployment of US Cruise and Prishing II nuclear missiles in Europe to protect it from the permanent possible Soviet attack. Eventually, three USA could insist its hegemony on Western Europe , it was a hegemony that captured the nature of the whole relationship of USA with Europe (67 - 82) .

### **II.5.2 US and the Middle East**

The Middle East was from the very beginning of the Cold War a theater for a hot rivalry and high stakes. The abundant oil fields made the region of vast strategic

importance to the USA and rivalry among the two superpowers to gain control of oil-rich areas was sharp. The region was mainly settled by Muslim Arabs, Israel was, however, America's strategic ally in the Middle East. When it was founded in 1948, the USA hastened to recognize it, the Jewish lobby in the USA was so strong and played a major role in that recognition, it even channeled financial aids to Israel. The neighboring Iran was also of big oil importance. When Prime Minister Mossadegh nationalized the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, he was withdrawn and replaced by a pro-American friend named the 'shah' who served US and British wishes and interests. The rivalry with USSR reached its climax in the Suez crisis of 1956 when belligerent states: Britain, France and Israel strove against Egypt that was led by Abd Naser who also nationalized the Suez Canal. The crisis eventually ended by the withdrawal of belligerent's troops after the serious Soviet warning when President Khrushchev threatened to use nuclear missiles if belligerents would not withdraw (McCauley 50-1).

The Truman administration policy in the Middle East was shaped by three pillars; abandonment of the traditional US policy of isolationism, recognition of Israel and the follow of a schizophrenia diplomacy in its attitude toward the region. Though the Middle East at first was not among US priorities, the NSC 68 hence US policy toward the region to be more concerned about protecting American interests there, President Eisenhower argued in 1956, that the Western World and the Middle East were, "together the most strategic areas in the world. Western Europe requires Middle Eastern oil and Middle Eastern oil is of importance mainly its contribution to the Western European economy." (qtd. in Dobson and Marsh 118). But what Eisenhower missed to mention was that most of that oil was either produced by American companies or covered by them. US oil companies operated in the Middle East made them playing the role of America's ambassadors there. In the six days war of 1967, Johnson supported Israel in its military

campaign against Arab states and did nothing to force it to withdraw, furthermore, in 1968, he provided Israel with F.A. Phantom jets, the thing that showed the US special ties with it. Israeli security and protection of US oil interests were noticeably America's fault lines in the region. Moreover, when the war of Yom Kippur was erupted in 1973, Arab states including Syria and Egypt could achieve some victories but Americans urgently supplied Israel with more powerful and effective arms that could eventually turn the military balance to it and repelled Arab forces. Meanwhile, when the Soviets announced that they would intervene militarily with the Arab side, the US saw that as a step to establish a Soviet foothold in the region. Accordingly, the US put its nuclear arms on alert and pushed UN efforts to solve the problem. In other words, a Soviet intervention was considered by Americans as a fault line and a red line. Henry Kissinger, an American diplomat, made great efforts and finally the UN announced that Israel should withdraw its troops under the UN decision 242.

In November 1979, Iranian revolutionaries seized the American embassy in Tehran holding its employees as hostages and in December 1979, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan to support a leftist regime there. Ayatollah Khomeini, the Iranian leader, overthrew the Shah who used to be America's friend and declared the establishment of a new Islamic Republic of Iran that announced its enmity to both Israel and the USA. Iran became an embittered Bastion of anti-Americanism. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was unfavorable for US interests in the Middle-East. The Carter administration threatened to use military force to protect American oil interests in the Arab Gulf under the Carter Doctrine of 1980 which made it clear that any attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Gulf region will be considered as an attack on the vital interests of America, and such an action will be repulsed by any means including military force.

All American administration tended to establish pattern of allies in the Middle East mainly with Israel and the oily Saudi Arabia. During the 1973 war, Israel was provided with more than 3\$ billion of weapons, whereas during the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1980's, Washington turned a blind eye to Israel, American efforts to secure Israel has always been centre to US foreign policy in the region. President Carter succeeded to establish the famous Peace Treaty of 1979 between Egypt and Israel that remained his greatest foreign policy success. From Nixon onwards, there was a great willingness to face Middle Eastern terroristic groups especially after the 1982 Beirut incident during which 241 American marines were killed in a truck bomb. In addition, the Regan administration stroke against El Quadafi's Libya in 1986. The USA has always concentrated its efforts to keep the continuous flow of Arabi-Saoudian oil (110-24).

### **II.5.3. US and Asia**

Asia witnessed the coming of American arrogance of power that was marked firstly with the Japanese nuclear bombing at the end of WWII that catastrophically ended the life of more than 400.000 Japanese civilians in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Truman administration by doing so has sent a message to the globe saying that we are the sole possessor of the atomic bomb. US containment to communism in Asia saw its highest clashes; however, the practice of this policy in Asia depended on military force to rollback communism where both USSR and USA engaged not in a cold but hot wars by agency. The Korean and Vietnamese wars had well illustrated that hot struggle. The loss of China in 1949 accelerated the Cold War and constituted a great strategic failure to the USA in the region. Accordingly successive US administrations refused to recognize the PRC, Communist Republic of China, and claimed that Taiwan is the true China. The Korean War that was waged between 1950 and 1953 was the first NSC68's

implementation of recommendations in the region, it declared the global dimension of containment.

Japan that used to be America's enemy during WWII was reconstructed to absorb the US ideology of liberalism and free markets and remained US strategic ally in Asia till now. The story of this began in 1945 when General MacArthur preferred an Americanization of the Japanese political and economic systems including democratic governing and capitalistic economy that resulted eventually in a pro-American liberal Japan. Successive US administration sought to secure Japan against any communist threat by establishing new military bases especially in Okinawa. Henry Kissinger argued that, "trilateralism including the US, Western Europe and Japan to be the power houses of liberal capitalism," he added that Japan has become a key centre of world power and that it should be given the same importance as Eastern Europe . It was obvious that the man was speaking from ideological measures. Accordingly, Japan was treated by the US a vital geostrategic ally and as a main trading partner throughout the Cold War, it was America's fault line in that region. The Vietnam War was another important issue in Asia where containment resulted in another catastrophic struggle that ended by extreme American disappointments as Nixon viewed that the US has lost in modern history against the heroic communist leader Ho chi Minh.

Relations with communist China remained delicate and it was not until 1971 that the USA recognized the PRC and was followed the historic visit of President Nixon to China in 1972 when diplomatic relations was established (Dobson and Marsh 98 - 109).

### **Conclusion:**

The entrance of America to the Second World War marked the end of US Isolationism that seemed inappropriate to safeguard American interests and dominance

and announced the beginning of an era of full engagement in world affairs. The USA led a Western coalition in a severe Cold War against communism and followed an active military and diplomatic containment of the communist expansion by rebuilding the economies of its West-European allies on its liberalistic ideology through the Marshal Plan and the Truman Doctrine. As we have seen, the shift from isolation to intervention was automatically accompanied by a parallel shift in the US fault lines that came to be centered during this era, 1945-1990, on two main issues; the security of its Western Allies through NATO against any possible Soviet subversion, and the preservation and spread of US ideology based on the free markets and democratic representation.



### **III. Chapter Three: Post-Cold War American Foreign Policy**

#### **Introduction**

After so long a struggle to confirm its status as the world's greatest power, the USA faced the end of the century by a genuine victory on the Soviet Communism. The fall of the Easter Bloc in 1989 was a turning point in the traditional world order that was bipolar in its nature, such a fall paved the way to the Americans to consider themselves a unique leader for international politics. The chapter describes the way Americans responded to the end of the old era and the beginning of the new one, it deals with the major events by which President Bush Sr has inaugurated his 'New World Order'. Within the context of this new world order, Washington moved ahead to reorganize the world allies and to fix new fault lines on the ruins of the old ones. The chapter examines also the way how America came to define its new potential adversaries generating mainly from the Islamic ideology and China as a coming economic and military rival. Thus, new concepts were to be made by Americans to insist their global hegemony and to draw the new global map through one socio-politico-economic ideology.

#### **III.1. Collapse of the Soviet Union**

During the 1980's, the Soviet Union was facing multiple serious problems, in fact it was since the 1950's that there had been a long-term decrease in the rate of Soviet economic growth because of many reasons. Economically, the Soviet system that was centrally planned or 'Command Economy' resulted in an extreme bad and wrong use of the nation recourses as well as it has failed to supply incentives from entrepreneurial innovation. The Soviet command economy was in fact an inefficient system because it has ignored the civilian economy while it has pushed huge amounts of money on the military sector. In addition to this economic pressure, the arms race between the USA and

the USSR that took and another dimension or a turning point in 1983 when US President Ronald Regan announced a new program known as the 'Stars War' made the USSR spending more on developing his arm's abilities. In addition, the Soviet support of overseas regimes such as the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 constituted another factor. These elements had a huge impact on the Soviet consumer sector and resulted in an increasing shortage of goods, commenting on the terrible situation that the nation reached depressing (Ochoa 10).

In 1985, Michael Gorbachev was elected as a President to the USSR, the new President followed a new strategy to reform and revitalize the Soviet system. The strategy included three key elements; First, the 'Perestroika', it involved economic encouragement to market forces and individual initiative. Second, the 'Glasnost', it meant promoting openness in politics and media as well as social democracy. Third, reduction of defense budget by following international arms-reduction treaties. "The promise I gave to the people when I started the process of perestroika was kept: I gave the freedom," said Gorbachev (qtd. in 13).

In 1989, while the debate reached its climax about a possible decline of the American empire, the Berlin Wall that was a major symbol of the Cold War and of an Iron Curtain that lasted forty five years separating the East of European continent from its West finally fell. Consequently, in a short time, Germany was re-unified under the banner of a democratic capitalist State and President Gorbachev declared to his Warsaw Pact that he no longer intervened or controlled their political or social systems. A year later the old flag of the Czars replaced the traditional flag of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, the Soviet Union collapsed and was replaced by the new Russian republic (Schulzinger 352).

In his famous book *“American Empire: the Realities and Consequences of US Diplomacy”*, Bacevich argued that the events of 1989 marked a turning point in the world’s history in the way it has ended the long struggle between the USA and USSR that has long shaped the international politics, “with the collapse of the Soviet Union, a new era in world history began,” he said. The 1989 year became year ‘Zero’. When Madeline Albright was asked about works of scholarship written in that year, she replied, “they are about as useful now as archeology, they are ancient history.” (qtd. in 35). Others like Fukuyama predicted in his book’s thesis *“the end of history and the last man”* that there will be no other conflicts after the Cold War’s end and that the Liberal Democracy system will be universalized as the final stage of human evolution. He said, “the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind’s ideological evolution and the Universalization of Western Liberal Democracy as the final form of human government” (qtd. in Huntington 31). However, Huntington in his book *“the Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order”* gave an alternative realist vision to the post-cold war world and predicted that cultural and religious identities will be the primary source of fault line conflicts in the post cold-war world saying, “In the late 1980’s, the communist world collapsed and the Cold War international system became history. In the post-cold war world, the most distinctions among peoples are not ideological political, or economic, they are Cultural.” (21)

### **III.2. A New World Order**

The Berlin Wall had come down, communist regimes had collapsed, the United Nations was to assume a new importance, the former Cold War rivals would engage in ‘partnership’ ... The president of the world leading country [USA] proclaimed the “New World Order.” (Huntington 31).

In the late of 1990's, President George Bush Senior stated, "today a New World Order is struggling to be born ... a world where the rule of the law supplants the rule of the jungle." He added, "this is a historic moment. We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict and Cold War. We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a New World Order." (qtd. in Axelord 506).

The disintegration of the Soviet Eastern Block in 1991 left the USA as the sole most powerful nation in the world and led many to consider the post-Cold War world as a unipolar one in which America is the only remaining superpower enjoying a special global leading position. Reporting the words of Samuel p. Huntington, Kennedy asserted, " 'the United states' , of course, is the sole state with pre-eminence in every domain of power: economic, military, diplomatic, ideological and cultural – with the reach and capabilities to promote its interests in virtually every part of the word." (qtd. in Hughes 155).

Huntington also thinks, "Contemporary international politics is instead a strange hybrid, a uni-multipolar system with one superpower and several major powers . ." Others, like Fukuyama proclaimed '*the end of history and the last man*' arguing that the long ideological struggle of mankind has eventually come to the end with the world settling on the democratic-liberalism system as a universal and final form of human government (155).

In his famous book '*An American foreign policy for a unipolar world*', Krauthammer also insisted on the fact that our world after 1990 in its ideological nature is unipolar with the USA as a hegemony power and led the opinion that this event was

unique and so significant, he even compared it to the fall of Ancient Rome, he described the moment 1990 as:

It was the end of everything - the end of Communism, of Socialism, of the Cold War. But the end of everything was also a beginning. On December 26, 1991, the Soviet Union died and something new was born, something utterly new – a Unipolar World dominated by a single superpower unchecked by any rival and with decisive reach in every corner of the globe. (1).

On their turn, Yahyaoui and El-Arbi wrote in their book *‘Tarikh El Alam El Moaser’* that the previous traditional order that was bipolar and which dominated the international politics for more than four decades has practically come to an end by the Collapse of USSR and its communist bloc. This latter resulted in the establishment of a New World Order under the leadership of the US where it has acted as the world’s sole policeman. The formidable show of military force against Iraq during the Gulf War of 1990 , the invasion of Panama and the arrest of the President Manuel Noriega were the events by which president Bush Senior has inaugurated his new world order (402-3). Globalization and the NATO members expansion into the East constituted an other major indicators of a US led a new reconstructed world order with new reconstructed fault lines and with America as a Unipolar hyper power . The expansion of NATO led by the US into the new East-European countries that were once members of the Soviet Warsaw Pact was in fact an expansion of US fault lines and a reconstruction of the old ones according to the new factors. The new world order actually was not the result of an agreement made between the world’s nations but was a legitimate child of the new international power’s balances and the new global geopolitical and ideological changes induced by the fall of the ideological rival, it was a natural consequence of US total political, economic,

military, technological, financial and cultural pre-eminence and domination. The Bush administration tended to maintain America's preeminence by reshaping the global environment where its interests would work as the red lines that no nation would be allowed to exceed (405-6). Yahyaoui and El-Arbi mentioned some of US major actions that inaugurated the new world order which among them:

**A.** The international military coalition led by the USA against Iraq in 1991 to liberate Kuwait and that resulted in an immense destruction of Iraq's military troops and strategic infrastructure under the cover of the 'international community ' to give legitimacy to the war and to destroy Iraq as a threat to both US oil interests in the middle-East and Israel security.

**B.** The US adoption of the peace-process negotiations between the Arabs and Israel starting from the Madrid-Peace Conference in January 1991 In a Unilateral step taken only by the USA and only according to the US vision and in a total absence of the UN.

**C.** The US aggression against some countries under the justification of holding Weapons of mass destruction "WMD" or the intention to do so such as with North Korea and Sudan, while it has turned a blind eye on Israel's huge nuclear arsenal .

**E.** The US military interventions through NATO in the Balkan crisis to solve the ethnic civil war there in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1994 as well as in Serbian Kosovo in 1990.

**F.** The US and British imposition of no-fly aerial zone on Iraq's northern region since 1991.

**G.** The American unilateral invasion of both Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003 that was extremely unsupported by the UN even by those UN's Security Council major members and with no legal justification in the face of worldwide protest Under the

justification of fighting terrorism and an Iraq's holding WMD despite the fact that no WMD were found.

These US actions revealed Bush's new world order under the leadership of America as a hegemonic power in the post Cold-War world and shown to what extent America was determined to reconstruct its traditional fault lines and to fix new advanced ones (406-7).

President Bush Senior inaugurated the new world order and made it obvious that his country deserves the world-leadership whom according to was no matter for negotiations depending on the fact that America is the sole winner that has become eventually a hyper power. He said, "America stands on the center of a widening circle of freedom ...and there is a need for leadership that only America can provide." (qtd. in 404).

### **III.3. A New Cultural Fault Lines**

Spurred by modernization, global politics in being reconfigured along cultural lines ... political boundaries increasingly are redraws to coincide with cultural ones. Cultural communities are replacing Cold War blocs and the fault lines between civilizations are becoming the central lines of conflict in global politics. (Huntington 125).

Huntington offers an alternative realist vision where cultural communities and civilizations replace states, his hypothesis is that the fundamental source of conflict in the new world will be primarily cultural. He identifies eight major civilizations and suggested that conflicts will occur along this fault lines especially between Islam and the West, he also claims religion to be the most important defining factor of civilizations. He viewed

that the disintegration of communism has reinforced in the west and particularly the USA as a leading power the idea that its ideological culture of democratic liberalism has actually won and was henceforth universally valid. Accordingly, America in the new world tends to promote its culture and spread it to a new advanced fault lines as Huntington stated:

The USA which has always been a missionary nation, believe that non-western peoples should commit themselves to western values of democracy free markets, limited government, human rights, individualism, the rule of the law, and should embody these values in their institutions .(qtd. in 184).

In the post Cold – War era, the USA will tend to continue its preeminent position and protect its strategic interests by claiming that they are the interests of ‘World Community’, a phrase that came to replace the old one the Free World’ so that to give global legitimacy to actions taken whether by the USA or its Western allies (184).

Meanwhile, the West especially America will continue to build what is seen as a ‘universal civilization’ based on US culture and values through modernization and westernization of the non-western societies. During the nineteenth century the “white man’s burden” used an effective means to spread and justify the export of Western political and economic ideology for other parts of the world. However, after the world of 1990, Huntington believes, “the concept of a universal civilization helps justify western cultural dominance ... Universalism is the ideology of America for confrontations with non – western cultures.” (qtd. in 66).

Huntington viewed that human rights and democracy promotion as concepts constituted a major means to reconstruct America’s cultural fault lines in the post-Cold War era and extend them into new nations and new societies. Democratization was a



central part of US foreign policy, it was endorsed by the Bush senior administration. In April 1990, US Secretary of State James Baker declared that “Beyond containment lies democracy,” he added, “President Bush has defined our new mission to be the promotion and consolidation of democracy.”(qtd. in 193). Bill Clinton’s assistant for national security announced that the Clinton’s main foreign policy issue would be “the enlargement of democracy”. Huntington emphasized the view that it was the demise of the Soviet Union that paved the way to the Americans to adopt these new expansionist concepts whose main goal was to expand US fault lines and to spread American culture and principles. Eventually, the promotion of human rights and democracy were to a large extent successful in many societies including new southern and Eastern European Countries such as Spain and Portugal as well as in Latin America and East - Asia where new democratic regimes appeared on the American model ( 193).

#### **III.4. Islamic Rivalry as a New Ideological Fault Line**

“The collapse of Communism removed a common enemy of the West and Islam and left each the perceived major threat to the other” (Huntington 211).

According to Huntington, the end of the long ideological rivalry between the USA and USSR that divided the world into two ideological camps and which ended by an American victory did not bring a permanent peace to America. The seeds of another new but ancient rivalry were sown, this time the rival is no longer communism, it is the ‘Islamic Resurgence’ and the ‘Islamic Fundamentalism’ that came to announce a new US ideological fault line. “The twentieth-century conflict between liberal democracy and Marxist-Leninism is only a fleeting and superficial historical phenomenon compared to the continuing and deeply conflictual relation between Islam and Christianity,” Huntington believes (qtd.in 209). Along history, the dynamism of Islam that was purely

expansionist in its ideology and that at a time reached Europe itself capturing Constantinople in 1453 and besieging Vienna in 1929. Bernard Lewis, a Western scholar asserts, “from the first Moorish landing in Spain to the second Turkish siege in Vienna, Europe was under constant threat from islam.”(qtd. in 210). Islam therefore represented the only ideological civilization that made the survival of the West in doubt. The fact that half of the number of fault line wars between 1820and 1929 were between Muslims and Christians, the source of that ongoing struggle flows from the differences in the nature of the two civilizations (210).

The two concepts of ‘jihad’ in Islam and ‘crusade’ in Christianity were the basics that made the struggle sharpen over time. The Islamic recent resurgence gave Muslims a new spirit and self-confidence of their values and civilizational superiority over the west (211). The historical conflict will continue to shape the future relations between the two blocs. As a matter of fact, nineteen of twenty eight fault line wars during the 1990’s were between Muslims and Christians led by the USA. A prominent Indian scholar states in 1990 that, “the US next confrontation will be with the Muslim world” (qtd. in 213). In the eyes of Americans, Islamic revival is overwhelmingly seen as the biggest threat to both US security and interests in the Middle-East. In a questionnaire in 1994 shared by American public’s and leaders showed that more than 61% of Americans determined Islam to be their source of threat and picked: Iran, Iraq and China as the top three states, year later, the questionnaire resulted in 72% of American public and 61% of official foreign policy leaders considering Islamic international terrorism and Islamic proliferation as threats to America and most importantly viewed the expansion of Islamic fundamentalism as the top threat. Moreover, in 1995, Secretary General of NATO commented on the Islamic fundamentalism, “at least as dangerous as communism.” A Clinton administration’s member said, “Islam is the global rival to the west.”(qtd. in

215). In accordance, NATO focus orientation was no longer directed to the eastern borders of Europe but to those southern ones since no longer communist threat was to be mentioned, the southern tiers were to be threatened by Islamist extremists of the Arab Maghreb, and those tiers drew the new US fault lines with the USA ( 215).

Huntington traced back the beginning of this new struggle to the 1979 Islamic Iranian Revolution that brought Islamists to power and that came to announce a quasi war with America when Khomeini, the Iranian leader declared, “Iran is effectively at war with America.” (qtd. in 216). Other extremist Islamist leaders have spoken similarly. In its turn, the USA defined five Islamic states: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya and Sudan as well as Cuba and North Korea to be ‘rogue, backlash and outlaw’ states, they are America’s new adversaries (216). During this quasi war, according to the US Defense department, between 1980 and 1995, seventeen military operations in the Middle East were engaged against Islamic targets that no similar case occurred with any other region. In that fault line war, the two sides targeted each other violently in a new clash and a new hot confrontation ( 217).

Mahdi El Mandjra, a Moroccan scholar, referred to the 1991 Gulf War as a vindication of what has just been said and described it as a US transition war to an era dominated by fault line wars basically between the USA and Muslims. Huntington emphasizes the idea that the defeat of the Soviet Empire in Afghanistan by the Islamist ‘Jihad’ resistance that was seen by America as the Soviet Waterloo of the Cold War meant to Muslims other things. The victory to them was very precious against a great foreign imperial power that gave them a wide feeling of self confidence and power and had a huge impact on the Islamic world. The war left behind expert Islamist fighters and extremist Islamic groups willing to promote Islam everywhere. “They beat one of the

world's two superpowers and now they are working on the second" said a US official in 1994 ( 247).

The Gulf War of 1991 during which the US led an international military coalition against Iraq was widely seen by the Muslim world as one not only against Saddam Hussein but against Islam and an Islamic nation. Though Muslim governments were divided and some even participated in the coalition, the Arab public and Islamic opinion rallied behind Saddam. They saw him as a 'Muslim hero' and condemned the US aggression, massive demonstrations took place in all Arab and Muslim states, Millions denounced the US action and refused the US intervention in a Muslim country. They were universally anti-West and strongly believed, "it is true that Saddam is a tyrant but he is our bloody tyrant." They knew that the US war was never to establish justice but rather to destroy Iraq as an Islamic power that rose and came to threaten both US hegemony in the oil-rich region and Israel ( 248). Islamist fundamentalist groups also Sympathized with Iraq and defined the war as a 'Crusade' led by the crusaders and Zionist conspiracy against Islam (249). Even Saddam's closest enemies such as Iran claimed, "those Ba'athists are our enemies for a few hours, but Rome is our enemy until Doomsday." The Arab Maghreb witnessed an explosion of support of Iraq, Tunisians and Algerians was from the beginning anti-West, "Algeria will stand by the side of its brother Iraq," Benjedid, the Algerian president Said (qtd. In 250).

### **III.5. China as a New Economic Fault Line**

With the down of the Cold War by an American genuine victory over communism, a prominent question seemed to pose itself: what would be the next challenging power to America?. US officials such as Mearsheimer estimate that China represents the most serious economic and military challenge to the US global leading

position and hegemony in the twenty first century especially when taking into consideration China's position as a permanent member in the UN security council, a major global nuclear power and a principal producer and exporter of weapons in the world (Dobson and Marsh 1999).

According to Huntington, the World Bank estimated in 1993 that China will become the world's largest economic power in the world early in the twenty-first century, the thing which will certainly alert the balance of power with the USA (103). The more successful economy of China generated self-confidence and assertiveness in the Chinese mentality. A Chinese leader expressed in 1994, "we Chinese feel nationalists which we never felt before, we are Chinese and feel proud in that" (qtd. in 106). The formidable economic growth of China in the last decades affected its global position in three ways. First, it enabled China to develop and enlarge its military and nuclear capabilities. Second, it has increased the tensions with the US and made it possible to be in a direct confrontation with America. Third, the Chinese economic growth has noticeably augmented its influence on the region and insisted its traditional hegemony on East-Asia. These latter alerted US foreign policy makers and led them to find ways how to contain that huge coming power (218). In accordance, American-Chinese relations became more hostile, the thing that led the Chinese press to declare that a US "New Cold War" against China is underway, Chinese President Jiang Zemin argued in August 1995 that the Western hostile forces are in a relative decline and threatened the USA that there are red borders to what it can do. Chinese military and political leaders became more antagonists against the US and often referred to as a hostile power, They saw the American military and political helps to 'Taiwan' as a main prove to their bad intentions aiming at a weakened China (223). Quickly, China was ranked in 1993 among the greatest threats to both American national security and interests by the American public. Meanwhile this

picture helped the Chinese leaders to define the US a new enemy to bolster their appeals to Chinese nationalism and to justify the expansion of its military power. In this context china was defined by the USA as a new fault line ( 224).

China's response to this American position was in a 40% augmentation of its military expenditure between 1990 and 1995 and the continuing development of nuclear capabilities as well as a continual provocative actions such us testing missiles near Taiwan, exporting missiles to Pakistan and developing Iran's nuclear programme . Relations between China and America reached its tension's climax in 2001 after China captured a US EP-3 reconnaissance plane after an emergency landing on the Chinese soil. Concerning Taiwan, President George Bush Junior informed in 2000 that if the Chinese were to decide to invade it, the US would defend it by whatever military means. Taiwan remained a difficult issue to be solved and Taiwanese leaders continued in 2005 to use the language of independence (Dobson and Marsh 201).

### **III.6. The Preventive War, the Potential Enemy and the War on Terrorism**

It is an enduring American principle ... there are few greater threats than a terrorist attack with WMD. To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the USA will, if necessary, act preemptively in exercising our inherent right of self defense. President G.W.Bush 2002. (qtd. in Kalaitzidis and Streich 315).

The preventive war was a Bush doctrine innovation that took shape after the 9/11/2001 attacks on the USA. It was a central foreign military strategy that aimed at securing both US people and US interests worldwide against what Bush considered to be America's potential enemies including what he described 'rogue states' . The doctrine was refined to justify US preemptive strikes against both countries suspected of

possessing WMD and terrorist groups such as el Qaeda. The new vision brought approximately a total US revision to its foreign policy and military might and was henceforth a total reconstruction that presented an entirely new theory of military force. If America's allies were not ready to join it, the Bush Doctrine was carried out unilaterally, it played a major role in promoting US global leadership (305).

Barber stressed the fact that the US invasion to Iraq in 2003 was a result of a long strategic ideology that was announced by Condoleezza Rice, US Secretary of States, as a national security strategy in September 20, 2002 that was officially adopted after the events of September 2001. President G.W. Bush has frequently mentioned this new view in his speeches most noticeably in West Point in the 2002 spring when he warned, "we must take the battle to the enemy and disrupt his plans, and confront the worst threats before they emerge." (qtd. in 80). The new ideology had a close connection with the 'PNAC' document entitled "*Rebuilding America's defenses : strategy, forces and resources for a new century*" made by Washington think tank that argued openly for the US to play a dominant role, military and diplomatically in the new world. The PNAC members included William Kristol, John Bolton, Paul Wolfowitz, Robert Kagan, Donald Rumsfeld and others who became later on members of the Bush administration. The document recommended that the US had to modify its military strategies to meet the new challenges and confront the new emerging threats. It was a document made to promote American global leadership and emphasized the need to 'preemptive strikes' against America's potential enemies by stating:

Enemies in the past needed great armies and great industrial capacities to endanger America. Now a shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to our shores for less than it costs a single tank

... as a matter of common sense and self defense, America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed. (qtd. in 80).

When President Bush was one day informed that he will face a list of sixty potential countries helping terrorists, he answered that the US will unilaterally overthrow their governments one after another ( 46). The preventive war constituted a national security strategy that was announced in September 20, 2002 saying, “we will never let our enemies to firstly strike.” According to Barber, whenever America is in danger inside its borders, it is a must to reconstruct and expand its borders into those potential dangers, the expansion meant here was the expansion of US fault lines and the borders that need to be secured are America’s fault lines. Iraq and the entire Middle East therefore were to be annexed, they came to determine and define the new US fault lines under the new strategy of the preemptive war as a new crucial mean to reach those lines (69-70).

In accordance, short after the September 11, 2001, attacks. US President Bush declared his global war on 'Terrorism'. He argued, “we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism,” he added, “Every nation in every region now has a decision to make: Either you are with us or you are with terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continue to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the USA as a hostile regime.” The President also made it clear, “Our war on terror begins with el Qaeda, but does not end there.” (qtd. in Loveman 369). In this context US troops and NATO launched an offensive military attack on Islamist Taliban Regime and el Qaeda camps in Afghanistan, they quickly succeeded to overthrow Taliban but failed to capture its leader Ossama bin laden in 2002. Iraq regime change, President G.W. Bush defined to be the next target after Afghanistan in his global war on terrorism ( 370). On March 19,



2003, President Bush sent a letter to the speaker of the house and president of senate demanding the authorization for military force use against Iraq whom he claimed to possess WMD and to help el Qaeda in the September attacks of 2001. The next day the invasion began (372). The war saw a rapid military victory. Americans took Saddam as a prisoner, and executed him after a theatrical (375). Bush said the war was to defend US security and the peace of the world but eventually no WMD were found and no evidence on Iraq's relation with el Qaeda. It was a holy war against Islam and an Islamic country as President Bush mispronounced it in one of his speeches referring to the war as a 'crusade' against an Islamic ideology (374).

Bush's war on terrorism that started by Afghanistan and Iraq did not end there as he has once said, it went furthermore, it led the Bush administration to become involved in other parts of the world like Pakistan, the Philippines, Somalia and others where there had been a regional Islamic groups that constituted a threat to both America and its western allies (Kalaitzidis and Streich 227).

### **III.7. The Project for a 'New Middle East' and the Creative Anarchy**

"Hegemony is as old as Mankind..." Zbigniew Brzezinski, Former US national Security advisor (qtd. in Nazemoray, Sec 1. Par 1).

The term 'New Middle East' as a new term referring to a new geo-political and geo-strategic concept within the American foreign policy was firstly coined by the US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in Tel Aviv, the capital of Israel, in June 2006. It came to replace the old term of the 'Greater Middle East'. The new US vision to the oil-rich region coincided with the inauguration of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan, oil terminal in the East of the Mediterranean. Condoleezza along with the Israeli Prime Minister Olmert during the climax of Anglo-American sponsored of Israel in its war on Lebanon that was

endorsed by Washington and London declared that a 'New Democratic Middle East' project was being launched from Lebanon. The project came to confirm a new but old Anglo-American-Israeli map to redesign and reshape the borders of the region in accordance to the American strategic and advantageous interests. This plan that had its origins years ago consists of creating a wide anarchy, violence, and instability throughout the 'creative anarchy' theory that extends from Iraq, Lebanon, Iran, Palestine, the Persian Gulf till the NATO borders garrisoned Afghanistan. The plan that was initiated by America and Israel defined Lebanon to be the starting point and the first application of their 'constructive chaos' which generates violence and warfare throughout the area so that the USA could redraw its map's borders that represented the new reconstructed geopolitical fault lines of America in the oil-rich region and that according to Americans should be redrawn so that to meet their objectives and strategic needs (Nazemroya, Sec 1). During a press conference, Rice stated:

What we are seeing here [in regards to the destruction of Lebanon by Israel attacks] is the growing, the birth pangs of a 'New Middle East' and whatever we do [the USA] have to be certain that we are pushing forward to the 'New Middle East' not going back to the old one. (qtd. in Sec 2. Par 1).

The words of Rice received a huge amount of criticism since she has ignored the suffering of Lebanese people caused by the Israeli bombs. According to Professor Mark Levine, the creative anarchy constituted a new strategy followed by the Bush administration as a new process for its new world order. The American occupation of Iraq particularly Kurdistan served as the balkanization, division, finalization and pacification of the Middle East. Moreover, the New Middle East, Pakistan and Afghanistan seemed to be the cornerstones for the enlargement and extension of US fault lines into the former

Soviet Union borders (Sec 3). The new Middle-East map prepared by a former American military Colonel named, Colonel Ralph Peters entitled '*The Bloody Borders*' showed to what extent the project tended to redraw the region. US foreign policy makers believed that the devastation of Lebanon by Israel is obligatory to a New Middle East envisioned by America and Israel (Sec 4).

Almost all violent conflicts in the area are the consequence of Anglo-American-Israeli agendas. The new regional ideology tended to aggravate the pre-existing regional tensions including those ethnic ones and exploit them and the Ultimate goal is to weaken those resistant movements especially those Islamic ones such as 'Hizbollah' in Lebanon and ' Hamas' in Palestine to facilitate the military occupation of those countries under the strategy of 'divide and conquer'. In fact, that has long been a U.S strategy not only in the Middle-East but it went furthermore in Africa, Latin America, the Balkans, Rwanda, Yugoslavia, the Caucasus and finally Iraq that well represented that new manner where the country has been split into regional spheres which led to a civil war with a severe domestic strife between Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds. The new project was in fact conducted by the assistance of pro-American states such as Saudi-Arabia that well served US strategies in the area. Democratization as a US principal element to its 'New Middle East' has just been a requirement for only those nations which refused to comply with the US political demands. But what about Hamas' Victory in a democratic election which still is unsupported by the US leaders and what about Saudi Arabia and other undemocratic regimes in the Middle East? The answer is clear, because they are firmly aligned with the American orbit and agenda (Nazemoray. Sec 7).

Huntington shares this last view, he referred to that US policy in the Middle East After 1990 as a 'Hypocrisy and double standards', a policy that does not care to anything

but only to US interests. A policy that shows the gaps between American principles and American actions, he also defined it as a policy of “but nots” Saying:

Democracy is promoted but not if it brings Islamic fundamentalists to power; non proliferation is preached for Iran and Iraq but not for Israel, free trade is the elixir of economic growth but not for agriculture, human rights are an issue with China but not with Saudi Arabia, aggression against oil-owning Kuwaitis is massively repulsed but not against non-oil owning Bosnians. (184).

## **Conclusion**

The end of the Cold War marked the end of the long ideological conflict with America as the sole global empire practicing a hegemonic global role with a pure imperialistic instinct. As the chapter showed, plans for world dominion led the new US officials to fix new fault lines and new enmities that according to the US thought may hamper Americans in insisting their hegemony. Islamic fundamentalism and China seemed to be America’s new adversaries. In accordance, US tools to create new fault lines were determined to be: the Universalization of US ideology and culture through globalization, human rights and democracy promotion. As we have seen, to accomplish that mission, the US set new concepts by which it aimed to prevent any power from aspiring to reach the military level of America.

## Conclusion

America's instability after the long and disastrous war of independence led the newly established nation to adopt a strict isolationist foreign policy. Entanglements with the Old World would be harmful for building the young and weak nation and for US unity. This is what Washington realized and what Monroe emphasized. European interference in the Western Hemisphere constituted a real threat to both US 'security' and 'interests'. Thus the Old World must be completely kept away from the New World and isolationism was the effective way to do so.

In accordance to these circumstances, early American founding fathers and policy makers opted to preserve their country's independence and freedom as well as to protect their vital interest and these issues represented the early US fault lines that the nation's policy was tied with. However, while embracing isolationism and neutrality in world affairs by staying aloof from the Old World, expansionism in the American continent from the very beginning represented the new nation's ideology. It was an expansion at the expense of all non-Americans, by the end of the nineteenth century and with an extreme belief in Manifest Destiny, the USA could establish its hegemony on the Western Hemisphere, safeguard its extra commercial interests and force the doors of economic interests in East-Asia open and that was a dramatic evidence of the extension of the US fault lines.

WWI represented a direct challenge to US isolationism, the US was slowly but surely dragged to the war. American intervention to the war was justified by the German threat to US vital interests but was later on be condemned as a great mistake. Post-war period, then, marked a strong return to isolation.

The coming of WWII witnessed the end of American isolationism. Though Americans had wanted disparately to stay out of the conflict, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor ranged the entire nation behind the war efforts and drew the US fully into the conflict. By the end of the war it was very clear that the United States has become a world power with unprecedented might, reach and sway as it was also clear that America could not retreat itself from world responsibility.

The end of WWII marked the beginning of another even more dangerous conflict that took ideological dimensions with another extra emerging superpower that is the USSR with its own ambitious communist instincts. The cold war that immediately followed the Second World War witnessed an American full commitments in world affairs during which the Americans thought that the only way to protect their ideology's existence is to control the Soviet communist expansion through the containment policy. The first of these commitments were economic represented in the Truman Doctrine and the Marshal Plan and then turned to be military through NATO. However, the practice of the same theory in Asia was totally different; there the USA depended on military force to rollback communism mainly in Korea and Vietnam. In this context US fault lines during the whole Cold War era witnessed a radical shift; they were oriented to the protection of US Western allies in the face of a permanent Soviet possible subversion, the preservation and promotion of US Liberal democratic ideology as well as the protection of US vital interests.

America came out the Cold War as the sole world hyper power and the greatest empire the world had ever known. Yet, once the Soviet union collapsed and the Cold War ended, beckoned American policy makers to reconstruct their traditional fault lines and to

fashion a New World Order from a position of unrivalled power practising an absolute global hegemony and taking unilateral decisions with no one to compete them.

Concerning the future of US foreign policy, when US Secretary of State, Madeline Albright was one day asked about this issue, she replied, “President Clinton and I ... have often spoken about the goals of American foreign policy. Boiled down, these have not changed in more than 200 years. They are to ensure the continued security, prosperity and freedom of our people.”

In the light of this short glance and as the US has become more and more involved in world affairs, it is expected that America will continue to sustain its preeminent position and defend its interests by referring to them as the interests of the ‘world community’ to give global legitimacy to actions reflecting the interests of the USA. America will also continue to promote its ideology and culture and try to integrate the other world’s communities through globalization, democratization and human rights policies.

Concerning the relation with China as an economic and even military challenging power to the US leading position and as a major player in the world scene, it is expected that the USA will collaborate with its Western economic allies to slow the drift of Japan away from Europe and USA toward accommodation with China. Moreover, America will continue to create hindrances, restrictions and practice an economic containment to China inside the international institution such as WTO (World Trade Organization). Yet, America will tend to integrate other worlds economies into a global economic system which works in accordance to its objectives.

As far the relation with the Islamic world the US foreign policy machine will continue to create the vital and the appropriate environment for Israel to reach its

objectives to be solely a Jewish state with the acknowledgement of Arab states that have been brought to mainstream to the phantom theory of Iran and its nuclear advancement. Moreover, the process of disintegration of the Arab World will be achieved within a decade. However, all these may be slowed down by the urgent needs for financial expenditure locally for the nation demands are increasing and the economic recession is prevailing.



## **Bibliography**

### **Books**

Akis, Kalaitzidis and Gregory W. Streich. U.S. Foreign Policy. California: Greenwood, 2011. Print.

Axelord, Alen. America's Wars. New York: Wiley and sons, 2002. Print.

Bacevich, Andrew J. American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2003. Print.

Barber, Benjamin. Imbratoriyat El Khawf: El Harb wal Irhab wa Dimokratiya. Tran. Omar El Ayoubi. Beirut: Dar El kitab El Arabi,2005. Print.

Bardes, Barbara A, et al. American Government and Politics Today. Boston: Cengage, 2012. Print.

Brogan, High. The Penguin History of the United States of America. 2nd ed. London: Penguin group, 1999. Print.

Dobson, Alan P, and Steve Marsh. US Foreign Policy since 1945. 2 nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.

Hughes,William. Ed. Western Civilization EARLY Modern Through the Twentieth Century. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Guilford, CT: Dusking Graw. Hill, 1997. Print.

Huntington, Samuel p. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. 1997. Sydney: The Free Press, 2002. Print.

Jones, Howard. Crucible of Power: A History of American Foreign Policy from 1897. 2 nd ed. Maryland: Rowman and Litlfield, 2008. Print.

Jones, Maldwyn A. *The Limits of Liberty: American History, 1607-1980*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. Print.

Joy, Mark. *American Expansionism, 1783-1860: A Manifest Destiny?*. Edinburgh: Longman, 2003.

Krauthammer, Charles. *Democratic Realism: An American Foreign Policy for a Unipolar World*. Washington: AEI Press, 2004. Print.

Lind, Michael. *U.S Foreign Policy and the American Way of Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.

Loveman, Brian. *No Higher Law : American Foreign Policy and the Western Hemisphere since 1776*. North Carolina: North Carolina University Press, 2010. Print

Martel, Gordon .Ed. *American Foreign Relations Reconsidered 1890-1993*. 1994. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

McCaully, Martin. *Russia, American and the Cold War, 1949-1991*. 2 nd ed. Edinburgh: Longman, 2008. print.

Morison, Samuel Eliot, and Henry Steel Commager. *The Growth of the American Republic*. Vol. 2. 5 th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947. Print.

O'Callaghan, Bryn. *An Illustrated History Of the USA*. 1990. Edinburgh: Longman, 2007. Print.

Ochao, George. *America in the 1900's*. New York: Stonesong Press, LLC, 2006. Print.

Reeves, Thomas C. *Twentieth-Century America A Brief History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.

Schlesinger , Arthur M, and Fred, L Israel. The Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States 1789-2009.2001. New York: Facts on File, 2010. Print.

Schulzinger, Robert.U.S. Diplomacy since 1900. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.Print.

Shmidt, Donald E.The Folly of War .American Foreign Policy:1898-2005.USA: Algora, 2005.Print.

Withfield, Stephen J. Ed. A Companion to 20th Century America. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. Print.

Yahyaoui A. Kader, and Ahmine El Arbi. Tarikh El Alam El Moaser. Algiers: O.N.P.S, 2005. Print.

### **Articles**

Nazemoray, M. Darius.“Global Research-Plans for Redrawing the Middle-East: The Project for a‘New Middle-East’ ”. Media Watch, January 21, 2013. Web. 05 May 2013.

"Open Door policy." Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopaedia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 2010. DVD.