

**People's Democratic Republic of Algeria**  
**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research**  
**Mohamed Boudiaf University –Msila**  
**Faculty of Letters and Languages**  
**Department of English**



**U.S. Foreign Policy towards Latin America in 1990s:  
Continuity or Change**

**Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and English in Partial Fulfilment of  
the Requirements for the Master's Degree**

**Submitted by:**

**Amal KABACHE**

**Djaouhar BEN ELBAR**

**Supervised by:**

**Karima LAOUIDJI**

**Chahrazed HAMOUMA : Chairperson**

**Amel BENIA: Examiner**

**Academic year: 2019 /2020**

## **Dedication:**

To my family, to my friends, and to everyone shares us love, care, and respect. To all doctors, nurses, teachers, and soldiers who fight against recent disease COVID19.

## **Acknowledgments:**

We would like to express our gratitude to numerous people whose help eased the way to fulfill such research, first of all, we would like to express our gratitude to our supervisor Mrs. Karima laoudji, who we have been honored to be her students for two years, as we feel indebted to her for her scientific generous spirit. We also would like to express our deep thanks to our teachers, and our heartfelt thanks would go to the Head of English Language Department Mr. Mohamed Saber, for his care and patience.

## **Abstract**

This research is concerned with the investigation of American foreign policy under the concept of continuity or change. This research work analyses American foreign policy towards Latin America in 1990s, i.e. after the end of Cold War; the latter was an ideological war between United States of America, and Soviet Union as two rival powers each of which competing with the other over world leadership. Under this kind of rivalry, some countries such as in Latin America were victimized under the pretext of fighting and containing Communism, so America conducted a direct interventionist policy towards the region. By the end of Cold War the Soviet Union collapsed, and its threat ceased to exist. The world witnessed a shift from unipolarity to polarity, i.e. American leadership over the world; hence, the American foreign policy towards Latin America in 1990s is based on this data; the researchers hypothesize that the collapse of Soviet Union had significantly impacted United States foreign policy in the sense that it was obliged to change it, i.e. change in foreign policy strategy from hostile, direct, armed, and interventionist policy to cooperative policy. By the end of this research, the researchers came to prove their main hypothesis that America changed its policy strategy once the Soviet Union ceased to exist in Latin America added to that the validity of their set of sub-hypotheses which confirm that: Foreign multidimensional competition over Latin America, movements of democratizations in the region added to United States distant past of support of dictatorships, the growing of Anti-Americanism in Latin America, and the existence of other profitable spheres of influence other than Latin America impacted United States policy makers to change their foreign policy strategy. Finally, researchers answered their main question that American foreign policy towards Latin America in 1990s is a continuity not a change; what changed is the strategy of foreign policy.

### **Key Words:**

The United States of America, Latin America, foreign policy, the Soviet Union, cold war

## المخلص

يهتم هذا البحث بالسياسية الخارجية الامريكية تحت اطار الاستمرارية او التغيير، فهذا البحث يحلل السياسة الامريكية الخارجية تجاه امريكا اللاتينية خلال التسعينات أي بعد نهاية الحرب الباردة، فالأخيرة عبارة عن حرب ايدولوجية بين الولايات المتحدة الامريكية و الاتحاد السوفييتي كقوتين متنافستين كلاهما يتنافس على قيادة انحاء العالم الاخرى تحت هذا النوع من التنافس بعض الدول مثل امريكا اللاتينية كانوا ضحايا تحت ذريعة محاربة واحتواء الشيوعية واجرت امريكا سياسة التدخل المباشر تجاه المنطقة ولكن في نهاية المطاف ومع انهيار تهديدات الاتحاد السوفييتي وذلك بسقوطه من الساحة شهد العالم تغير من الثنائية القطبية الى الاحادية القطبية ،اي قيادة الولايات المتحدة الامريكية للعالم ،استنادا على هذه البيانات ،الباحث افترض ان انهيار الاتحاد السوفييتي قد اثر بشكل كبير على السياسة الخارجية الامريكية تجاه امريكا اللاتينية في التسعينات ،بمعنى انها اضطرت الى تغييرها ، اي تغيير استراتيجية السياسة الخارجية من سياسة معادية ،مباشرة ، مسلحة ، و ذات طابع تدخلية الى اخرى تعاونية . بحلول نهاية هذا البحث ،توصل الباحثان الي اثبات فرضيتهما الرئيسية و التي تنص بأن امريكا غيرت استراتيجية سياستها الخارجية لما شهدت منطقة امريكا اللاتينية اختفاء الاتحاد السوفييتي. اضافة الي صحة الفرضيات الفرعية التي تمثل مصادر السياسة الخارجية الامريكية في فترة التسعينات . الفرضية الفرعية تؤكد ان : المنافسة الخارجية متعددة الابعاد اتجه امريكا اللاتينية ،و الحركات الديمقراطية في المنطقة اضافة الي دعم الولايات المتحدة القديم و الحديث الي الانظمة الديكتاتورية المعادات الدولية المتزايدة لأمريكا ، و وجود مجالات نفوذ اخرى مربحة غير اللاتينية اثرت على صناعات السياسة الخارجية الامريكية لتغيير استراتيجية السياسة الخارجية . و اخيرا يتم الرد على سؤال البحث الرئيسي الذي يثبت بأن طابع السياسة الامريكية تجاه امريكا اللاتينية فترة التسعينات هو الاستمرارية وليس التغيير ،ما تغيير هو استراتيجية السياسة الخارجية فقط .

## الكلمات المفتاحية:

الولايات المتحدة الامريكية، الاتحاد السوفييتي ، السياسة الخارجية، امريكا اللاتينية، الحرب الباردة.

### **List of Abbreviations:**

**U.S.A:** United States of America

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

**S.U:** Soviet Union

**U.S:** United States

**WWI:** World War I

**WWII:** World War II

**FDR:** Franklin Delano Roosevelt

**UN:** United Nations

**OAS:** Organization of American States

**N.A.T.O:** North Atlantic Treaty Organization

**USAID:** United States Agency for Inter Development

**LAIA:** Latin American Integration Association

**CACM:** Central American Common Market

**CARICOM:** Caribbean Community and Common Market

**EAI:** Enterprise for the Americas Initiative

**CMC:** Common Market Council

**FTAA:** Free Trade Area of the Americas

**GATT:** General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

**IACHER:** Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

**IADB:** Inter-American Defense Board

**IAS:** Inter-American System

**NED:** National Endowment for Democracy

**IMF:** International Monetary Fund

**LAFTA:** Latin American Free Trade Association

**NAFTA:** North America Free Trade Association

**SAFTA:** South America Free Trade Association

**CAFTA:** Central America Free Trade Association

**NAALC:** North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation

**NAAEC:** North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation

**IADB:** Inter-American Development Bank

**CIA:** Central Intelligence Agency

**FBI:** Federal Bureau of Investigation

**AIPAC:** American Israel Public Affairs Committee

**ESF:** Economic Support Fund

**IMET:** International Military Education and Training

**DA:** Development Assistance

**CSH:** Child Survival and Health

## Table of content:

- I. Dedication
- II. Acknowledgements
- III. Abstract
- IV. List of Abbreviations
- V. Table of Content

### General Introduction

- 1. Background of the Study.....1
- 2. Statement of the Problem.....2
- 3. Questions .....2
- 4. Hypothesis .....2
- 5. Significance of the Study .....3
- 6. Objectives of the Study ..... 3
- 7. Scope of the Study .....3
- 8. Methodology..... 4
- 9. Structure of the Research .....4

### Chapter one: Identification of U.S. Foreign Policy

- 1.1. Introduction.....4
- 1.2. Foreign Policy and some relevant Concepts .....5
  - 1.2.1. Foreign Policy and International Relations .....5
  - 1.2.2. Foreign Policy and International Politics .....5
  - 1.2.3. Foreign Policy and Diplomacy .....6
- 1.3. Identification of U.S. Foreign Policy .....6
  - 1.3.1. Hamiltonian School .....6
  - 1.3.2. Wilsonian School .....7
  - 1.3.3. Jeffersonian School .....7
  - 1.3.4. Jacksonian School .....7
- 1.4. Nature of U.S. Foreign Policy .....8
- 1.5. Characteristics of U.S. Foreign Policy .....8
  - 1.5.1. Official .....8
  - 1.5.2. External/ Foreign..... 9
  - 1.5.3. Potential/ Optional.....9
  - 1.5.4. Goal Oriented .....9
  - 1.5.5. Unified.....10
- 1.6. Orientations of U.S. Foreign Policy.....10
  - 1.6.1. Regional.....10
  - 1.6.2. Interventionist/Non-Interventionist.....11
- 1.7. Determinants of U.S. Foreign Policy.....11
  - 1.7.1. Internal Determinants.....12

1.7.1.1 Military Capability .....	12
1.7.1.2. Economic Capability .....	12
1.7.1.3. Political Structure .....	12
1.7.1.4. Public Opinion.....	13
1.7.1.5. Mass Media.....	13
1.7.2. External Determinants.....	13
1.7.2.1. Physical Environment.....	13
1.7.2.2. Social Environment.....	13
1.8. U.S. Foreign Policy Making.....	13
1.8.1. The Constitutional Background.....	14
1.8.2. The National Security Council.....	14
1.8.3. The Department of State.....	14
1.8.4. The Department of Defense .....	16
1.8.5. The Central Intelligence Agency.....	16
1.8.6. The Executive Branch.....	17
1.8.6.1. The Role of President.....	17
1.8.6.2. The Role of Vice President .....	18
1.8.7. The Legislative Branch.....	18
1.8.8. The President VS the Congress.....	19
1.9. Conclusion.....	19
 <b>Chapter two: Historical Background to U.S. Foreign Policy towards Latin America after WW2</b>	
2.1. Introduction .....	20
2.2. WW2 .....	21
2.3. Cold War .....	21
2.4. U.S. Cold War Policy in Latin America.....	22
2.4.1. U.S. Intervention in Guatemala .....	22

<b>2.4.2. U.S. Intervention in Cuba.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>2.4.3. U.S. Intervention in Chile .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>2.4.3.1. Allend as Marxist .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>2.4.3.2. Allend Relations with International Communitis.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>2.4.3.3. Allend Regime Relations with the Socialist Bloc .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>2.4.4. U S. Intervention in Nicaragua .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>2.5. Anti-Americanism in Latin America.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>2.6. U.S. Support of Dictatorships in Latin America and Democrazation Movement... </b>	<b>36</b>
<b>2.7. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>36</b>

### **Chapter Three: U.S. Latin American Policies in 1990s**

<b>3.1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3.2. Foreign Competition.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>3.3. U.S. Post- Cold War Policy in Latin America: U.S, Brazil, and Mexico Relations ..</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>3.4. George H.W. Bush Foreign Policy towards Latin America.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>3.4.1. U.S. Relations with Mexico (NAFTA).....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.4.2. CAFTA.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>3.4.3. U.S. Relations with Brazil (FTAA).....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>3.5. Bill Clinton Foreign Policy towards Latin America.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>3.5.1 Protecting human rights and spreading democracy.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>3.5.2 US-Mexican Relations.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>3.5.3 US-Haitian Relations.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>3.6. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>General Conclusion.....</b>	<b>56</b>

### **Appendix**

<b>Table of U.S. Presidents .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Works Cited.....</b>	<b>59</b>

## **General Introduction**

---

### **Background of the Study:**

American foreign policy is known for its complexity, diversity, and change. The U.S. Declaration of Independence against the British rule is considered as the first spark of American foreign policy. From Washington's time to H. Hoover's, America had been an isolationist nation. Adherents of George Washington's doctrine strongly believe that if America wants strength, it has to build it at home. Furthermore, if it wants to stand itself upon superior moral standards in the eyes of other nations, then external interventions has to be avoided. An isolationist policy would safeguard America from armed confrontations which would bring about more damage than benefit at the time. Still, there are uncontrolled conditions that shaped American politics. In addition to America's entry into World War 2, and the end of the Cold War era are by far the most significant events that redirected American foreign policy. The two previous events resulted in the collapse of the Soviet Union and the rise of America as the world's sole superpower. As stated above, American foreign policy is known for its diversity, i.e. American foreign policy conduct is addressed to approximately every country in the world, and Latin America is one of the many other nations in the world, which is said to be the most important areas that U.S. directs its policy to. The follower of this vital issue of U.S-Latin America foreign relations would soon realize what Latin America represented and what it actually means to the U.S interests. It is advised by field specialists that it would be worth studying if one classifies U.S-Latin American issue into two main eras. The first era is before the end of the cold war, which is characterized by America's direct ideological intervention to protect itself basically from the ideological threat of communism. The second era of 1990s is characterized by the shift from ideological interests to political and economic ones especially when America's fear of communism ceased to exist. It is now the task of policymakers to reassess and refocus on better potentials for their policy validity.

## **Statement of the Problem:**

Since the presidency of James Monroe, U.S. administration had considered Latin America as an area of vital and paramount geostrategic importance to the United States. Monroe's doctrine asserts that America has a complete right to have an eye peeled over this area from which the U.S could be threatened. By the end of the cold war, which marked the demise of Soviet Union, the most powerful enemy of American values and interests, the world witnessed the birth of a new world order. America became the world leader which eventually entailed further requirements, strategies, and objectives to maintain this position. As communist threat was gradually swept from America's backyard, i.e. American foreign policy towards Latin America changed dramatically. Hence, the problem lays on how significant the collapse of Soviet Union contributed to this change, i.e. a change from ideological and security direction to political and economic ones, since this study lays in the controversial issue of whether American foreign policy has been characterized by continuity or change.

## **Research Questions:**

This study aims to answer these questions:

1. Does the American policy towards Latin America change or not in 1990s?
2. If it did, how these changes were put into practice?
3. How did U.S.A maintained the same policy towards Latin America in 1990s?

## **Major Hypothesis and Subsidiary Hypotheses:**

The collapse of Communist Soviet Union's influence in Latin America led the USA to change its strategy in the region.

### **Sub-hypotheses:**

1. The existence of more strategic and economically profitable regions than Latin American countries such as Africa had a major impact on the cooperative relations between the U.S. and Latin American countries
2. The movement of democratization in Latin America along with U.S. distant support of dictatorships in the region has weakened U.S. pretexts of fighting tyranny, i.e. it has worsened national and international acceptance over launching an American direct interventionist policy towards Latin America.
3. U.S. foreign policy in 1990s is impacted by the growing sentiments of Anti-Americanism not only in Latin America but also in other parts of the globe.

**Significance of the Study:**

This study of American foreign policy towards Latin America in 1990s is significant in the sense that U.S. foreign policy is one of the most complicated and dynamic foreign policies all over the world. The exploration of U.S-Latin American affairs would help students and researchers whose areas of interest are history or international relations to understand this complicated issue. Continuity or Change scrutinized under two different, but linked periods i.e. before and after Cold War, would shed light on how internal and external factors have shaped American foreign policy towards one of the most sensitive and strategic places in the globe

**Objectives of the Study:**

The main objective of this study is to find out whether American foreign policy towards Latin America in 1990s significantly changed or not. If it changed, the research intends to explore the nature of those changes and in what way they were put into practice? If not, the researchers seek to find out how the USA has stuck to the same policy though its motive had ceased to exist.

**Scope to the Research:**

This research is concerned with American foreign policy towards Latin America in 1990s under the issue of "U.S. foreign policy: Continuity or Change.

**Suggested Methodology:**

This research will be based on both historical and argumentative analyses. Most of data will be collected from books; articles, journals, periodicals, interviews, and if possible documentaries. We will also have recourse to previous academic studies undertaken by other scholars, teachers, and students which have a relevance to American foreign policy aspects such as the process of making American foreign policy.

**Structure of the Study:**

This study consists of three chapters each of which has sections and subsections. In an attempt to provide a theoretical background to the study, in the first chapter the researchers will define the meaning of U.S. foreign policy and the process of U.S. foreign policy making. The second chapter is a historical background to U.S. foreign policy towards Latin America during Cold War. The third chapter is the core of the study in the sense that it will provide with details analyses of foreign relations between the U.S and Latin America in 1990s

## **1 Chapter one: Identification of U.S. Foreign Policy**

### **1.1 Introduction:**

Foreign policy is considered as one of the most studied fields of political sciences for its vital importance. The study of foreign policy helps researchers to grasp issues of international dimensions. It helps to have a better and clearer picture of one country or group of countries national and international relations, interests, and views. Thus, the researchers sought in this chapter to identify U.S foreign policy as a concept. This could be achieved through the exploration of its nature, characteristics, orientations, and determinants. The follower of the flow of American Foreign policy analysis will undoubtedly realize its complexity in terms of making. This is due to its openness to various key factors, change, flexibility, and many other features. On the one hand, its ultimate goal is to advance peace and moral values such as democracy, human rights, and freedom. On the other hand, it is hostile, expansionist, and interventionist. Thus, the researchers seek to understand and to explain the official and/or non-official bodies that are responsible for making U.S. foreign policy so as to grasp the reason behind this complexity; this is going to be the main item in this chapter.

### **1.2 Foreign Policy and some Relevant Concepts:**

#### **1.2.1 Foreign Policy and International Relations:**

According to Dr. Abo Amir, foreign policy is less thorough than International Relations in the sense that foreign policy is composed of a number of general orientations that are made at the beginning of a historical period, i.e. directions made whenever a new administration takes office. Foreign policy is also an operation conducted by a state to defend its national interests so as to fulfill certain predetermined objective (Abo Amir 34). In other words, foreign policy is made inside a country and it is reflection of its domestic policy. In contrast to this idea, International Relations, according to Mercille Mirl, is: " International Relations can be defined as all influxes that transcend states' borders, These influxes comprise relations between states' governments, relations between individuals and groups, either private or public groups, diplomacy, negotiations, wars ...etc. It also could comprise political, ideological, social, cultural influxes" (Toufik 12-13). Consequently and because International Relations is composed of various key international actors such as international organizations, multi-national companies, etc., foreign policy of group of states represent only a part of International Relations and that is why International Relations is a broader concept than foreign policy.

### **1.2.2. Foreign Policy and International Politics:**

International Politics is defined by Hamid Rabiaa as the interaction that must result from a confrontation that is necessary and expected as a consequence to different decisions and objectives that come from more than one political unit" (Toufik 18). This definition implies that International Politics is broader than foreign policy in the sense that interactions of different foreign policies constitute International Politics. Besides, members responsible for the application of foreign policy are individuals, institutions, parties while members of International Politics are states, international organizations, and active groups. Thus, the element of analysis in foreign policy differs from the one of international politics (Toufik 20).

To add, International Politics is composed of the interaction of different foreign policies of states isolated from other political actors as already mentioned, foreign policies of countries make International politics which, in turn, makes international Relations.

### **1.2.3. Foreign Policy and Diplomacy:**

Foreign policy differs from diplomacy in two basic aspects; first, foreign policy is the procedure that a country follows in its political, economic, and financial relations with other countries whereas diplomacy is only the executing tool of foreign policy (Essied 43). Second, diplomacy's distinctive merit is that it tries to realize a country's plans or foreign affairs peacefully.

In contrast, foreign policy is characterized by its repetitive alternation of peaceful and non-peaceful procedures and tools, thus depending on the state's national interests. In this respect, the Russian writer Tonkin defines diplomacy as "the activity that is practiced by presidents, governments, foreign affairs administrations, delegations, expeditions, and this activity is addressed to realize foreign affairs objectives using peaceful tools (Essied 65).

## **1.3 Identification of U.S Foreign Policy:**

According to Walter Russel there are four schools of thought in the American Foreign Policy. In a book was published in 2001-2002 under the headline: special providence: American Foreign Policy and how it Changed the World; he identified four major schools of thought that have affected and, shaped the foreign policy making process throughout American history. Russel argues had constituted the basic ways of looking at foreign policy until now. The book suggest a fresh look at geopolitical, and America's relations with the world came out right at the time of 9/11 attacks. Russel's book puts forward one truth that the American foreign policy making process had been and still flexible process.

### **1.3.1. Hamiltonian School:**

It was named after Alexander Hamilton; most of American politicians are Hamiltonians. This school focused on economy, and hegemony stability, and it represented among the old republican foreign policy establishment seek a close alliance between the government, and

business; i.e. marriage between politics, and democracy, so the relationship between government, and economy was the key to success of country. This school wanted the U.S in its day to build of global commercial, and security system based on sea power, and technological leadership, maintaining a balance of power in key geopolitical threats, and seeking to attract potential rivals like China into the American system. As they did not believe in wars, and did believe in protecting of American merchants and investors to integrate into the global economy, so they believed in mercantilism, and universal business.

Hamiltonians based themselves on the ideology of centralism, and to take up the British burden as hegemony adapt to economic change; originally mercantilism, but adapting free trade; i.e. they focused on trade. (Russel 12)

### **1.3.2. Wilsonian School:**

It was named after the president of the U.S Woodrow Wilson, it principled on morality, and interests, and it was just like Hamiltonian school, and wanted U.S to build a world order, but into anchor it in liberal human rights practices, and establish the rule of international law, settling international problems within the legal bodies of international organizations rather than the economic, and security frameworks.

Wilsonian and Hamiltonian schools were two schools dominated the foreign policy establishment thought about the world we live in, and they wanted to build a national order.

### **1.3.3. Jeffersonian School:**

It was named after Thomas Jefferson, they were isolationists, so they wanted the U.S to stay far from wars, and they had historically sought to avoid war and foreign entanglements at all costs. It was principled on inward looking

Jeffersonians generally opposed to almost any war rather than a war of self-defense following a direct enemy attack, and they defended the argument that American foreign policy should be concerned about spending democracy abroad than about safeguarding it at home; in this context John Quincy Adams says “ America goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher of freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own” (light.t 221), so he invites American politicians and policy makers not to go abroad to search for the fake monster to be. As the Jeffersonians think that the protection of American democracy at home in a dangerous world as the most pressing and vital interest of American people.

### **1.3.4. Jacksonian School:**

It was named after the 7th president of U.S Andrew Jackson, this school was principled on show your strength; i.e. self-reliance. Jacksonians thought rooted in the populist and popular culture of honor, independence, courage, and military pride among American people, so they had been suspicious of foreign adventures, but strongly believed in national defense, and support a strong military and decisive action against any threat to the U.S, its honor, and reputation abroad.

As they focused on internal security of the U.S territory, and the well-being of the American people.

#### **1.4. Nature of U.S foreign policy:**

To the very nature of American foreign policy dates back the early era of its foundation. It is because it proved to be of enduring merit in constitution of 1787, which was later modified by the fourteen. First, U.S. preferences were set at a domestic level. No interests were shown to the outside world. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and many other prominent figures in the history of the US believed that enrollment in world affairs brings no good, only wars and confrontations.

As the pace of events accelerated unexpectedly, U.S. economic interests seemed to be endangered. No choice was left to the U.S. government but to intervene in world matters to protect its economy. Though U.S. attempts to avoid embarking upon world conflicts, events like Pearl Harbor accelerated U.S. interests and security with intervention. No choice was left to the USA to keep their neutral position.

Since then, American foreign policy has shifted in its goals and tools of implementation. Starting from the WWII, America could not maintain its supremacy without the existence of an external enemy. The protection of its national interests pushed the USA to look for pretexts in order to intervene in territories around the world, so as to realize and preserve its supremacy. It could be seen that George Washington's advice not to engage in world affairs was proved not to be valid.

American leaders and policy makers seemed to have adopted the Darwinian principle-"the survival of the fittest", and since, according to them, the pursue of happiness would not be realized without valid values such as free trade, which seemed to be the only values which help to develop and settle world affairs. Across the timeline of post-Cold War events, American interests were dedicated to preserving values like peace, promoting democracy, and fighting tyranny. In the aftermath of 9/11 events, this belief became stronger and stronger. Apparently, American leaders tried to find the right time and place when and where people of the world would be prepared and ready to accept American value of democracy to set its entire focus on gaining the maximum of benefit. An example of this is the American war against Iraq," American foreign policy makers through mass media and other tools were used in order to get the world's support to their interventionist policy". In the light of the above cited facts, the ultimate objective of American foreign policy is to preserve American leadership due to American Pragmatism.

#### **1.5. Characteristics of U.S Foreign Policy:**

Through foreign policy tradition, scholars draw some distinguishing characteristic features that are implied in U.S foreign policy activity.

### **1.5.1. Official:**

It means that it is made, at the first place, by official bodies inside the U.S government. That is, there is no non-official institution or body in the state which has the final word in directing U.S foreign policy conduct (Essied Salim 70). However, there is a room left to them to contribute because non-official institutions, for example, do have useful facts and pieces of information that in a way or another help better conduct a balanced U.S foreign policy.

Accordingly, the executive branch is usually the political body that gives U.S foreign policy its official aspect. It is, most of the time, represented by the president, vice president, and other official body members of the state.

### **1.5.2. External/ Foreign:**

As the term suggests, U.S foreign policy is conducted outside the borders of the state. Despite the fact that it is made by internal bodies of the state- internal environment- its application or execution is in the international environment (Essied Salim77).

Evaluation or reaction to a certain foreign policy conduct can never be achieved unless it is put and run in the targeted external political environment. In this way, political experts can evaluate their foreign policy objectives and tools, i.e. they can assess the degree of utility or success of the adopted foreign policy

### **1.5.3. Optional/ Potential:**

This characteristic feature is a basic element in defining U.S foreign policy. That is, U.S foreign policy programmes and decisions are chosen among other potentials, so as there is no single political behavior to be adopted and counted as a reaction to other foreign political behaviors. Any state has many foreign policy programmes and decisions in which the most effective one that presumably fulfils the state's chosen objectives and intimal interests is to be adopted (Essied Salim 80).

### **1.5.4. Goal Oriented:**

The U.S. conducts foreign policies to guarantee that her decision makers set objectives are to be realized, this element asserts that any foreign policy must be addressed to achieve the policy makers' determined objectives. All available resources (human sources, raw materials, economic resources, and military resources, etc.) should be prepared or should be created to achieve these objectives. For example, the budget dedicated to army industry and manufactory differs from democrats and republicans. During the PNAC policy, financial expenditure addressed to army industry reached the top of costs.

Accordingly, foreign policy can not be considered as a mere reaction to the external political environment, but rather is a conscious and deliberate process seeking to influence the external environment. This operation, i.e. foreign policy enables the state to be a key actor' in the international system or at least to achieve and maintain its national interests (Essied Salim 88).

### **1.5.5. Unified:**

U.S foreign policy is fixed and targeted to fulfill certain designed goals. Though there might be so many decisions, still they all serve one or a couple of fixed and unchanged objectives. Foreign policy decisions can not be numerous and in contradiction with an issue of national interest, i.e., an issue of values and traditions, In other words, those decisions are the results of a certain philosophy and thought. (Kapstein 20).

For example the American opposition to authoritarian, and tyrannical regimes. It is by no means that the US government comes with a public decision that makes it stop defending its claimed right to disseminate western values such as democracy, free enterprise, individualism, etc. To conclude, it is US foreign policy instruments or strategies that might represent serious differences as compared to issues of philosophy or values which are not put into action.

## **1.6. Orientations of U.S Foreign Policy:**

Politically speaking, policy makers of U.S choose their foreign policy conduct and tools regarding different factors. A greater regard is given to the national interests of the country while careful and scientific study of the state's internal and external conditions is also of paramount impact on foreign policy conduct. Indeed, the identification of a country's main objectives along with the study of internal and external sources of U.S foreign policy clearly explains the state's tendency towards a certain direction. The following are U.S foreign policy orientations:

### **1.6.1. Regional/ International Orientation:**

In this orientation, and as the term presupposes, a state address its foreign policy solely to its regional geographic environment and much less interest is given to issues and regions far away from them (Larson 37). This orientation is, furthermore, associated with a claimed national role that the state tries to accomplish, i.e. role of a regional leader. A state conducting this direction benefits and invests its greater and different capabilities compared to other less powerful states of the region, which makes it as a regional power exercising regional active roles (Hatti 173). America, Brazil, Germany, Iran, Turkey are examples of states conducting a policy addressed to their regional atmospheres. In contrast, there is the International Orientation in which a state's foreign policy is addressed to an international scale (Larson 38). America, for instance, especially after the WWII addresses its foreign policy towards approximately every part of the world. It directs its policy to parts in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East, Unlike the regional direction, states adopting the international direction follow and seek to realize their countries' national role, the role of 'a movement or trend leader'. This role usually reflects a state's specific doctrine or philosophy, and these countries posse the required means to fulfill this role (Hatti 174).

America is rather a good example to explain this orientation. It directs its policy to the entire globe seeking to air its values like democracy and freedom.

### **1.6.2. Interventionist/ Non-interventionist Orientation:**

Unlike the previous direction which categorizes U.S foreign policy conduct based on state's general objectives, this orientation categorizes U.S foreign policy according to the state's strategies and tools of U.S foreign policy conduct. To find out whether or not the state's foreign policy is interventionist, one might need to observe and study "what intervention tools had been used by a state: the interventionist orientation permits an international unit a country' to direct other international units' policies by affecting their current political systems (Falcoff 38- 39). This orientation is often adopted by the world's major powers which try to gain power and preserve their national interests.

American foreign affairs with Latin American countries such as Cuba, Guatemala, and Nicaragua are examples of this orientation. From another angle, we find the non-interventionist orientation. States adopting this direction though they seek to affect other international units' political affairs: they do not intervene using interventionist instruments in states' political systems (Aronson9).

### **1.7. Determinants of U.S Foreign Policy:**

As far as the theoretical overview of U.S foreign policy determinants is concerned, there are two different views on how significant domestic or external determinants are of vital importance to U.S foreign policy analysis. The first group sees "foreign policy as a function of domestic politics, the effects of key domestic factors are often seen by this approach as uniform, direct, and singular" (gtd in Al\_angari). Explaining this point of view, Wolfram Hanrieder considers the affecting role of domestic sources of U.S foreign policy saying " analytical emphasis rests on the domestic political system ; the structures and opportunities of the international environment are relegated to the secondary analytical role of serving as 'input' from the international system into the domestic system " (gtd in Al\_angari). In contrast, a second group holds that the international environment or external determinants have a major role in U.S foreign policy analysis. Commenting on this point of view, Hanrieder argues that "the structures of necessity imposed by the international environment take analytical precedence over considerations of preferences and the possibility of choice" (Al\_angari 1). In the same vein, some scholars see the ability and the appropriateness of the two approaches merged together into one approach which benefits using both views. An approach which links and collaborates every data concerning U.S foreign policy to better understand and comprehend what a country is capable of in conducting external activity. In this respect, Harrieder provides a fruitful compromise over the two differing views saying " by taking both dimensions into account , a wider range of relevant data is brought together and more comprehensive analysis becomes possible" (Al angari 1)

## **1.7.1. Domestic/Internal Determinants:**

### **1.7.1.1. Military Capability:**

As the state's international interests lies under the logic of confrontation and competition, U.S needs to accomplish an army force either to help disseminate its , presumably, right thoughts and ideologies , or defend itself against hostile forces .In this respect William Caplin argues that: “ the foreign policy decision-maker must consider the military strength and weaknesses of his state when making foreign policy ”( qtd in Al\_angari 5 ).

Accordingly Brecher identifies military capability as "the power which encompasses different necessary means, the level of technology, military man-power army financial resources, leadership. Training and moral (qtd Al Angari 5)

### **1.7.1.2. Economic capability:**

Over the history of civilizations it has been more and more evident that one can not separate politics from economy. They are two faces of the same coin. U.S foreign policy is highly dependent on its economy. A country like America, which is famous of its global foreign policy, for sure, must have a great independent and prosperous economy. This is clearer with third world countries when they are bargained to sign political negotiations and treaties next to having industrial commodities.

Another example of the importance of economy in shaping foreign policy is Brazil .Once it realized its growing regional importance as an economic power, it could criticize AFTA and impose U.S. policy towards the invasion of Iraq.

### **1.7.1.3. Political structure:**

The type of a state political system is of crucial role in foreign policy conduct. A country's political stability, for example USA and an example of the latter is Iraq. It is as Al Angari maintains:

it refers as well to various traits of the political system which may influence the decision process in foreign policy : the type of political regime (authoritarian or democratic); the character of the party system (one party or multi-party); civil military relations of control and the extent of the openness or closeness of the whole governmental decision-making apparatus" (Al Angari 6).

### **1.7.1.4. Public opinion:**

It is the state's population thoughts, attitudes and opinions over taken decisions. Public opinion seems to be valid, as a foreign policy source, only in democratic regimes. According to Caplin: the more democratic a state the greater the number of people to whom the leaders tend to listen. Because democracy means among other things, elections, anybody who votes has some capacity to command the attention of the decision maker.

In autocratic states the policy influences are limited to a few very powerful individuals who control important organizations such as the Army (Cox and Takashi 8).

#### **1.7.1.5. Mass Media:**

If domestic public opinion is important in the shaping of a state's foreign policy, mass media plays a more significant role in building people attitudes and reactions. Accordingly Al Angari argues:

Decision makers formulate policies with an eye toward either effect on public opinion and since public opinion can readily be molded by the press, the mass media becomes a significant intervening variable in foreign policy analysis. This is more so in an open political system where the climate of opinion is freer from direct manipulation by decision-makers (qtd in Al Angari 9).

#### **1.7.2. External Determinants:**

State's political behaviors are highly influenced by their external settings. The latter combines both regional and global geopolitical positions, institutions, and organizations. U.S Monroe Doctrine, for instance, asserts that America for Americas' led to specific mutual relationships between the U.S. and Latin American countries. Though there are different aspects among scholars concerning divisions or classification of external environment, one might follow the most common of them:

##### **1.7.2.1. Physical Environment:**

It is the stable determinant which includes the geographical factor of a state; its position among many other states. The geopolitical position of U.S explains its vulnerability to wars, for example, its natural resources guarantees its economic independence, and thus identifying its political independence (Dobbins 12).

##### **1.7.2.2. Social Environment:**

This is concerned with the state's political system which interacts with other supporting or opposing foreign policies of other nations. It is like a social relationship between different members of states. In this context Al Angari asserts "relations among single states are intimately related to the matrix of the International system as a whole and to the study of foreign policy of states in particular" (Al Angari 13).

The International system, in turn, comprises state's political, security, and economic negotiations and treaties with other nations through governmental or non-governmental institutions.

## **1.8. The Process of U.S Foreign Policy Making:**

American propagandists claim that the American civilization and specifically the American political system are the most successful regimes in modern history. The American constitution, which was the result of long debates by knowledgeable and experienced historical figures such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, is the pillar that US political, economic, security prosperity stands on. Since the drafting of the constitution in 1787, each leading power had already been regulated and balanced. The American system of the separation of powers explains why it has been successful for a rather long time or may be forever. Figures like the president or the vice president as well as institutions like the congress have their leading and well framed tasks in foreign policy making process.

### **1.8.1. The Constitutional Background:**

According to the constitution of 1787, powers of foreign policy are equally shared in balance between the president and the Congress. Hence, president's decisions concerning treaties with foreign nations are not effective without the acceptance of at least two thirds majority of the Senate. Whereas the Congress is the sole body to declare war though the president is commander-in-chief of armed forces, the constitution gives exclusive power to the president to appoint ambassadors and key posts in policy namely the Secretary of State.

The congress is authorized by the constitution to accept or even reject the ambassadorial or government appointments (McKeever and Davies 329)

### **1.8.2. The National Security Council (NSC):**

The establishment of NSC dates back to the National Security Act of 1947. The National Security Council has played a significant role in shaping American Foreign and security policies. It has been created to supply official actors to the making of foreign policy. In this context, Richard A. Best, Jr. says:

The National Security Council (NSC) was established by statute in 1947 to create an interdepartmental body to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security (2).

Basically, the foundation of the NSC was aimed at reviewing foreign policy issues for the president in terms of national security affairs. Over time, the influence of this body, especially that of the NSC adviser, on the foreign and security policy making has become increasingly conspicuous. As a result, there has been a change which led to the enlargement of this body. Later, it developed to enclose the president, vice president, secretary of state, secretary of defense, and, since 2007, the secretary of energy (2). Historically, as a reaction to the emerging challenges after the Cold War, reliance on NSC became a necessity. "Some argue that the NSC should be broadened to reflect expanding role of economic, environmental, and demographic issues in national security policymaking" (Best, Jr. 2).

As far as its importance to foreign policy making is concerned, National Economic Council was created by Bill Clinton for the purpose of cooperating closely with the NSC on international economic matters. When George W. Bush chose Condoleezza Rice, as his NSC advisor, it was not accidental, but because she was the Professor of Political Science at Stanford University. She also, played the role of the Republican presidential candidate's top foreign policy adviser in Bush's presidential campaign in 2000 (Ishtiaq and Saleh 54). While President Bush in the wake of the 9/11 events, established a Homeland Security Council, (Best, Jr. 2).

### **1.8.3. The Department of State:**

As the lead of the foreign affairs agency, which is formed of various bureaus, secretaries, and undersecretaries, the State Department is basically endowed with foreign policy issues. Because of its vital importance, it makes the top priority to the president advisory body, in which the State Department helps formulating and implementing US foreign policy programmes. According to Mckeever and Davis, the Department was originally created in 1789 in order to manage U.S foreign affairs, i.e. its basic function is to represent the U.S at world scale using its bodies such as embassies and consulates, to negotiate with other nations, act as a storehouse of knowledge concerning other nations' political developments, and to formulate pieces of advice to the president (Mckeever and Davies 332-3).

According to the State Department Web site, its roles in foreign policy are as follows:

The Executive Branch and the Congress have constitutional responsibilities for U.S foreign policy. Within the Executive Branch, the Department of State is the lead U.S foreign affairs agency, and the Secretary of State is the President's principle foreign policy advisor. The Department advances U.S. objectives and interests in shaping a freer, more secure, and more prosperous world through its primary role in developing and implementing the President's foreign policy. The Department also supports the foreign affairs activities of other U.S. government entities including the Department of commerce and the US agency for International Development ("Department Organization").

In addition, the State Department has other primary roles including:

Leading interagency coordination in developing, and implementing foreign policy, managing the foreign affairs budget and other foreign affairs resources. Leading and coordinating U.S. representations abroad, conveying U.S foreign policy to foreign governments and International organizations through U.S. embassies and consulates in foreign countries and diplomatic missions to International Organizations. Conducting negotiations and concluding agreements and treaties on issues ranging from trade to weapons. Coordinating and supporting international activities of other U.S. agencies and officials ("Department Organization").

In sharp contrast to the stated functions, some may claim and consider its decreasing roles in the shaping of foreign policy. Asserting this claim, Ishtiaq and Saleh included the U.S. Commission on National Security 21<sup>st</sup> century, which in February 2001 launched a furious criticism upon the Department's inadequacy stating: "The Department of State, in particular, is a crippled institution starved for resources by Congress because of its inadequacies". The same report ended up the following statement: "only if the State Department's internal weaknesses are cured will it become an effective leader in the making and implementation of the nation's foreign policy" (60).

Having a short glance at the State Department's history, one might back up this claim, Dorthy M. Sampas, Senior Foreign Service Officer in Department of State, mentions the diminishing functions of the State Department's since the WWII. According to Dorthy, the list of cases which appear to be most significant and permanent are:

-The loss of the Executive function of coordinating foreign policy for the president and the president's almost exclusive advisor on foreign policy, in 1947, with the National Security Act and the Establishment of the National Security Council.

- The loss of the Intelligence, gathering, intelligence-coordinating and covert operation functions, 1947, with the National Security Act and the establishment of the Central Intelligence Agency.

-The loss of overseas information operations function, with the establishment in 1953 of the United States Information Agency, first viewed as an appendage to the Department, but later a quite independent agency to which the Department merely aimed to provide policy guidance.

- The loss of responsibility for supervising and coordinating the trade agreements program and for directing US participation in trade negotiations with other countries, to the Special Trade Representative, in 1975, under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and Trade Act of 1974.

-The loss of cultural and educational exchange programme to USIA in 1978.

-The loss of commercial function, assistance to U.S. business overseas and development to the Department of Commerce.

- The loss of the foreign policy crisis management function in 1981, with vesting of this function to the Vice President after the Secretary of State had specifically requested the role.

-The loss of the foreign policy guidance for U.S. overseas information operations with the establishment in 1981 of the Public Diplomacy, Programme under the authority of the National Security Council (Dorthy 1-2).

While Dorthy attributes the State Department decreasing roles to the personality of the president or the Secretary of State (Dorthy 1), Ishtiaq refers to the tensions between careerists and political appointees as the main cause behind the inadequacy of the Department (Ishtiaq

and Saleh 59). In a nutshell, it might be seen that the State Department is highly influenced by its responsible officers as well as the personality of U.S. presidents. This could be better clarified through the rise and fall of the Department's role along different administrations. Following her experience as US Ambassador to the UN, Madeleine Albright assumed office of the Secretary of State during President Clinton administration and gained the Department's reputation and was much considered as a policy implementer rather than an advisor (Ishtiaq and Saleh 63).

#### **1.8.4. The Department of Defense:**

For better prospects in foreign policy, the Department of Defense as a term and as an organization appeared in 1947. It, therefore, was created to encompass the War Department and the Department of the Navy and other many bureaus and secretaries to form one complete body worth consulting of military matters. It might be called, the Pentagon named after the building in which it is located, Created to guarantee US security, inside and outside, and to secure American interests, the Department of Defense is a key factor in foreign policy making. The same way economy affects foreign policy conduct, the military defense also affects foreign policy in clarifying of what a country is capable of and what is not. The Department of Defense derives its strength from the gigantic budget devoted to it.

As a matter of fact, the higher expenditures of the Department of defense are considered as a double-edged weapon. It benefits the Congress where employment opportunities increase in states where these military installations exist, and it also benefits the Arms Industry which tries to accomplish the Pentagon needs (Mckeever and Davies 333).

Although the military power represents one of the pillars of American foreign policy, its influence seems to be dependent on the character of the President, the majority of the Congress, and world political conditions, and this is why the differing rates of the budget are devoted to the Department of Defense. The massive budget devoted to the DOD during the Cold War and during the George Bush administration as compared to Bill Clinton's is an example that explains the key role of the DOD in the making of foreign policy.

#### **1.8.5. The Central Intelligence Agency:**

At the international level, whenever the word or the abbreviation "CIA" is mentioned, instantly a picture conjures in most people minds 'a secret American agency specialized in espionage'. Despite this fact, it's been first created to provide American policy makers with the necessary information that help the USA to make and conduct a healthy foreign policy. Back in time, the USA was not quite sure of many things concerning the safety of its national interests which were under constant threat. Precisely, it was during the post WWII era that America feared the happening of incidents like Pearl Harbor attacks. While the Soviet Union managed to take over previously occupied territories, U.S. political experts and practitioners were wondered what were the things the Soviet Union was going to do. That is why:

One of the jobs of the Central Intelligence Group, (CIG) which eventually became the familiar CIA, was to put together a comprehensive set of files on

the Soviets, as well as prominent European and South American nations, and keep them up to date so that assessments could be made as to the threat posed to the United States (Downie 2).

Acts manifesting U.S. trust and reliance on CIA on the one hand, and CIA's high levels of commitment and perfection on the other, are its well done missions at the global scene. CIA's intervention in the Italian elections since 1948 to support Christian Democrats over their Communists opponents, role of restoring the Iranian Shah to power in 1953, military support of the Bungled Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in 1961, successive assassination attempts of President Fidel Castro of Cuba in the 1960s, and the waging of a secret war in Laos during President Johnson's administration are all examples backing this claim (McKeever and Davies 337).

### **1.8.6. The Executive Branch:**

#### **1.8.6.1. The Role of the President:**

Being the spokesman of the country and the head of the Foreign Service, the armed forces, the intelligence services, and bureaucracy, the president has the power to react to the non-stoppable and new events in world matters. The president's reaction is to be considered as a foreign policy initiator while Congress's attitude remains optional either support or altering the course of a policy. President Reagan's response to the conflict between Argentina and UK is a rather good example of the president's response to foreign affairs or events. As a response to this event, the Executive Branch suggested an overture which was refused from the part of Argentina. As an immediate reaction, the Secretary of State Alexander Haig's announced U.S. support to British operations and the stopped Arms sales to Argentina. Congress's attitude did not differ from the response of the Executive branch ("Foreign Policy Roles of the President and Congress"). Another example of president's response to foreign events is President Bush's reaction to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in August 2, 1990. This immediate response took the form of economic sanctions against Iraq and the sending of U.S. troops to help Saudi Arabia against a probable attack. Eventually, the Congress supported the President's response through under the umbrella of the UN, and enacted economic sanctions into law. The Congress's approval of the use of armed Forces to implement UN Security Council Resolutions is a clear indicator of full support to the President ("Foreign Policy Roles of the President and Congress").

The U.S president has also independent action to react to the expected and unexpected world political conditions. The president is allowed to respond immediately on his own without having the Congress aware totally of the issue. Presidents have their quick, but accurate researches on a specific situation, added to their experience and knowledge about Congress's views, and most importantly seizing an opportunity to react duly, effectively, and independently ("Foreign Policy Roles of the President and Congress"). The Congress is, then, put under two situations: either to support the president, or to curb him. In most cases, the Congress presented full support.

Grimmet set some examples explaining and clarifying this role. An example for this role is President Reagan's order to bomb Libya on April 15, 1986, allegedly to counter state-supported terrorism. Another instance is President Bush's order to invade Panama on December 20, 1989 to apprehend General Manuel Noriega. In this case, Bush knew in advance Congress's support in addition to public opinion which in turn influenced Congressional response ("Foreign Policy Roles of the President and Congress").

Presidents though given such high levels of responsibility, they must have consulted and calculated everything concerning an issue, and without forgetting, for sure, the Congress's views about the issue in order to undertake an "Independent Action" which might affect the course of a foreign policy conduct.

#### **1.8.6.2. The Role of Vice President:**

As clearly as the term suggests, the Vice President is the person who is next in charge in case the president faces a problem or detained by something hindering him from fulfilling his job. It is in case of the removal of the president from office, or of his death, inability to discharge the power and duties of the office, or resignation, that the Vice President takes his office. Because Vice presidents, though traditionally were not elected along with the president, they may act as advisors of the president in multiples issues. It is by Constitution that the Vice President is assigned to preside over the Senate and with the right to vote in case of a tie-vote. Furthermore, the Vice President according to Amendment 25 is given the role to decide over the question of Presidential Disability ("What Duties Does the Constitution assign to the Vice President").

According to Diana Walker, Vice Presidents accomplish and do what they have been assigned to do by the president. They might also serve as surrogates if the president is outside the country, they might do the reception of dignitaries, and they might also be present at funerals (1).

#### **1.8.7. The Legislative Branch: The Role of the Congress:**

Throughout American history, the Congress which is composed of The House of Representatives (435 members representing states according to number of population) and The Senate (100 members 2 per state) has been concerned traditionally with domestic issues. Nevertheless, it has the role of the shaping and implementation of US foreign policy in the sense that it may oppose the powers and decisions of the Executive Branch, In order to prevent the reoccurrence of already committed mistakes, the Congress has the role to make laws that may affect indirectly the course of foreign policy such as to declare wars and approve or reject the president's nomination of judges. In a way or another, the congress, since it is based on representation, might affect foreign policy conduct. The following examples are some examples of the interference of the Congress in American foreign policy: - President Wilson's failure to get the Senate's approval over his League of Nations after the WWI (Zoellick 2).

-The continuous conflict between the Congress and President Reagan over a number of issues such as the Congress's objection to the selling of Airborne Warning and Control systems aircraft to Saudi Arabia, sanctions imposed on South Africa, and countering nuclear-freeze resolutions (Zoellick 2).

- Congressional criticism of President Truman's management of the Korean war (1950-1955) and his dismissal of General Douglas Mc Arthur has greatly reduced the president's popularity at home and contributed to the victory of the Republicans in the elections of 1954 (Ishtiaq and Saleh 50).

### **1.8.8. The President vs. the Congress:**

According to the Constitution of the USA, the President and the Congress are given major roles in the shaping of American foreign policy. In order to create a balance of power in determining foreign policy, the Constitution made sure that each branch had roles which overlap to shape sound foreign policies regardless of which one plays the decisive role. Depending on consensus over foreign policy, president's party ideology and the majority members of the Congress, case studies showed rises and flows in the domination of either of the bodies in the shaping of foreign policy. A study demonstrated that during the periods of 1789-1829 and 1899-1945, the Bush and Reagan administrations represented Presidential dominance over foreign policy making. In contrast, the periods of 1829-1898, 1837-1861, 1869-1897, 1918-1936, 1943, and after the end of the Vietnam War in 1973 were characterized by Congressional initiative and dominance ("Foreign Policy Roles of the President and Congress").

While Robert Dahl in 1950 wrote: " Perhaps the single most important fact about Congress and its role in foreign policy, therefore, is that it rarely provides the initiative. Most often initiative springs from the executive-administrative branch", Francis Wilcox, who was the Staff Director of the State Foreign Relations Committee from 1947- 1955, and Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization's Affairs from 1955-1961 says " some of the most imaginative and constructive foreign policies since WWII have originated in Congress" ("Foreign Policy Roles of the President and Congress"). All in all, it is the world's political, economic, and military situations which influence foreign policy, not the President or majority members of the Congress.

### **1.9. Conclusion:**

Through the theoretical framework of U.S foreign policy identification, the researcher , after gathering and merging different views about foreign policy, provides a definition which maintains that foreign policy is the state's external, official, goal-oriented political behavior which aims at realizing the state's national interests. In addition, one might also include that U.S foreign policy strategy , as based on its goals, can be interventionist as it can be non-interventionist. Finally, U.S foreign policy is basically based on its conditions, i.e. its domestic as well as its external environments.

## **Chapter two: Historical Background to U.S Foreign Policy towards Latin America after WWII**

### **2.1. Introduction:**

In this chapter, the researchers intend to clarify certain conditions that, in a way or another, affect American foreign policy conduct in the Post W.W.II era in which this affect lies in the adoption of more cooperative relations with Latin American countries. Those conditions, politically speaking, are to be considered as foreign policy external determinants. Though internal determinants of American foreign policy are of vital importance, the researchers seek to mention the only external ones. As a matter of fact, Post W.W.II external determinants of U.S. foreign policy include: Latin American Anti- Americanism which was basically caused by a list of grievances against U.S. interventionist policies in the region, the growing foreign competition, and the dual relationship between the U.S. support of dictatorships in the aftermath of the W.W. II until the movement of democratizations in Latin American countries after the demise of the Soviet Union. As the researchers contend that the analysis of how American policy makers dealt with Latin American countries during the rise of Soviet Union as both a rival and competitor power in the region is of paramount importance. At the time and under the pretext of fighting Communism in the region, which American leaders considered as ideologically threatening, America adopted a policy known as Containment.

## **2.2. WWII:**

During the period from WWI to the WWII, American isolationist decision went steady. The majority of Congressmen, though multiple proposals and attempts of President Franklin Roosevelt to carry out a military intervention in Europe, maintained their loyalty to neutrality. As a consequence of this, there had been many Neutrality Acts passed. In addition, at that time, America was exhausted as a result of the economic crisis of 1929. Foreign policy makers assured the vital importance of regarding domestic circumstances as basic and urgent needs would be met. President Roosevelt, though criticized and opposed, worked hard to have his country's economy recovered. This was partially accomplished by his project "The New Deal". Busy solving its problems, less interest in both Congress and American public opinion on world matters, Roosevelt could not get approval for intervention in the WWI.

Unexpectedly, the growing number of attacks of the Axis seemed to be worth threatening U.S. interests. Italy's invasion of Ethiopia, a member of the League of Nations and conquest of Albania; Hitler's violation the WWI Peace Treaty when he seized Rhineland, Austria in 1939, and Sudetenland; and Japan's invasion of parts in China in 1937 and air raids on US base in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, left no choice to the US administration to remain neutral. It's only in these circumstances that President Roosevelt succeeded in convincing Congress to declare war. America's entry into the Second World War was essentially due to the Pearl Harbor incident, though America entered the war earlier when it signed the Lend- lease Pact supporting and sustaining by all means possible the Allies, especially Britain. During the WWII, in spite of a huge loss of many lives, America's economy was growing rapidly whereas the economy of European nations such as Britain and France was declining.

Political instability in Europe, Asia, and Africa was not of much help to U.S interests. The more peace and stability are realized in the world, the more they are open to USA trade and economy, and thus making America more prosperous due to its unchallenged trade and economy. However, it could be suggested that, through the analysis of American foreign policy activities, America could manage its interests both in case of international crises and stability.

## **2.3. Cold War:**

The Cold War is a term used to describe the state of the increasing suspicions and tensions between the U.S. and the Soviet Union from the aftermath of the WWII to the late 1980s. The end of the WWII brought about two rising powerful nations. The USA became the representative of the Capitalist ideology against an Eastern power representing communism. Both powers showed hostility right after the end of the WWII.

Origins of the Cold War date back to the WWII. The American use of atomic bomb against Japan even before the S.U could join the American Japanese war raised suspicion to S.U policy makers. Stalin's interpretation of US termination of Japan using two atomic bombs in two successive days meant to him not only to prevent S.U from entering the war with Japan

so as not to claim old territories taken by Japan as a result of the victory of Japan over S.U in the Russo-Japanese war of 1905, but also to intimidate the Russians (King 3).

As the U.S. ideological opposition to S.U became conspicuous, war was unavoidable. With Britain total support, USA declared its doctrine "Truman Doctrine". This doctrine asserted U.S. pledge to prevent the Soviet influence in Eastern Europe. Economic measures like U.S. Marshal Plan of 1948 to reconstruct Europe, to end the Lend- Lease programme to Russia, to criticize the Soviet Expansionism in Eastern Europe, and to prevent them from removing German factories to Russia raised Russian suspicion (King 6-7). Thus, Stalin declared war on February 9", 1946 asserting his country's ideological opposition to USA. As a response to Stalin's speech, in which he proclaimed S.U 's intention to triumph communism over Capitalism, the USA adopted a policy to contain communism (King 6-7).

Given the evident enthusiasm of American's for a war of ideology, Stalin enthusiastically declared one openly on February 9", 1946, by asserting in a speech that the contradictions of Capitalism would tear the Capitalist countries apart and communism would become the reigning system in the world. In the Speech, Stalin implied that future wars were inevitable until communism was triumphant over Capitalism (King 6-7).

In order to avoid a WWIII, American policy makers sought to ease tensions with S.U . In doing so, America adopted an "atomic Diplomacy", and the Russians were welcoming to it. As they had no choice, the Russians benefited from this seemingly loose policy to eliminate their fears and create an atomic bomb of their own,

## **2.4. U.S. Cold War Policy in Latin America:**

### **2.4.1. Intervention in Guatemala:**

From the outset, the Guatemalan government, as many other Latin American countries, was put under the umbrella concept of the Monroe Doctrine which assured U.S. hegemony over the region. During the late 19th and 20th centuries, Guatemalan military dictators met and supported the financial as well as the ideological interests of America. The support of American interests included exempting some U.S. corporations from paying taxes, and ceding considerable prime farm land to foreign corporations. An example of dictators who welcomed foreign American investment is the regime of General Jorge Ubico (1931/1944) in which he ceded Guatemala's best agricultural lands, and De Facto Control of Puerto Barrios, the Caribbean Sea Port that grants Guatemala access the Atlantic Ocean in exchange of building Guatemala's infrastructure. In addition, General Ubico allowed the establishment of U.S. military in Guatemala (Francisco Aristizabal Federico Maximiliano Osorio 1).

On the promise to develop Guatemala and rise up with it to higher levels of development, the new democratically elected president Jacob Arbenz Guzman undertook some major procedures which erected the eventual uprisings against him both at home and abroad (Lusher 16). To initiate his new policy which was influenced by the new constitution, Guzman started some land reform procedures among which included "nationalization" and expropriation of lands. In Fact, he was not much of an inventor, he, as a patriot, tried to follow up on the path

of his predecessor Juan José Arevalo who was much influenced by Roosevelt New Deal (Lusher 17).

As for interests, American interests seemed to be endangered by President Guzman's land reforms. According to his Decree 900 of 27 June 1952, major set aside investment lands were expropriated to the behalf of Guatemala states. In doing so, the Land Reform threatened the agricultural monopoly of the United Fruit Company (Lusher 17).

Tensions between Guatemala and the U.S. which suspected Guatemala of turning to Communism however date back before Guzman's administration. Before him, there was the freely elected Conservative University Professor Juan José Arevalo (1945-1951), who early in his administration showed his ultimate intention to modernize Guatemala. Fulfilling so, and according to the constitution which allowed for the legal possibility of expropriating unused farm land to the behalf of the Guatemalan peasant majority, he, in 1947 signed a liberal labor law which favored workers' rights and put an end to the exploitive practices of United Fruit Company. In addition, president Arevalo supported the Caribbean Legion, which the CIA deemed as a threat to the U.S. Geopolitical interests in the Western Hemisphere. Consequently, U.S. policy makers were informed by CIA reports that Arevalo has not only showed communist tendencies, but he also supported Communist Liberal thoughts (Francisco Aristizabal Federico Maximiliano Osorio 2).

The continuing Social Liberal reforms by Guzman only raised U.S. fears of Guatemala's Communist regime. Acts like Guzman's cooperation with the Communist Guatemalan Labor Party to help him better plan his land reforms, the expropriation of unused UFC farmlands in 1953, the expropriation of more UFC lands in October 1953 and February 1954, the refusal of payment of UFC for the true value of its farmland in the Pacific Ocean Coast of Guatemala, toleration for known communists, and Guzman's buying from Wehrmacht army equipment from Czechoslovakia, a Socialist Republic communist republic, confirmed how far Communism became a threat to U.S. interests and ideals in Guatemala.

Consequently, to react to such Communist threat, America adopted different successive strategies to overthrow Guzman. CIA covered Operation in Guatemala took place through three different, but cumulative operations. The first plan, Operation PBFORTUNE began in September 1952 in which it was targeted to use exiled Guatemalans whose intention was to overthrow Guzman from office, and whose political inclination is right-wing anti-Communist Guatemalan proponents. The rebel groups or the "Army of Liberation" was supplied by U.S. operational funds and equipment to depose Arbenz government (Francisco Aristizabal Federico Maximiliano Osorio 2). The Rio Act (1947) which is a Latin American non-intervention treaty from the Good Neighbor Policy increased the U.S. fear of losing its political credibility in Latin America, thus the PBFORTUNE operation was deactivated when it was feared to be aired to public. Next is operation PBSUCCESS of 1954 which included direct physical confrontation between U.S. supported rebel groups and the resignation of Guzman and the installation of Colonel Carlos Castillo Aramas as president of Guatemala ("Stephen M. Streeter: Interpreting the 1954 U.S. Intervention in Guatemala"). The final operation was PBHISTORY, which took place in July 1954, in which U.S. CIA agents tried

to find concrete evidence of President Guzman's involvement and cooperation with USSR. The operation held no confidential evidence. ("Max Holland; Operation PBHISTORY: The Aftermath of SUCCESS").

All in all, American intelligence succeeded to depose Guzman from office basically with Guatemalan efforts despite the fact that it could fulfill it alone using direct intervention. Furthermore, CIA role of propaganda and misrepresentation of information, which was basic, helped to manipulate both American public opinion and Guatemalan rebel groups into believing of the importance of overthrowing the threat that Guzman administration poses in the region.

#### **2.4.2. U.S. Intervention in Cuba:**

The Relationship between the United State and Cuba is deeply rooted in history. In fact, each of them dealt with the other even before they got their independence. This kind of relationship was never political; instead, it began by commercial means. Early in the 18th century, Cuba and North American mainland established illegal commercial contracts avoiding the payment of colonial taxes. Further relations were established because of the American War of independence, when Spain opened Cuban ports to North American commerce officially in November 1776 to gain more economic profit. With the increasing trade benefits from Cuba, events like the Annexation of Louisiana (1803), and Florida in 1819, together with Cuba's near, fertility, mineral wealth, its geostrategic position and the decreasing control of Spain over the area, all urged U.S political leaders to see Cuba as a possible new state (Mezhoud 3-4).

The fact that Cuban people rivaled against Spain's rule enabled U.S. policy makers to understand two things. First, the power and influence of Spain are in decline. Second, even if those countries gain their independence, they would be unable to rule themselves properly. Though Spain, which seemed to be endangered by revolutions, it stood well thanks to the holy Alliance (Russia, Austria, France, and Prussia) (Mezhoud5).

Holding the belief of the inability of those people to govern themselves and fearing any other foreign interventions in Latin America , James Monroe, on December 2 , 1823 declared an end to the New World colonization and warned foreign powers that any intervention in Western hemisphere would be considered as a threat to U.S, i.e., "the Monroe Doctrine", The Monroe Doctrine asserted that the United States would not interfere with existing European colonies nor in the internal affairs of European countries and expected that the latter would be the same( Mezhoud6).

Among the eventual consequences of the Monroe Doctrine is the "Roosevelt Corollary" written in 1904 to assert the right of the United States to intervene in Latin American lands if they suffered from economic or political troubles. The importance of the Monroe Doctrine lies in setting the first ideological justification for any direct or indirect U.S intervention in the area. It firmly established an official American censorship over Latin America; it seems that Cuba was not only a demand of policy makers, but also because Southern statesmen wanted more slave states. The U.S. made an offer over 100 million dollars to buy Cuba from Spain,

which the latter refused (Mezhoud 6-7). Another offer to purchase Cuba is President Franklin Pierces' offer of 130 million dollars to purchase Cuba in 1853, but it failed. In addition, a sign of the American continuing concern for Cuba is the American document, Ostend Manifesto, was published in Aix -La-Chappelle, in Prussia in 18 October 1854. The three persons responsible for the document claimed that "Cuba is as necessary to the North American republic as any of its present members, and that it belongs naturally to that great family of states which the union is the providential nursery" (qtd. in Mezhoud 8). They stated that Spain's control of Cuba was unnatural, and consequently the U.S. offered to buy Cuba from Spain, but the latter refused. U.S. policy makers warned "by every law, human and Divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain" (qtd in Mezhoud 8). The Ostend Manifesto was not authorized by the Franklin Pierce's administration and was immediately rejected (Mezhoud 8).

American attempts to seize or to annex Cuba never stopped. It happens that the liberation wars of Cuba against Spain revived U.S. hope for annexing Cuba. The first two wars were unsuccessful. The last one, i.e. the Cuban War of Independence, was mainly caused by Spain's hostilities against Cuban people. Unwisely, and as a reaction to Cuban demand for independence, and to Cuban rebel forces control of most of the Island, Spain replaced Martinez Compass with General Veleriano Weyler Y Nicolan, who became known later as the butcher. His brutal policy did not only raged Cuban people, but also pushed American policy makers to intervene (Mezhoud10-11). As a result to the increasing threats over American citizens in Cuba, in January 1898 the USA sent U.S battleship Maine to Havana to protect and bring back American citizens. The ship then was exploded and sunk in the sea; the Yellow Press attributed this act to the Spanish government. As a reaction, President William McKinley called for the use of force to stop the war in Cuba, which later was approved by the Congress, Spain declared war against USA and the latter did the same. The war erupted in 1898, and American troops eventually won the war. This was called the Spanish-American War (Mezhoud 11-12- 13).

Earlier, Venezuela had problems with Berlin, where the Venezuelan president cited the Monroe Doctrine, and threatened the British government that the U.S. would interfere if any other foreign powers exert pressures in the region (Mezhoud10). The triumph of U.S. over the Spanish rule added to Venezuelan call for American help, i.e. Venezuelan acceptance of the American Monroe Doctrine increased American dominance over the region.

Right after the expulsion of the Spanish from Cuba, the U.S. adopted a policy of occupation, for there might be the rising of potential revolutionary governments in Cuba. As a result, an amendment was presented to the United States senate which was eventually passed by a vote of 43-22. Although it was rejected at the beginning by the Cuban Assembly, it was adopted later by a vote of 16-11 and was integrated to the Cuban Constitution. The Platt Amendment as it was called guaranteed the point that Cuba will not negotiate with countries willing to "impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba" or allow "any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization for military or naval purpose or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion". Furthermore, the amendment prevented Cuba from concluding any debt contracts unless guarantees are set forward that debts are to be fulfilled out of the

ordinary revenues. In addition, the amendment ensured U.S. intervention in Cuban affairs when the U.S. considers the need to do it (qtd. in Mezhoud 14).

Critics of the Platt Amendment by the U.S. anti-imperialists and Cubans were not promising. Cubans considered the U.S. as substitute to the Spanish oppressor, In his terms, Secretary of War Root tried to clarify U.S. intentions behind this amendment, He assured that U.S. intervention will take place only if Cuba's independence is at bounds without interference in its internal affairs. In spite of many attempts to convey and convince U.S anti-Imperialists of U.S. clear intentions to preserve Cuban interests, things were only going worse, and the occupation of Cuba was ended, leaving the U.S. to adopt newer and similar policies (Mezhoud15).

Anti-American Imperialists, though disguised by American foreign policy makers, added to the Cuban negative sentiments, led to the end of American occupation of Cuba. However, Platt Amendment was deemed to be a leading step towards another similar policy; Roosevelt's corollary, or which is later to be called the "Big Stick policy". In this respect, Theodore Roosevelt gave a speech on his annual message to the Congress justifying his policy towards the region:

All that this country desires is to see the neighboring countries stable, orderly, and prosperous .Chronic wrongdoing, or unimportance which results a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, many in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western hemisphere the adherence of the United States, however reluctantly, in a flagrant cases of such wrong doing or impotence, to the existence of an international police power. (qtd. in Mezhoud 16)

According to President Roosevelt's Corollary, U.S. administration, has a complete right to intervene in case economic or political problems in the Caribbean and Central American countries needed regulations or needed to be stabilized. As the Monroe Doctrine previously asserted the slogan "America for Americans", Roosevelt's Corollary came back to this same claim.

Criticism of this policy continued denouncing the hegemonic and the interventionist mood of policy. Noam Chomsky affirmed that Roosevelt's Corollary was simply a clear imperialist threat influenced by Monroe Doctrine. Other critics like Christopher Coyne and Steven Davies stated that this policy shall lead to negative results in terms of national security as well as domestic politics (Mezhoud 18).

The growing sentiments denouncing U.S. interventionist attitudes to Latin America as a means to solve problems of corruption, as a foreign policy external determinant, affected the successive administrations. Both Presidents William Howard Taft and Franklin Roosevelt introduced non-interventionist foreign policies. The first is the "Dollar Policy" in which Howard's administration claimed that the region's instability could be resolved economically, and Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor Policy", according to which his administration clarified that peaceful relations would better solve and cure wrongdoings in the region (Stark 19-20).

Foreign policy is highly affected by internal sources as well as external events. Since the end of the WWII, during which the world witnessed the rising of S.U and U.S. as the only two powers confronting and competing to rule the world, matters seem to be prone to change. So, how American foreign policy looked like after the WWII towards Latin America, especially Cuba?

Tensions and suspicions between the S.U and USA began even during the WWII during the Pearl Harbor event and U.S. reaction to Japan by their termination of Hiroshima and Nagasaki using two atomic bombs. In addition to this fact, suspicions even grew worse when U.S. and S.U did not agree on the future of Germany and Eastern Europe during the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945). It is quite clear, then, that anti-communist inclinations are by no means an American cherished ideology. Since then, they became two world hostile powers engaged in a "Cold War" (Stark 24).

Cuba, which held so special relationship with the United States, seemed to be rebellious, while the U.S. attributed the economic and political instability of Cuba to its origins, i.e. to their inherited Spanish thinking prominent Cuban figures referred this kind of corruption to American abusive and interventionist foreign policies. Despite Cuba's economic development, especially 'Sugar trade', which was highly backed up by U.S. economic help, people in the countryside still suffered from hunger, and poverty. America's stance of helping President Fulgencio Batista, who was deemed as dictator, encouraged new rebellions and ambitious future President Castro to stay in his stance against American interventionism (Stark26- 27). Reacting against American interventionist policies, and wishing to improve his country's position, Castro launched some agrarian reforms and most importantly, began the movement of nationalizing U.S. owned industries. U.S. Eisenhower administration reacted by imposing gradual trade restrictions on the island which were only increasing. In October 18, 1960 America prohibited all exports to Cuba, and in January 1961 U.S. broke diplomatic relations with Cuba. With all these previous restrictions, Castro found it logical to ask, especially that they share the same ideology, for Soviet help (Stark 30-31). Now it became clear that Castro and America have become enemies.

The fact that the U.S administration and Fidel Castro saw each other as rival enemies made things worse. America saw Castro as a direct threat to American interests in the sense that Castro did not accomplish his promised reforms; for the USA, Castro is "a fateful challenge to the inter-American system" (qtd. in Mezhoud 32). Added to the fact that Cuba is the nearest communist threat to America (90 miles far from the shores of Florida), Castro's regime functioned, according to America, as model for other communist movements in the Americas (Mezhoud 34).

Castro, from the other angle, saw America as an imperialist power seeking dominance not only in Cuba, but in the whole region. Though American policy makers tried to establish authentic justifications for their future intentions to intervene in Cuba, for example, a pamphlet published by the State Department entitled 'Cuba', Castro got more sure and confident in their artificial plots. The U.S. backed incursion of Cuba by anti-communist rebels or 'Operation Zapata specifically and most importantly in the Bay of Pigs area in 17 April

1961 to remove Castro from office (Stark33), America expelling Cuba from organization of American states (OAS), the Cuban Project ( or Operation Mongoose/ or the Special group) which was a US secret programme of propaganda against Cuba and to remove the Communists from power, and the 1962 US plan 'Operation North Woods which used flag operations to damage Cuba's picture and to give America an authentic justification to antivenin Cuba made Castro tightly believe of American hostility and imperialism. The immediate procedure made by Castro was his call for Soviet help. Competing over world leadership and angered by American imperialism, the Soviet welcomed Castro's call and supplied him with weapons 'missiles' which led to The Missile Crisis of 1962. The Soviet's immediate positive response or approval to Castro's plan was not only caused by the belief that Cuba is a worthy ally, but also to react to US pressure exerted from the placement of Jupiter intermediate-range ballistic missiles in April 1962 in Turkey (Stark , 36).

The operation went through secretly after Cuba's President and Khrushchev approvals of the installation of missiles in 4th and 7th July respectively. Soon after, American intelligence discovered the operation and promised among some other options a military blockade to the Soviet ships which were carrying the missiles. Fortunately, the missiles never were installed , and a deal between the Soviet Union and USA was made to solve the dilemma, according to which America promised not to invade Cuba and to remove its missiles from turkey, and Soviets had to retrieval its missiles; consequently, the crisis was ended in 28 October 1963.

#### **2.4.3. U.S. Intervention in Chile:**

The U.S Chile relations date back to days of 'War of Chilean Independence', in which U.S. influence began by appointing Joel Roberts Poinsett as a special agent to the South Spanish colonies. He, in the period from 1810-1814, was assigned with the task to point out revolutionists' prospects in their attempt to decolonize Chile from Spanish rule. Since then, American intervention grew gradually. However, tensions between U.S, and Chile seemed to have an early beginning. Chile's War of the Pacific from 1879 1883, when Chile engaged in a conflict with neighboring countries whose people demanded cease of Chile control and asked for revenues for their industries and raw materials caused U.S. intervention siding with Peru, Because U.S, had interests with Peru and Chile's leaders considered U.S stance as biased, their decision was to ban American intervention and advised the U.S to stay neutral. In attempt to further U.S. influence in the region U.S. sought to back President José Manuel Balmaceda against the Congressional opposing forces in the Chilean Civil War of 1891. Later and as a result to Balmaceda's failure, and again to reinforce U.S. influence, America tried by all means to push UK's influence in the region which was an opponent supporting Congress and the forces at first place ("United States Intervention in Chile").

During the twentieth century, except from the growing economic relations between the U.S. and Chile due to the two World Wars, political relations especially from the part of Chile were characterized with 'Isolationism', i.e. Chile averted closer relations with USA. Chile from an American perspective formed potential Communist threat which has greater economic opportunities such as the massive deposits of copper and iron ("Chile Relations"). Eventually, U.S Chile relations during the 1960s and onwards were characterized by tension.

This period witnessed the emergence of Dr. Allende as a probable dangerous enemy to U.S interests; it is from this period that American intervention reached its higher levels.

#### **2.4.3.1. Allende as a Marxist:**

U.S. fear of Allende came out as a result to his open rejection of any form of Western, especially American influence in Chile. On occasion, Allende maintained that "my studies taught me that Socialism was the only solution to these problems and that Chile had to find its own road" (qtd. in Aaron Reed 142-143).

In addition, he is self-proclaimed as "a Marxist Social President". In similar occasions, Allende expressed as clearly as he could his opposition to Western values in which upon taking office, he exclaimed that "the president of the republic is a socialist ... I have reached this office to achieve the economic and social transformation of Chile, to open the road for socialism, Our aim is Marxist Socialism, total and scientific" (143).

A further terrifying fact about Allende is his deep belief of the utility of a revolutionist attitude to the healing of Chilean political and economic situations. Accordingly, Allende holds that "the people of Chile chase the road of revolution and we have not forgotten the fundamental principle of Marxism; the class struggle. During the electoral campaign we said that the purpose of our struggle was to change the regime, the system". He subsequently concluded that the 'backwardness' of Chile's society was directly linked to Capitalism (Around Reed 143). At this stage Allende's opposition to U.S. policy makers has been made clear through his various open anti-American speeches which directly denounced American interference in Chile

#### **2.4.3.2 Allende Relations with International Communists:**

The fact that he was one of 'Principle Speakers' in 1953 at a ceremony honoring Joseph Stalin following his death denoted his complete belief and commitment to international Communism, As maintained by Benjamin Aaron Reed that not any figure can say the following except of a true Communist and Marxist, "Stalin was to the Russian people a banner of revolution, of creative executions, of human sentiment, a symbol of edifying peace and inbounded heroism... but above all this is his enormous faith in Marx and Lenin Doctrine and his unyielding Marxist behavior" (gtd. in Aaron Reed 144)

Later, in "a speech in the Kremlin on December 7, 1972, Allende called the Communists superpower the 'Big Brother of Chile" (144). Other proofs of Allende support of International Communism is his visits to Moscow and Cuba, in which Allende got 'Lenin Peace Prize and a gift from S.U and Fidel Castro respectively.

At the end of an interview, Debruy referred to Allende as a "Comrade President"; however, the latter was not denied by Allende The term use i.e. "Comrade President" spread out of the Soviet Bloc denoting supporters of Soviet States and Communism (145).

### **2.4.3.3. Allende Regime Relations with the Socialist Bloc:**

Another evidence in the eyes of U.S. political leaders that puts Chile as a Communist threat is its relations with Soviet Union, the Polish Government, the Yugoslavs, the Hungarians, and the East Germans, who were willing to help Chile economically. Furthermore, the establishment of diplomatic relations with North Korea and North Vietnam only validated U.S. fear in addition to the Chile's secured loan of \$65 million from China (147). Significantly, right after Allende took office, he began his Social Platform Movement which angered and endangered U.S. economic interests. Allende, on November 20, 1971, ordered the nationalization of Nibra, On December 1 1971, he nationalized Bellavista Tome, the country largest manufacturer. The nationalization of the copper industry including three American companies-Anacondas Co, Kennecott Corp, and Cerro Corps in July 11, 1971 is a further major reform. In addition Allende called for the nationalization of the Banking system and the exclusion of any operating national bank in December 1971. Moreover, his order to expropriate farms including the American owned ITT meant nothing to U.S. policy making, but how far a socialist and communist threat Chile has become.

Most importantly is the Popular Unity or Allende's Coalition. The coalition includes the Communist Party as well as Allende Social and Radical Parties. According to Pinera the CP in Chile "was the largest and best organized of all the Communist parties and the third largest in the Western World, after those of France and Italy" (qtd. in Aaron Reed 148). Demonstrating the strength of the Coalition in Chile's politics is the general elections of 1969 0in which Allende won the Presidential Elections of 1970, is with the votes of CP, Social and Radical Parties, that Allende could make it through to the Presidential Elections (148).

Finally, as a Marxist, Socialist, and Pro-Communist democratically elected President hardened the mission of American policy makers. It would be hard for them to overthrow a democratically elected president. U.S fear of Chile's rising geopolitical threats which not only will reside in the neighboring nations of Latin America, but also to a wider world is expressed in Kissinger's words:

Allende's election was a challenge to our national interests. We did not find it easy to reconcile ourselves to a second Communist State in the Western hemisphere, We were persuaded that it would soon be inciting anti-American politics, attacking Hemispheric solidarity, making common cause with Cuba, and sooner or later establishing a close relations with the Soviet Union. (Smith 136-137)

Reacting to these threats, Nixon's Administration urgently called for the authenticity as well as the obligation to intervene to overthrow the source of threat-Allende. The covered interference included funds to realize anti-Allende propaganda, which eventually took the form of pamphlets, newspaper articles, radio, and television programmes. Funds were also used to bribe members of Chilcan Congress in order to vote against Allende's confirmation. Furthermore, CIA's support took other forms such as the financial support by U.S. corporations like International Telephone and Telegraph Company in the 1960s until 1970. These steps were to be later called "Track I Plan' to overthrow Allende. Track II plan's main

objective was to prepare an atmosphere to rise a coup in Chile. Nixon, after been sure of Allende's confirmation as a president and his confirmation that he would not hesitate a moment to conduct his reforms, decided to exhaust Chile's economy as a way to better create internal tensions and eventually easing the coup. In doing so, U.S. reduced its financial aid to Chile and denied Chile's access to International Banks.

The shortcomings of U.S. economic pressure on Chile resulted to the rising inflation, expectation of massive budget defects, national strikes by stop keepers, trackers, and minors (137-138). The catastrophic economic conditions of Chile and CIA's involvement in the assassination of Allende's loyal and mighty military officer led to the success of the coup. After the coup neither Allende's death news proved that he definitely committed suicide, nor has the CIA been condemned as a primarily planner and supporter of the coup. Despite this fact, David Briscoe maintains that "The CIA is acknowledging for the first time the extent of its deep involvement in Chile, where it dealt with coup-plotters, false propagandists and assassins" ("CIA Admits Involvement in Chile" 1).

#### **2.4.4. U.S. Intervention in Nicaragua:**

Probably Nicaragua was one of the countries that witnessed American direct interventions in Latin America more than others. Early in the 19th century, America gave recognition to the newly formed government of the American adventurer, William Walker, who overthrew the already existing government to establish his in 1856 (Lena Kornau 9). Later in the 20th century, as early as 1909-10, 1912-25, and 1925-1933, American forces were present and interfered in Nicaraguan affairs. First, in 1909, two American citizens were killed by Nicaragua Government, which summoned U.S. intervention. Looking for a pretext, America broke relations with President José Zelaya's government and joined his rival revolutionary forces who denounced his regime. Together with U.S. navy assistance, rebels commanded and led by the conservative, Juan José Estrada won the revolution making the U.S. a greater beneficial partner through negotiations which resulted in America established its control over Nicaragua and benefited from nation's main resources. Soon after, José Madriz was appointed president by the Nicaraguan Congress. Surrounded by corruption and pressure, Madriz resigned from office leaving it to Estrada when the U.S. agreed to support him (\* U.S. Military Involvement in Nicaragua").

To make things better and under American supervision a coalition of conservative-liberal regime was to be installed under the leadership of Estrada in 1 January, 1911. Eventually, matters only grew worse between conservatives and liberals and the liberal Luis Mena, who was the minister of war, forced Estrada to resign. An immediate result was, then the appointment of the Conservative Adolfo Diaz as the president of Nicaragua. The second U.S. intervention took place when America refused the appointment of General Luis Mena as the president of Nicaragua after the end of Diaz presidency in 1913. His reaction was to rebel against the Diaz government, in which he and the liberal Benjamin Zelayadon formed a force to face both Nicaraguan and Diaz's U.S. supported marine forces. Consequently, in 1912, U.S. forces landed at the ports of Carinto and Bluefield's resulting in the killing of Zelayadon and the fleeing of Mena. Another form of intervention was U.S. supervision of elections of 1913

asserting the obligation of a conservative elected president. Again and because liberals refused to elect, Diaz continued to be president. What's worth noting is that every time when the U.S is behind any conservative president it gains economic and even political support. An instance of this is the ratification of the Chomorro - Bryen Treaty enabling the U.S. to build a canal through Nicaragua. Another instance of U.S. intervention which is an indirect one is the 1920 elections when U.S support led to the election of Emiliano Chomorro ("United States Intervention, 1909-1933).

Afraid of a civil war that would result in case of a victory of leftists, U.S policy makers sent marines in order to guarantee the safety of its citizens and properties, Again, U.S. non-direct or physical intervention saved Nicaragua from tow civil wars. The first is when U.S. convinced through peace agreement Chomorro to resign office to Adolfo Diaz. Consequently, the previous liberal vice-president Juan Bautista Sacasa returned from exile and claimed the presidency. The USA again kindled 'tensions' between liberals and conservatives through peaceful solutions. On 20 May, 1927 both the liberal rebellion leader General José Maria Moncada and Nicaraguan conservative government made a settlement, i.e. disarmament. As a matter of fact, the treatment 'agreement' enabled U.S to establish a non-partisan military force supervised by the U.S., added to the Diaz right to finish his presidency term, and U.S allowance to keep its forces to maintain order and stability in Nicaragua.

Filled with Nicaraguan nationalism, Augusto César Sandino refused to sign the Pact of Espino Negro; the Army which the U.S. was allowed to train called Moncada as a traitor, and most importantly formed an army to rebel against both the conservative regime of Chomorro and the U.S. intervention in Nicaragua. His forces were organized under on army called the Army of Defense of Nicaraguan Sovereignty. Due to the Americans' rising opposition of further U.S. intervention in Nicaragua, and because Sacasa won the elections, Sandino was offered recognition. Despite this fact, Sandino refused the maintaining of the National Guard and deemed it as unconstitutional because of its ties to U.S., consequently and as an attempt to increase his reputation, Somoza Garcia who is the Chief Director of the National Guard, killed Sandino and later destroyed his army. The increasing weaknesses of Sacasa enabled Somoza Garcia to win the elections of 1936 constructing a military dictatorship which would last for four decades ("United States Intervention 1909-1933 ").

In the context of the Cold War, when American perception of threats centered around Soviet Communism, we find Nicaragua in the period from the 1979s to the 1990s onwards as another instance of American physical involvement, Fearing the installation of a communist regime in a period of chaos when Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) took back office after the imposed resignation of Somoza dynasty, U.S. policy makers under Reagan's administration were much obliged to intervene (Lena Kornau12) A hint or an indicator that puts Nicaragua as a communist suspect under Sandinista's rule was the U.S. discovery of Nicaragua's shipping of arms from Soviet-Bloc counties to Salvadoran rebels who stood against U.S. backed regime. Another indirect perception of threat is Reagan's claim to authorize interventions and to seize the Sandinistas is the restoration of democracy.

Significantly, U.S. officials feared "the threat of good example" (qtd. in Lena Kornau 12-13) if Nicaragua's social reforms realized success (Lena Kornau 13).

Paving the way to a successful overthrow of the Sandinistas, Carter authorized a covert CIA press operation which would prepare the emergence of a 'moderate alternative'. Moderate alternative would be in Blum terms "the inclusion of Somoza's political party in the future government" and maintenance of both the corrupt structure of Nicaragua and the National Guard, and pressure on Sandinista's government to include certain chosen men, of course by U.S. officials, into the government ("William Blum Nicaragua 1981-1990"). Enthusiastically, Ronald Reagan announced his policy's intention. In this respect, Blum maintains that it "deplores the Marxist Sandinista takeover of Nicaragua", in fulfilling it, U.S. government cut off all sorts of assistance to the Sandinistas, in addition, Nicaraguan government was banned from exporting its sugar to U.S. markets. A further step was U.S. exerted pressure on International Monetary Bank and European Common Market not to provide Nicaraguan financial loans. On its part, the CIA covertly provided aid to Cardinal Miguel Obando and the Catholic Church aiming the "religious instruction" to "thwart the Marxist-Leninist policies of the Sandinistas" ("William Blum Nicaragua 1981-1990").

Total but untraceable, at least at the time, full support to the Contras, the rebel group against Sandinista, attacked and destroyed almost everything. Nicaraguan oil suppliers, fishing, agricultural crops, fertile farmlands, educational centers, medical centers, mines were destroyed in order to weaken Sandinista's rule. Although Contrast's actions which were meant to intimidate Nicaraguan people worked and the elections held in which Sandinista's rule was over due to Nicaraguan citizens fear of both the terrifying acts of Contras and U.S. military intervention as long as such rule exists, the U.S. later condemned Contras acts and got its hands clean. Finally, in 1990 a coalition of political parties took office under the name of "National Opposition Union" which seemed to be welcomed by U.S. new administration of George Bush. He called it "a victory of democracy" ("qtd. In William Blum Nicaragua 1981-1990").

#### **2.4. Anti-Americanism in Latin America:**

The case of Latin American Anti-Americanism attitude or resentment is much complicated in the sense that it undergoes a rise and a fall in political, economic, and military relations. As put by Moris when he raises the following questions: "do Latin American citizens admire the U.S. for its material wealth and opportunities this creates for them, or do they revile the U.S. because of the military and economic threat it has historically posed?" (qtd in Baker and Cupery 2). Moris goes further when he believes that these previous differing views might together make the case of Anti-Americanism in Latin America (qtd in Baker and Cupery 2).

As Baker and Cupery assert, academic analysis concerning the case of Latin American resentment against America falls under two major theories. The first and for most importance, which seems to be of much common interpretations and judgments is "the Foreign Policy Legacy of Resentment". This theory basically attributes to anti-Americanism in Latin America to the "two centuries long list of military and economic wrongs committed by the north hegemony in its so called 'backyard". The second theory is the "Ambivalence Theory";

it confirms that "Latin Americans as expressing a love-hate sentiment towards the U.S. - repelled by these foreign policy legacies yet allured by the material prospects the U.S. has to offer" (1)

The school of Foreign Policy Legacy of Resentment maintains that the majority of Latin American citizens believe and feel a "a deeply rooted disposition" added to the "instinctive anti-American reflex" (qtd in Baker and Cupery 3) generated since the days of independence up to the middle of the twentieth century, which touched almost all social groups in Latin America (3). Bending the two currents, i.e.; the current that focuses on the U.S. geopolitical misdeeds, and the current that focuses on the U.S economic exploitation adopted in nations of Latin American anti-Americanism, Smith Peter confirms that:

This widely shared Latin American distaste for the U.S. is derived not from mere abstractions about U.S. military, economic and diplomatic hegemony but rather from tangible experiences with its often brutal consequences, as the region has been more frequently victimized by U.S. meddling than any other set of countries in the world. Over the past two centuries, the United States has annexed territory, colonized and occupied independent states, embargoed trade, invaded to collect debts, staged coups, removed democratic leaders, backed brutal despots, expropriated land, dominated trade and investment relations, and sponsored violent insurgencies in Latin America ( qtd in Baker and Cupery 3).

According to David and Cupery, the imperialist impulse imposed by U.S. on Latin American countries through the Monroe Doctrine, U.S.-Mexican war, Dollar Diplomacy, and Cold War Containment still resides into the mindsets of Latin American peoples due to the loss of land sovereignty and life. Cases frightening Latin Americans include the economic embargo imposed on Cuba and the U.S. support of the coup in Venezuela in 2002 (David and Cupery 4).

Early in the 19 century, anti-American resentment in Latin America began. It is from the days of U.S. taking over of Texas province from Mexico. Another incident fueling anti-Americanism in Latin America is the U.S. Mexican War of 1848, in which the U.S. was a winner taking much land of Mexico as an own property. Further resentment was caused by U.S. imperialist military interference in Nicaragua (1855) and Cuba during the Spanish-American war in which Cuba was subordinate to U.S. power in the context of the Monroe Doctrine and the Big stick Diplomacy.

Later in the 20" century, as a clear opposition to the U.S. claim of promoting democracy, the supported coup against the democratically elected president of Guatemala, Jacob Arbenz Guzman, only made relations between U.S, and Latin American countries worse. One of the most important issues raising suspicion and loss of credibility in the eyes of Latin American people or probably in the eyes of the entire world is U.S. hostility against Cuba during the second half of the 20th century. Tensions even increased resulting from the continuous hostilities of the U.S. policy makers through the continuing economic sanctions which exhausted Cuban economy.

The list of grievances includes both economic and military wrongdoings. The list of direct interventions includes the 1964 coup d'état in Brazil, the invasion of the Dominican republic in 1966, U.S. support for the coup d'état in Argentina in 1976, and Chile in 1973, U.S. support for dictators such as Augusto Pinochet, Anastasio Somoza, Alfredo Stroessner, and Manuel Noriega. All these U.S.-supported coup d'états or dictators were alleged to serve U.S. interests on the behalf of Latin American peoples, thus eventual resentment only grew bitter. Economically speaking, one might divide economic activity addressed to Latin American countries into two periods. The first one is before the collapse of the S.U in which help, debts, etc. were intended to help those responsible big boys in Latin American countries to whom will, in turn, help and support America's cause. The second period, after 1999, U.S. Free Trade agreement and other many plans were deemed to be the principle factor which exhausted Latin American countries' economies due to the unchallenged U.S. economic power.

## **2.5. American Support of Dictatorships in Latin American and Democratization Movements:**

In the context of determining external sources of American foreign policy conduct in the Post WWII era, the researcher finds it of paramount importance to clarify the fashion of supporting dictatorships in Latin America, which Peter Smith contends that it dates back even before the Cold War era; however, the case gets further interest only during the Cold War, as a basic element in foreign policy analysis. U.S. policy makers sought to back dictatorships in Latin American countries with the ultimate goal to diminish communism at world stage, in this respect Robert Holden maintains:

In Central America, the consequences of the creation of what have been called national security states have been well documented. Security threats emanating from the deteriorating social, political, and economic fabric were largely ignored, while democracy itself was defined as a security threat by the military governments in power and by their patron in Washington (qtd. in Aeron Reed 71).

Backing the same idea, Nelson Rockefeller the Special Assistant to the President for Foreign Affairs under Eisenhower maintained that "Dictators in this countries are a mixed blessing... It is true, in the short run, that dictators handle Communist effectively. But in the long run, the U.S. must encourage the growth of democracies in Latin America if Communism is to be defeated" (72).

Finally, another source of American foreign policy which would harden U.S. pretext to interfere in Latin America is highlighted in the attitudes of Latin American intellectuals, specifically towards the U.S. exploitation of political and economic situations of dictatorship governments in Latin America during the Cold War and the movement of democratizations in governments such Brazil.

## **2.6. Conclusion:**

In the light of the analysis of the aforementioned elements of foreign policy, it has become clear that American dominance in the region is prone to judgment and harsh criticism. Latin American countries as fueled by long lists of grievances against the U.S. imperialistic interventions made it possible for countries such as China or even group of countries such as the European Union to invest in the region after being discouraged by many political and economic obstacles. Politically speaking, Latin American intellectuals often resented the contradiction of U.S. political rhetoric compared to their actual policies. The U.S long support of dictatorships in the region at the expense of its democratic ideals made it difficult to believe in American political validity. The situation even gets harder for American policy makers when: seeing the success of democratic regimes in countries such as Brazil in which it can eventually exert regional pressure ,pressure which might be opposing to U.S. interests , and the increasing Chinese and European competition in the region.

## **Chapter Three: U.S. Latin American Policies in 1990s**

### **3.1. Introduction:**

After the Nineteenth century, it had been possible to believe in isolationist policy, so in this chapter, we tend to study the shift of the US foreign policy from isolationism to internationalism in which the United States kept far from intervention in other countries affairs, but keeping away from the world affairs was not possible due to the events characterized the world between the World Wars. The U.S was obliged to intervene to protect its territories as well as to make international relations focusing on trade issues in order to achieve co-operation to increase power.

### **3.2. Foreign competition:**

The growing anti-Americanism in the region which had been fuelled by the American Hostile interventions under the slogan of “America for the Americans” and later under the Context of fighting communism left no option for Latin American countries not to seek foreign alternatives. The adoption of the democratic regime in almost all Latin American Countries in the aftermath of the Cold War car added to the shift to the acceptance of Neoliberal economic system which was hoped for economic development helped the integration of foreign competition. One of the examples clarifying this point was China.

As the page of the Cold War car was wrapped, China dedicated its efforts to occupy a Position in Latin American countries. Chinese prospects for the region were not restricted to Economic operations, but also, it hoped for more diplomatic and military ones too. The overall Objective behind economic exchange between China, and Latin American countries was the Securing of ‘Raw materials’ (Koleski 03). China’s economic techniques, though they were Considered inferior to America, which were adopted to successfully integrate in these Countries’ economies were different.

As for trade, Chinese trade to its probable future partner had increased dramatically in the last decade. An indicator of the growing importance and the liability of Chinese trade exchanges was that China lies emerged as the largest export destination for Argentina, Costa Rica, and Cuba" (Koleski 4). A point of interest to China and a point of threat to America is that China was becoming more and more efficient partner to sensitive and profitable Latin American countries such as Brazil; which had previously created Morcesor to protect itself and other neighboring countries from American economic dominance, and Venezuela.

The main major operation to enter into the arena of competition was China's efforts to create free zones of economic exchanges. As America created NAFTA, CAFTA, and FTAA, China concluded free trade agreements with Chile in 2006, Peru in 2010, and Costa Rica in 2011. Later on after the FTA's departure, trade volume between Chile and China grew to reach 100% progress. Furthermore; the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) considered FTA as a mutually beneficial experience. Basic good exchanges under the ETA's were Chinese consumer appliances. Tele-Communication, and automobile industries which due to their low prices were able to compete with other Latin American markets. An example was the increased sales of Chinese motorcycles to Chile to reach 1.650% this made Chinese sales dominate 75% of the Chilean motorcycle market Brazil was another area of influence to both China and America. In the context of foreign competition to the U.S.A. in Latin America, trade between China and Brazil increased to reach 1.838%.

### **3.3. U.S. Post -Cold War Policy in Latin America: US, Brazil and Mexico Relations**

Once the ideological threats which were posed by S.U almost ceased to exist in Latin American countries U.S. Policy makers, who traditionally were committed to preserve American leadership, worked for new contexts, and priorities in the region. The collapse of S.U proved as an important evidence that Communism was unable to guarantee economic development as compared to Western Capitalist systems.

Another Fact is that America considered and still considers Latin America as its own area of interest "backyard", and consequently the reconciliation of the consequence of the long list of interventions in the region became an urgent need due to the rising suspicions in world political scenes. World political and economic changes influenced U.S. foreign policy making in the sense that it had to find new priorities, and new ways of bilateral relations. On the top of the U.S. Post -Cold war priorities lies the economic one, for there was no such a threat like Communism. Drug trade, illegal immigration, and terrorism did not represent as much harm to U.S. Latin American relations as Communism did or as Islamic Radical Terrorism did in the 9/11 events.

The failure of Communism and the conviction of the utility of liberal Western economic systems created a basis of acceptance to American economic initiation.

### **3.4. George. H. W. Bush Foreign Policy towards Latin America:**

Foreign policy of George H. W. Bush administration was the foreign policy of the United States from January 1989 to January 1993 while George H. W. Bush was the Republican president. He had very extensive foreign policy experience, but unlike the U. S. previous president Ronald Reagan he downplayed vision and emphasized caution and careful management.

#### **3.4.1. U.S. Relations with Mexico (NAFTA)**

In 1990s Mexico was one among the important partners of the U.S. government. Although U.S. Mexican relations before the WWII was characterized by U.S. dominance, and intervention; i.e. Mexico hatred of U.S. policies, "conflict and turmoil were the dominant traits U.S Mexican relations for most of the nineteenth century, and during the first four decades of the twentieth century (Mexico Relations With). Relations took another path of corporations:

Mexico and the United States formed a new relationship during the WW II, eschewing the foreign policy of nonintervention and sensitivity to issues related to national sovereignty

in favor of heightened collaboration on a broad range of wartime issues. During the Cold War the United States and Mexico developed a new style in which the two countries bargained on some issues and mostly neglected, or ignored one another on other matters until the late 1980s, with the end of the Cold War, the United States, and Mexico began a period of extraordinary cooperation, marked by NAFTA and immigration, debt relief, and anti-drug efforts. President George H. W. Bush and Carlos Salinas de Gortari not only championed the creation of NAFTA, but also put in motion a new relationship based on less ideological and more pragmatic approach to bilateral issues. (Mexico relations with).

By the end of the twentieth century, Mexico became after agreeing on the project of NAFTA in 1993 and exactly after six years of NAFTA activity, the second largest partner of U.S trade after Canada, with two-way trade approaching \$210 billion in 2000. Indicators of the willingness of both US and Mexico agreement to the bilateral economic relations of NAFTA was its continuation from 1993 up till 2002 when Mexico's President Fox insisted the importance of free trade and foreign policy ties. with America Mexico relations with Apart from economic bilateral relations between U.S. and Mexico, though they were the basic element behind the stability of US and Mexican political, and security affairs greater collaborations on issues concerning immigration border security, and Narco trafficking, democracy and environment matters increased. An example of security bilateral relations in President Bush's and Fox signed Smart Border plan which included intelligence cooperation. The plan of 2002 was aimed to weed out those whom we don't want in our country-the terrorists, the coyotes, the smugglers, those who prey on innocent life" (Mexico relations with").

Accordingly NAFTA was a shortened term which stands for the North American Free Trade Agreement compassed the USA, Canada, and Mexico. NAFTA was signed by President George II W. Bush, Mexican President Salinas, and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney in 1992, signed in 1993, and implemented in January, 1994. (Kimberly Amadeo History of NAFTA)

According to Amadeo NAFTA was created to:

- Grant the signatories Most Favored Nation status.
- Eliminate barriers to trade and facilitate the cross-border movement of goods and services.
- Promote conditions of fair competition.
- Increase investment opportunities.

- Provide protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights.
- Create procedures for the resolution of a trade disputes.
- Establish a frame work the further trilateral, regional and multilateral cooperation to expand NAFTA's benefits (-Kimberly Amadeo, History of NAFTA).

On 1 January, 2008, all tariffs between the three countries were eliminated benefiting a trade which from 1993-2009 tripled from \$ 297 billion to \$ 106 trillion Evaluating NAFTA's efforts, Amadeo argues that "NAFTA has eliminated trade barriers, increased investment opportunities, and established procedures for resolution of trade disputes. Most importantly. it has increased the competitiveness of the three countries involved in the global market place- ("Kimberly Amadeo History of NAFTA").

In addition, a more detailed analysis about NAFTA's achievements was offered by the Office of the United States Trade Representative in 19 March 2008.

According to this article:

- Business investment in the United States has risen by 117% since 1993, compared to 45% increase between 1979 and 1993.
- U.S. employment rose from 110.5 million people in 1993 to 137.6 million in 2007.
- U.S manufacturing output rose by 58% between 1993 and 2006. Manufacturing exports in 2007 reached all time high with a value of dollar 982 billion.
- U.S. businesses sector real hourly compensation rose by 1.5 % each year between 199 and 2007, for a total of 23.6 % over the full period.
- Canada and Mexico accounted for 37% of the total growth of US. Agricultural exports since 1993. Moreover, the share of total U.S agricultural exports destined for Canada or Mexico has grown from 22% in 1993 to 30% in 2007
- Mexican wages grew steadily after the 1994 Peso Crisis. reached pre-crisis levels in 1997; and have increased each year since.
- NAFTA created two bi-national institutions unique to the agreement which certify and finance environmental infrastructure projects to provide a clear and healthy environment for residents along the U.S. Mexico border (NAFTA- Myths vs. Facts).

Although there have been many advantages of NAFTA concerning US government, other evaluation concerning Mexico is of prior importance. While much of the previous article's evaluation was centered on how well or how successful NAFTA plans were to U.S

economy, Mexico, according to R. Phil English's article, Mexico and NAFTA, seems to be a much less benefited partner compared to USA and Canada.

In this article he points out to duce points as basics of measurement of how successful the regulations of NAFTA went through years in Mexico. These points were environmental impacts standard of living/economic impact, and workers rights in Mexico. Concerning the environmental impact of NAFTA upon Mexico, the report deplors the fact that not only that "between the years of 1958 and 1999 pollution levels sky-rocked rural soil eroded by 89%, municipal solid was increased by 108%, water pollution increased by 29°1 and urban an pollution increased by 97%", but " what even more alarming as that the financial benefits of wade for Mexico is outweighed heavily by the damage it did to the environment in dollar terms ( 3). As for the second point; the standard of living which was supposed to be enhanced due to the assumption that free trade will improve economy, which, in turn, would bring about higher standards of living. The case in Mexico was never as expected. In this respect, English confirms that: "in Mexico poverty and unemployment have actually increased since NAFTA was initiated in addition to an increase in Illegal aliens crossing from Mexico to the United States in recent years" (4). English in addition. in 2004, the Washington Post Report points out that ten years after the creation of NAFTA, 19 million more Mexican people were living in poverty than twenty years ago, and one-to four Mexicans was unable to afford adequate food (5).

Finally, the repot evaluates workers' rights in Mexico. The article not only attribute, poverty to employment, but also shows how workers were treated under the provisions of NAFTA; According to Jose Miguel Vivanco. Director of Human Rights Watch for the Americas, "The NAFTA labor accords suffer from both structural defects and a lack of political will (7). He, moreover, argues that the evidence of such defects refer back laths "Lack of action of governing bodies 'National Administrative Office' (NAO) within Canada, Mexico, and America to enforce punishment against offenders" (7).

An instance of how badly workers' rights in Mexico are regulated is the 14 serious complaints about workers' rights which have been violated and never been successful to the degree of having the offenders, despite the existence of strong evidences, found guilty (7-8) In a nutshell. The trading benefits both from the U.S. or Mexican sides do not guarantee continuity of cooperation. The growing temptation which is exhibited by China and the overwhelming socio-economic problems in Mexico threaten the continuity of such an agreement In addition, one might also mention the dominating or hegemonic economic role that has been exercised by U.S policy makers. Although there were some border problems,

drug trade when weighed against the massive economic benefits the U.S receives annually, such cases are less important to be counted as threatening as long as Mexico as still a third partner in NAFTA.

### **3.4.2. CAFTA**

In April 2001 U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick initiated a dialogue with Central American countries on the possibility of opening a trade area that was freed of tariffs, and based on many facilitations, in the same van. Bush administration sought to construct and explore a free trade agreement on this occasion. Bush in a speech in Washington at the Organization of American States (OAS) asserts

“Today I announce that the United Stat. will explore a free trade agreement with the countries of Central America. My administration will work closely with Congress toward this goal. Our purpose is to strengthen the economic ties already have with time nations; to reinforce their progress toward economic and political and social reforms, and to take another step toward completing the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA)” (Salem -Xirinachs and Granados 1)

As the U.S had previously been the main trading partner of the countries in the agreement. i.e. Costa Rica , the Dominican Republic, El Salvador. Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, it became clear that there was a need to free trade agreement Besides though about the issue even which date back to the 1980s in addition to the concerns NAFTA had evoked only strengthened believes of the necessity of constructing such agreement (Salazar - Xirinachs and Granados 2).

According to CAFTA provisions, its concerns not only seek to fulfill trading purpose, but also to strengthen, and standards of environmental issue in Central American and the Dominican Republic.

In addition duties on more than 80% of more than 20 \$ billion in U.S goods would end as long as those goods were exported to the region. In the sent term. 5 years ahead of U.S Central American trade relations, another 5% will be annulled Other facilitation include the annulment 15% of trade tariffs along side with giving measurable advantage of Central American countries (“What is CAFAT”)

Although there were large economic, political, and social asymmetries between the United States and the Central American countries, each views CAFTA as beneficial and important Form the U.S perspective, CAFTA was not only concerned with economic matters, but also encompasses trade, political, and security matters, The following chart shows the different objectives behind CAFTA from U.S perspective.

**Table: 1**

U.S. objectives, motivations, and benefits in CAFTA

**U.S objectives, motivations, and benefits in CAFTA****TRADE POLICY RELATED**

- Take a positive step toward completing the FTAA
- Signal U.S commitment to free trade
- Create a ° Success Case ° of an FTA with smaller economies

**National Security Related**

- Strengthen efforts to control drug traffic
- Curb money laundering and prevent terrorism
- Reduce immigration

**Political and strategic**

- Promote economic political and social reform in Central America
- Promote political stability and democracy in the region
- Signal U.S commitment to Latin America

**Economic**

- Increase U.S exports to the region
- Improve global competitive in key sectors

**Source: (Salazar -Xirinachs and Granados 6)**

On the other side of the agreement we find Central American countries perspective or proposes behind the partnership in CAFTA.

**Table: 2**

Central American objectives, motivations, and benefits in CAFTA

**Central American objectives, motivations, and benefits in CAFTA**

**Trade Policy Related**

- Reduce uncertainty by locking in market access to its main trading and largest market in the world
- Insure against the risks of a protracted FTAA negotiation

**Economic and development**

- Promote exports
- Attract investment
- Diversify imports, with benefits for both consumers and productivity
- Improve institutions and market economy fundamentals
- Promote policy reform
- Increase bilateral and multilateral aid flows

**Political**

- Improve social conditions and democracy
- Overcome local resistance to further economic and political reforms.

**(Salazar –Xirinachs and Granados)**

Source: **(Salazar –Xirinachs and Granados)**

Although the long list of asymmetries between U.S and Central American countries, which might affect the course of the agreement , evaluations upon its success or failure is of great difficulty since it is still processing.

### **3.4.3. US. Relations with Brazil (FTAA)**

Another American economic project aimed to forge multilateral cooperative relations with Latin American countries is the Free Trade Area of Americas. This plan aims to extend the NAFTA agreement to the Western hemisphere with the exclusion of Cuba. The plan as for today encompasses 34 independent countries; before it had been put to practice; discussions had been early held in 1994 at a meeting of trade ministers and business leaders in Miami. Discussions on the same matter continued until the Second Summit of the Americas in 1998; when there were certain objectives and measures which would make FTAA look like an extended, and strengthened version of NAFTA (Understanding the Free Trade of the Americas 8).

Tracing back roots of Latin American countries search for new systems which could improve their economies, J.F. Hornbeck. a specialist in International Trade and Finance in his article -A Free Trade Area of the Americas: Major Policy Issues and Status of Negotiations affirms: In the aftermath of the 1980s debt crisis, much of Latin America embraced broad economic policy reform that included major strides toward trade liberalization. This trend raised the prospect of a previously unrealized idea -a free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA)".

From a Latin American perspective, the 34 member countries sought to " reflect the evolution from an 'old system of closed sub regional agreements that dominated in the past-war era , to one based on more open and deeper commitments both within and outside the region. Examples include the North American Free Trade Agreement , The Southern Common Market (Moresor).

From an American prospective, FTAA would increase Latin American trade with the large market, Strengthen reciprocal trade between countries of Latin America, and encourage foreign investment within member countries (1).

### **3.5. Bill Clinton Foreign Policy towards Latin America:**

David Marinis considers the Clinton since his childhood used to deceive his family in his behavior.

Clinton had many contradictory desires that he was aiming for from behind achieving them placed him among the top American presidents in addition to his economic targets, he wanted to push the peace process in the Middle East and keep the blockade on Iraq. On the other hand, he declared that the United States will only fight humanitarian wars in the future.

Brzezinski believes that Clinton had a belief in the historical inevitability of globalization, and it was a necessary realization to review the global policy of the United States towards the outer world.

The arrival of the Democrats to the presidency in 1992 represented by President Clinton came due to the complete supremacy of the United States on the world stage, and the status of which entitles it to a wide margin of Maneuver to achieve its targets. Clinton worked during his tenure to give priority to the economic factor. Anthony Lake, National Security Adviser in 1993, supports this trend: « During the Cold War we contained a global threat to market democracies and now it should to work to expand its range ».

The Clinton government began to play the role of trader promoter for the big corporations.

Clinton came with the slogan "It's the economy, stupid," and he linked the national security of the United States to the economic security and that through his emphasis that economic liberalism was closely related with the democratic model, and thus he worked to support countries committed to this trend:

« Our national security strategy is based on expanding the community of market democracies to reduce the series of threats affecting our country, our allies, and our interests, the more political and economic liberalization is imposed in the world, especially in countries that are important to our strategies, the more secure our homeland and our people will be more prosperous. ».

We note from this Clinton's commitment to resolving foreign issues as one of his policy priorities and spreading American values across the world, and this was embodied in the interventions that took a humanitarian character. Delayed, ethnic cleansing against Bosnian Muslims were stopped the democratization of Bosnia and the creation of a multi-ethnic situation. The aim of the intervention in Kosovo after stopping the war was to establish a more democratic government and build a strong economy.

The interventions carried out by the United States, which took a humanitarian character in general, were motivated by Clinton's background, which was that supporting international stability worked to promote a productive and open global economy, and this played a major role in the prosperity of the US economy due to the large presence of American companies in the global economy.

Generally speaking, the US government during the Clinton era gave importance to alliances and the search for international consensus, as it fought its wars and interventions

remotely and avoided implicating American forces on the ground, and maintained a policy of containment, but against rogue states "Iran, Iraq, North Korea" to prevent nuclear proliferation.

And if Clinton announced plans to build a radar site that supports the deployment of Al-Rocketi shield system agreed not to renew Boutros-Ghali and to reject the mine clearance treaty. The Republican Congress, in its second term, was behind many policies and positions, such as refusing to pay the United States' share towards the United Nations, the Iraq Liberation Act and other decisions. The economic priorities, especially the economic ones, have improved, as the economic situation in the United States and the world has improved, trade has flourished, and international investments have moved, The United States has signed a free trade agreement with North American countries, and among the most important factors of American economic superiority was the focus on technological and informational superiority. Clinton's closes friend said: « The central target of Clinton's foreign policy in the media age should be to win the battle for the global flow of information ».

#### US-Cuban Relations

The end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union as a superpower did not affect the United States' relations with Cuba as it did in most regions of the world. Neither the Cuban regime abandoned its communist principles, nor did the United States lift the blockade and the trade urbanization imposed for decades. Rather, in 1995 Clinton signed The Helms-Burton Act, under which sanctions are imposed on foreign companies "European Canadian or Latin American" investing or having commercial relations with Cuba, and this law came against the background of Cuban forces dropping two private planes of exiled pilots and Cuban activists who were flying in Cuban territorial borders and spreading anti-Castro propaganda. The American law has been subjected to wide international criticism.

In general, the American policy towards Cuba had began to face reservations even within the United States. Therefore, some American initiatives have come to ease the suffering of the Cuban people.

In January 1999, the Clinton administration passed a law to allow the largest number of people to communicate with each other, and this legislation included procedures requiring travel permits for Americans wishing to visit the island, as well as designing temporary visas for Cubans wishing to enter the United States, permitting the sale of food and medicine in case to independent entities, and accepting departure of charter planes to Cuba from Los

Angeles, New York and Miami to Havana and other Cuban cities and expanding the use of the direct mail service.

In March 2000, the President of the Senate on Foreign Relations included in the list of permits ending the amendment of the penalties for the sale of food and medicine "Jess helms", and in July of the same year the Senate and Representatives voted to end the ban on food and medical sales to Cuba, and the new measures included expanding aspects of cooperation between the two peoples in several humanitarian, religious, cultural, sports and academic fields.

As a result, in 1999, 150,000 to 200,000 Americans were able to visit Cuba, compared to less than 40,000 in 1998. On the Cuban side, more than 40,000 Cubans were able to enter the United States on temporary visas, after the number did not exceed nine thousand in 1998.

### **3.5.1 Protecting human rights and spreading democracy**

The issue of human rights and the importance of the transition to democracy in Cuba began to arouse the world's interest. In the Summit of the Americas in Havana 1999, the Prime Minister of Spain and a number of Latin American leaders spoke about the lack of democracy in Cuba.

The United States was convinced of the necessity to work with the Cuban people. After his re-election in 1996, Clinton established the Institute for Democracy for Cuba funded by the US Agency "USAID" for development.

The aim of this initiative was to work on developing Cuban civil society, providing material support to families of political prisoners, distribute books, magazines and direct aid to Cuban None Government Organizations to prepare a quiet transition to democracy. Clinton also increased support for Marty TV to draw attention to human rights violations.

Clinton also worked to provide important political and material support to the Cuban community in Florida and during his period the aid programs directed to Cuba, which were part of the United States' strategy to support the Cuban people, isolate their regime, and build solidarity with human rights protection activities developed through the Economic Support Fund "ESF"

The United States also sought in its security strategies to deal with Cuba, as Clinton proposed a series of steps aimed at improving drug control, and direct bilateral talks in 1999 resulted in an agreement on direct contact to inspect ships.

In 2000, the US State Department announced that there was no evidence in the United States that would make it add Cuba to the list of countries that seek to produce drugs or assist in their transit.

### **3.5.2 US-Mexican Relations**

The Mexican-American relationship is distinguished due to historical and geographical conditions, and that is why the United States is linked with Mexico in several aspects, as this link is the most important in Latin America, and there are many aspects of this link where the security and economic relations take great importance as the security of the borders extending over a distance of 2000 miles. In addition to trade exchanges, they remained at the top of the agenda of the two parties, whether at the summits of the Americas or in bilateral meetings the issues of immigration, terrorism and drug trafficking were also the most important security concerns related to border safety.

During the early 1990s, the Mexican government and the Clinton administration avoided delving into the issue of immigration in the bilateral agenda to facilitate the NAFTA negotiations. During the mid-1990s the Safe Return Program was established, and the Clinton administration tripled the US budget to combat illegal immigration in 1996, and built steel high tissues, and sophisticated technical control provided.

Clinton and Mexican President Ernest Zedillo signed in 1997 a joint immigration declaration that included great work to respect human rights in dealing with this file, especially after the increasing voices of international organizations about cross-border violations.

### **3.5.3 US-Haitian Relations**

Haiti was the first country in the region to gain its independence in January 1804, and France was the first to recognize it, as the United States refused to do so due to its fear of the black slave revolt in neighboring countries, and its recognition was delayed until 1862 under President Lincoln's rule, and it intervened in 1915 in fear of its investments due to internal turmoil.

The American policy in Haiti in the post-Cold War era was mainly related to the development of events on the level of this country and the turmoil and instability that it lived through.

With the beginning of the 1990s, John Bertrand Aristide became the first president to be elected democratically by more than 65%, and he made major changes, including the restructuring of the army and the exclusion of many of its leaders, and this is what triggered a

coup against him under the leadership of General Raul Cedras on September 30, 1991 and was removed from power and expelled to Venezuela, and this sparked regional and international criticism, and in October 1991, Bush Sr. Aristide to rule and stop all forms of relationship and support for the revolutionaries while maintaining humanitarian aid, but the Bush administration issued a report accusing Aristide of human rights violations during his rule, and during this period the United States imposed an oil embargo on Haiti and forced thousands of refugees to return after their influx on the American coasts. The President Bush was cautious in dealing with the file, as the United States supported the putschists, then backed down after international condemnation and wanted to correct the situation.

With the arrival of Clinton to power, he approved in April 1993 the sending of a multinational peacekeeping force to Haiti, which Aristide refused and Clinton demanded to impose global mandatory sanctions on Haiti, Clinton announced after that he would prevent persons affiliated with the Haitian regime from entering the United States.

In July 1993, the United Nations imposed an international boycott and prevented entry to Haiti. This obliged General Cedras to enter the United States and meet with Aristide and representatives of the United Nations. The United States sponsored the "Governors of the Island" agreement signed between the two parties in New York to end the crisis and called Cedras to resign so that Aristide would return. All the sanctions imposed on Haiti were suspended by Security Council Resolution No. 861, and after that the United States tried to solve the problem of frozen assets of the revolutionaries, but on the basis of a case-by-case this angered Sidras and sparked new waves of violence that led to the assassination of many Aristide officials, and the United Nations proposed a mission for a period of six months. The Haitian army obstructed it, and in 1993 two hundred soldiers were deployed from the United States and Canada, but their mission failed, so the oil infrastructure was restored, and other economic sanctions.

In late of 1993,s at Clinton's request, American forces moved to the Haitian coasts to monitor all moving ships to stabilize the blockade. A blacklist of members of the Haitian forces was included, and the President of the Dominican Republic, Joaquim Balagar, a friend of the Haitian military elite, was asked to abide by the blockade.

In 31-7-1994, with support from Clinton, the United Nations issued Resolution 940, which authorizes member states to form an international peacekeeping force to calm the situation, and on 17-9-1994, Carter led a delegation to negotiate with army leaders to peacefully restore Aristide and implement the Governors' Agreement on the island, and a day later Under pressure from the United States and the mediation of Carter, the agreement would

be studied, and the US-led international coalition entered Haiti on 10 -15- 1994 after a comprehensive boycott.

The first mission of the United States was to restore security and establish civil institutions and to work to provide an appropriate environment for the return of refugees from the United States, the estimated 68,000 who were forced into Guantánamo, and the United States entered along with 25 countries and numbered 23,000 soldiers and thus formed a multinational force "MNF." Its mission is to prepare for the return of Aristide, it was done, the imposed attendance was raised, and Cedras was granted a complete amnesty.

The United States worked to ensure the implementation of laws and remained at the head of the MNF and supervised the training of police and army personnel from Guantánamo recruits, after which the United States withdrew and handed over the mission completely to the multinational forces.

Clinton's target was to restore democracy and legitimacy to Haiti to improve its image among the peoples of the region and on the other hand to get rid of illegal immigrants, and that stability in the region is in the interest of the United States due to the great geographical proximity. During this period, with the support of the United States, the World Bank granted assistance to Haiti worth \$ 40 million to revive the economy and for humanitarian purposes. On the other hand, the volume of US aid to Haiti was weak, as aid to Bosnia, for example, was five times greater.

Aristide completed his remaining term in office and left power after the 1995 elections in favor of Rene Preval. The latter undertook extensive reforms, such as privatizing the public sector, and his period was marked by a major economic recession until the end of his rule in 2000 due to the inherited crises.

Aristide was re-elected in the late 2000s, with the United States questioning the fairness of the ballot and deeming it a shame for democracy, the United States and other donors refusing to provide aid worth 600 million \$.

Clinton stressed to Aristide the need to reform the economic and judicial systems, investigate electoral irregularities, work to achieve a safe and stable environment for Haiti, prosecute human rights violators, and fight drug trafficking.

### **3.6. Conclusion**

This chapter had provided a historical hint of American foreign policy after the cold war towards Latin America, covering a number of changes in U.S. policy. The American foreign policy makers really reconsidered its foreign strategies in terms of the increasing economic cooperative relations. Examples include three major FTA's that cover the whole of Latin America, these FTA's are AFTA, CATA, FTAA.

## General Conclusion

This research basically started on the aim to answer the question of whether American foreign policy towards Latin America in 1990s was continuity or change. Bewildered by how significant the S.U collapse affected U.S. foreign policy making, the researchers through theoretical and practical chapters tried to set analysis about instances of relations in the region. Methodologically speaking, one might contend that the research would be significant when instances of two different, yet strongly linked periods, political relations' analysis between many key actors is of paramount importance.

As for the first period, which is the historical background to U.S. foreign policy after WWII; the researcher showed how America dealt with some countries of Latin America in the context of the Cold War .U.S. perspective of how dangerous the ideological and economic threats that the S.U posed in the region drove it to a certain attitude of foreign policy making. In this context and as opposed to Soviet Union dangers, America suspects or perspectives of threat in the region affected it into conducting direct interventionist policies in Latin America. Instances include Cuba, especially after the rise of Castro as an influential nationalist figure, in which the world nearly witnessed a devastative war; a war which its basic weapon was missiles. Allende's Chile was also another sensitive instance where America exercised it defenses against a country which showed welcoming status to Communism. Guatemala, though its relatively higher levels of democracy at the time didn't succeed fleeing American hegemony. Afraid of communist tendencies and, not different from Guatemala, Nicaragua also witnessed American physical interventionism,

As for the second period, after Cold War, i.e.1990s as world matters were in a constant change, basically the collapse of the Soviet Union, American foreign policy programmers seemed to be much obliged to adopt newer substitutions. Among influential circumstances that succumbed U.S. policy makers to change their foreign policy strategies was foreign multidimensional completion over Latin America. An instance was the Chinese relentless growing, especially economic influence in the region. As we have seen, China not only entered the Latin American market, but also it could overpower American products such as the field of telecommunications. One might contend that soon enough after conducting healthy, and reciprocal economic exchanges, china will also be able to exert some political influence; and that's what really happened when China tried to win Latin American political support over Taiwan. Movements of democratizations in almost every Latin American country added to the fact that America not only supported dictatorship regimes in the post WWII era, but even in 1990s such as the U.S. support for Pinochet hardened U.S. influence in the region. Finally, the researchers might say that American foreign policy makers really reconsidered its foreign policy strategies in terms of the increasing economic cooperative relations. Examples include three major FTA's that cover the whole of Latin America These FTA's were NAFTA, CAFTA, FTAA.

## Appendix:

Table of U.S. presidents

<b>Period of presidency</b>	<b>PRESIDENT</b>	<b>Political Party</b>
1789-1797	George Washington	Federalist
1797-1801	John Adams	Federalist
1801-1809	Thomas Jefferson	Democratic-Republican
1809-1817	James Madison	Democratic-Republican
1817-1825	James Monroe	Democratic-Republican
1825-1829	John Quincy Adams	Republican
1829-1837	Andrew Jackson	Democratic
1837-1841	Martin Van Buren	Democratic
1841	William Henry Harrison	<i>Unaffiliated</i>
1841-1845	John Tyler	<i>Unaffiliated</i>
1845-1849	James K. Polk	Democratic
1849-1850	Zachary Taylor	<i>Unaffiliated</i>
1850-1853	Millard Fillmore	<i>Unaffiliated</i>
1853-1857	Franklin Pierce	Democratic
1857-1861	James Buchanan	Democratic
1861-1865	Abraham Lincoln	Republican
1865-1869	Andrew Johnson	Democratic
1869-1877	Ulysses S. Grant	Republican
1877-1881	Rutherford Birchard Hayes	Republican
1881	James A. Garfield	Republican
1881-1885	Chester A. Arthur	Republican
1885-1889	Grover Cleveland	Republican
1889-1893	Benjamin Harrison	Republican
1893-1897	Grover Cleveland	Democratic
1897-1901	William McKinley	Republican
1901-1909	Theodore Roosevelt	Republican
1909-1913	William H. Taft	Republican
1913-1921	Woodrow Wilson	Democratic
1921-1923	Warren G. Harding	Republican
1923-1929	Calvin Coolidge	Republican
1929-1933	Herbert Hoover	Republican
1933-1945	Franklin D. Roosevelt	Democratic
1945-1953	Harry S. Truman	Democratic
1953-1961	Dwight D. Eisenhower	Republican
1961-1963	John F. Kennedy	Democratic
1963-1969	Lyndon B. Johnson	Democratic
1969-1974	Richard M. Nixon	Republican
1974-1977	Gerald R. Ford	Republican
1977-1981	Jimmy Carter	Democratic

<b>1981-1989</b>	Ronald Reagan	Republican
<b>1989-1993</b>	George Bush	Republican
<b>1993-2001</b>	Bill Clinton	Democratic
<b>2001-2009</b>	George W. Bush	Republican
<b>2009-2017</b>	Barack Obama	Democratic
<b>2017-</b>	Donald J. Trump	Republican

Source:

*Kelly, Martin, "Chart of the Presidents and Vice Presidents". thoughtco.com. New York, New York. Retrieved February 20, 2020. <https://www.thoughtco.com/presidents-and-vice-presidents-chart-4051729> :05/052020.*

## Works Cited

### 1-BOOKS:

- Aronson, Bernard W., and others. Independent Task Force Report: US-Cuban Relations in the 21st Century. Council on Foreign Relations, 1999.
- Baylis, John, and Steve Smith. "With the Assistance of Patricia Owens." *The Globalization of World Politics. An introduction to International Relations* (2005).
- Brown, Chris. "Fog in the Channel: Continental International Relations Theory Isolated (or an essay on the paradoxes of diversity and parochialism in IR theory)." *International relations—still an American social science* (2001): 203-219.
- Cox, Michael. "The empire's back in town: or America's imperial temptation—again." *Millennium* 32.1 (2003): 1-27.- Smith, Stephen Murray, et al., eds. *International theory: positivism and beyond*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Essied Salim, Mohamed. "Foreign Policy Analysis". 2nd edition .Cairo: Ennahda El Misria Library, 1997:43-88
- Falcoff, Mark, and Robert Royal, eds. *The Continuing crisis: US policy in Central America and the Caribbean: thirty essays by statesmen, scholars, religious leaders, and journalists*. University Press of Amer, 1987.
- Kapstein, Ethan B., and Michael Mastanduno. *Unipolar politics: Realism and state strategies after the cold war*. Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Larson, Eric V., et al. *Assuring Access in Key Strategic Regions toward a Long-Term Strategy*. No. RAND/MR-112-A. RAND ARROYO CENTER SANTA MONICA CA, 2004.
- Lawson, Stephanie, ed. *The new agenda for international relations: from polarization to globalization in world politics?*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Lebow, Richard Ned, and Thomas Risse-Kappen. *International relations theory and the end of the Cold War*. Columbia University Press, 1995.
- McKeever, Robert J., and Philip Davies. "Politics USA/Robert McKeever and Philip Davies." (2006).
- Nau, Henry R., and David L. Shambaugh, eds. *Divided Diplomacy and the Next Administration: Conservative and Liberal Alternatives*. George Washington University, Elliott School of International Affairs, 2004.
- Reed, Benjamin A. *American foreign policy in Latin America (1945-1975): the containment policy and the perceptions of "threat"*. Diss. University of Pittsburgh, 2012.
- Saad Hakki, Toufik. *Principles of International Relations*. 3d ed. Amman: Wail .2006.

- Szanton, David L., ed. *The politics of knowledge: Area studies and the disciplines*. University of California Press, 2004.
- Wendt, Alexander. *Social theory of international politics*. Vol. 67. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Yucef Hatti, Nassif. *Theory in International Relations*. Beirut: Dar Elkitab El Arabi , 1985.

## **2-PERIODICALS AND REVIEWS:**

- Haass, Richard N., and Policy Planning Staff Director. "Defining US foreign policy in a post-post-Cold War world." *Remarks to the Foreign Policy Association* (2002).
- Lentner, Howard H. "Public policy and foreign policy: divergences, intersections, exchange." *Review of Policy Research* 23.1 (2006): 169-181.
- Randall, Stephen J. "United States-Latin American Relations in the Post-Cold War, Post-9-11 Years." *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 6.4 (2004).
- Reus-Smith, Christian. "The constructivist turn: Critical theory after the Cold War." (1996).
- Soares de Lima, Maria Regina, and Monica Hirst. "Brazil as an intermediate state and regional power: action, choice and responsibilities." *International affairs* 82.1 (2006): 21-40.

## **3-REPORTS AND SEARCH PAPERS:**

- Best Jr, Richard A. "The National Security Council: An Organizational Assessment." **LIBRARY OF CONGRESS WASHINGTON DC CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, 2009.**
- Colin, D., W. Dubinsky, and C. Derrick. "Latin America and the Caribbean selected economic and social data." *Washington DC: United States Agency for International Development* (2007).
- Domínguez-Rivera, Roberto. "Fox's Mexican Foreign Policy: A Case of Post-authoritarian Semi-peripheral Realism." *45th Annual International Studies Association Convention, Montreal, Canada, March. 2004.*
- Donnelly, Thomas, Donald Kagan, and Gary Schmitt. *Rebuilding America's Defenses: strategy, forces and resources for a new century*. Project for the New American Century, 2000.

- Moniruzzaman, M. "Ishtiaq Hossain and Mohsen M. Saleh (Eds.) 2009. American Foreign Policy and the Muslim World, Al-Zaytouna Center for Studies and Consultation, 422pp." Asian Journal of Social Science 39.4 (2011): 565-567.

-Villareal, M. A., and Jennifer E. Lake. "Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America: an overview and selected issues." LIBRARY OF CONGRESS WASHINGTON DC CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, 2010.

-Walters ,Todd M., "The Mexico-U.S. Partnership Enhancing Our Common Security".Report From a Workshop Organized by The Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Cambridge Office, (December 2005),

#### **4-JOURNALS:**

- David „Maraniss," In Clinton, a Past That's Ever Prologue", Washington Post Staff Writer, (Sunday, January 25, 1998).

- Sampas, Dorothy M. The Role of the Department of State in the Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process. NATIONAL WAR COLL WASHINGTON DC, 1987.

- Shifter, Michael. "Tracing the roots of anti-Americanism in Latin America." (2004): 107-112.

#### **5 WEB LINKS:**

-Aggestam, Lisbeth "Role Conceptions and the Politics of Identity in Foreign Policy ". ARENA Working Papers, WP 99/8,in [https://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/publications/arena-working-papers/1994-2000/1999/wp99\\_8.htm](https://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/publications/arena-working-papers/1994-2000/1999/wp99_8.htm)

-Bernie, Ivanr and Martin Roy, "NAFTA and Mercosur : Two Competing Models?,"in : <http://www.ciaonet.org/globaljavascript/global.is>

-Connie, Veillette, and Others, "U.S. Foreign Assistance to Latin America and the Caribbean", Congressional Research Service, (January 2006)..in : <https://nationalaglawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/crs/RL32487.pdf>

-The Cafta Intelligence Centre, "What is CAFTA?". In : [www.caftaintelligencecenter.com/subpages/What\\_is\\_CAFTA.asp](http://www.caftaintelligencecenter.com/subpages/What_is_CAFTA.asp). 01 Aug 2020

