How did the U.S., which was founded as a republic that was opposed to empires, become an empire? When did the U.S. become the world policeman? How did the president become the leader of the free world? Is the Caribbean Sea “an American lake” where the U.S. is largely free to do what it wants? What will the world be like in the year 2030? These are some of the questions that are examined in this chapter on global affairs, an area of public policy that presents special challenges for holding government power politically or legally accountable.
The term global affairs includes foreign policy—the federal government’s plans to advance national interests in dealing with other nations; national security—policies and actions to protect against domestic and foreign threats to the U.S. government or the territorial integrity of the U.S.; and war powers—the use of military force. Like domestic policy, global affairs involve politics. However, there are two important differences between the politics of domestic affairs and global affairs. One of the differences concerns the fact that the political system of accountability does not operate in global affairs the way it operates in domestic affairs; the other difference concerns the legitimacy of projecting government power abroad.

The power problem in global affairs is accountability. Global affairs present special challenges for the political system’s mechanisms to hold government officials politically and legally accountable for their use of power. The accountability problem has been a recurring theme in debates about foreign affairs from the founding of the republic to the war on terror.

- The Constitutional Convention. The delegates to the constitutional convention in 1787 extensively debated how to hold the government accountable on matters related to war powers and external (foreign) affairs.
- The early years of the republic. The debate about accountability continued during the early years of the republic when the U.S. was a new nation that was surrounded by imperial powers that were ambitious to expand their sphere of influence and Native Americans that sometimes opposed American expansion westward.
- Becoming a world power. Accountability was an issue in the latter part of the 19th Century when the U.S. developed into an economic and military power and used that power to acquire territory and exert influence beyond the nation’s original borders.
- Acting as the world’s policeman. In the early years of the 20th Century accountability was an issue when the U.S. assumed the role of world policeman and leader of the free world in the early years of the 20th Century.
- The Cold War. During the Cold War, the emphasis on secrecy and emergency powers in the global fight against communism weakened the ordinary methods of holding government (particularly executive officials) accountable for the use of power in national security affairs.
- The War on Terror. Congress delegated the president broad power to make and implement counterterrorism policy. Holding presidential power politically or legally accountable has remained one of the most important and controversial issues in the debates about counterterrorism policy.

Legitimacy is an important concept in political science. It is a normative term that refers to the belief that something is appropriate, legal, right, or just. A legitimate government, law, or public policy is one that is accepted as appropriate. A democratic government is the legitimate authority to govern domestically. But what gives a government—even a democracy—the right to project power abroad? This is a political question that has been asked from the founding of the republic to contemporary debates about U.S. involvement with global affairs.

This chapter examines accountability and legitimacy by discussing four main questions about global affairs policy.
- Should the U.S. be involved in global affairs?
- What should global affairs policy be?
- How is American power projected abroad?
- Who should make global affairs policy?
The first question is whether the U.S. should be involved in global affairs or stay out of external matters and concentrate on domestic affairs. This is basically the question of engagement or isolation. The second question is substantive: once the decision has been made to get involved with global affairs, what should public policy be concerning international drug cartels, international trade, global warming, the Middle East, or the strength of the dollar? Elements of the policy making process (or stages) apply here—although there are some differences between domestic and foreign policy. The third question about global affairs is how should the U.S. project American power? Should the U.S. use hard power—that is, military force—or soft power—that is, economic power and political influence including diplomacy—in order to achieve its objectives? The fourth question is who should make policy. The question, who should make foreign affairs policy, is primarily the struggle between congress and the president (and to a lesser extent the courts) over control of global affairs. The institutional conflict between congress and the president is one of the things that make the politics of global affairs distinctive and different from domestic affairs. There are some non-governmental actors who participate in the foreign affairs issue networks but interest groups play a smaller role than they do in domestic affairs. The fourth question is about the system of checks and balances. The system of checks and balances is much weaker in global affairs than domestic affairs, which is another reason why the politics and governance of global affairs is distinctive. The weaker checks and balances present special accountability problems particularly for holding presidents legally accountable for the way they use power. Two aspects of presidential power over foreign affairs create accountability problems. The first is the Sole Organ Doctrine. The Sole Organ Doctrine holds that the president is the sole organ of the nation in its dealings with other countries. To paraphrase President George W. Bush, “I am the decider.” By this he meant that congress and the courts were NOT the deciders. The second aspect of presidential power that creates special accountability problems is executive discretion. Executive discretion is an executive official’s freedom of choice to decide upon a course of action. Executive discretion is exemplified by war powers statutes, national security statutes, or other statutes that delegate the president power to do whatever the president thinks is necessary. The chapter includes prominent examples of statutes that give the president broad discretion to act in domestic and national security affairs. Executive discretion is one of the distinguishing features of global affairs policy.

17.1 | The Weak System of Checks and Balances in Global Affairs

There are several ways that the politics and government of global affairs are different than domestic affairs. First, global affairs typically involve different kinds of conflicts. Domestic conflicts typically involve economic or values choices; global affairs conflicts typically involve national interests or security. Second, global affairs have historically involved a different set of government and non-government actors than those that are typically involved with domestic affairs. State and local governments and the set of interest groups that participate in domestic policy making are not as prominent in global affairs. Third, the system of checks and balances does not work in global affairs the way it works in domestic affairs. In domestic affairs, policy choices are typically between competing economic interests (e.g., business versus labor),
partisan conflict (e.g., Republicans versus Democrats), ideological conflict (e.g., conservative versus liberal views on the size and role of government), or institutional conflicts between Congress, the president, the Supreme Court, or between the national and state governments. The Madisonian system of checks and balances that was intended to prevent government abuse of power includes the separation of powers, federalism, public opinion, and (today) partisanship. But these checks and balances do not operate in global affairs the way they operate in domestic affairs.

17.11 | Partisanship

Party politics has become part of the system of checks and balances: the party IN power is supposed to be held accountable by the party OUT of power. But party politics does not work in global affairs the way it works in domestic affairs. For example, there is an old saying that politics stops at the water’s edge. This saying describes the belief that it is appropriate to play politics in domestic policy but not foreign policy. The belief that politics should stop at the water’s edge reflects the desire to put aside party politics or other political differences so that the U.S. can present a united front in its dealings with other countries. The belief that politics should stop at the water’s edge is the basis for appeals to create bipartisan foreign policy. The appeal for bipartisanship in foreign affairs is based on the assumption that partisan conflict and competition are appropriate for domestic politics but not foreign affairs.

17.12 | Separation of Powers

The separation of powers among the three branches of government is different in domestic and global affairs. In global affairs, the president is the most powerful actor. Congress generally follows the president’s lead. The Supreme Court has a tradition of judicial restraint in global affairs—it generally stays out of disputes involving global affairs. Furthermore, in cases where individuals, companies, or Congress have challenged presidential actions, the Supreme Court has ruled that the president has primary, and perhaps exclusive, responsibility for the conduct of global affairs. In *U.S. v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation* (1936) a company in the business of selling weapons, the Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation, challenged the president’s power to declare an arms embargo prohibiting the sale of arms to two South American countries that were fighting over a disputed border region. President Franklin Roosevelt declared the arms embargo because he thought it would aid the American foreign policy goal of bringing peace to the region. The Supreme Court upheld the president’s power using the Sole Organ doctrine. The Sole Organ doctrine, which was first stated by Representative John Marshall, is that the Constitution makes the president the “sole organ” of the nation in its dealings with other nations. The Court’s ruling strengthened subsequent presidential claims that the president, not Congress or the courts, has the power to conduct foreign policy. There are differences of opinion about the scope of the Sole Organ doctrine. Congress and the Supreme Court do challenge presidential actions, but both Congress and the Supreme Court have agreed that the president has broad powers in the area of global affairs and they generally defer to the president’s determination of what policies are appropriate. The president can limit partisan or other challenges to foreign affairs policies, particularly those related to national security, by portraying critics or political opponents as un-American, unpatriotic, or even a threat to national security. Presidents play the Commander-in-Chief card to limit political opposition.
17.13 | Federalism

Federalism is the geographic division of powers between the national and state governments. Federalism does not operate as a very important check on presidential power in global affairs because global affairs are predominantly, and on some matters exclusively, national rather than state government powers. The Supremacy Clause provides that federal laws (the Constitution, statutes, and treaties) shall be “the supreme law of the land” and states are required to recognize federal laws. According to the preemption doctrine, federal policies trump state policies where they conflict. The states can pass laws in policy areas where the federal government also legislates (e.g., education, crime, the environment). But federal law preempts state laws that conflict with federal law. Immigration policy is one of the areas where state and federal laws sometimes conflict because states bordering Mexico, for example, have special interests in immigration issues. As the number of illegal immigrants has increased in some states, and the number of immigrants in general has increased in some states, voters in those states have enacted laws that clash with federal laws—or reflect a different view of how to enforce existing immigration laws, or present different views on eligibility for public services such as education, health care, and social welfare.

17.14 | Public Opinion

In democratic systems, public opinion is considered a vital essential check on government power. But there are three reasons why public opinion is often a weak check on government power in global affairs. First, the public is not as well informed about foreign affairs as it is about domestic affairs. The typical voter pays much closer attention to domestic issues such as the condition of the schools, the economy, and the roads than matters of foreign affairs. Second, the public is more dependent on the federal government for information about global affairs. A person may know a great deal about the condition of the local roads that they drive regularly because they have personal experience with driving them. A person may know a great deal about whether their neighborhood is safe and whether their local schools are good. But the average person is dependent on the government for information about most of the issues related to global affairs. This information dependency gives the government a freer hand to act independent of public opinion or even to create public opinion. Third, the typical public reaction to an international crisis, emergency, or foreign threat is to rally around the flag. This phrase describes the increase in patriotic support for the government that typically occurs in the wake of a foreign threat, attack, or crisis. The rally effect certainly occurred after the terrorist attacks of 9/11 when presidential approval ratings increased dramatically. The president, as the government official most closely identified with global affairs, can expect increased public support in the immediate aftermath of a foreign crisis that touches on national security. However, public support will decline if a crisis continues, a hostage rescue or military action fails, or a war lingers on for a long period of time.

17.2 | Two Traditions: Isolation or Engagement?
There are two competing views of U.S. global affairs policy: **isolationism** and **engagement**. These two views describe what U.S. global affairs policy is and, to a certain extent, what global affairs policy should be. The isolationist view is that the U.S. should maintain its tradition of staying out of foreign affairs or at least minimizing its engagement. Isolationists advocate inward looking politics where the government focuses on domestic or internal affairs rather than outward looking politics where the government focuses on foreign or external affairs. The isolationist tradition in American politics can be traced to three causes. First, the country was founded as a republic that was born of a revolution fought against the imperial tradition of global engagement practiced by the European powers, primarily the British, French, and Spanish empires. The second reason is geography. The U.S. was a young nation that was separated from the intrigues of European power politics by two great oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific, which enabled it to minimize interactions with other countries. The third reason is ideological. The ideological argument for isolationism is that the U.S. has rejected activist or engaged foreign policy because it has an “anti-statist ideology” that includes a rejection of centralized government power.1

Engagement refers to the argument that the U.S. has a political tradition of active engagement in global affairs and that this engagement is appropriate policy. Supporters of engagement describe the U.S. history of involvement with other nations from the earliest days of the republic. They maintain that the U.S. has strategically used its economic, military, and political power to advance its interests abroad. The view presented in this chapter is that the U.S. has elements of both isolation and engagement. The engagement in global affairs has historically been controversial because the anti-statist ideology—sometimes expressed by liberals and sometimes expressed by conservatives—opposes national government activism abroad. But American politics also includes very prominent examples of engagement in global affairs.

**17.21 | Isolation**

American politics has from the founding included debates about whether to be involved with global affairs and how any involvement should occur. One of the most famous expressions of isolationist policy is President George Washington’s **Farewell Address**. This famous Address, which was delivered as Washington was preparing to leave office in 1796, is remembered today primarily for the father of the country advising the young republic’s future leaders to stay out of foreign affairs and international intrigues—particularly the European politics that produced seemingly endless wars. Washington did indeed advise the country’s leaders to avoid entangling alliances. But Washington did not advise isolation. He did not urge the nation’s leaders to look inward not outward. His advice was more nuanced. Washington advised having **commercial** (or business) relations with other nations but not political relations:

> “History and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government…. The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible.”

He though that avoiding political connections was the best way for the young republic to keep out of the European politics that had a long history of complicated political entanglements that resulted in many and long wars. Washington urged the country’s future leaders to be skeptical of
“entangling” U.S. peace and prosperity with the European tradition of the politics of intrigue and avarice. When political connections with other countries were necessary, he recommended “temporary alliances” for those emergencies and warned the nation’s leaders to “steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.” He also worried about the U.S. joining an alliance with another country because he believed that “a small or weak” country that attached itself to a “great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.”

Washington’s *Farewell Address* was not limited to giving advice about how the country could avoid war, while not becoming subservient to great powers, and still pursue the national interest. He also spoke about the importance of remaining true to the nation’s founding values while pursuing national self-interest. He specifically mentioned values such as observing good faith and justice towards all nations, promoting peace and harmony with all nations, avoiding “inertive antipathies” against some nations and “passionate attachments” to others, and advocating trade with all nations. Washington and other leading members of the Federalist Party, most notably Alexander Hamilton, wanted the U.S. to develop as a “commercial republic.” But Hamilton disagreed with those who believed that commercial republics were the key to a peaceful world because commercial republics would not engage in armed conflict with other countries because they would be interested in trade rather than imperial power or national glory. In *Federalist Number 6*, for example, Hamilton argued that it was naïve idealism or “utopian” to think that commercial enterprises would replace war.

Isolationists also opposed U.S. participation in WWI and initially opposed U.S. fighting in WWII. One of the most famous advocates of isolationism was Charles Lindbergh. Lindbergh was a national hero whose strong statements urging the U.S. to stay out of WWII permanently damaged his reputation. His 1941 *Address to the America First Committee* is a strong statement of isolationism.

### 17.22 | Engagement

The political tradition of engagement also has roots in early American politics. The active engagement tradition is evident in early 19th Century thought and action. The Monroe Doctrine (1823) declared that the entire Western Hemisphere was within the U.S. sphere of influence and any attempts by European imperial powers to colonize countries or to interfere with political developments within the region—at a time when Latin American countries were experiencing independence movements from the Spanish Empire—would be considered justification for American military action. The doctrine of Manifest Destiny and the idea of American Exceptionalism also provided political and religious justifications for territorial expansion. Manifest Destiny is the belief that the United States was destined to expand its sphere of influence over the western territories of North America and even beyond the region. Manifest Destiny provided the political justification for westward expansion to settle the American frontier. It provided a justification for fighting Indian Wars to remove Native Americans from their traditional lands. It also provided a justification for territorial expansion by buying vast tracts of land through agreements such as the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, which almost doubled the geographic size of the nation. The nation’s territory also expanded in 1819 when Spain ceded the territory of Florida and in 1845 when the U.S. annexed Texas.

The Louisiana Purchase greatly increased the geographic size of the U.S.  
[http://www.nps.gov/archive/jeff/lewisclark2/circa1804/heritage/louisianapurchase/louisianapurchase.htm](http://www.nps.gov/archive/jeff/lewisclark2/circa1804/heritage/louisianapurchase/louisianapurchase.htm)
Manifest Destiny also justified military expansion by fighting the Mexican-American War (1846-1848) and Spanish-American War (1898). When the U.S. won the Mexican-American War in 1848 it acquired the vast territories that comprise California, Arizona, and New Mexico. The U.S. bought Alaska from the Russian Empire in 1867 and annexed the Republic of Hawaii in 1898. The U.S. victory over Spain in the Spanish-American War gave the U.S. possession of the former Spanish colonies of the Philippines and Puerto Rico and control over Cuba. The Spanish-American War was politically controversial in the U.S. because it involved an offensive use of American military power abroad. Critics of the War argued that it transformed the U.S. from a republic into an empire. The U.S. was a young republic that had successfully fought a revolutionary war against Great Britain, a great imperial power. In fact, the U.S. Declaration of Independence and Revolutionary War served as models for other nations to assert their national independence from other imperial powers that ruled over other people. William Graham Sumner (1840-1910) was an American academic whose essay entitled “The Conquest of the U.S. By Spain” (1899) argued that the U.S. won the Spanish-American War but paid a high price for its military victory: the U.S. won the war but lost its status as a republic because it acquired colonies and became an imperial power.  

American Exceptionalism is the belief that the U.S. is a special country, that its creation and rise to superpower status are indications that the U.S. is a great country that is destined to play a unique role in world politics, and that it has a responsibility to use its power. Exceptionalism has played a very important role in the nation’s global affairs, particularly in providing a justification for the legitimacy of the U.S. using its political, military, and economic power to project American influence abroad. American Exceptionalism continues to play an important role in American political discourse, presidential campaign rhetoric, and public policy.

The U.S. role in world politics has changed a great deal since the country was founded. The U.S. plays a much greater role and a very different role in international affairs. The conventional wisdom is that the Founders opposed U.S. involvement in foreign affairs, particularly getting involved with the intrigue of European power politics. While they were indeed wary of foreign affairs, they did not advise isolation rather than engagement. Reading two major sources of the Founders’ thinking—the debates at the constitutional convention of 1787 and the Federalist Papers—paints a more complicated picture. The convention delegates thought a great deal about how a young republic should deal with other nations and extensively debated foreign affairs. They knew that a successful republican government must be strong enough to provide national security from foreign threats. The Founders were not isolationists—at least not in the sense that they wanted the U.S. to be a republic that only looked inward and was only concerned about domestic affairs. They were aware of world politics. They understood that the Revolutionary War was not merely about the U.S., that the Revolutionary War for independence was part of a broader, even global conflict that involved the U.S. and the global powers of the day: England, France, Spain, and the Netherlands.

In fact, the Founders realized that the U.S. was likely to be unable to remain unaffected by politics outside the country even if it wanted to remain isolated. Therefore they supported the creation of a commercial republic. A commercial republic was one that was actively involved with other countries (particularly the European power) but primarily by commercial dealings.
The engagement was international trade rather than the use of military force. The belief that the U.S. should be engaged in international trade made political sense. The U.S. was a struggling young nation. It faced economic difficulties. Sectional differences between the north, the sound and the frontier raised questions about national unity. The young republic did not have a substantial military, and it was surrounded by territories controlled by Indian Tribes and three expansionist imperial powers (France, England, and Spain). The Founders were acutely aware of foreign threats to their existence.

17.3 | Foreign Policy

Foreign policy is defined as the set of goals and public policies that a country establishes for its interactions with other nations and, to a lesser extent, non-state actors. Foreign policies are designed to promote national interests, national security, ideology, political values, and economic prosperity. The tools of foreign policy include economic, political, social, diplomatic, technological, and military resources.

As U.S. economic and military power increased during the latter part of the 19th century, the U.S. became an increasingly important player on the global stage. This aspect of American political development marked an important, long-term shift in U.S. foreign policy that included territorial expansion, more active involvement in foreign affairs, and more engagement in international relations. In the early years of the 20th Century, U.S. foreign policy was shaped primarily by growing international trade, concerns about immigration, participation in World War I, and claims of a national right to intervene in Caribbean and Central American politics.

The U.S. role on the global stage continued to increase after WWII with American efforts to avoid another global conflict by bringing order to the anarchistic world of international relations. International relations were “anarchistic” in the sense that each country pursued its national interest using power politics, whereby might makes right and justice is merely the national interest of the stronger nation, and relying on military force as the primary way to settle the disputes that inevitably arose. The U.S. interest in playing a role in world peace did not begin with the WWII era. It has older roots. President Woodrow Wilson had ambitious, idealistic plans to use American power to make the world safe for democracy. One component of this plan was the creation of a League of Nations. However, the Wilson administration was unable to convince Congress to support the League of Nations. The U.S. never joined the League of Nations partly because of the political tradition emphasizing unilateral action rather than joining international organization and the preservative of U.S. sovereignty.

In the years preceding WWII, the United States was involved with foreign trade, but otherwise its foreign policy in the 1920s and 1930s tended to be isolationist. As a result, when Germany and Japan built up their military in the 1930s and used military force against their neighbors, the Roosevelt administration had to overcome strong public resistance to joining international efforts to confront the threats presented by these new totalitarian regimes. The U.S. did provide military aid to Great Britain in its fight against Germany (e.g., though the Lend-Lease Program) and then entered the war and lead allied war efforts against Germany, Japan, and Italy. The contribution of U.S. industrial production as the American economy was converted from peacetime production to wartime production was a major factor in winning the war. Until WWII, the U.S. would mobilize the military for war and then demobilize the military after the war. After WWII, the U.S. returned to a peacetime economy and industrial production but kept
some of the most important government institutions that were responsible for national security and military readiness. The U.S. kept a standing peacetime army for the first time in its history. And the federal government kept the institutions that were created to ensure national defense and national security. Therefore one legacy of WWII is the warfare state. The term warfare state refers to the permanent national security and defense institutions, including the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency. One result of the Great Depression was the creation of a social welfare state. One result of WWII was the creation of a warfare state.

During the middle years of the 20th Century, American foreign policy was dominated by World War II and the Cold War. The post-WWII era of U.S. economic prosperity contributed to the expansion of American influence abroad and extended engagement in global affairs. The end of the hot war did not mean the end of conflict. The U.S. adopted the Cold War policy of containment to limit the Soviet expansion of its influence over regions of the world. Containment was a multi-faceted policy that was intended to counter Soviet influence in countries or regions where the Soviets were extending their influence. Containment included the use of American economic, military, and political power.

- Economic power. This included using foreign aid and other types of economic or development assistance as instruments of foreign policy.
- Political influence. This included diplomacy, treaties (such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NATO), and other international agreements such as executive orders as instruments of foreign policy.
- Military power. This included overt military actions, covert operations, and even proxy wars. A proxy war is a war that is militarily supported by one country but found by another usually smaller country.

In a famous Farewell Address delivered January 17, 1961, President Eisenhower warned of the dangers presented by the national security establishment. He advised the American public and government officials to “guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence...by the military-industrial complex.”

The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1989 meant that the U.S.’s main adversary during the long Cold War period was no longer an immediate military threat. As a result, American foreign policy shifted away from the military and toward international trade, human rights, and diplomacy as ways to achieve foreign policy goals. This change from military power to international relations as the central element of foreign policy continued until the terrorist attacks of 9/11.

17.31 | The Modern Conservative Era

In foreign policy, the modern conservative era began in the latter 1960s and early 1970s as a reaction against liberalism. Conservatives blamed liberals and liberalism for making the U.S. economically vulnerable and militarily weak. They specifically blamed liberals for the following problems:

- Going soft on communism. Conservatives thought that American foreign policy was no longer sufficiently anti-communist, that the American emphasis on peace and diplomacy
reflected efforts to appeasement the Soviet Union that were similar to British efforts to appease Hitler’s Germany prior to WWII.

- The loss of the War in Vietnam. The loss of the war, punctuated by media images of the chaotic withdrawal of the remaining Americans when Saigon fell in 1975, raised questions about both the effectiveness of American military power and the willingness to use military power in the national interest. Conservatives blamed liberals for the loss of national confidence in American power, a condition that conservatives called the “Vietnam Syndrome.”

- Energy dependency. In the 1970s, two oil embargoes by The Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) exposed how vulnerable the American economy (and lifestyle) was because of dependence on foreign oil.

- The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in December 1979. The perception that the U.S. could do little about the invasion or similar aggressive actions by the United States’ main Cold War adversary contributed to a sense of American military weakness or decline.

- The Iran Hostages. In 1979, Americans were taken hostage in Iran as part of a revolution against the Shah of Iran, an authoritarian ruler who had been an ally of the U.S. in the Middle East. The hostage-taking, and a failed hostage rescue mission, reinforced the perception of American weakness.

In order to counteract these real and perceived weaknesses, conservatives (and Republican presidents) advocated a buildup of the American military and a restoration of the American sense of a duty to act with a national purpose on the world stage. Richard Nixon’s Address to the Bohemian Society in July 1967 explains the intellectual foundations of President Nixon’s foreign policy goals and those of Republican Presidents Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush. This Address is significant because it shows that already in the mid-1960s conservative political leaders were describing communism as a failed and failing ideology; giving American military superiority credit for the years of peace following World War II (which came to be called Pax Americana); encouraging a military buildup based on the conservative idea of “Peace Through Strength;” and advocating the use of American economic power as an instrument of foreign policy to counter Soviet influence across the globe. In fact, many of the ideas in Nixon’s 1967 Address informed President Reagan’s foreign policy in the 1980s.

Ronald Reagan won the 1980 presidential election at least partly because he campaigned on the promise of rebuilding the national spirit and the military to fight Soviet communism. After the fall of the Soviet Union, conservatives advocated American acceptance of its responsibility as the sole remaining superpower. In The Case for Goliath: How America Acts as the World’s Government In the Twenty-First Century (2006), Michael Mandelbaum argued that the U.S. had become a de facto world government because of its status as the sole remaining military and economic superpower. The U.S. offered military security in regions of the world through alliances such as NATO, the promotion and regulation of international trade through economic treaties as the General Agreements on Tariff and Trade (which is now the World Trade Organization), financial stability through the maintenance of a solid dollar as a global currency, and support for legal recourse for the violation of human rights.
The end of the Cold War in 1991 began a period where American foreign policy shifted away from the East-West conflict between two military superpowers (the U.S. and the Soviet Union). Post-Cold War foreign policy emphasized economic issues: the promotion of trade; economic development; and global economic competition. Economic competition has focused on China, India, and Brazil, who have emerged as major economic competitors particularly in manufacturing. China is also a Communist country therefore its rapid economic development and emergence as an economic competitor has raised concerns about whether it will present a military and political threat to the U.S. The economic results of China’s public policy strategy to promote rapid economic growth and development are already apparent. China now has the world’s second largest economy (as measured by Gross Domestic Product) having surpassed Japan. The close relationship between economics and politics has historically raised questions about how a nation plans to use its power, and the political consequences of China’s emergence as a world economic power are certainly a part of American political debates about China.

The emergence of these new international economic competitors has prompted debates about what public policies the U.S. should adopt to ensure that the U.S. remains competitive in the global marketplace. The Conference Board is a “global business membership and research association” that describes itself as working to advance the public interest by providing the world’s leading organizations with practical knowledge to improve their performance and to better serve society. Like many other business organizations, the Conference Board promotes public policies that encourage economic growth. It believes that the current low rates of economic growth in the U.S. have two main causes. The first is demographics. The U.S., like other developed countries, has an aging population. An aging population means an increased percentage of elderly people. Elderly people require more medical care and other social services and they are less likely to be working—the therefore they are more likely to be consumers of services rather than producers. The Conference Board believes that the second cause of low economic growth is educational: stagnant educational attainment is blamed for stagnant economic growth rates. The Conference Board recommends changing immigration policy to solve the demographic problem of an aging population—specifically, changing immigration policies to allow more high-skilled workers into the country. Business interest groups generally support immigration policy as a partial solution to the problem of stagnant educational attainment or a mismatch between employer needs and employee skill sets.

Should the U.S. grant more temporary work visas for certain skilled foreign workers in order to meet the demand for high tech workers? The H-1B Visa Program was designed to do so. But now employers are using the program for a different purpose. Listen to “Older Tech Workers Oppose Overhauling H-1B Visas.”

Think About It!
Is immigration the solution to the problem of low economic growth?
Act on It!
Contact a government official (in the U.S. or another country), a business leader, or an interest group or political party official to see what they think about immigration policy.
Globalization is a broad term with two meanings. It refers to the process whereby governments, economies, cultures, and societies are becoming more and more interconnected and interdependent. It also refers to the results or impacts of these processes. The process of globalization began with the promotion of international trade, primarily international business, but it has extended far beyond trade to include issues such as human rights, environmental policy, sustainable development, and even good governance. Globalization is one of the factors that diminish the differences between domestic affairs and global affairs.

Globalization makes the people of one country more connected with the people of other countries. It also makes people more interdependent. This is ironic because Americans do not know very much about the people, politics, geography, and economics of other countries compared to what people of other countries know about the U.S. One reason why people in other countries know more about the U.S. than Americans know about them is that U.S. media do not provide much coverage of politics in other countries compared to other countries’ media coverage of U.S. politics. Read a newspaper or magazine, watch a television news program, or go to your favorite Web site to see how much news coverage is state/local, national, and international.

**Think About It!**
What do people in other countries think about U.S. presidential elections?

**Act on it!**
Write a letter to the editor of one of the major newspapers of the world to see whether it gets published.

17.34 | *New Foreign Policy Issues: Religion*

Human rights issues are one of the foreign policy. In recent years, freedom of religion has become one of the human rights issues that foreign policy makers have addressed. As a result, the Department of State’s Office of International Religious Freedom now provides information about the status of freedom of religion in various countries that can be used as a benchmark for assessing freedom of religion as one component of how free a political system is.
17.4 | Instruments of Foreign and Defense Policy

Treaties and executive agreements are the two major forms of official agreements with other countries. The major difference between treaties and executive agreements is that executive agreements are less formal than treaties and they are not subject to the constitutional requirement of ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

17.41 | Treaties

Treaties are formal written agreements between two or more countries. The Treaty Clause of the Constitution (Article II, Section 2) provides that the President “shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur....” This means that the president or his advisors negotiate a treaty with another country or countries, but the Senate must ratify it in order to take effect. There are at least four reasons why the Senate might reject a treat. First, senators might oppose the substance of the treaty. A proposed treaty can be opposed on policy grounds and voted against the same way that proposed legislation is voted against. Second, senators might have a principled objection to treaties in the tradition of heeding President Washington’s advice to beware entangling alliances with other countries. President Wilson proposed the Treaty of Versailles after World War I but the Senate rejected it primarily because the isolationist tradition made Senators wary of U.S. participation in permanent international organizations.

Sovereignty and federalism are the third and fourth reasons why Senators, state government officials, and the general public are wary of treaties. The term sovereignty means the supreme and independent government authority. The idea of national sovereignty and the commitment to preserving U.S. national sovereignty is very strong in the U.S., much stronger than in many European countries for instance. Treaties can obligate U.S. government officials to comply with international law or treaty obligations, thereby weakening U.S. national sovereignty defined as the power to act independently. Therefore defenders of U.S. national sovereignty, organizations such as Sovereignty International, Inc., alert Americans to the threats presented by treaties, executive agreements, and the general trend toward global governance. National sovereignty is one of the reasons for political opposition to the United Nations, opposition to putting U.S. troops under UN control, and even opposition to treaties that strengthen human rights or the rights of children—two issues that might seem on their face to be non-controversial.

Figure 17-1 below describes three levels of sovereignty (state, national, and supranational). American political development includes the change from the founding era when the states were considered the primary level of government to the modern era when the national government has assumed greater powers. This change has been controversial and remains one of the reasons for opposition to “big” government. Efforts to create supranational governing authorities are even more controversial because they would mark a shift toward locating sovereignty outside the U.S. political and government system.
Figure 17.1: Three Levels of Sovereignty

The fourth reason why Americans are wary of treaties is federalism. In most nations, treaties supersede domestic law: the treaty trumps domestic law where there is a conflict between the two kinds of law. In the U.S., federalism complicates the legal status of treaties. Treaties are considered federal laws. But their effects on state laws are complicated because of the divisions of power between the national and state governments.

The Constitution’s Supremacy Clause provides that federal law trumps state law where the state law conflicts with federal law. Treaties (and executive agreements) have the same legal status as federal laws. State government officials may be even more opposed to treaties that limit state criminal justice policies—for instance, prohibiting the execution of minors or requiring the state to notify consular officials when a non-citizen has been arrested in the state—than federal laws.

Exactly where treaties fit into the U.S. legal system is further complicated by three factors. First, Congress can modify treaties, reinterpret treaty obligations, and even repeal treaties even if doing so constitutes a violation of international law. Second, the president can unilaterally reinterpret provisions of treaties—as President Carter did with the Panama Canal Treaty. Three, the Supreme Court has ruled that it has the authority to declare a treaty unconstitutional just as it has the authority to declare a statute unconstitutional (but it has never done so).

The legal status of treaties is provided for in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The State Department has taken the position that the Vienna Convention represents
established law (but note the three complicating factors mentioned above). One of the responsibilities of the State Department is to report on treaties. The following are major treaties:

- The North Atlantic Treaty (1949) established the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). NATO was the major international treaty organization during the Cold War era. The Treaty created the major alliance between the Western powers that confronted the Soviet Union.
- The World Trade Organization (WTO) is one of the international bodies that promotes and regulates international trade with the goal of liberalizing international trade—that is, minimizing trade barriers. The WTO’s emphasis on trade reflects the post-Cold War shift toward trade rather than national security.
- The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) is an example of the foreign policy emphasis on promoting free trade in regions of the world.

17.42 | Executive Agreements

An executive agreement is a formal document that is negotiated between the president and the head of another government (typically the prime minister). As such, executive agreements are not permanent agreements because they do not necessarily bind subsequent presidents the way that treaties do. An executive agreement does not have to be ratified by the senate. For this reason, over time presidents have relied less on treaties and more on executive agreements and the number of treaties has decreased and the number of executive agreements has increased. The Constitution does not mention executive agreements. But in a 1937 case, U.S. v. Belmont, the Supreme Court recognized the constitutionality of executive agreements, the president’s power to enter into executive agreements, and determined that executive agreements have the same legal status as treaties. In fact, the Court’s unanimous ruling stated that the federal government’s “external powers” could be exercised without regard to state laws. The president’s power to enter into executive agreements is now part of the American political and legal tradition.

17.5 | The Actors: Institutions and Organizations

Government and non-government actors participate in the Global Affairs policy-making process, particularly foreign policy. The following describes some of the major participants in the global affairs issue network, their roles, and their goals.

17.51 | Congress

Article I of the Constitution vests all legislative power in Congress. The Constitution also grants Congress specific powers. The Constitution grants Congress the power to declare war and it requires treaties, which are negotiated by the president, to be ratified by the Senate. Congress also has the power of the purse. This is relevant to global affairs because it means that Congress enacts the civilian budget for the State Department, which is one of the main foreign policy actors, and the military budget for the Department of Defense. Congress uses its power of the purse, its budget authority, to influence foreign and national security policy.
The House and the Senate have committees with jurisdiction over various areas of foreign policy. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee website describes the committee history, members, hearings, and legislation. The committee plays an important role in shaping foreign policy as well as legislative oversight of the government agencies responsible for implementing foreign policy. After the Republican takeover of the House of Representatives in the 2010 mid-term elections, Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-Florida) was selected as Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The Committee’s Website candidly acknowledged that the president, not Congress, takes the lead in foreign policy. According to the History of the Committee, the executive branch “does take the lead on nearly every aspect of foreign policy, but congressional committees use the power of the purse” to exert influence over the president’s policies. In the 113th Congress, the House Foreign Affairs Committee website (accessed February 2, 2013) described its jurisdiction as being “responsible for oversight and legislation” related to a broad range of policy responsibilities, including oversight and legislation relating to foreign assistance; the Peace Corps; national security developments affecting foreign policy; strategic planning and agreements; war powers, treaties, executive agreements, and the deployment and use of United States Armed Forces; peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions; arms control and disarmament issues; activities and policies of the State, Commerce and Defense Departments and other agencies related to the Arms Export Control Act, and the Foreign Assistance; international law; promotion of democracy; international law enforcement issues, including narcotics control programs and activities; Broadcasting Board of Governors; embassy security; international broadcasting; public diplomacy, including international communication, information policy, international education, and cultural programs; and other matters.

17.52 | The President

In a parliamentary system, foreign policy is the responsibility of the head of government—usually the prime minister and the foreign minister, who is a political appointee of the prime minister. In the U.S., the president and the secretary of state, a presidential appointee, are the primary actors responsible for making and managing foreign policy. The president’s importance in conducting foreign policy is reflected in the fact that the president’s name is often attached to the administration’s foreign policy: the Monroe Doctrine; the Truman Doctrine; the Kennedy Doctrine; the Nixon Doctrine; the Reagan Doctrine; the Bush Doctrine; and the Obama Doctrine. A president’s doctrine typically announces the major outlines of an administration’s policy. The Monroe Doctrine announced that the U.S. considered the Caribbean within its sphere of influence and opposed European intervention. The Truman Doctrine announced the administration’s Cold War policy: stopping Soviet expansion; supporting free people who were resisting subjugation; and negotiating regional defense treaties (the Rio Pact of 1947—Latin America; NATO in 1949); ANZUS with Australia and New Zealand; and SEATO with Southeast Asia). The Truman Doctrine greatly expanded the role of the U.S. as the world’s policeman. A president’s doctrine also announces the administration’s policy concerning the use of military force, particularly whether its approach to resolving international conflicts and pursuing national interest will rely on hard power (the military) or soft power (diplomacy). A president’s doctrine is sometimes a reaction to the predecessor’s doctrine if the predecessor was of a different political party. For example, the Bush Doctrine under Republican President George
W. Bush emphasized unilateral military action to advance national interests and the Obama Doctrine under Democratic President Barack Obama emphasized multilateral action.

The secretary of state is the functional equivalent of the foreign minister in a country with a parliamentary system of government. The secretary of state conducts diplomacy, state-to-state policy discussions, and certain interactions with the government officials of other countries. The secretary of state and ambassadors are nominated by the president and confirmed by the Senate. Congress also has power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

It is ironic that the president is today the dominant foreign affairs actor because most presidents come to office with little or no experience with global politics. A president’s political experience is usually limited to domestic politics. A president may have served as the governor of a state (usually one of the larger, more influential states), a senator (again, usually from one of the large, more influential states), or served as vice-president. This means that most presidents get on-the-job training when it comes to global affairs. But presidents typically come to office with high public expectations about serving as the leader of the free world, acting on the global stage by flying around on Air Force One, or perhaps acting as the Commander-in-Chief deploying the U.S. military. Congress also has high expectations for the president’s foreign policy agenda.

Congress has greatly increased presidential power over global affairs by statutorily delegating broad legislative power to the president. With the possible exception of the War Powers Resolution of 1973, the following are examples of congressional delegations of legislative power to the president on matters of national security, war powers, and emergency powers. They all illustrate the problem of holding presidents legally accountable for the use of power because they give the president the power to do whatever the president thinks is necessary. This is such a vague standard that it not an effective way to hold power accountable.

- **Hostage Rescue Act (1868).** This Act authorized the president to take “all actions necessary and proper, not amounting to war, to secure the release of hostages.”

- **The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (1964).** “WHEREAS, the communist regime in Vietnam...have repeatedly attacked U.S. vessels lawfully present in international waters....” RESOLVED, That the Congress approves the determination of the President “to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.”

- **The First War Powers Act of 1941.** This Act delegated broad powers to the president to organize and wage war.

- **The War Powers Resolution** of 1973. In order to ensure collective judgment when committing troops to hostilities or situations where hostilities are imminent, the president shall consult with Congress, report to Congress, and shall seek authorization to maintain commitments beyond specified time periods.

- **International Economic Emergency Powers Act (1977).** This Act authorizes the President to declare a national emergency and order embargoes, trade sanctions, asset seizures.

- **Public Law 105-235 (SJR54-Trent Lott) January 27, 1998.** WHEREAS, Operation Desert Storm ended January 28, 1991, and United Nations Security council Resolution 686 (providing for UNSCOM nuclear inspectors) and 687 (providing for economic sanctions until weapons of mass destruction were disclosed, destroyed, and Iraq pledged to not use such weapons) were still in force; (Followed by 27 more whereas) RESOLVED, that Iraq is in “material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations,” and
therefore the president is urged to take appropriate action, in accordance with the U.S. Constitution and relevant laws of the U.S., to bring Iraq into compliance with its international obligations.

- Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Terrorists. (Public Law 107-40, Enacted September 18, 2001.) The Act authorized the President “to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.”

- Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution. (Public Law 107-243, Enacted October 16, 2002.) This resolution began “WHEREAS, Iraq remains in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations, [Followed by a list of 22 “whereases” listing among others the invasion of Kuwait, violations of UN cease fire terms of disarmament, weapons inspections, weapons of mass destruction, threat to the national security of the United States, 9/11 attacks and terrorists known to use Iraq, UN Sec. Council Res. 678 authorizing use of force to enforce UN Resolutions] and resolved that “The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate” in order to (1) defend the national security of the United States and (2) “enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.”

17.53 | The State Department

The Secretary of State is the head of the Department of State. The State Department is the main executive branch agency responsible for developing and implementing foreign policy under the president’s direction. The following is the State Department’s mission statement from the November 2010 Agency Financial Report: “Advance freedom for the benefit of the American people and the international community by helping to build and sustain a more democratic, secure, and prosperous world composed of well-governed states that respond to the needs of their people, reduce widespread poverty, and act responsibly within the international system.” This mission statement reveals the State Department’s broad mission. It includes promoting democracy, security, and prosperity abroad.

The State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency’s The World Factbook provide a great deal of useful information about government and politics in other countries. For information about a country and descriptions of U.S. relations with that country see the Additional Resources section at the end of this chapter which includes links to the Department of State “Countries and Regions.” One way to develop a better understanding of politics and government in the U.S. is to compare the U.S. with other countries. The Library of Congress’ Country Studies Website provides a great deal of information about the countries of the world.

17.54 | The Department of Defense

The Department of Defense (DOD) plays a central role in providing for national security. The Department of Defense is an executive department. The Secretary of Defense is a political
appointee who is usually a member of the President’s **inner cabinet**—the small number of heads of the executive departments who lead the most important agencies: State; Defense; Treasury; and Justice). The Pentagon is the building where much of the DOD policy making and business operations are headquartered. **DOD publications** describe a broad range of defense matters.

The U.S. spends a great deal of money on national defense. The military budget is large as measured in absolute dollar amounts or when compared with defense spending in other countries. The Global Studies website provides a report on **worldwide military spending**. The end of the Cold War was expected to bring a “peace dividend,” a government saving from reduced defense spending. But then the War on Terrorism began with wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Even with reductions of military forces in those two countries cutting defense spending is hard for some of the same reasons that cutting government spending in general is hard. Defense contractors, members of Congress, and the Department of Defense have vested interests in maintaining or increasing spending. Military contracts are distributed across states and congressional districts.

17.55 | **The National Security Agency**

The NSA is located within the Department of Defense, Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence. The NSA is such a secret agency that its letters are sometimes said to refer to No Such Agency. The NSA’s core missions “are to protect U.S. national security systems and to produce foreign signals intelligence information. The **Information Assurance** mission confronts the formidable challenge of preventing foreign adversaries from gaining access to sensitive or classified national security information. The **Signals Intelligence** mission collects, processes, and disseminates intelligence information from foreign signals for intelligence and counterintelligence purposes and to support military operations. This Agency also enables Network Warfare operations to defeat terrorists and their organizations at home and abroad, consistent with U.S. laws and the protection of privacy and civil liberties.” The NSA is responsible for collecting and analyzing foreign communications and foreign signals intelligence as well as protecting U.S. government communications and information systems. **Locating the NSA within the Department of Defense** gives you a sense of the complexities of the DOD and NSA.

17.56 | **The Central Intelligence Agency**

The CIA’s website provides information about its **history, organization, and mission**. Its mission statement describes the CIA as “the nation’s first line of defense.” It carries out its mission by:

- “Collecting information that reveals the plans, intentions and capabilities of our adversaries and provides the basis for decision and action.
- Producing timely analysis that provides insight, warning and opportunity to the President and decision makers charged with protecting and advancing America’s interests.”

17.57 | **The Department of Homeland Security**
The DHS was created in 2003 after the terrorist attacks of 9/11 to better coordinate anti-terrorist activities. The DHS is a huge, complicated organization that performs varied functions. It can be considered an umbrella organization because it has responsibility for such a broad range of functions that are related to homeland security ranging from transportation to immigration to telecommunications policy. The Transportation Security Agency was created after 9/11. In 2003 it was moved from the Department of Transportation to the Department of Homeland Security to highlight its role in protecting national security. The TSA is responsible for ensuring freedom of movement of individuals and commerce.

One national security policy that the average American sees (and sometimes feels!) is airport screening of passengers. The passenger screening policy that is being implemented by the Transportation Security Administration is based on a strategy that involves searching for bombs rather than bombers. Passengers and luggage are searched to find dangerous materials (bombs, weapons, and items that could be used for terrorism). The alternative strategy is to search for bombers, to look for individuals who are likely to be threatening or dangerous, to screen passengers than luggage. One reason why the U.S. focuses on searching for bombs rather than bombers is because looking for individuals is controversial. It requires data gathering about people and making assumptions about who is likely to be a threat and who is not. Government data banks raise concerns about big government monitoring people. The government does maintain a No Fly list. Furthermore, a TSA decision to search individuals based on their physical appearance, their religion, their dress, their nationality, or their travel or educational patterns, is profiling.

The DHS is also responsible for certain aspects of immigration policy: maintaining border security, providing immigration services, and enforcing immigration laws. The USA Patriot Act and other counter-terrorism policies have substantially increased the size and scope of government power, thereby raising familiar questions about maintaining “that delicate balance” between individual freedom and government power.

17.58 | Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs)

Government officials are not the only individuals and organizations that are active in the politics of global affairs. There is a large and growing body of non-governmental actors that lobby in the area of global affairs policy. The interest groups are varied, with organizations advocating on behalf of economic, ideological, ethnic and national identity, religious, and other issue-based interests or causes.

The Foreign Policy Association (FPA) is a non-profit organization that was founded in 1918 to foster public knowledge of and interest in the world by providing publications, programs, and forums. The Foreign Policy Association’s website describes its mission as serving “as a catalyst for developing awareness, understanding of, and providing informed opinions on global issues” and “encourage[ing] citizens to participate in the foreign policy process.” One of the FPA’s outreach efforts is the Great Decisions Global Affairs Education Program. Great Decisions is composed of the annual Briefing Book, Great Decisions TV, the National Opinion Ballot Report, discussion groups across the country and the Great Decisions Online newsletter. Great Decisions has become the largest nonpartisan public education program on international affairs in the world. It has published a Citizen’s Guide to U.S. Foreign Policy and founded the World Affairs Council of Washington, D.C.
Think tanks and public policy organizations such as the Council on Foreign Relations are also influential in the policy making process. They produce studies of various issues, they provide policy experts who testify at congressional committee hearings, and they lobby for and against specific policies and issues. These organizations are also influential because their members are recruited for government positions. When a new administration comes into office, it recruits government officials from these organizations: Republican presidents tend to recruit government officials from organizations with Republican or conservative leanings while Democratic presidents tend to recruit government officials from organizations with Democratic or liberal leanings. Think tanks and public policy organizations also provide places for policy experts to work while they, their party, or their ideas are out of government.

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) was established in 1921. The CFR website describes the CFR as “an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher” that serves as a resource for its members, government officials, business executives, journalists, educators and students, and civic and religious leaders.

Economic interest groups are also active lobbyists in formulating foreign policy. Business organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, as well as labor organizations such as the AFL-CIO, lobby on behalf of international trade, commerce, and labor issues. In fact, globalization and the importance of international trade as an aspect of foreign policy have expanded the political arena in the sense that economic interest groups lobby for or against public policies in both the domestic and foreign policy arenas. Interest group politics now extends beyond the territorial boundaries of the U.S.

A broad range of business interests have a major stake in foreign and national security policies. For example, the federal government does not manufacture military weapons or other equipment. The federal government buys military equipment from private sector companies. Consequently, the aerospace and defense industry has a big financial stake in the defense budget, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s (NASA) budget, and other federal programs. For instance, the decision to scuttle the shuttle program has had major impacts on the aerospace industry and the communities surrounding the manufacturing and launching sites. In fact, privatization has increased the private sector’s stake in the defense budget (as well as the budgets of other federal agencies). The U.S. military has privatized a broad range of services. It now relies on private sector companies to provide services that were once provided by members of the military. The Army and Air Force Exchange Services, which the government created to provide merchandise and services to members of the military, strives to provide American troops and their dependents with a “taste of home” wherever they are stationed across the globe. These tastes include familiar fast food franchises and other amenities. The military now contracts with food service companies to provide food that was once provided by army cooks in mess halls.

Privatization is not limited to support services such as food or amenities. Most of the contractors are unarmed service providers, but the military signs logistics contracts with companies that provide armed security guards for the military and civilian support personnel. Of the more than 70,000 private sector civilians that were working in Iraq in 2011 on military contracts to provide necessities and amenities for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, a great majority are service sector workers. Many of these employees are “third-country nationals,” workers hired by foreign companies to work under service sector contracts for the military. The extensive reliance on privatization—relying on private sector to provide public services—presents new accountability problems. The U.S. military is responsible for its own actions. The U.S.
government negotiates Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA) with countries where the military is deployed. The SOFA agreements typically include provisions that describe which country’s court system will be used to try individuals who commit crimes. Who is responsible for poor or unsafe working conditions when the military contracts with private sector companies that use subcontractors or employers that are not even American? Who is legally accountable when military contractors commit crimes while employed for the U.S. military? Blackwater, Inc. (which is now called Xe) was a U.S. company that received large government contracts to provide security services in Iraq and Afghanistan. The CEO of Blackwater described his company’s mission as doing for the national security apparatus what FedEx did to the postal service. When Blackwater employees were accused of criminal acts including rape, torture, and murder, the murky legal accountability presented serious problems that were highlighted during congressional hearings.

Think about it!

17.6 | War (and Emergency) Powers

The need to get the power problem right by striking the right balance between granting and limiting power is especially important for war and national emergencies. A successful constitution is one that strikes “that delicate balance” between granting government enough power to be effective while also limiting power enough so that government officials can be held accountable. The Founders gave a great deal of thought to war powers. They sought to give the national government enough power to protect the country from foreign invasion. The delegates at the Constitutional Convention of 1787 extensively debated issues related to foreign affairs, national security, and war powers. National security was an important political issue during the constitutional convention and in the early years of the republic because the U.S. was a young republic, and a militarily weak nation that was surrounded by ambitious imperial powers: The Spanish Empire, The British Empire, and the French Empire. The debates during the constitutional convention of 1787 reflect the concerns about whether a monarch-like president was needed to protect the country’s national security, or whether a republic was strong enough to protect it. The Founders worried about giving the new national government too many war powers. They were especially concerned about the creation of a new executive official, the president. The creation of the presidency was controversial because it was seen as a step away from a republic and toward monarchy, the form of government that the Revolutionary War was fought against. Furthermore, the colonial experiences that inspired the Declaration of Independence and the Revolutionary War included monarchs who used war powers for their personal or national glory. The first American form of government, the Articles of Confederation, did not have an executive figure because not having an executive was considered the best way to avoid the problem of imperial ambition.
The delegates to the Constitutional Convention in 1787 debated whether to create a presidency and what to do about war powers. A majority thought that the lack of an executive was one of the major flaws in the Articles of Confederation and, after extensive debate, the delegates decided to create a presidency. Some of the worries about war powers were eased by the decision to divide control over war powers. The Constitution provided that Congress declares war and the president as Commander-in-Chief wages war.

17.61 Divided Control of War Powers

The war powers are divided between Congress and the president. Congress was delegated the power to declare war and the power to raise and support armies. The president was made the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces: the president waged war as the “top general.” This division of control over war powers is usually described by saying that Congress makes war (decides whether to go to war) and the president wages war (as the Commander in Chief). During the colonial era, the Founders experienced the offensive use of war powers by imperial powers. The British, French, and Spanish imperial model of government included using military power to expand the empire. The colonists’ experience with offensive imperial power caused the delegates to the Constitutional Convention in 1787 to be concerned about war powers. They decided to give the new national government defensive war powers so that it could effectively defend the young republic against foreign invasion. But they nevertheless worried about war powers.

In “Political Observations” (April 20 1795), James Madison described war as the “germ” that presented the greatest threat to liberty and republican government:

“Of all the enemies of true liberty, war is, perhaps, the most to be dreaded, because it comprises and develops the germ of every other. War is the parent of armies; from these proceed debts and taxes; and armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few. In war, too, the discretionary power of the Executive is extended; its influence in dealing out offices, honors and emoluments is multiplied; and all the means of seducing the minds, are added to those of subduing the force, of the people. The same malignant aspect in republicanism may be traced in the inequality of fortunes, and the opportunities of fraud, growing out of a state of war, and in the degeneracy of manner and of morals, engendered in both.

No nation can preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare. War is in fact the true nurse of executive aggrandizement. In war, a physical force is to be created; and it is the executive will, which is to direct it. In war, the public treasuries are to be unlocked; and it is the executive hand which is to dispense them. In war, the honors and emoluments of office are to be multiplied; and it is the executive patronage under which they are to be enjoyed; and it is the executive brow they are to encircle.

The strongest passions and most dangerous weaknesses of the human breast; ambition, avarice, vanity, the honorable or venal love of fame, are all in conspiracy against the desire and duty of peace.


These are extremely strong words warning the country about the dangers that the war powers presented to republican government! Madison acknowledged that the decision to increase
security by granting the government power to repel foreign invasions also increased insecurity by exposing the nation to the risk that the war powers would be used internally to threaten republican government. Is this germ theory of war powers accurate? As the U.S. became an economic and military power, it did use its powers to extend American influence abroad. Two notable 19th Century examples of this use of U.S. military power are the Mexican-American War and the Spanish-American War. World Wars I and II were fought primarily for reasons other than extended American power abroad, but one consequence of WWII was a greater awareness of how the U.S. could use its economic, political, and military power abroad to prevent war. This was once of the policies underlying the Cold War foreign policy. As a result military force was not limited to defensive actions but also included offensive actions. This was an important shift in thinking about national security and foreign policy. President George W. Bush declared that his administration was adopting the doctrine of preventive war, which is the use of military force for policy wars or using military force as an instrument of foreign policy. President George W. Bush’s September 2002 National Security Strategy announced elements of what was unofficially called the Bush Doctrine, the set of principles that guided the Bush Administration’s foreign policy. The Bush Doctrine had two main principles. First, it announced that the U.S. would unilaterally withdraw from treaties dealing with arms control and global warming. Second, it emphasized that the U.S. would take unilateral military action to protect national security interests: the U.S. would act alone to use military force and it would take preventive military action. The Bush Doctrine of preventive military force was controversial because it declared that as a matter of policy the U.S. would not wait to use military force defensively—it would use military force preemptively in order to prevent threats to national security interests. According to the National Security Strategy document,

“The gravest danger our Nation faces lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology. Our enemies have openly declared that they are seeking weapons of mass destruction…. The United States will not allow these efforts to succeed. We will build defenses against ballistic missiles and other means of delivery. We will cooperate with other nations to deny, contain, and curtail our enemies’ efforts to acquire dangerous technologies. And, as a matter of common sense and self-defense, America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed. We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best. So we must be prepared to defeat our enemies’ plans, using the best intelligence and proceeding with deliberation. History will judge harshly those who saw this coming danger but failed to act. In the new world we have entered, the only path to peace and security is the path of action.”

17.62 | Wars

The U.S. has declared war against another country only five times:

- **War of 1812** (1812-1814). The U.S. declared war against Britain. The war ended with the Treaty of Ghent in 1814.
- **Mexican-American War** (1846-1848). The U.S. declared war against Mexico in 1846. The war ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848.
- **Spanish-American War** (1898). The U.S. declared war against Spain in 1898. The war ended with the Treaty of Paris 1898.
Chapter 17: Global Affairs

- **World War I** (1914-1918). The U.S. declared war against Germany and Austro-Hungarian Empire 1917. The war ended in 1918.
- **World War II** (1939-1945). The U.S. declared war against Japan in December 1941 and the global war was fought against Japan, Germany, and Italy (The Axis Powers). The war ended in 1945.

But the U.S. has taken many more military actions than these four officially declared wars. Some of the undeclared wars, ongoing military conflicts, and military actions were approved by Congress (e.g., congressional resolutions authorizing the use of military force) or international bodies such as the United Nations. These military actions include the following:

- The Quasi-War with France (1798-1800)
- The Indian Wars
- The Civil War (1861-65)
- The Russian Civil War (1918)
- The Korean War (1950-1953)
- The Vietnam War (1961-1975)
- Afghanistan War 2001—
- Iraq War (2003—)

Two of the most prominent military conflicts (that is, undeclared wars) are the Korean War and the Vietnam War. The Vietnam War was an especially controversial war. It has had a profound and lasting impact on American politics. Long after the war was over, political debates about foreign affairs, national security, and war powers still reference Vietnam. Supporters and opponents of the Vietnam War, and supporters and opponents of contemporary military action, still refer to the war to justify their positions for or against war. The critics of military action (e.g., in Afghanistan or Iraq or Iran) appeal for “No more Vietnams.” This slogan is usually meant to remind the public and government officials that the decision to use military force as an instrument of foreign policy is fraught with risks. On the other hand, those who support the use of American military power abroad urge the nation to recover from “The Vietnam Syndrome.” They use the term Vietnam Syndrome to describe a condition where the nation is so worried about the use of military power that it is afraid to use U.S. military power to accomplish foreign policy objectives. The modern conservative movement’s support for building up the military and the use of military force during the Republican presidencies of Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush, was intended to recover from the Vietnam Syndrome.

17.63 | The War of 1812

The War of 1812 was fought against Great Britain, Canadian colonists loyal to Britain, and Native Americans allied with the British. The U.S. declared war against Great Britain for several reasons. First, the U.S. wanted to expand its national borders into the Northwest Territory, which included areas under British control. Second, trade restrictions during Great Britain’s war with France limited U.S. commerce. Third, the British had impressed (that is, forced into service) American merchant sailors into the British Royal Navy. And fourth, British support for Indian tribes conflicted with U.S. policy of westward expansion into frontier areas. During the years
when Great Britain was at war with France, its imperial adversary, Great Britain was preoccupied and did not actively resist American expansion. But when Napoleon was defeated in 1814 the British sent armed forces to North America. They captured and burned Washington, D.C. in the summer of 1814. However, in the fall and winter U.S. forces defeated British forces in New York and New Orleans. The battle of New Orleans created a renewed sense of American patriotism. The defense of Baltimore inspired the U.S. national anthem, *The Star-Spangled Banner*. The sense of national pride in fighting and winning another war against Great Britain, an imperial power, produced what historians called *The Era of Good Feelings*. The label was attached to the period from around 1816 to 1824 (the presidency of James Monroe) when partisan politics and domestic political conflict was subdued compared to the preceding era.

What a person thinks about a war depends upon which side they were on. Americans have a very different perspective on the War of 1812 than Canadians. Southerners have a different perspective on the Civil War than Northerners. The Vietnamese have a very different view of the War in Viet Nam, which they call “The American War,” than Americans.

**Think About It!**

Teaching the War of 1812 Different in U.S., Canada”

**17.64 | The Mexican-American and Spanish-American Wars**

These two 19th Century wars are considered together here because they were declared for basically the same purpose: territorial expansion and global influence. The Mexican-American War was fought to expand the territory of the U.S. over the North American continent as part of the belief in Manifest Destiny and westward expansion to settle frontier areas. The Spanish-American War was fought during an era of American politics included debates about how to project the American economic, political, and military power and influence abroad. The Spanish-American War was controversial because it resulted in the U.S. acquiring territories abroad, which opponents believed transformed the U.S. from a republic, which had fought the Revolutionary War against imperial power, into an imperial power. The following image is a poster from the 1900 presidential campaign. It describes the Spanish-American War of 1898 as one that was fought for political ideals (using military power in the service of humanity) rather than for projecting American imperial power abroad.
The Cold War was the period of almost continuous conflict between western democracies and communist countries from the end of World War II in 1945 until 1991 with the fall of the Soviet Union. It was called a Cold War because it was primarily a period of non-shooting conflict as opposed to a hot war or shooting war. The Cold War began in 1946 or 1947. In 1946 Winston Churchill delivered his famous “Sinews of Peace” Speech at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, in 1946. Churchill described an Iron Curtain descending across Eastern Europe all along the countries that bordered the Soviet Union. The Iron Curtain delineated the boundaries between the western, democratic, or “free world” and the communist world. The Iron Curtain was a powerful metaphor that Churchill intended to alert the West, which had just fought a long and bloody war against Germany, Japan, and Italy, to mobilize against the new threat that the west faced from its former ally during World War II: the Soviet Union.

Then in 1947 the U.S. directly intervened in a civil war in Greece in order to prevent Greece from falling into the Soviet sphere of influence. And in 1948 the U.S. implemented the
Marshall Plan (The European Recovery Program) to rebuild Europe in order to stop Soviet expansion.

The Cold War was a period of political, economic, and military, conflict and competition between the East and the West. The conflict sometimes included proxy wars. A proxy war is when two major powers (such as the U.S. and the Soviet Union) use third parties (other countries or even non-state actors such as freedom fighters, revolutionaries, insurgents, or even terrorists) to fight for them against their major adversary. During the Cold War, the U.S. and the Soviet Union sponsored proxy wars in Angola, Afghanistan, and Latin America. The Korean and Vietnam Wars were also part of the Cold War confrontation between East and West. The U.S. and its western allies including Great Britain, France, and Western Germany confronted the Soviet Union and its satellite states (e.g., East Germany; Poland; Hungary). The Cold War competition included the space race (the first to launch a satellite; the first to put a man on the moon) and even Olympic competition.

The terms East and West are not primarily geographic terms. They refer to two different political, economic and social systems. The Western world consisted of the United States and its allies. Although U.S. and Soviet military forces never directly fought one another, conflict was expressed and organized through military coalitions, conventional force deployments, providing financial and military support for allies, espionage, propaganda, a conventional and nuclear arms race, and technological competitions such as the Space Race. Nation-states relied heavily on the two superpowers and other aligned nations to assist their national security. This relationship was referred to as collective security, a term popularized after World War I. Since the breakup of the Soviet Union, the end of the Cold War, and the rise of terrorism, U.S. national security policy is no longer framed as a bi-polar world of the two superpowers. The Cold War finally ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

The Cold War has had profound and lasting effects on American government and politics. The American public believed that life in a nuclear age meant living with an enemy, the Soviet Union, which was poised to launch a nuclear attack against the United States and its western allies. This belief changed the way the American government worked. The American public supported a federal government that was prepared to take decisive preventive or defensive action to protect national security. As a result, the power of the federal government, particularly the power of the president, increased. During the Cold War, power flowed from the states to the national government, which had primary responsibility for national security; and it flowed from congress to the president because Congress is an institution that was designed for representation and deliberation, not for decisive action in the nuclear age. As Alexander Hamilton put it, the presidency was designed to provide an executive official who could act “with dispatch” or speed in times of emergency.
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One way to get a sense of the political climate of the Cold War times is to watch some of videos that were produced by the government to educate the public about the threat of nuclear war and how to protect themselves from it. The “Duck and Cover” videos were intended to teach children how to protect themselves in case of a nuclear attack by ducking and covering themselves with whatever was available. In a classroom, students would duck and cover under a desk. The government also took videos of nuclear tests. Declassified videos show nuclear tests that were conducted in the 1950s in a Nevada valley that was sardonically called the valley where the giant mushrooms grow. President Truman created the Nevada Test Site in 1950 to provide a continental nuclear test site which was cheaper than the existing Pacific test sites. Two of the videos are Operation Plumbbob and Let’s Face It:

- The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission presents Operation Plumbbob, the Department of Energy Video #0800022 “Military Effects Study.” Operation Plumbbob consisted of around 30 nuclear test explosions to measure the impacts of nuclear explosions on buildings, animals, plant life, soil and air contamination—and people, including the people who witnessed the explosions.
- The Federal Civil Defense Administration presents Let’s Face It, U.S. Nuclear Test Film #55.

The Nevada Test Site can now be visited by tourists who want to walk through “Doom Town” and see where more than 100 atomic tests were conducted. One Atomic Tourist Web site reassures potential visitors with the following statement: “Radiation badges are no longer necessary when visiting.”

The Cold War
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HpYCplyBknI

17.66 | The War on Terror

The war on terror is a politically and legally distinctive war. First, it is not an armed conflict between countries—it is a conflict between the U.S. and terrorist organizations (principally al Qaeda) and the individuals and organizations that support it. In international law, a war is a state of armed conflict between two or more nations: it is an armed international conflict. Second, Congress did not declare war on al Qaeda. On September 14, 2001 Congress passed a joint resolution, The Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF), which authorized the president to use all necessary and appropriate armed force “against those responsible for the recent [9/11 terrorist] attacks launched against the United States.” The AUMF gave the president power to go to war. The AUMF is an example of how Congress has delegated to the president power to do whatever the president thinks is necessary and appropriate to protect national security. It is difficult to hold a government official legally accountable for their use of power when they have such a broad grant of discretionary authority to act.
The third reason why the war on terror is distinctive is that it is a war without a battlefield. It is a global conflict that is not limited to a geographic “theater of war” or actual battlefield. The war on terror does include actual battlefield theaters of war: Iraq and Afghanistan, for instance. But the U.S. government describes the war on terror as a global conflict that is fought within the U.S. and within other countries, and it describes the war on terror as a conflict that requires a broad range of assets: military force, economics, intelligence, and surveillance. And it is a war that requires protecting infrastructure from attacks, protecting the financial system from cyber-attacks, and a broad range of counterterrorism policies.

Finally, the war on terror is distinctive in that it is a war with no apparent end. In conventional warfare, one side usually wins and the war is declared over. The war on terror does not seem to provide any such benchmarks for determining victory.

The war on terror has focused attention on political violence. Political violence is the use of violence to achieve a political goal. Political violence has historically been one of the most controversial issues in politics whether it is domestic affairs, global affairs, or national security policy. The use of military force has been controversial throughout American history. The terrorist attacks on 9/11 renewed the focus on terrorism as a distinctive use of political violence. Political violence, that is violence that is intended to achieve a political objective, is not considered inappropriate in American political culture. On the contrary, political violence has been an important part of some of the nation’s most important developments: the nation was founded as the result of a Revolutionary War; the union was preserved as a result of the Civil War; the westward expansion of the country and the settling of the frontier is mythologized; and the U.S. has used military force (violence) to expand its territories and extend its sphere of influence globally. Terrorism is a kind of political violence. Not all political violence is terrorism. Terrorism is generally considered the inappropriate or illegal use of political violence. The central problem with defining terrorism is that it is extremely difficult to clearly and objectively differentiate between acts of political violence that are considered legitimate and those acts of political violence that are considered illegitimate. The saying, “One person’s freedom fighter is another’s terrorist,” captures the difficulty providing an objective definition of terrorism. Pacifists who consider all use of violence or force illegitimate have the clearest position. By contrast, those who consider political violence appropriate for certain purposes or causes face the challenge of explaining the legitimate and illegitimate reasons for using violence. This challenge is made difficult by the subjectivity trap: defining causes that you support as legitimate and those you oppose as illegitimate; and concluding that the ends justify the means (if the end is legitimate then the means are legitimate).

17.67 | The Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are unconventional wars. A conventional war is one that is fought between the uniformed military of two or more countries (or nation-states). Unconventional conflicts are fights against insurgents—individuals and organizations rather than government forces. The combatants may not be in uniform, may not be part of a formal military chain of command, they may not carry arms openly, and they may be intermingled with the general population. There may also not be a battlefield, an actual geographic place where the fighting takes place. The fighting occurs in the cities and rural areas where the people live and work and try to go about their daily lives during the fighting. In an unconventional war, it is often difficult to identify the enemy, whose physical appearance may be identical to civilians.
who are not the enemy. Civilian casualties are often one of the high costs of such unconventional warfare. The problem of killing innocent civilians is especially troubling in unconventional, asymmetrical warfare.

**Symmetrical warfare** is warfare where the combatants have roughly equal military might, have similar kinds of power, and use similar weapons. **Asymmetrical warfare** is warfare where one side has a great deal more military power than the other. As a result of the great differences in military power, the two sides in asymmetrical warfare are likely to use very different weaponry. Iraq and Afghanistan are examples of asymmetrical warfare. The U.S. has vastly greater economic, military, and technological power than Iraq and Afghanistan. As a result, the U.S. and its opponents use very different weapons. The U.S. uses its military and technological advantage to wage high technology warfare that relies on sophisticated weapons systems including missiles, airplane bombers, and unmanned drones that are controlled by personnel who can be stationed half-way around the world from the actual battlefield. But other great powers have not had a great deal of military success in fighting in Afghanistan. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, the U.S. was the sole remaining military superpower. U.S. military hegemony meant that any military conflicts that the U.S. engaged in were going to be asymmetrical warfare where the enemy relied on weapons and strategies very different from the strengths of the U.S. military. The counter-insurgencies the U.S. faced in Iraq and Afghanistan are examples of asymmetrical warfare that frustrated military superpowers in the past and frustrated the U.S. military. In Afghanistan, for instance, counter-insurgencies made it very difficult for the British and Soviets, two military superpowers, to get out of the country after invading it and finding some initial success.

The U.S. military had a hard time adapting to the fighting in Iraq. The Iraq war began with the U.S. conducting a “blitzkrieg” attack. The U.S. military quickly overwhelmed Iraqi defenses but then it faced ongoing resistance and conflict that required it to militarily occupy Iraq. U.S. political officials and military leaders were reluctant to acknowledge this aspect of the fighting. In fact, the Joint Chiefs of Staff refused to call the ongoing conflict an insurgency because the word insurgency evoked memories of the U.S. being bogged down in Vietnam. In fact, the military was not prepared to fight such a conflict. The U.S. Army is a large bureaucratic organization. The Army field manual assumed that the battles it would be fighting would be large scale “set pieces” where the armies of the countries at war would engage one another on a battlefield. This conventional wisdom left the U.S. military unprepared for the ongoing conflict that it faced in Iraq and Afghanistan. A small band of high-ranking young officers with military experience fighting unconventional wars in Vietnam and elsewhere realized that the Army had to change in order to be prepared to fight insurgencies. One of these “insurgents” was David Petraeus. In *The Insurgents: David Petraeus and the Plot to Change the Army Way of War* (2012), Fred Kaplan describes how this “cabal” of “insurgents” forced the Army to change.
One challenge in unconventional warfare is minimizing the risks of civilian casualties, which are sometimes euphemistically called “collateral damage.” Civilian casualties are a serious problem because in unconventional warfare against insurgencies “the people are the prize.” Successful wars against insurgencies usually require paying some attention to “winning the hearts and minds of the people” so that they will not support insurgents. This goal is frustrated when innocent civilians become casualties of warfare. One of the ways that the U.S. military has adapted to the problem of identifying the enemy in Iraq and Afghanistan (and more broadly as part of counterterrorism policy) is to use sophisticated information systems in addition to sophisticated weapons technology. The military is using social network analysis to identify insurgents who are a threat that lives and works among the general population, which is not a threat. Terrorist groups such as al Qaeda and insurgencies are organized as networks: individuals or groups that work together. This helps identify the insurgents rather than the civilian population. The military now uses social network analysis to attack the network of insurgents rather than merely to target individual insurgents who might plant a roadside bomb or other Improvised Explosive Device.

In conventional warfare the objective may be to overwhelm the enemy by destroying its military resources and undermining the popular support for continued fighting. In counterinsurgency warfare, the goal is different. Jingoist slogans such as “Bomb them back to the stone ages” or “Nuke them all and let God sort them out” are morally, politically, and militarily problematic in conflicts where one goal is getting the people on your side. Counterinsurgency is militarily complicated because “The people are the prize in a counterinsurgency operation.”

The U.S. use of drones—that is, unmanned aerial vehicles or UAVs—for “targeted killings” presents serious political, legal, and moral questions.

- Is “targeted killing” a euphemism for assassination?
- Who decides whom to target, to put on a kill list?
- What legal checks limit the use of drones?
- What will happen when other nations or organizations develop or obtain the technology to use drones against the U.S. or its allies?

Think About it!
The following PBS program examines Targeted Killings:
http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2013/01/targeted-killings.html
The Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International is an organization whose mission includes supporting and advocating for unmanned systems and the robotics industry. The Association has been closely aligned with military uses of the technology but it now actively supports expansion into law enforcement and even the private sector markets for unmanned vehicles.

17.68 | The “Air” Wars: Developing a media war plan as a force multiplier

The term air power usually refers to missiles, bombers, jet fighters, helicopters, and now drones (unmanned aerial vehicles). The U.S. Air Force is the primary branch of the military that fights air wars and strives to maintain control over the skies. Today, the term air war includes another entirely different kind of air power: the media. The U.S. strategy for winning the war in Iraq included the development of a media war plan as a force multiplier. The media war plan included elaborate efforts to get the media to provide the public with the military’s views of the conflict, particularly video images of American military technology. The air power in this case included embedding reporters with troops. The goal of the media war plan was to develop and maintain public support for the war effort.

17.69 | Types of Military Action

Table 17.69 below describes three types of military action. The defensive use of military force is the least controversial and the Constitution specifically provided for it in the Constitution. The use of military power to preempt an imminent attack is also not very controversial and the courts have recognized that the government can act before an armed enemy that is poised to attack actually attacks. The third type of military action is the most controversial politically and legally. A preventive war is a policy war: the government simply decides to use military force. The War in Afghanistan was a defensive war fought against a country that enabled a terrorist organization to attack the U.S. The War in Iraq was a preventive war. The Bush administration decided to use military force to obtain regime change in Iraq. In fact, the buildup to the War in Iraq is a good example of how the government can control or even create public opinion on matters of national security. The government’s false claims that Saddam Hussein had contacts with al Qaeda and possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) created public support for the invasion of Iraq.

Think About It!
Can the government create public opinion about global affairs?
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qxhlkzTg14M

Table 17.69: TYPES OF MILITARY ACTION
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DEFENSIVE

Enumerated Powers:
Article I, section 8 provides that “The Congress shall have Power...To declare War...;...suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions.”

Implied Powers:
The government, particularly the president, has the implied power to use military force for rescue missions (such as the Mayaguez and Iranian Hostage rescue missions).

PREEMPTIVE

Case Law:
Supreme Court rulings allow the government to respond to a “clear and present danger,” a legal doctrine. The logic of conspiracy also means that the government does not have to wait until an armed enemy that is poised to attack actually attacks.

PREVENTIVE

Policy Wars:
The decision to use military force as an instrument of foreign policy.

17.7 | National Security

The term national security refers to a country’s use of economic, political, and military power and influence to maintain its territorial integrity and political institutions. The concept of national security can be traced to the creation of nation-states, when armies were used to maintain domestic order and provide protection from foreign attacks. People create governments and form nation-states to provide for the defense of individuals and their civilization. These are basic government functions: “The most elementary function of the nation-state is the defense of the life of its citizens and of their civilization.” A government that is unable to defend these values “must yield, either through peaceful transformation or violent destruction,” to one that is capable of defending them. Each nation develops and implements its national security policy as an attribute of national sovereignty.

17.71 | Elements of national security

In his classic book, Politics Among Nations (1948), Hans Morgenthau—a leading figure in international relations theory, politics, and law—described national security policy to include the following elements:

- Diplomacy. Diplomacy is the practice of negotiating agreements between two or more nations. Diplomacy is used to build alliances and isolate threats. Professional diplomats usually conduct diplomatic relations as representatives of their nation on matters related to war and peace, trade, economics, culture, the environment, and human rights. U.S. diplomats negotiate the terms of international treaties and executive agreements prior to their endorsement by the president and, if a treaty, ratification by the Senate.
• **Emergency Preparedness.** Protecting national security includes protecting communication systems, transportation, public health systems, and the economy from attacks. The increased reliance on electronic communications in these sectors has highlighted the importance of protecting them from cyberattacks.

• **Economic power.** Nations use their economic power to reward allies by creating favorable trade and foreign aid agreements, to build international support by such favorable treatment, and to punish threats by, for example, promoting trade sanctions or even embargoes.

• **Military force.** Nations use military force or the threat of military force to meet threats to national security interests and to prevent nations or organizations from presenting threats.

• **Domestic Legislation.** Laws that target individuals or organizations that support violence or terrorism, for example. The State Department maintains a list of terrorist nations and laws such as the PATRIOT Act give the government power to prosecute individuals or organizations that provide material aid to such groups.

• **Surveillance.** Nations use surveillance, spying, and covert operations for national security purposes. The U.S. uses its intelligence agencies to respond to threats and to prevent them. The Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Administration, and the Defense Intelligence Agency are federal agencies that are responsible for providing surveillance related to national security (as opposed to ordinary criminal activity). The Cold War and the War on Terror have blurred some of the traditional lines between domestic surveillance and foreign surveillance.

• The FBI is used to protect the country from internal threats to national security or public order.

### 17.72 | U.S. National Security

During the Cold War era, U.S. national security relied heavily on military force or the threat of military force. National security became an official guiding principle of U.S. foreign policy with the enactment of the **National Security Act of 1947**. The Act created

- The National Military Establishment (which became the Department of Defense when the Act was amended in 1949);
- A Department of the Air Force from the existing Army Air Force;
- Separate military branches that were subordinated to the Secretary of Defense, which was a new cabinet level position;
- The National Security Council. The National Security Council was created to coordinate national security policy in the executive branch. The NSC is the president’s main forum for considering national security and foreign policy issues.
- The Central Intelligence Agency. The CIA was the nation’s first peacetime intelligence agency.
- The National Security Agency. The NSA was so secretive that the letters NSA were humorously said to mean No Such Agency. The NSA Web site describes it as the home of the government’s “code makers and code breakers.”

For most of the 20th Century, national security was defined primarily in terms of military power. National security required having a military that was strong enough to protect the country from
foreign attacks or threats. For example, WWII was armed conflict between nation-states: the U.S. and its allies fought against countries (Germany, Japan, and Italy) that had invaded other countries. The Cold War included armed conflict between nation-states, but it also involved non-state actors or non-state actors that were supported by nation-states. Today, non-state actors such as terrorist organizations or international drug cartels are considered greater threats to U.S. national security than military attacks by another country. Since the end of the Cold War the concept of national security has been broadened to include economic security, technology, natural resources, and even environmental conditions.

In the 21st Century, national security is being defined more broadly to include resources other than military power that are vital to a country’s national security. The U.S. Department of State acknowledges this broader definition of national security. During the Obama administration the Department of State’s mission statement committed the department to advancing freedom by building a more democratic, secure and prosperous world where government addressed the needs of the people—including poverty. (Website accessed January 28, 2013)

The interest groups that advocate for national security policies also recognize this broader definition of national security. For example, the Center for New American Security defines national security to include natural resources. The concept of national security was broadened to include more than military power beginning with recognition of the importance of petroleum. The world’s economies are dependent on fossil fuels: oil, coal and natural gas. American dependence on imported oil is one of the main reasons why the U.S. has been so involved with the Middle East. The region’s abundance of oil has played a role in American foreign and defense policy. The American economy’s dependence on foreign oil has made petroleum an important factor in maintaining U.S. military strength. Energy independence is a goal with economic, military, and national security benefits. However, oil is not the only natural resource that is considered vital to national security.

17.73 | Food and Water

Governments are responsible for providing an adequate and safe food supply. Population growth and hunger are related issues that can become national security issues. The U.S. has a strategic oil reserve that is used to prevent disruptions in the energy supply. China, the world’s most populous country, has a strategic pork reserve that it uses to prevent food scarcity from becoming a national security issue.

Think About It!

A Strategic Pork Reserve?
“Food for 9 Billion: Satisfying China’s Growing Demand for Meat”

Water is also a vital resource for human and other life. Access to an adequate and safe supply of fresh water is considered a component of a nation’s security in a world where there is increased competition for this valuable and increasingly scarce resource. A United Nations Report “Water Scarcity” states that almost 20% of the world’s population now lives in areas of physical scarcity. It provides information about and prospects for “water for life” in a world where (to
quote Samuel Coleridge, Rime of the Ancient Mariner) there is “Water, water everywhere, nor any drop to drink.” As nations compete for access to water, water will become a more important component of a nation’s national security.

Every four years the National Security Council compiles a Global Trends Report that describes and analyzes developments that are likely to affect national security. The National Security Council is comprised of 17 U.S. government intelligence agencies. The 2012 Report describes 2030 as “a radically transformed world.” Asian countries will surpass the U.S. and Europe. The good news is that compared to 2012, there will be less poverty, more democracy, more individual rights, and increased health. The bad news is that the world of 2030 is likely to include much more fighting over natural resources, particularly food and water.

17.74 | Non-fuel minerals

Non-fuel minerals are also important for advanced economies where rare and precious minerals used in the manufacturing and high-tech economies of the world. Non-fuel minerals are essential to manufacture of aircraft and computers and automobiles. In the information age, cell phones require tantalum, liquid crystal displays require indium, and other familiar products that are part of everyday modern life require platinum group metals. Rare earth minerals with properties such as conductivity, luminescence, and strength are very valuable for high-tech economies. Organizations such as the Center for New American Security, which identifies national security as increasingly dependent on a secure supply of natural resources, lobby for a broader perspective on national security, one that includes energy, minerals, water, land, climate change, and even biodiversity.

17.75 | Immigration

Immigration has a special place in American politics. The U.S. proudly proclaims that it is a nation of immigrants. The Statue of Liberty famously welcomes immigrants seeking opportunities for a better life. Immigration is one part of the American dream of individuals and families working hard for a better life for themselves and their children. But immigration has also been very controversial from the early decades of the 19th Century until today. Immigration first became controversial during periods of increased immigration especially from non-Anglo
regions of the world—particularly eastern Europe and Asia. The debates about immigration have historically been about the quantity (the number of immigrants to allow into the country) and the quality (what kinds of immigrants are desirable and what kinds are undesirable) of immigrants. One government document, The Dillingham Commission Report on Immigration, ranked immigrant groups, which influenced immigration policy for decades.

Historically, congress had plenary power to determine immigration policy. Immigrants did not have rights, therefore immigration policy, including decisions to deport immigrants, were entirely political decisions. However, the various civil rights revolutions during the latter half of the 20th Century extended rights to more and more groups. Immigrant rights groups advocated for providing certain legal protections for immigrants. The American Civil Liberties Union’s Immigrants’ Rights Project, the National Network For Immigrant and Refugee Rights, and other organizations work to provide immigrants and refugees rights. The general trend toward extending rights to immigrants was reversed by three events.

• The War on Terror. The first and most significant event has been the war on terror following the 9/11 attacks. The threat of terrorism made immigration and control of the nation’s borders—border security—central elements of national security policy. This mean that the normal politics surrounding immigration policy, including questions about how much due process immigrants were entitled to, was overshadowed by national security (or national insecurity) policy: national security trumped interests in protecting immigrants.

• Patriotism. The patriotic fervor that swept the country in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on 9/11 also created a sense that the U.S. needed to better protect its national identity by limiting the number and kinds of people who were coming to the country legally and illegally. Concerns about protecting national identity have periodically shaped public debate about immigration policy. Patriotism or the preservation of a distinctive American identity is sometimes expressed as opposition to immigration.

• The Great Recession. The third event was the Great Recession and the lingering economic downturn that followed it. Economics affects politics. Economic hard times once again increased the sense that immigrants, particularly illegal immigrants, were taking scarce jobs from citizens, depressing wages, and consuming government benefits such as education, health care, and social welfare without paying a fair share of taxes.

The failure to prevent the terrorist attacks on 9/11 was blamed in part on failure to maintain border security. As a result, the federal government was reorganized in order to provide more control over information about immigration. The Department of Homeland Security includes the Customs and Immigration Services Agency (CIS). The CIS uneasily combines the provision of services for immigrants and the function of enforcing immigration laws. In the U.S. system of federalism, immigration is the responsibility of the federal government, not the states. But the American political experience includes people turning to whatever level of government they think will address a problem that they think the government needs to solve. Recently, voters in several states have concluded that state action is necessary to control the borders and enforce immigration laws because the federal government does not seem willing or able to effectively maintain control of national borders or enforce immigration laws by deporting illegal immigrants. These are the policy reasons that state legislatures make when they enact anti-immigration measures. Arizona is a border state whose government officials worry about illegal
immigration and inadequate control over the Mexican border. The Arizona Legislature passed the Legal Arizona Worker’s Act which required state employers to check the immigration status of employees and provided for revocation of the business license of state companies that employed undocumented workers. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce challenged the law. The Chamber of Commerce argued that the federal government has complete power over immigration policy, and that under the preemption doctrine, a state law that conflicts with a valid federal law is unconstitutional under the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution. In Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. v. Whiting (2011), the Supreme Court upheld the state law on the grounds that the state law requiring employers to check the immigration status did not conflict with the federal law. The Arizona legislature also passed SB1070, which made it a crime to be in the state illegally and required Arizona law enforcement officials to question individuals whom they detained about, among other things, their immigration status. In Arizona v. U.S. (2012) the Court struck down three provisions of the law and upheld one.

17.8 | Comparative Politics and International Relations

17.81 | Comparative Politics

Comparative politics is a field of political science that relies heavily on the comparative method of studying government and politics. Comparative politics is one of the oldest fields in the study of politics. Aristotle compared the different forms of government to determine the best form of government. Today, comparativists are generally divided into one of two categories: area-specialists (e.g., Africa, Latin American, Asia, or the Middle East) or scholars who apply social science methods to the study of different political systems by comparing similar systems or comparing different systems. Comparative politics is often considered the study of non-U.S. government and politics, but the comparative method is also used to study American politics (e.g., comparative state politics). One way to increase understanding of U.S. government and politics is to compare it with government and politics in other countries. Some important comparative works include Giovanni Sartori’s 1976 study of party systems, Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba’s 1963 study of civil culture, and Samuel Huntington’s 1968 study of developing countries. Today, global organizations describe and analyze issues such as freedom, economic development, good government, and corruption from a comparative perspective. Transparency International provides information about corruption, including corruption by country. It defines corruption as the “abuse of entrusted power for private gain.” It examines corruption related to topics such as access to information, education, humanitarian aid, and intergovernmental bodies. The organization’s goal is to work toward government, politics, business, and civil society that is free of corruption.

Think about it!
When comparing countries, would a different kind of map, a non-geographic map, be useful?
International relations (or international studies) is the study of relations between countries. International relations involves the study of organizations, law, and issues including national security, economic development, crime (drug, terrorism, trafficking), environmental sustainability, social welfare, and human rights. International relations examines nation-states or countries but it is not limited to governments. International relations is also the study of the behavior of intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations and the Organization of American States; non-governmental organizations; and multinational corporations. In fact, international non-governmental organizations and businesses have become very important participants in international relations. Interpol, the International Criminal Police Organization, is an international intergovernmental organization whose mission is to “Connect Police for a Safer World.” The development of national and international organized criminal enterprises prompted the development of international policing efforts. With 190 countries as members, Interpol is one of the largest intergovernmental organizations. Its organizational structure includes a president, and executive committee, and a General Assembly which meets annually to discuss coordination of policing.

Historically, international law was the body of rules and principles that governing nations and their dealings with individuals of other nations. This is public international law because it deals with government bodies. International law, which included jus gentium (the law of nations) and jus inter gentes (the agreements between nations), was the body of rules of conduct that are generally accepted as binding or controlling. International law is based on the consent of the parties that are subject to it. The United Nations is the major public international law organization. Its main judicial body is the International Court of Justice. Over time, international law has extended its scope to include non-government actors. This is private international law—the body of rules and principles that govern individuals and non-governmental organizations. International law is a growing body of law that has been developing piecemeal—that is, it has developed area by area or domain by domain. Trade law, intellectual property and contract law, human rights law, criminal justice law, and environmental law have been developed largely independently of one another, based on the interests and consent of the parties, rather than as a comprehensive strategy for coordinated legal development enacted by a single authoritative source. In terms of modern American foreign policy, “internationalists” are advocates of U.S. engagement in global affairs.

There are two general theories of international relations: realism and idealism. One element of a political ideology is a belief about human nature as good or bad, self-interested or public-minded. Ideological assumptions about individual behavior are also applied to thinking about the behavior of nations (which are, after all, organizations of individuals). Realism and idealism are based on different assumptions about the behavior of nations.

Realism is the theory that international relations can be best explained by the fact that nations are rational actors that primarily pursue their self-interest. Realists assume that human beings are by nature self-interested and competitive rather than benevolent and cooperative, and this self-interested individual behavior also characterizes nation-states. Accordingly, a nation’s paramount self-interest is national security—survival in a Hobbesian world where nations, like individuals, pursue their self-interest without being constrained by national or international government. Realist believe that other goals and values such as democracy, equality, peace,
human rights, and justice may be important but they are secondary to the primary goal of national self-interest. Human rights and justice are recognized when they happen to coincide with national interest, but when they conflict with national interest, the pursuit of national interest trumps these other political values.

Realists assume that the natural state of international relations is anarchy. Anarchy is a condition where governments (or individuals) are able to pursue their own interests without legal restrictions. Without a governing body or set of rules to limit the actions of nations, countries exploit power advantages over one another to achieve their national interest. Realism is therefore associated with power politics. Power politics is the belief that (national) might makes right. In other words, there is no objective understanding of justice because justice is merely whatever the stronger power (e.g., the winner of a war) says it is.

Two famous political theorists whose views reflect realist assumptions about human and national behavior are the Italian political philosopher Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) and the English political philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). In *The Prince*, Machiavelli argued that a political leader had to use power politics in order to accomplish the two main goals that he thought all good leaders should strive for: maintaining the state (or nation) and achieving great things. Machiavelli defined power politics to include deception, manipulation of other actors, and the use of force—whatever means were necessary to accomplish their goals. In *Leviathan* (1651), Hobbes argued that strong government was necessary to create and maintain good order because individuals were by nature self-interested and had to be controlled. Both Machiavelli and Hobbes are considered realists in the sense that they believed that good strong leadership required a willingness to do what was effective rather than what was morally or legally right.

Idealism is the theory that international relations can be organized and conducted according to values other than, and perhaps even higher than, national self-interest alone. These values or higher ideals include justice, human rights, and the rule of law. In international relations, idealists believe that the behavior of nations can include actions that are motivated by political values other than national interest. In contrast to realists, idealists believe that the self-interested nature of individuals and governments can be tempered or limited by the introduction of morality, values, and law into international relations. President Woodrow Wilson (1913-1921) is perhaps the American political official who is most strongly identified with idealism. Indeed, in International Relations idealism is sometimes referred to as Wilsonian Idealism. After the end of WWI, Wilson worked to create what he called a “Just Peace.” He believed a just peace could be creating by developing an international system where individual nations were able to put aside their narrow self-interest and power politics to work for international peace and cooperation. At the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, Wilson advocated for a treaty, The Treaty of Versailles, which would commit nations to his peace plans and create the League of Nations. However, the U.S. Senate failed to ratify the Treaty in part because of the fear that U.S. national sovereignty would be compromised by legal requirements to comply with decisions of the League of Nations.

This concern about preserving U.S. sovereignty can still be heard today by critics of the United Nations, generally, and by opponents of specific treaties such as the Law of the Seas Treaty (the LOST) which was negotiated during the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference from 1973-1982. The U.S. Senate has not ratified the LOST. There are two main reasons for
opposition to the treaty. First, opponents are concerned that the treaty’s environmental policies, which are intended to promote sustainability of marine resources and environments, would require increased government regulation of business and commercial activities. This concern is understandable because the Law of the Seas Treaty marks a change from the historical view that under the law of *mare liberum* each nation was free to use resources in international waters as they saw fit, to a legal regime that regulated international waters to conserve resources and achieve sustainability. Second, opponents of the LOST worry that it would further erode U.S. sovereignty by requiring the United States to enforce laws that were developed to represent interests other than those of U.S. interests. Government regulation and national sovereignty are two issues of special interest to conservatives. Consequently, conservative organizations such as the *Heritage Foundation* and the National Center for Policy Research, and libertarian organizations such as the Cato Institute, opposed ratification of the Treaty.

The political debate about how the U.S. should use its power, whether the U.S. global affairs policy should be idealist or realist, is not merely theoretical argument. The debate has a profound impact on foreign relations. During the Cold War, the debate about idealism or realism was framed as the question whether the U.S. could even win the war against communism while adhering to democratic values and the rule of law. The “hawks” leaned toward realism (i.e., fighting the way the enemy fought; doing whatever was necessary to win) and the “doves” leaned toward idealism (i.e., playing by the rules of limited warfare). The war on terror revived this debate. The realists in the Bush administration argued that the existing legal rules governing the criminal justice system and the laws of war were inadequate for the war on terror. As a result, the administration authorized the use of enhanced interrogation and special military commissions. Idealists considered enhanced interrogation, such as waterboarding, a euphemism for torture which was prohibited by domestic and international law. Idealists also defended the use of the existing legal systems for trying individuals suspected of terrorism.

Think about it!
Watch the video of the congressional investigation of the use of “coercive management techniques” for perspectives on the debate about torture, harsh interrogation, or enhanced interrogation: [http://video.pbs.org/video/1629461216](http://video.pbs.org/video/1629461216)
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The U.S. Department of State Country and Foreign Policy Information

The United Kingdom: https://www.gov.uk/
U.S. relations with the United Kingdom: http://www.state.gov/p/eur/ce/uk/
Canada: http://www.canada.gc.ca/home.html
U.S. relations with Canada: http://www.state.gov/r/ce/bgn/2089.htm
Mexico: http://en.presidencia.gob.mx/
U.S. relations with Mexico: http://www.state.gov/r/ce/bgn/35749.htm
Israel: http://www.gov.il/firstgov/english
U.S. relations with Israel: http://www.state.gov/r/ce/bgn/3581.htm
Germany: http://www.bundesregierung.de/Webs/Breg/EN/Homepage/_node.html
U.S. relations with Germany: http://www.state.gov/r/ce/bgn/3997.htm
Brazil: http://www.brasil.gov.br/?set_language=en
U.S. relations with Brazil: http://www.state.gov/r/ce/bgn/35640.htm
China: http://english.gov.cn/
U.S. relations with China: http://www.state.gov/r/ce/bgn/18902.htm
Saudi Arabia:
http://www.saudi.gov.sa/wps/portal/yesserRoot/home/?ut/p/b1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMARGjzOd3Z2dgj1NjAz8zUMMDTznZ2NHU0NDd29DfWDU_P0_Tzve1P1C7dFQFV9YhO/dl4/d5L2dBISevZ0FBIS9nQSEh/
U.S. relations with Saudi Arabia:
http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/hrrpt/2005/61698.htm

2 Sumner’s anti-imperialist, anti-war essay defending republican government is available at [http://praxeology.net/WGS-CUS.htm](http://praxeology.net/WGS-CUS.htm)

3 Eisenhower’s *Farewell Address* is available at: [http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/dwightdeisenhowerfarewell.html](http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/dwightdeisenhowerfarewell.html)

4 Nixon’s *Address* is available at [http://www.state.gov/ho/frus/nixon/i/20700.htm](http://www.state.gov/ho/frus/nixon/i/20700.htm)

5 For an educational perspective on how to present globalization see [http://www.cotf.edu/earthinfo/remotesens/remotesens.html](http://www.cotf.edu/earthinfo/remotesens/remotesens.html)

6 [http://www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/treaties/](http://www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/treaties/)


9 Quoted in [http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/10192007/blackwater.html](http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/10192007/blackwater.html)


