

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Chapter 1 : Foreign policy of the United States - Wikipedia

This book integrates the study of presidential politics and foreign policy-making from the Vietnam aftermath to the events following September 11 and the Iraqi War. Focusing on the relationship between presidents' foreign policy agendas and domestic politics, it offers compelling portraits of presidents Nixon, Carter, Reagan, Bush I, Clinton, and Bush II.

After a few truly good years during "when there was low inflation, almost full employment and a favorable balance of trade, President Lyndon B. Johnson could have undoubtedly spent more on these programs had he not had to pay for the war abroad, which Martin Luther King, Jr. Moreover, huge spending on the war in Vietnam led to an increasingly unfavorable balance of trade, which contributed to an international monetary crisis and threat to U. That threat was seen as convincing evidence that the U. Inflation fueled by the escalation of the Vietnam and later Yom Kippur War also increased food prices and contributed to the oil price hike in , which then led to inflationary expectations. Spur Policy Changes The conflict in Vietnam spurred a series of policy changes almost immediately. First of all, the conflict led Congress to end the military draft and replace it with an all-volunteer army as well as reduce the voting age to The Right to Vote at Age 18 During the Vietnam War, the notion that year-old men could be drafted and forced to risk their lives in the war without the privileges of voting in state and local elections or the ability to consume alcohol legally put pressure on legislators to lower the voting age nationally. Congress eventually passed the 26th Amendment in March and President Nixon ratified it on July 1, The End of the Draft Even though the draft had been employed since the Civil War, it became highly controversial during the Vietnam War as President Johnson begun to commit huge numbers of ground troops to Vietnam in mid s and the death toll mounted day after day. The draft lottery in , which failed to address the unfair discrimination against the low-educated and low-income class, only encouraged stronger resistance to the Vietnam war and the draft itself. As a result, there were more and more draft dodgers and the anti-war movement expanded. In the midst of widespread disillusionment with the conflict in Vietnam, President Nixon, who had promised to end the draft during his presidential election, saw ending the draft as an effective political weapon to diminish the anti-Vietnam war movement. Nixon believed middle-class youths would stop protesting the conflict once it became certain that they would not have to fight and risk their lives in Vietnam. Despite initial opposition from both Congress and Department of Defense, President Nixon signed a new law to end the draft and put the selective service structure on standby. The AVF turned out to be a positive development in the midst of widespread sentiment against the military after the Vietnam War. It was deemed feasible, affordable, and therefore, one of the best way to raise military manpower. Mistrust the Government Beyond policy changes, the U. The Vietnam conflict totally changed the attitudes of a generation. The military, in particular, was discredited for years after the conflict. The defeat in Vietnam was a humiliating experience for the U. It undermined American confidence in U. President Jimmy Carter, who took office in , was the first U. His secret support to the Contras against Nicaraguan government was an exemplary example. Bush went to war against Saddam Hussein in the Persian Gulf War in with the same cautious approach. After its swift victory at the expense of relatively few casualties, President Bush declared in March The Continuing Effect The fear of foreign intervention returned just about two year later in the Horn of Africa. In response, President Bill Clinton ordered American troops to withdraw from Somalia days later, leaving a haven for extremist groups. Half a year later, starting on April 6, , up to one million Rwandans were killed within three months. However, President Clinton decided not to intervene in the genocide out of fear of a repeat incident in Somalia, which becomes one of his biggest regrets. On a visit to Rwanda in , Clinton formally apologized for American inaction. He believes American intervention, albeit marginal, at the beginning of the genocide might have saved as many as , people. In general, the U. In fact, it has been used as a metaphor for almost every single time the U. It is likely that the Vietnam Syndrome will continue to impact American foreign policy for years to come. You Might Also Like:

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Chapter 2 : "Foreign Policy During the Vietnam War" by Syeda Menebhi

In the period since World War II anti-colonialism probably would have been a better guideline for American foreign policy in Asia than anti-Communism. And even now it would make better sense.

Hegemony, Isolationism, or Engagement. A Study of Modern War. Graphically describes the fire-fight that erupted in the streets of Mogadishu, Somalia, between U. Political Morality in a One-Superpower World. Lynn-Jones, and Steven E. Debating the Democratic Peace: An International Security Reader. John Ikenberry, and Takashi Inoguchi, eds. Impulses, Strategies, and Impacts. An exceptionally valuable volume as an introduction to this issue. The Lexus and the Olive Tree. A spirited defense of globalization that is engagingly written. Somalia and Operation Restore Hope: Reflections on Peacemaking and Peacekeeping. To End a War. Rogue States and Nuclear Outlaws: Rogue States and U. Containment After the Cold War. The Search for Consensus from Nixon to Clinton. A Strategy in Decline? Foreign Policy and Rogue States. An article by a former senior official at the IMF criticizes that organization for its imperious policies toward developing countries. An article by a leading "realist" scholar that debunks globalization as a wildly exaggerated phenomenon that has done little to alter the ways states conduct their foreign policies.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Chapter 3 : How did the Vietnam War affect America? - The Vietnam War

Address administration's Afghanistan agenda al-Qaeda Ameri American foreign policy argued arms Bill Clinton Bosnia Bush administration Bush's campaign Carter administration Central America claimed Clinton administration coalition Cold War Congress congressional crisis critics cultural declaratory history defense democracy democratic despite.

Rather than massive recriminations, a collective amnesia took hold. That forgetfulness gave way in the early s to a renewed interest in the war: Hollywood, network television, and the music industry made Vietnam a staple of popular culture; and scholars, journalists, and Vietnam veterans produced a flood of literature on the conflict, especially concerning its lessons and legacies. Much of it, emphasizing the enormity of the damage done to American attitudes, institutions, and foreign policy by the Vietnam ordeal, echoed George R. An agonizing reappraisal of American power and glory dampened the celebration of the Bicentennial birthday in The United States also paid a high political cost for the Vietnam War. It weakened public faith in government, and in the honesty and competence of its leaders. Indeed, skepticism, if not cynicism, and a high degree of suspicion of and distrust toward authority of all kind characterized the views of an increasing number of Americans in the wake of the war. The military, especially, was discredited for years. It would gradually rebound to become once again one of the most highly esteemed organizations in the United States. In the main, however, as never before, Americans after the Vietnam War neither respected nor trusted public institutions. They were wary of official calls to intervene abroad in the cause of democracy and freedom, and the bipartisan consensus that had supported American foreign policy since the s dissolved. The Democratic majority in Congress would enact the War Powers Resolution, ostensibly forbidding the president from sending U. Exercising a greater assertiveness in matters of foreign policy, Congress increasingly emphasized the limits of American power, and the ceiling on the cost Americans would pay in pursuit of specific foreign policy objectives. The fear of getting bogged down in another quagmire made a majority of Americans reluctant to intervene militarily in Third World countries. The neo-isolationist tendency that former President Richard M. Quite clearly, for at least a quarter of a century after the Vietnam War ended, that conflict continued to loom large in the minds of Americans. Accordingly, a new consensus among foreign policy makers, reflecting the lessons learned from the Vietnam War, became manifest: Another consensus also gradually emerged. At first, rather than giving returning veterans of the war welcoming parades, Americans seemed to shun, if not denigrate, the 2 million-plus Americans who went to Vietnam, the 1. Virtually nothing was done to aid veterans and their loved ones who needed assistance in adjusting. Then a torrent of fiction, films, and television programs depicted Vietnam vets as drug-crazed psychotic killers, as vicious executioners in Vietnam and equally vicious menaces at home. Yet this altered view of the Vietnam veterans as victims as much as victimizers, if not as brave heroes, was not accompanied by new public policies. Although most veterans did succeed in making the transition to ordinary civilian life, many did not. More Vietnam veterans committed suicide after the war than had died in it. Even more--perhaps three-quarters of a million--became part of the lost army of the homeless. And the nearly , draftees, many of them poor, badly educated, and nonwhite, who had received less than honorable discharges, depriving them of educational and medical benefits, found it especially difficult to get and keep jobs, to maintain family relationships, and to stay out of jail. Although a majority of Americans came to view dysfunctional veterans as needing support and medical attention rather than moral condemnation, the Veterans Administration, reluctant to admit the special difficulties faced by these veterans and their need for additional benefits, first denied the harm done by chemicals like Agent Orange and by the posttraumatic stress disorder PTSD afflicting as many as ,, and then stalled on providing treatment. Although diminishing, the troublesome specter of the Vietnam War continued to divide Americans and haunt the national psyche. It emerged four years later when Bill Clinton, the Democratic candidate for president, faced accusations that he had evaded the draft and then organized antiwar demonstrations in while he was a Rhodes scholar in England. In each instance, such charges reminded

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Americans of the difficult choices young Americans had to make in what many saw as at best a morally ambiguous war. Its stark black granite reflecting panels, covered with the names of the more than 58,000 American men and women who died in Vietnam, is a shrine to the dead, a tombstone in a sloping valley of death. Lacking all the symbols of heroism, glory, patriotism, and moral certainty that more conventional war memorials possess, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is a somber reminder of the loss of too many young Americans, and of what the war did to the United States and its messianic belief in its own overweening virtue. John Whiteclay Chambers II.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Chapter 4 : What We Should Learn From Vietnam – Foreign Policy

Foreign Policy, Vietnam War, and Watergate, The Impact of Vietnam Kent State tragedy, Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, War Powers Resolution, military draft, presidential power. The Vietnam War affected the United States in many ways. Most immediately, it spurred policy changes. The United States ended the military draft and switched to an all-volunteer army.

Post-war Vietnam One of the challenges of the new nation was the bombing damage left by years of war. Post Vietnam faced many challenges. Within days the US-backed South Vietnamese government turned on its heels and fled, its leaders spirited out of Vietnam with American assistance. After more than a century of foreign domination and 21 years of war and division, Vietnam was finally a single, independent nation, free from external control and interference. Saigon was renamed Ho Chi Minh City, in honour of the revolutionary leader, who had died six years earlier. A new national constitution was adopted and on July 2nd, North and South Vietnam were officially reunified. The new nation was formally called the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, a title it retains today. The task of forging this new nation generated excitement among leaders of the CPV – but there were a number of problems and obstacles they had to overcome. The most significant barrier to this was political opposition. These loyalists had been subjected to American propaganda which suggested the communists would slaughter every one of them. This threat never eventuated, however, the CPV wanted to neutralise the risks posed by loyalists and other political opponents. Opponents of the new regime were sent to reeducation camps. The CPV set about purging elements of the old order. Many were sent to the notorious reeducation camps *trai hoc tap cai tao* where they were later joined by former civil servants, capitalists, Catholic priests and other representatives of the old order. Camp inmates were given no criminal charge, trial or sentence. According to the CPV, reeducation would continue until the state was satisfied with rehabilitation. The camps were not Nazi-style death camps; summary executions were rare and even torture was uncommon – but they did impose hard labour, brutal discipline and dire conditions, coupled with the despair of never knowing if or when freedom would come. By 1975, seven years after the reunification of Vietnam, around 1 million people were reportedly still detained. There were reports that reeducation was still continuing into the 1980s. The Vietnam War had taken a severe toll on Vietnamese farmland, industry and infrastructure. Much of this was the result of sustained American bombing missions. In the north, 29 of the 30 provincial capitals had sustained heavy bombing damage, one-third of them almost utterly destroyed. In southern Vietnam, the local economy had been propped up with US aid and investment; consequently, there had been little in the way of development, indigenous investment, new industries or infrastructure. In the post-war south, at least three million civilians were unemployed, while several million took to the roads in search of food. The CPV attempted to transform southern Vietnam using similar policies and methods used in the North during the 1950s. Vietnam became a one party socialist state with a centrally directed economic system. The second was the nationalisation of industry, including French-owned coal mines and other foreign corporations in Vietnam. The third was land reform: Peasants in the South, in contrast, tended to be better off. Many South Vietnamese had been given land as part of US-sponsored reform projects in the 1950s, so were unwilling to give it up. They had also heard horror stories, some exaggerated and some not, about land collectivisation and famine in the North. The cadres sent to implement them encountered stubborn resistance, even hostility. In several southern provinces land reform took many years to achieve; in some areas, it failed altogether and was eventually abandoned. Faced with the challenges of feeding a war ravaged nation of 58 million people, the new socialist government demanded moderate increases in the production of rice, corn, vegetables and grain crops. In return for this increased productivity, the CPV promised that each citizen would receive 17 kilograms of unprocessed rice per month. Even modest targets could not be met, however. In 1975, Vietnam fell. Production was disrupted by peasant resistance but the country was also critically short of seed, fertiliser, pesticides, farming tools and machinery. Adverse weather events, particularly floods in the late 1970s, only worsened these problems, as did a downturn in foreign trade and imports. The US and its allies refused to trade with Hanoi, in part because of

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

disputes over missing American servicemen Washington claimed were still imprisoned in Vietnam. By civilians in Vietnamese cities were subject to food rationing; most received a paltry two kilograms of rice and grams of meat each per month. School children in Hanoi, photographed in Vietnam was granted membership of the United Nations in , however, for the first decade of its life, it was shunned by most Western nations. China cut all aid to Vietnam in but Hanoi retained close ties with the Soviet Union. The CPV relaxed its economic grip on Vietnam in the mids, allowing the operation of small factories, businesses and service industries for profit. They were not accompanied by political reforms, with Vietnam remaining a staunch one party socialist state. Since Vietnam has progressed in a similar fashion to China, its economic policies becoming increasingly capitalist and market oriented, though tempered by socialist controls. In Hanoi withdrew its troops from Cambodia, which allowed it to reenter the international fold. It has become a significant agricultural exporter, the third largest oil producer in Asia and an important manufacturer of clothing, textiles and computer components. Vietnamese society contains considerable poverty and wide divisions in income and wealth, though this is slowly improving. In terms of government, Vietnam remains a one-party socialist state. The government is nominally democratic, however, the CPV exercises strict controls, with only party-approved organisations and candidates permitted to nominate for election. In the first years of its rule, the CPV created a one-party socialist state. The CPV also implemented a program of land reform and collectivisation in the late s. This proved disastrous, encountering resistance in many areas, triggering production downturns and famine. Internationally, Vietnam retained close ties with the Soviet Union but was shunned by most Western nations. This continued until economic reforms and liberalisation in the late s. Today Vietnam has a fast-growing mixed economy, with growing elements of capitalism, however, it remains a one-party socialist state and the CPV maintains a firm grip on politics and information. Content on this page may not be republished or distributed without permission. For more information please refer to our Terms of Use. To reference this page, use the following citation:

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Chapter 5 : Vietnam War - Wikipedia

A revealing look at presidential politics and foreign policy-making from the aftermath of Vietnam to the NATO intervention in Kosovo. The book illuminates the relationship between presidents' domestic and foreign policy priorities and the key role of public opinion in constraining presidential.

Emir Simsek The meaning of the Vietnam War for American foreign policy remains a hotly contested and unresolved issue. Most aspects of the war remain open to dispute, ranging from the wisdom of U. A powerful domestic antiwar movement that arose in the mids influenced a bipartisan group of U. The War Powers Resolution mandated that U. If Congress does not declare war within sixty days of the commitment, the president must terminate the use of U. Since its passage, however, the War Powers Resolution has made little impact on presidential warmaking because creative ways have been found to circumvent its limitations. Most pronounced from the American withdrawal in to the Gulf War in , the Vietnam syndrome congealed after the war as the public mood slid toward isolation and the belief that troops should be committed only in cases of national invasion. During his first term in office, President Ronald Reagan assured the nation that there would be "no more Vietnams," a refrain also echoed by George H. Bush during his presidency. To conservatives, this meant that U. To others, it meant that popular opinion would now limit any extensions of American military power across the globe. The public would not support a troop commitment to another war against communists, even in the Western Hemisphere. American invasions of Grenada and Panama in the s were short-lived partly because of executive fears of escalating military involvement without strong public support. The deaths of more than two hundred marines at a base in Beirut, Lebanon, in threatened to rekindle the nightmare of Vietnam once again. But the victorious Gulf War of did much to remove the enormous burden of the Vietnam conflict from the back of American foreign policy. He helped to limit the information released about the conflict to prevent another "living-room" television war and patiently built up his forces to maximum strength before attacking Iraqi troops. The architects of the Gulf War also relied on precision bombing rather than ground troops in order to minimize casualties and preserve public support for the war. Following the Persian Gulf War the American public showered returning troops with a level of adulation not witnessed in the United States since , and cracks became visible in the Vietnam syndrome. But hesitation in committing troops to Bosnia and the withdrawal from Somalia stemmed in part from Clinton administration fears that the conflicts there would escalate and damage American credibility, as with Vietnam. Strong domestic support for a precision bombing campaign over Kosovo in , however, demonstrated how far the American public had drifted from the antiwar fervor of the early s. As time healed the wounds of violence and bloodshed, the impact of the Vietnam conflict still lingered for the Vietnamese and American people. But a new phase began, characterized by hope, new friendships, and cultural and political exchange unprecedented in the history of two nations once at war. Comment about this article, ask questions, or add new information about this topic:

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Chapter 6 : Download [PDF] American Foreign Policy Since The Vietnam War Free Online | New Books in

Writing before the crisis in the Persian Gulf, he concluded that a superficial consensus had been attained even before President Bush sent American forces into combat. Employing the method of "structured, focused comparison" the author asks a set of identical questions about the Nixon, Carter and Reagan administrations.

The "lesson of Vietnam," as public officials understand it, will probably be a shifting composite of these three views. All three of them assume in differing degree that the United States should use its military strength to defeat and discourage revolutionary movements in Asian countries and to contain Chinese power. I find this unfortunate, for each of the most common interpretations is so fundamentally misguided as to preclude enlightened changes in U. I believe a fourth line of interpretation of American involvement in Vietnam, absent from the debate in Washington, provides a better basis for comprehending the past and planning for the future. Three Interpretations We still do not know how the Vietnam War will finally end, and thus we cannot know whether the outcome of the war will be generally understood as an American victory, a stalemate or compromise, an NLF victory, or indeed if there will be any consensus at all. It is already clear that the NLF and North Vietnam have scored an extraordinary success against overwhelming odds, although at a very high cost to themselves in blood and destruction. But it remains impossible to tell whether the war will eventually end because the Saigon regime collapses, because domestic dissent in America causes a rapid and total U. Future American policy in Asia will depend heavily on how the final outcome in Vietnam is actually perceived by policy-makers. At this point, however, it seems fair to suppose an inconclusive ending to the war with enough ambiguity to support a number of differing interpretations on who won and who lost what. We can also suppose that regardless of the outcome, a consensus will emerge around the conclusion that American involvement in Vietnam was too costly to serve as a model for future U. Despite these imponderables, three different interpretations dominate the Vietnam debate at the present time: A qualified success Position 2: A failure of proportion Position 3: A qualified failure of tactics. Position 1 "that the war has been a qualified success" is the view of most professional military men and the American Right. They see American involvement in Vietnam as a proper exercise of military power, but feel that our effort has been compromised by Presidential insistence on pursuing limited ends by limited means. They criticize Washington for seeking "settlement" rather than "victory," and join the Left in condemning President Johnson for his failure to declare war on North Vietnam. They argue that our armed forces have had to fight the war with one hand tied behind their backs, pointing to the refusal to authorize bombing the dikes in North Vietnam, restrictions on targets in Hanoi and Haiphong, and the failure to impose a blockade on shipping to North Vietnam. Even though victory has not been sought by all means at our disposal, this view does not regard the Vietnam War as a failure. In a characteristic statement, Colonel William C. There is also reason to believe that this lesson has not been lost on other would-be aggressors. Position 1 sees the Vietnam War as a war of conquest by one country against another, the NLF as a mere agent of Hanoi whose role is to pretend that the war is a civil war and thereby discourage an effective response. The implication for the future is that the United States is not about to be fooled into treating Communist-led insurgencies any differently from outright Communist aggression against a friendly state. This, I think, is why history will be kind to President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk, because if we continue to stand firm in Vietnam as they advocate, then the world will have made incalculable progress toward eliminating war as the curse of mankind. This interpretation also claims that the American decision to fight in Vietnam gained time for other anti-Communist regimes in Asia to build up their capacities for internal security and national defense, assuming that the American effort in Vietnam created a shield that held back the flow of revolutionary forces across the continent of Asia. More extravagant exponents of this line of interpretation even contend, on the most slender evidence, that the Indonesian generals would not have reacted so boldly and successfully to the Communist bid for power in Djakarta in October had not the

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

American presence in Vietnam stiffened their resolve. Advocates of Position 1 tend to admire the Dominican intervention of 1965, where massive force was used and results quickly achieved with little loss of life. The domestic furor over the Dominican intervention disappeared quickly, mainly as a consequence of its success and brevity. Sophisticated adherents to Position 1 admire the Soviet intervention of August 1968 in Czechoslovakia for similar reasons. This model of overwhelming capability rather than the slow escalation of capability as in Vietnam is likely to influence the doctrine and future proposals of those who favor interventionary diplomacy. The second position — that the war is a failure of proportion — is widely held by American liberals. They feel that the Vietnam War was a mistake from the moment President Johnson decided in 1964 to bomb North Vietnam and to introduce large numbers of American ground combat forces. Position 2 also, by and large, rejects the notion that the war was caused by the aggression of one state against another, but views Vietnam instead as an international civil war in which both sides have received considerable outside support. Hoopes, who served in the Pentagon from January to February 1968, first as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs and then as Under Secretary of the Air Force, explains the failure of Vietnam as the result of a loss of a sense of proportion by decision-makers at the top. But the President and the tight group of advisers around him gave no sign of having achieved a sense of proportion. Former Ambassador Edwin Reischauer, respected among liberals, has carried this kind of analysis to a more general level of interpretation: David Mozingo takes this argument one step further, recognizing the need for a perspective on Asia that is suited to the special historical and political conditions prevailing there, a perspective that might even suggest the end of a rigid policy of containment of China. In Asia," Mozingo continues, "the containment doctrine has been applied in an area where a nation-state system is only beginning to emerge amidst unpredictable upheavals of a kind that characterized Europe three centuries earlier. Among the lessons drawn from Vietnam is the futility of aiding a foreign regime that lacks the capacity to govern its society and the conclusion that certain types of intervention, if carried too far, help produce results that are the opposite of the goals of the intervener. The American failure in Vietnam is partly laid to ignorance about Vietnamese realities and partly to exaggerated confidence in the ability of massive military intervention to fulfill political objectives. This is essentially the view of Stanley Hoffmann. Again, as with Hoopes, the search is for an effective foreign policy, combined with a sense of proportion and an awareness of the inherent limits imposed on American policy. The Nixon doctrine, announced at Guam on July 25, 1969, is an explicit effort to avoid repeating the mistakes of Vietnam, as these leaders understand them, without altering the basic mission of American policy in Asia. The Nixon Administration is critical of the Vietnam effort to the extent that it believes the same ends could have been achieved at lesser cost in American blood and treasure, and, as a result, with less strain on American society. In his November 3, 1969, address on Vietnam, President Nixon explained the Nixon doctrine as embodying "three principles as guidelines for future American policy toward Asia": Secondly, we shall provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of a nation allied with us or of a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security. Third, in cases involving other types of aggression, we shall furnish military and economic assistance when requested in accordance with our treaty commitments. But we shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defense. We will help where it makes a real difference and is considered in our interest. It is difficult, however, to extract much sense of concrete policy from the rhetoric of the State of the World message to Congress last February. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker is reported to have said that the policy of Vietnamization involves only changing the color of the bodies. Another expression of the Nixon doctrine seems to be an escalation of American involvement in Laos, increasing our covert role in training and financing government forces and staging saturation bombing raids on contested areas, thereby causing a new flow of refugees and seeking to deprive the Pathet Lao of its rural population base. A Critique These three positions identify the present boundaries of serious political debate in the United States. It is likely that the early seventies will witness a struggle for ascendancy between the advocates of the liberal view Position 2 and the advocates of the Nixon doctrine Position 3. Extending the doctrine of deterrence to counterinsurgency

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

situations Position 1 could gain support if the political forces behind George Wallace or Barry Goldwater gained greater influence as "a third force" in American politics or significantly increased their already strong influence within the Agnew-Mitchell wing of the Nixon Administration. Position 1 accepts "victory" as the proper goal of the American involvement in Vietnam and regards the means used as appropriate to the end of defeating the insurgency in South Vietnam, whether that insurgency is viewed as a species of civil war or as an agency of North Vietnamese aggression. In contrast, Position 2 shifted away from victory as a goal and moved toward the advocacy of some kind of mutual withdrawal of foreign forces and toward some effort to reach a settlement by non-military means once it became evident that the means required for the more ambitious goal were so costly in lives, dollars, and domestic support. Position 3 specifies the goal of the involvement as obtaining conditions of self-determination for South Vietnam and its present governing regime, a position that seems to imply an outcome of the war that is close to total victory; however, there is a certain ambiguity as to whether the real goals are not more modest than the proclaimed goals. In any event, Position 3 regards the means used to have been unnecessarily costly, given the goals of the involvement, and accepts, at least in theory, the desirability of a non-military outcome through a negotiated settlement of the war. As with strategic doctrine, the deterrence of insurgent challenges rests on the possession of a credible capability and on a willingness to respond with overwhelming military force to any relevant challenge. Position 2, which is much less tied to an over-all doctrine, views the post-Kennedy phases of the Vietnam involvement as a clear mistake and argues for a much greater emphasis on non-military responses to insurgent challenges. This position also seeks to limit overt intervention to situations in which its impact can be swift and effective. Position 2, therefore, depends on having a fairly secure regime in power in the country that is the scene of the struggle. It also emphasizes keeping a sense of proportion throughout such an involvement, either by way of a ceiling on the magnitude of the commitment or by way of a willingness to liquidate an unsuccessful commitment. Position 3 is midway between the first two positions in tone and apparent emphasis. It develops a more globalist strategy, emphasizing that the U. The merits of the particular case are thus tied to a global strategy, but there is an effort to shift more of the burdens of response to the local government. What this means in those cases where the government cannot meet these burdens, as was surely the case in Vietnam all along, is very unclear. What happens under Position 3 when self-reliance fails? Both Positions 2 and 3 look toward Japan as a more active partner in the development of a common Asian policy. What is most surprising about these three positions is the extent to which they accept the premise of an American counterrevolutionary posture toward political conflict in Asia. To be clear, however, this espousal of counterrevolutionary doctrine is applicable only in situations that appear to be revolutionary. Where there is no formidable radical challenge on the domestic scene, as in India or Japan, the American preference is clearly for moderate democracy, indeed the kind of political orientation that the United States imposed upon Japan during the military occupation after World War II. However, where an Asian society is beset by struggle between a rightist incumbent regime and a leftist insurgent challenger, then American policy throws its support, sometimes strongly, to the counterrevolutionary side. As a result, there has been virtually no disposition to question the American decision to support the repressive and reactionary Saigon regime provided that support could have led to victory in Vietnam at a reasonable cost. In fact, the last four American presidents have been in agreement on the political wisdom of the decision to help Saigon prevail in its effort to create a strong anti-Communist state in South Vietnam, thereby defying both the military results of the first Indochina war and the explicit provisions on the reunification of Vietnam embodied in the Geneva Accords of Positions 1 and 3 share an acceptance, although to varying degrees, of the basic postulates of "the domino theory. McGeorge Bundy, a belated convert to Position 2 after an earlier allegiance to the moderate form of Position 1, gave up on the war because its burden was too great on American society. Nevertheless, he took pains to reaffirm the wisdom of the original undertaking: The original insights of collective security and liberal evangelism were generous and wise. The Excluded Fourth Position There is another interpretation which has been largely excluded from the public dialogue thus far. It repudiates our present objectives in

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Vietnam on political and moral grounds. I favor this fourth position for several good reasons. There is no evidence that China needs containing by an American military presence in Asia. Of course, countries in the shadow of a dominant state tend to fall under the influence of that state whenever it is effectively governed. This process is universal and has deep historical roots in Asia. But there are important countervailing forces. First, China is preoccupied with its own domestic politics and with principal foreign struggles against the Soviet Union and Formosa. Second, many of the countries surrounding China have struggled at great sacrifice to achieve independence, and their search for domestic autonomy is much stronger than any common ideological sentiment that might tempt Asian Communist regimes to subordinate their independence to Peking. The evidence thus suggests that the American effort to contain China in Asia is a determination to contend with a paper tiger. More significantly, the multifaceted conflicts in Asia cannot be comprehended in abstract or ideological terms. Asia is undergoing a two-phase revolution that began as a struggle against colonialism during World War II and will continue for at least another decade. The first phase represented the struggle to reacquire national control over the apparatus of government by defeating foreign rule. This struggle is largely completed. In most parts of Asia the colonial system has collapsed and foreigners have been removed from power. But in several Asian countries, including South Vietnam, the native groups allied with the colonial system have clung to political power, stifling social progress and economic reform. Thailand, although never formally a colony, continues to be governed by a traditional elite that is ill-inclined to initiate the reforms needed to build a society devoted to the welfare of its population as a whole.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Chapter 7 : Foreign Policy - Constitutional Rights Foundation

American Exceptionalism and the Legacy of Vietnam examines the influence of the belief in American exceptionalism on the history of U.S. foreign policy since the Vietnam War. Trevor B. McCrisken analyzes attempts by each post-Vietnam U.S. administration to revive the popular belief in exceptionalism both rhetorically and by pursuing foreign.

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

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

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

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Chapter 8 : Some Ways the Vietnam War Impacted or Changed Our Government's Foreign Policy | Synonym

For decades, the Vietnam War has had a significant influence on American foreign and military policy. The United States had never lost a war until its military forces and diplomats were forced to.

Visit Website Seeking to regain control of the region, France backed Emperor Bao and set up the state of Vietnam in July , with the city of Saigon as its capital. Both sides wanted the same thing: But while Ho and his supporters wanted a nation modeled after other communist countries, Bao and many others wanted a Vietnam with close economic and cultural ties to the West. According to a survey by the Veterans Administration, some , of the 3 million troops who served in Vietnam suffered from post-traumatic stress disorder, and rates of divorce, suicide, alcoholism and drug addiction were markedly higher among veterans. When Did the Vietnam War Start? The Vietnam War and active U. The French loss at the battle ended almost a century of French colonial rule in Indochina. The subsequent treaty signed in July at a Geneva conference split Vietnam along the latitude known as the 17th Parallel 17 degrees north latitude , with Ho in control in the North and Bao in the South. The treaty also called for nationwide elections for reunification to be held in Eisenhower had pledged his firm support to Diem and South Vietnam. Though the NLF claimed to be autonomous and that most of its members were not communists, many in Washington assumed it was a puppet of Hanoi. Kennedy in to report on conditions in South Vietnam advised a build-up of American military, economic and technical aid in order to help Diem confront the Viet Cong threat. By , the U. Gulf of Tonkin A coup by some of his own generals succeeded in toppling and killing Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, in November , three weeks before Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas, Texas. Congress soon passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution , which gave Johnson broad war-making powers, and U. In March , Johnson made the decisionâ€”with solid support from the American publicâ€”to send U. By June, 82, combat troops were stationed in Vietnam, and military leaders were calling for , more by the end of to shore up the struggling South Vietnamese army. Despite the concerns of some of his advisers about this escalation, and about the entire war effort amid a growing anti-war movement, Johnson authorized the immediate dispatch of , troops at the end of July and another , in Westmoreland pursued a policy of attrition, aiming to kill as many enemy troops as possible rather than trying to secure territory. Heavy bombing by B aircraft or shelling made these zones uninhabitable, as refugees poured into camps in designated safe areas near Saigon and other cities. Even as the enemy body count at times exaggerated by U. Additionally, supported by aid from China and the Soviet Union, North Vietnam strengthened its air defenses. The later years of the war saw increased physical and psychological deterioration among American soldiersâ€”both volunteers and drafteesâ€”including drug use, post-traumatic stress disorder PTSD , mutinies and attacks by soldiers against officers and noncommissioned officers. Between July and December , more than , U. Bombarded by horrific images of the war on their televisions, Americans on the home front turned against the war as well: In October , some 35, demonstrators staged a massive Vietnam War protest outside the Pentagon. Opponents of the war argued that civilians, not enemy combatants, were the primary victims and that the United States was supporting a corrupt dictatorship in Saigon. On January 31, , some 70, DRV forces under General Vo Nguyen Giap launched the Tet Offensive named for the lunar new year , a coordinated series of fierce attacks on more than cities and towns in South Vietnam. Taken by surprise, U. Reports of the Tet Offensive stunned the U. With his approval ratings dropping in an election year, Johnson called a halt to bombing in much of North Vietnam though bombings continued in the south and promised to dedicate the rest of his term to seeking peace rather than reelection. Despite the later inclusion of the South Vietnamese and the NLF, the dialogue soon reached an impasse, and after a bitter election season marred by violence, Republican Richard M. Nixon won the presidency. In an attempt to limit the volume of American casualties, he announced a program called Vietnamization: In addition to this Vietnamization policy, Nixon continued public peace talks in Paris, adding higher-level secret talks conducted by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger beginning in the spring of The North Vietnamese

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

continued to insist on complete and unconditional U. My Lai Massacre The next few years would bring even more carnage, including the horrifying revelation that U. After the My Lai Massacre, anti-war protests continued to build as the conflict wore on. In and, there were hundreds of protest marches and gatherings throughout the country. On November 15, , the largest anti-war demonstration in American history took place in Washington, D. The anti-war movement, which was particularly strong on college campuses, divided Americans bitterly. For some young people, the war symbolized a form of unchecked authority they had come to resent. For other Americans, opposing the government was considered unpatriotic and treasonous. As the first U. Nixon ended draft calls in, and instituted an all-volunteer army the following year. Kent State Shooting In, a joint U. The invasion of these countries, in violation of international law, sparked a new wave of protests on college campuses across America. At another protest 10 days later, two students at Jackson State University in Mississippi were killed by police. By the end of June, however, after a failed offensive into South Vietnam, Hanoi was finally willing to compromise. Kissinger and North Vietnamese representatives drafted a peace agreement by early fall, but leaders in Saigon rejected it, and in December Nixon authorized a number of bombing raids against targets in Hanoi and Haiphong. Known as the Christmas Bombings, the raids drew international condemnation. When Did the Vietnam War End? In January, the United States and North Vietnam concluded a final peace agreement, ending open hostilities between the two nations. After years of warfare, an estimated 2 million Vietnamese were killed, while 3 million were wounded and another 12 million became refugees. In, Vietnam was unified as the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, though sporadic violence continued over the next 15 years, including conflicts with neighboring China and Cambodia. Under a broad free market policy put in place in, the economy began to improve, boosted by oil export revenues and an influx of foreign capital. Trade and diplomatic relations between Vietnam and the U. In the United States, the effects of the Vietnam War would linger long after the last troops returned home in. Psychologically, the effects ran even deeper. The war had pierced the myth of American invincibility and had bitterly divided the nation. Many returning veterans faced negative reactions from both opponents of the war who viewed them as having killed innocent civilians and its supporters who saw them as having lost the war, along with physical damage including the effects of exposure to the toxic herbicide Agent Orange, millions of gallons of which had been dumped by U. On it were inscribed the names of 57, American men and women killed or missing in the war; later additions brought that total to 58, The Fall of Saigon

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Chapter 9 : Post-cold War Policy

Central to America's foreign policy in the post-war period was the containment of the Soviet Union and communism. During the Cold War, the United States and its allies competed with the Soviet Union and its allies militarily, economically, and ideologically.

Senate, the President of the United States negotiates treaties with foreign nations, but treaties enter into force only if ratified by two-thirds of the Senate. Both the Secretary of State and ambassadors are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The United States Secretary of State acts similarly to a foreign minister and under Executive leadership is the primary conductor of state-to-state diplomacy. Powers of the Congress[edit] Main articles: Constitution gives much of the foreign policy decision-making to the presidency, but the Senate has a role in ratifying treaties, and the Supreme Court interprets treaties when cases are presented to it. Congress is the only branch of government that has the authority to declare war. Furthermore, Congress writes the civilian and military budget, thus has vast power in military action and foreign aid. Congress also has power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. These policies became the basis of the Federalist Party in the s, but the rival Jeffersonians feared Britain and favored France in the s, declaring the War of on Britain. After the alliance with France, the U. Initially these were uncommon events, but since WWII, these have been made by most presidents. Jeffersonians vigorously opposed a large standing army and any navy until attacks against American shipping by Barbary corsairs spurred the country into developing a naval force projection capability, resulting in the First Barbary War in The short experiment in imperialism ended by , as the U. It became the basis of the German Armistice which amounted to a military surrender and the Paris Peace Conference. In the s, the United States followed an independent course, and succeeded in a program of naval disarmament, and refunding the German economy. Operating outside the League it became a dominant player in diplomatic affairs. New York became the financial capital of the world, [8] but the Wall Street Crash of hurled the Western industrialized world into the Great Depression. American trade policy relied on high tariffs under the Republicans, and reciprocal trade agreements under the Democrats, but in any case exports were at very low levels in the s. Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt moved toward strong support of the Allies in their wars against Germany and Japan. As a result of intense internal debate, the national policy was one of becoming the Arsenal of Democracy, that is financing and equipping the Allied armies without sending American combat soldiers. Roosevelt mentioned four fundamental freedoms, which ought to be enjoyed by people "everywhere in the world"; these included the freedom of speech and religion, as well as freedom from want and fear. Roosevelt helped establish terms for a post-war world among potential allies at the Atlantic Conference; specific points were included to correct earlier failures, which became a step toward the United Nations. American policy was to threaten Japan, to force it out of China, and to prevent its attacking the Soviet Union. The American economy roared forward, doubling industrial production, and building vast quantities of airplanes, ships, tanks, munitions, and, finally, the atomic bomb. Much of the American war effort went to strategic bombers, which flattened the cities of Japan and Germany. President Richard Nixon, After the war, the U. Almost immediately, however, the world witnessed division into broad two camps during the Cold War; one side was led by the U. This period lasted until almost the end of the 20th century and is thought to be both an ideological and power struggle between the two superpowers. A policy of containment was adopted to limit Soviet expansion, and a series of proxy wars were fought with mixed results. In, the Soviet Union dissolved into separate nations, and the Cold War formally ended as the United States gave separate diplomatic recognition to the Russian Federation and other former Soviet states. In domestic politics, foreign policy is not usually a central issue. In the 1960s the Democratic Party took a strong anti-Communist line and supported wars in Korea and Vietnam. Then the party split with a strong, "dovish", pacifist element typified by presidential candidate George McGovern. Many "hawks", advocates for war, joined the Neoconservative movement and started supporting the Republicans especially

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

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