



NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COURSE CODE: INR 312

COURSE TITLE: AMERICAN DIPLOMACY IN THE 20TH CENTURY

COURSE GUIDE

INR 312 AMERICAN DIPLOMACY IN THE 20TH CENTURY

Course Team Arinze Ngwube (Course Writer/ Developer) –
Satellite Town Lagos
Barnabas Anger Ph.D (Course Editor) – Benue
State University, Makurdi
Olu Akeusola Ph.D (Programme Leader) – NOUN
Terhemba Nom Ambe-Uva (Course Coordinator) –
NOUN

National Open University of Nigeria
Headquarters
14/16 Ahmadu Bello Way
Victoria Island
Lagos

Abuja Office
5, Dar es Salaam Street
Off Aminu Kano Crescent
Wuse II, Abuja

e-mail: centralinfo@noun.edu.ng

URL: www.noun.edu.ng

Published by
National Open University of Nigeria

Printed 2012

ISBN:

All Rights Reserved

Printed by:

CONTENTS

PAGE

Introduction.....	iv
Course Aims.....	v
Course Objectives.....	v
Course Materials.....	v
Study Unit.....	v
Textbooks and References.....	vii
Assessment.....	vii
Tutor-Marked Assignment.....	vii
Final Examination and Grading.....	viii
The Course Material.....	viii
Tutor-Marked Assignment.....	viii
Final Examination and Grading.....	viii
Course Overview.....	ix
Facilitators/Tutors and Tutorials.....	ix
Summary.....	ix

INTRODUCTION

INR 312: American Diplomacy in the 20th Century is a one-semester course in the third year of B.A (Hons) degree in French and International Studies. It is a two-unit credit course designed to introduce you to how American diplomacy was shaped in the 20th century. The course prepares you for a basic understanding of the principles underlying international diplomacy. It is designed to help you understand and reflect independently on contemporary debates about the structure and dynamics of change in American diplomacy. INR 312 provides a survey of the key events in American's relations with the rest of the world, with specific focus on the inter play between domestic pressures and external threats.

The United States (US) was founded as an exceptional nation. It was founded in a world of other nations. Her founding fathers wanted the United States to be and remain an example of liberty for the world. They also created institutions of civilisation. It was expected that these institutions would allow the US in advancing their interests and ideas in an uncertain world. For them, diplomacy, like a domestic legal system or an elected legislature was a civilised institution seen as protecting American interests and a way of conducting international affairs. The fundamental American interest is to ensure that America remains independent and governed by the American people. However, America is a land of liberty founded on universal principles. American diplomats have the responsibility to speak for freedom around the world. Diplomacy is not an end itself. It is seen as a tool to advance America's interest. It gives the US some of the instruments it needs to lead like-minded nations and provide a means, by which government learns about, speaks to and negotiates with other powers.

This Course Guide provides you with the necessary information about the contents of the course and the materials you will need for a proper understanding of the subject matter. It is designed to help you get the best of the course by enabling you to think productively about the principles underlying the issues you study and the projects you execute in the course of your study and thereafter. It also provides some guidance on the way to approach your tutor-marked assignments (TMA). You will of course receive on-the-spot guidance from your tutorial classes, which you are advised to approach with all seriousness.

Overall, this course will fill an important niche in the study of French and International studies, especially as it is interested in knowing the objectives, principles, evolution and practice of American diplomacy in the 20th Century, and the impact this has on world politics. The course has both a theoretical and practical component.

COURSE AIMS

The aims of this course are to:

- explicate the concept of American diplomacy
- discuss broadly-based survey knowledge of the US foreign policy in the 20th Century
- provide a survey of key events in American relation with the world
- provide a sharp critical perspective in dealing with contemporary geopolitics
- discuss how American diplomacy is shaped by a variety of factors: social, political, economic and military.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

At the end of this course, you should be able to:

- explain the conceptual basis of American diplomacy
- identify the factors that shape American diplomacy such as national interest, domestic policy, international environment and so on
- reflect on contemporary debates about the structure and dynamics of change on American diplomacy
- discuss American diplomacy and her interactions among states and more broadly, the working of the international system as a whole.

COURSE MATERIALS

1. Course guide
2. Study units
3. Textbooks
4. Assignment file
5. Presentation schedule

STUDY UNIT

There are four modules in this course made up of 19 study units. Some units may be longer and/or more in depth than others, depending on the scope of the course that is in focus. The four modules in the course are as follows.

Module 1 Introduction to Diplomacy

- Unit 1 The Concept of Diplomacy
- Unit 2 Evolution of Diplomacy
- Unit 3 Types of Diplomacy
- Unit 4 Actors on the Diplomatic Stage
- Unit 5 Privileges and Immunities

Module 2 Understanding American Diplomacy

- Unit 1 The Context of American Diplomacy
- Unit 2 The United States of American and the First World War
- Unit 3 The United States of American and the Second World War
- Unit 4 The Rise of the United States of America

Module 3 Hegemonic exploits of America in the 20th Century

- Unit 1 The Concept of National Interest
- Unit 2 National Interest and American Diplomacy in the Cuba Missile Crisis
- Unit 3 National Interest and American Diplomacy in the Vietnam War
- Unit 4 National Interest and American Diplomacy in Afghanistan War
- Unit 5 America and the Cold War Era

Module 4 The Role of the United States of America in International Organisations

- Unit 1 The Contribution of the United States of America in the Establishment of International Organisations
- Unit 2 Global Institutions
- Unit 3 Regional Institutions
- Unit 4 Sub-Regional Institution

Each module is preceded with a listing of the units contained in it, and a table of contents, an introduction, a list of objectives and the main content in turn precedes each unit, including Self-Assessment Exercises (SAEs). At the end of each unit, you will find one or more Tutor-Marked Assignment (TMA) which you are expected to work on and submit for marking.

TEXTBOOKS AND REFERENCES

Zakaria, F. (1999). *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual origins of America's World Role*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Morgenthau, H. (1948). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Brief Edition. Revised by Kenneth Thompson. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

Norman, P. & Perkins, H. (2010). *International Relations and the World Community in Transition*. Third revised edition. New Delhi: A.I.T.B.S Publishers India.

Stephen E.A. & Douglas, G. B. (1997). Eight revised edition. New York: Penguin.

Thomas, G.P. & Dennis, M. (Ed.). (2000). *Major Problems in American Foreign Relations*. Volume 11: Since 1914 Lexington, MA: D.C Health, Fifth edition.

At the end of each unit, you will find a list of relevant reference materials which you may wish to consult as the need arises, though I have made efforts to provide you with the most important information you need to pass this course. However, I would encourage you, as a third year student to cultivate the habit of consulting as many relevant materials as you are able to within the time available to you. In particular, be sure to consult whatever material you are advised to consult before attempting any exercise.

ASSESSMENT

Two types of assessment are involved in the course: the Self-Assessment Exercises (SAEs), and the Tutor-Marked Assessment (TMA) questions. Your answers to the SAEs are not meant to be submitted, but they are also important since they give you an opportunity to assess your own understanding of course content. Tutor-Marked Assignments (TMAs) on the other hand, are to be carefully answered and kept in your assignment file for submission and marking. This will account for 30 per cent of your total score in the course.

TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

At the end of every unit, you will find a tutor-marked assignment which you should answer as instructed and put in your assignment for submission. However, this Course Guide does not contain any tutor-

marked assignment question. The tutor-marked assignment questions are provided from Unit 1 of Module 1 to Unit 4 of Module 4.

FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

The final examination for INR 312 will take two hours and make up 70 per cent of the total course grade. The examination questions will reflect the SAEs and TMAs that you have already worked on. I advise you to spend the time between your completion of the last unit and the examination revising the entire course. You will certainly find it helpful to also review both your SAEs and TMAs before the examination.

THE COURSE MATERIAL

In all of the courses, you will find the major components thus: As you observe, the course begins with the basics i.e. the simple grounding and expands into a more elaborate complex and detailed form. The main body of this course guide is presented in the form of instructions. All you need do is to follow the instructions given in each of the units, which contains objectives, reading materials and explanations. This will be along with self-assessment exercise and tutor marked assignments. All these will assist you in achieving the objectives of each unit and a holistic understanding of American diplomacy in international relations.

TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

There is an assessment file containing tutor –marked assignments (TMAs) .There are 14 TMAs in this course you need to submit at least four assignments of which the highest three marks will be recorded. Each recorded assignment counts 10 per cent of your total course grade. Three assignments will thus count for 30 per cent. When you complete your assignments send them with your form to your tutor for formal assessment on or before the deadline.

Self-assessment exercises are provided in each unit. The exercises should help you evaluate your understanding of the materials so far. They are not to be submitted. However, answers are provided or directions given as to where to find the answers within the units.

FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

There will be a final examination at the end of the course .The examination carries a total mark of 70 per cent of the total course grade. The examination will reflect the contents of what you have learnt and the self-assessment and tutor-marked assignments. You therefore need to revise your course materials before the examination.

COURSE OVERVIEW

There are 19 units in this course. You are to spend one week on each unit. All units have common features. The first item is introduction to the subject matter of the unit and how a particular unit is integrated into the next and the course as a whole. There are sets of the learning objectives of the units. The objectives tell you what you should be able to know on completion of the units. The objectives tell you what you should be able to know on completion of the unit. You should always go back to the objectives and confirm whether you have achieved the objectives.

FACILITATORS/TUTORS AND TUTORIALS

There are 15 hours of tutorials provided in support of the course. You will be notified of the dates and location of these tutorials, together with the name and phone number of your tutor as soon as you are allocated a tutorial group. Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, and keep a close watch on your progress. Be sure to send in your tutor-marked assignments promptly, and feel free to contact your tutor in case of any difficulty with your self-assessment exercise, tutor-marked assignment or the grading of an assignment. In any case, I advise you to attend the tutorials regularly and punctually. Always take a list of such prepared questions to the tutorials and participate actively in the discussions.

SUMMARY

The course is both a theoretical and practical course. American diplomacy is a dynamic sub field of study in international relations. Therefore you are expected to understand not only the theoretical and conceptual issues but also the practical expression of American national interest.

This Course Guide has been designed to furnish the information you need for a fruitful experience in the course. In the final analysis, how much you get from the course depends on how much you put into it in terms of time, effort and planning.

I wish you success in INR 312 and in the whole programme!

**MAIN
COURSE**

CONTENTS		PAGE
Module 1	Starting Point: Introduction to Diplomacy	1
Unit 1	The Concept of Diplomacy.....	1
Unit 2	Evolution of Diplomacy.....	9
Unit 3	Types of Diplomacy.....	16
Unit 4	Actors on the Diplomatic Stage.....	24
Unit 5	Privileges and Immunities.....	32
Module 2	Understanding American Diplomacy.....	38
Unit 1	The Context of American Diplomacy.....	38
Unit 2	The United States of American and the First World War.....	44
Unit 3	The United States of American and the Second World War.....	50
Unit 4	The Rise of the United States of America.....	56
Module 3	Hegemonic exploits of America in the 20th Century.....	63
Unit 1	The Concept of National Interest.....	63
Unit 2	National Interest and American Diplomacy in the Cuba Missile Crisis.....	70
Unit 3	National interest and American Diplomacy in the Vietnam War.....	77
Unit 4	National interest and American Diplomacy in Afghanistan War.....	84
Unit 5	America and the Cold War Era.....	90
Module 4	The Role of the United States of America in International Organisations.....	98
Unit 1	The Contribution of the United States of America in the Establishment of International Organisations.....	98
Unit 2	Global Institutions.....	104
Unit 3	Regional Institutions.....	116
Unit 4	Sub-Regional Institution.....	124

MODULE 1 INTRODUCTION TO DIPLOMACY

Unit 1	The Concept of Diplomacy
Unit 2	Evolution of Diplomacy
Unit 3	Types of Diplomacy
Unit 4	Actors on the Diplomatic Stage
Unit 5	Privileges and Immunities

UNIT 1 THE CONCEPT OF DIPLOMACY

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction
2.0	Objectives
3.0	Main Content
	3.1 Nature of Diplomacy
	3.2 The Meaning of Diplomacy
4.0	Conclusion
5.0	Summary
6.0	Tutor-Marked Assignment
7.0	References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit forms the bedrock upon which subsequent units and modules in this course are hinged, and therefore demands that you give it the attention it deserves. Diplomacy is seen as the peaceful conduct of relations among political entities, their principals and accredited agents. It has served as an instrument for nations to interact among themselves. Diplomacy provides a means of advancing a country's national interest by applying power assets in an attempt to persuade other countries to give way. During the conduct of diplomacy, United States of America (US) puts into consideration the political, economic, social and technological factors. The US has been able to influence and transmit a position or negotiate on a given issue or situation for a mutually acceptable outcome. Usually, when the word "diplomacy" is mentioned, people think of the discipline of international relations and communications as this is the most common context in which the word is heard. In this unit, you will learn the definition of diplomacy; its scope and relevance.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define diplomacy as an activity conducted by a state to further its interest
- discuss the functions of diplomacy
- analyse power as the foundation of diplomacy
- describe the various settings of diplomacy.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Nature of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is a tool, which the US uses to gain and expand relations among nations in the international system. This is a vital instrument in the game nations play on one another to pursue their interest. The sentiments of Stilwell and Stalin have some justification; they do not suggest the real nature of diplomacy, which consists of the techniques and procedures for conducting relations among states. In itself, diplomacy, like any machinery, is neither moral nor immoral; its use and value depend upon the intentions and abilities of those who practice it.

Diplomacy functions through a web of foreign offices, embassies, legations consulates, and special missions all over the world. It is commonly bilateral in character, but because of the growing importance of international conferences, international organisations, regional arrangements and collective security measures, diplomacy multilateral aspects have become increasingly significant.

The dimensions of diplomacy have been widened by the rapid growth of informal relations between the US a development, which is new in scope although not in essence. The advent of informal access on a large scale adds an important new dimension to international politics. Important as these developments are, the convention forms of diplomacy provided the means by which the nations of the world continue to carry on much of their formal business and regulate most of their official contacts. Sometimes, as Sir William Hayter, a diplomat, observed, "...oppressed with the futility of much of diplomatic life, the fatiguing social round, the conferences that agree on nothing, the dispatches that nobody reads, you begin to think that diplomacy is meaningless...." However, it does seem to me that the US will always need to organise their relationship with each other.

Diplomacy continues to remain a central mechanism for conducting the world's work and as such, it is a major instrument of national policy and of international relations.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Is diplomacy a discipline? Discuss.

3.2 The Meaning of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is the method in common use today of communication between governments. All governments, at all times and in all parts of the world have used envoys in communicating with other governments or authorities. There are traces of the practice recorded on Assyrian tablets in Greek and Roman history and in ancient China and India. The Republic of Venice was known to have founded diplomacy. In the 16th century, it maintained envoys in Switzerland, Naples, Turin, Milan and London as well as ambassadors at the courts of the emperor and of the Kings of France and of Spain. Later the Kings of France and of Spain maintained continuous representation in various cities. The practice of sending special missions for specific purposes continued to be prevalent until the 17th century. However, the business of government in earlier times did not require a system of intergovernmental relations and even when permanent contact between governments is found to be indispensable; diplomacy remained the practice in many cases to maintain abroad a subordinate class of envoys as distinguished from ambassadors with full rights and powers.

The method called diplomacy was practiced by temporary agents at all periods, the status and functions until of the diplomat were not recognised until the chief government came into continuous contact with agents residing abroad. The existing system first operated in Europe in the early 17th century; it has since become worldwide having proved itself essential to modern government.

No general definition of diplomacy can be very revealing. The Oxford English Dictionary calls it "the management of international relations by negotiation," or the "method by which these relations are adjusted and managed." Diplomacy is a basic human activity. One of the most astute students and practitioners of diplomacy in the twentieth century Harold Nicolson. For example, in his interesting study, *The Congress of Vienna*, Nicolson wrote: "Diplomacy is useful even when dealing with a remote historical episode to consider where diplomacy ends and foreign policy begins. Each of them is concerned with the adjustment of national to international requirements."

Diplomacy, on the other hand, is not an end but a means; not a purpose but a method. It seeks, by the use of reason, conciliation and the exchange of interests, to prevent major conflicts arising between sovereign states. It is the agency through which foreign policy seeks to attain its purpose by agreement rather than by war. Thus, when agreement becomes impossible, diplomacy, which is the instrument of peace becomes operative and foreign policy, the final sanction of which is war alone becomes operative. Childs (1948) defines diplomacy as the process by which policy is carried out. Policy is made by different persons and agencies; but seemingly on major matters in any state, whatever its form of government. It is made at the highest levels, though subject to different kinds of controls. It is the function of diplomacy to provide the machinery and the personnel by which foreign policy is executed. Since foreign policy is seen to be the projection of state image in an external environment, some form of negotiation is required and this gives merit to the definition above. Diplomacy is considered an indispensable tool for directing both the domestic and foreign affairs of state.

Sometime during his services as the top American military commander in the China-Burma Theater, General "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell recorded his thoughts as a Deck-Hand Diplomat:

A brief experience with international politics confirms me in my preference for driving a garbage truck. This is admittedly not the proper approach to the matter of international politics. It is a very serious business. A lot of Big Figures indulge in it, and a host of little ones trail along. Those who make the grade are of course interested to dignify and even glorify the profession, which can be done in the wink of the eye by using the term "diplomacy"- a word we usually utter on a hushed and respectful note. The term "diplomat" to the average American evokes a vision of an immaculately dressed being-pin stripe pants, spats cutaway and topper-and a coldly severe and superior manner which masks the lightning like play of the intellect that guides the ship of state, moves the pieces on the board with unerring precision, and invariably turns up in Washington without his shirt or rather our shirt.

More than a quarter of a century before General Stilwell wrote these words, a man of a wholly different background, Joseph Stalin had paid his respects to the art of diplomacy in these words:

A diplomat's words must have
no relation to actions-otherwise
what kind of diplomacy is it?
Words are one thing actions

another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Since diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron.

General Stilwell had encountered almost as many difficulties with American diplomatic representatives and Chinese officials as he had with the jungles of Burma or from the Japanese. Moreover, he also reflected a deep-rooted American conviction that whenever representatives of the US engage in negotiations with foreign diplomats, they come out on the short end of the deal. Stalin, on the other hand expressed the traditional attitude of modern dictators towards diplomacy, that it is a means of concealing a nation's real aims and providing a smoke screen for actions of a vastly different character.

The two Joe- Stilwell and Stalin took a cynical view of the art of diplomacy. The last sentence tends to destroy the nice distinction between diplomacy and foreign policy, which Mr. Nicolson makes. However, this sentence is misleading in that it suggests that diplomacy ceases to function when major international crises arise, especially if they lead to war. The object of diplomacy as foreign policy is to protect the security of a nation by peaceful means if possible, or by giving assistance to military operations, if war cannot be avoided. Diplomacy does not cease to function in time of war as Nicolson suggests; although diplomacy necessarily plays different role in wartime, the work of diplomats, as of foreign ministers may even expand. The diplomacy of the two world wars of this century provided convincing support for the contention.

Tunkin's definition of diplomacy is comprehensive and takes into consideration current trends in international diplomacy, in which modern states use different sophisticated means to attain their objectives. According to him, diplomacy means an activity (including content, modes and methods of the activity of general and special state agencies of foreign relations) of heads of states and governments, departments of foreign affairs, special delegation and missions and diplomatic representatives appertaining to the effectuation by peaceful means of the purpose and tasks of the foreign policy of the state.

Ian (1979) defines diplomacy as any means by which states establish or maintain mutual relations communicate with each other, or carry out politics or legal transaction in each case through their authorised agents. A cross section of definitions of diplomacy meets at one point –the crucial issues of negotiation and peace. It simply means that every

diplomatic endeavour must have peace as an end result. It therefore encourages peaceful co-existence in the international system. This again means that when conflict degenerates to armed conflict then diplomacy may become increasingly more necessary, but at this stage, it has failed. The viewpoint that war is an aspect of diplomacy based on contributions of eminent scholars as already seen is not correct. Diplomacy is intended to prevent conflict from escalating to armed conflict.

As one study notes “the desire to resolve problems amicably pervades all arenas of social organisation. It is the function of negotiation to provide a channel for peaceful dispute resolution” (Starkey, Boyer & Wilkenfeld, 1999:1). If diplomacy is important, it is very old. Even the most ancient and comparatively most primitive societies required reliable means of communicating and dealing with their neighbours. The process was generally considered worthy to warrant a general agreement that the safety of diplomatic messengers be assured by divine sanction. Diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of groups or states.

According to Barston (2006), diplomacy is the conduct of international relations through the intercession of professional diplomats with regard to issues of peace-making, trade, war, economics, culture, environment and human rights. International treaties are negotiated by diplomats pending endorsement by national politicians. In an informal sense, diplomacy is the employment of tact to find mutually acceptable solutions to a common challenge, one set of tools being the phrasing of statements in a non-confrontational or polite manner.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

In what ways do nations engage themselves in the international arena?

4.0 CONCLUSION

You must note in this concluding section that diplomacy continues to remain a tool nations use in advancing their interest. It is a means through which government interact with other powers. The conduct of diplomacy is shaped by political, economic, social and technological goals. However, diplomacy continues to remain a tool in international politics.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have highlighted the numerous definitions of diplomacy. You learnt that diplomacy is the art of conducting negotiations, agreements and relations between two or more parties in a sensitive way. We also looked at various definitions of diplomacy by various authors. Briefly, diplomacy is conducted for its propaganda value. Even where there is little hope for settlement, it may benefit a country's image to appear reasonable or to make opponents seem stubborn.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss the relevance of the study of diplomacy to the student of international relation.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Brownlie, I. (1979). *Principles of Public International Law*. London: Oxford University Press.

Cambon, H. (1931). *The Diplomatist*. London: Oxford University Press.

Chhabra, H. (1981). *Relations of Nations*. Delhi: Subject Publications.

Childs, J. (1948). *American Foreign Service*. New York: Holt.

Denza, E. (1976). *Diplomatic Law*. New York: Oceana Publications Inc.

Ikle, F. (1964). *How Nations Negotiate*. New York: Harper & Row.

Latham, R. (1988). *Diplomatic Handbook*. London: Longman Group.

Norman, D., et al. (2010.) *International Relations*. (3rd ed.). The World Community in Transition India: A.I.T.B.S Publishers.

Tunkin, G. I. (1972). *Theory of International Law*. London: George Allen and Unwin Limited.

Webster, C. (1952). *The Art and Practice of Diplomacy*. London.

Wriston, H. (1956). *Diplomacy in a Democracy*. New York: Harper.

Stilwell, J. (1948). *The Stilwell Papers*. Edited by Theodore N.White. New York: William Slone Associate.

Dallin, D. (1944). *The Real Soviet Russian*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

The congress of Vienna: A Study in Allied Unity, 1812-22. New York: Harcourt, Brace 1946.

UNIT 2 THE EVOLUTION OF DIPLOMACY

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Origin of Diplomacy
 - 3.2 Contemporary Diplomacy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Definition of diplomacy was given in unit one. A topical question that the student of international relations tries to approach is the evolution of diplomacy. Therefore, our main thrust in this unit is to look at the evolution of diplomacy.

The term “diplomacy” is derived from the Greek word *diploma*, which means a double document. During the Greek City-State, and all passports, imperial letters were stamped on double metal plates folded and sewn together. The term was applied to all official documents. This conferred certain privileges and immunities. With the emergence of states, diplomacy took on a more multilateral level making it more complex and sophisticated and creating a basis for distinct clear rules to govern protect the class of people that are involved in diplomacy.

This unit attempts to look at how diplomacy emerges from antiquity to contemporary times.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define diplomacy in antiquity
- summarise the evolution of diplomacy from ancient Greece to 19th century Europe
- explain the dynamics of contemporary international relations, including forces for change and continuity
- analyse how actors conduct their roles in the international system.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Origin of Diplomacy

Diplomacy in antiquity means practice of diplomacy in ancient times. There was no documented evidence of practice of diplomacy in ancient history; men could not survive alone economically and politically, there was the desire to enter into friendly relations with their neighbours. According to Nascimento da Silva (1972), diplomacy must have originated once people of various background or culture made contact and sought to find a common ground for their dealings. Representation and negotiation from historical accounts can be said to be as old as families, clans, tribes, and people met one another and sought to regulate marriage customs and contracts hunting trade, navigation communications disagreements and wars.

Diplomacy then was modern diplomacy ad-hoc in nature. Evidence of history show that cases of negotiations, alliances and coalitions of various people existed since antiquity. Though there could be no legal norms regulating diplomatic relations, emissaries who were sent by communities for negotiation and settlement of disputes enjoyed privileges and special protection based on religion. Gasiokwu (1997) quoting Harold Nicolson says:

Even in prehistory there must have common moments when one group of savages, if only for the purpose of indicating that they had enough of the day's battle, would like a pause in which to collect their wounded and bury their dead.

The above quote emphasised the need for negotiation in those days to save man from annihilation. Those who had to play those roles saw how dangerous they were and could never have accomplished them, if not given some sort of special protection.

The beginning of diplomacy dates to the Eastern Mediterranean and the region around the Tigris and Euphrates valleys. Diplomatic records in the region shows that what appeared to be embassies can be found in the region from as far back as the time of the great Babylonian Emperor, Hammurabi (1792-1750 BC). These beginnings found continuance and advancement in ancient Greece and Rome, which originated many of the concepts and practices used in modern

diplomacy. Diplomatic missions are described in Homer's *Iliad* (about 850 BC) and the Greeks, followed by the Romans wrote treaties, established the rudiments of international law, initiated or revived other aspects of diplomatic practice, and used ambassadors to negotiate disputes. The Byzantine Empire, which flourished after Rome's collapse, added further to the beginning of diplomacy by training negotiators and by establishing the first department of foreign affairs.

The diplomacy of Italian city-states started in the 15th century contributed to the beginning of diplomacy through the establishment of first permanent diplomatic missions since Hammurabi's time, more than 3,000 years earlier. Italians also introduced summit meeting as a diplomatic practice and became practically known for diplomatic practice and for diplomatic artifice.

The French system is the direct predecessor of modern diplomacy. Cardinal Richelieu who served as chief minister (1624-1642) to King Louis XIII was the first to see diplomacy as an ongoing process rather than as an expedience, and he consolidated all foreign affairs functions under one ministry. Later during the reign of Louis XIV (1643-1715), the minister of foreign affairs became a member of the King's cabinet and permanent embassies were established in all major capitals, with lesser ranked missions in minor capitals. It was also at the end of this era that Francois de Callienes wrote the first diplomatic manual, on the manner of negotiating with sovereigns.

Ancient China during the Eastern Chou Dynasty (770-256 BC) made contacts with other parts of Asia. Problems were solved according to the accepted principles and envoys were given instructions on how to act to maintain peaceful relations with other heads of states.

Contribution to the development of diplomacy by Africans can be traced to ancient Egypt, which is said to have contributed more to diplomacy in antiquity. Egypt had contacts with the Mediterranean countries, Arab states, Babylon and India ever before the fourth century BC Egypt sent and received trade delegations from these states with which she had contact.

It seems earliest recorded diplomatic intercourse of "international" relevance took place in the Nile valley. The wealth of Egypt made it a focal point of commerce and thus brought it into contact with other people. The first treaty of which the full text was preserved was the one drawn up between Ramese II of Egypt and Hattusalis, the prince of the Hittites. This treaty among other things dealt with the extradition of

deserters to their country of origin with the pledge that neither the guilty, nor their wives, mothers nor children will be put to death.

Finally, old diplomacy that developed mostly in Europe had several traits; one was elite domination. “L’etat c’est moi” (I am the state). Louis XIV supposedly proclaimed with some justification and true to that assertion, foreign policy was dominated by the monarch and ministers and diplomatic corps recruited from the nobility and gentry. Democracy had begun in a few places, but the saying of the people in foreign affair was still minimal. As conducted by the elite, diplomacy was further marked by secrecy; treaties were often secret. There were a few multilateral conferences such as the congress of Vienna (1815) but bilateral diplomacy (direct negotiations between two countries) was the normal form of negotiation.

In summary, diplomacy in antiquity was mainly by ad-hoc diplomacy, military diplomacy and the art of peace treaties.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the contribution of the Greeks to diplomacy.

3.2 Contemporary Diplomacy

Contemporary diplomacy can be said to have started in the 17th century. From this period, diplomacy underwent series of revolutionary processes differing from the practice during the Greek period, antiquity in the era of Italian city-states. The sending of envoys and maintaining permanent legation was already an accepted tradition in Europe at this time. The treaty of Westphalia in 1648 was precisely the direct source of modern diplomacy. This treaty confirmed the principle of balance of power in Europe and thus obliged states to keep watch on one another. The treaty was seen to be the most important judicial instrument of the time, and most importantly, laid the foundation for the development of international law and diplomacy by its recognition of the existence of European states as separate sovereign kingdoms, thus the evolution of diplomacy based on peaceful co-existence of the monarchs.

Harold (1939) whose little book “Diplomacy” has been a classic on the subject has called attention to three developments of the 19th and 20th centuries, which have greatly affected the theory and practice of diplomacy. These are 1) the growing sense of the community of nations (2) the increasing appreciation of the importance of public opinion and 3) the rapid increase in communications. The first two developments have clearly enlarged the diplomat’s functions and enhanced his

importance. The result has been the “worldwide intermeshing” of foreign offices and diplomatic posts through which most of the formal contacts between states are now maintained.

As the number of international organisations, groupings, and conferences increased, multilateral diplomacy took on added significance. The impact of public opinion on diplomacy is now generally recognised, but until the era of the new diplomacy, that impact seemed to be slight. Today it is demonstrable that the policy makers of all nations, including those of totalitarian states, are sensitive to currents of public sentiments: witness the time and effort that are devoted to educational and propaganda work. One of the main functions of diplomatic representatives is reporting on the attributes of the people in the country to which they are accredited. As Lord Gore –Booth (1979) puts it:

Diplomacy in this period proceeded according to well-defined rules and civilised convention. It was personal and flexible and its style, while not without subtlety, was clear enough for all who took part in it to understand, not only what was explicitly said, but also what was to be taken for granted. By 17th and 18th centuries European monarchs maintained missions abroad, they also made efforts to keep and improve on their diplomatic relations.

Modern diplomacy covers a wide range of human activities, involving state and non-state actors. These actors advance their interests through dialogue, correspondence, conferences, lobbying, negotiation, threats of war and even acts of violence. The 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the 1963 Convention on Consular Relations are important landmarks in contemporary times.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss diplomacy in contemporary time.

4.0 CONCLUSION

There was no documented evidence of practice of diplomacy in ancient history; men could not survive alone economically and politically, there was the desire to enter into friendly relations with their neighbours. Contemporary diplomacy can be said to have started in the 17th century; from this period, diplomacy underwent series of revolutionary processes differing from the practice during the Greek period, antiquity in the era of Italian city-states. The conduct of diplomacy is shaped by political, economic, social and technological goals. Modern diplomacy covers a wide range of human activities, involving state and non-state actors. These actors advance their interests through dialogue, correspondence, conferences, lobbying, negotiation, threats of war and even acts of violence.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed the evolution of diplomacy. You have learnt how diplomacy emerged. We also look at how various states emerge in the conduct of diplomacy.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What are the major factors that account for the shift from the old to the new form of diplomacy?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Anger, B. (1992). *Scope and Abuse of Privileges and Immunities by International Protected Persons*. (Unpublished Thesis). Faculty of Law, University of Jos, Jos.

Brownlie, I. (1979). *Principles of Public International Law*. London: Oxford.

Cambon, H. (1931). *The Diplomatist*. London: Oxford.

Chhabra, H. (1981). *Relations of Nations*. Delhi: Subject Publications.

Childs, J. (1948). *American Foreign Service*. New York: Holt.

- Denza, E. (1976). *Diplomatic Law*. New York: Oceana Publications Inc.
- Gasiokwu, M., et al. (1997). *Contemporary Issues and Basic Documents on Diplomatic and Consular Law*. Nigeria: Mono Expressions Limited.
- Ikle, F. (1964). *How Nations Negotiate*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lord, G. (1979). *Satow's Guide to Diplomatic Practice*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Ltham, R. (1988). *Diplomatic Handbook*. London: Longman Group.
- Nascimento, S. (1972). *Diplomacy in International Law*. A.W. Wijnhoff Leyden: Rule of Law Press.
- Norman, D., et al. (2010). *International Relations third Revised Edition the World Community in Transition*. India: A.I.T.B.S Publishers.
- Satow, E. (1959). *Guide to Diplomatic Practice*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Tunkin, G.I. (1972). *Theory of International Law*. London: George Allen and Unwin Limited.
- Webster, C. (1952). *The Art and Practice of Diplomacy*. London.
- Wriston, H. (1956). *Diplomacy in a Democracy*. New York: Harper.

UNIT 3 TYPES OF DIPLOMACY

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Leader- to- Leader Diplomacy
 - 3.2 Democratised Diplomacy
 - 3.3 Cultural Diplomacy
 - 3.4 Parliamentary Diplomacy
 - 3.5 Informal Diplomacy
 - 3.6 Gunboat Diplomacy
 - 3.7 Defence Diplomacy
 - 3.8 Multilateral Diplomacy
 - 3.9 Regional Diplomacy
 - 3.10 Public Diplomacy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The previous unit described the evolution of diplomacy. This unit will look at types of diplomacy. The concern of this unit is to look at types of diplomacy, which actors in the international system are using in pursuing their interest. The unit will also look at the various types of diplomacy.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- describe diplomatic practice in the modern era
- distinguish key events in relations among nations
- develop the vital skills employed in the study of diplomacy
- analyse types of diplomacy.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Leader-to-Leader Diplomacy

Modern transportation and communication have spawned an upsurge of high-level diplomacy. National leaders regularly hold bilateral or

multilateral summit conferences and foreign ministers and other high ranking diplomats jet between countries conducting shuttle diplomacy. The advent of globetrotting, leader-to-leader diplomacy and the increased frequency of telecommunications diplomacy are mixed blessings. Meeting between leaders can demonstrate an important symbolic shift in relations. For 50 years after the outbreak of the Korean War, relationship between Pyongyang and Seoul was antagonistic. This changed in June 2000 when President Kim Jong II of North Korea and his South Korean counterpart met in Pyongyang. Some agreements were reached. A clerk in Seoul however noted wisely that “maybe nothing dramatic will happen right away.” Most people would have agreed that a surprising amount of progress and understanding has been achieved already.

Some leaders can sometimes make dramatic breakthroughs. The 1978 Camp David Accord saw the process of normalising Egyptian-Israeli relations after decades of hostility and three wars. The Accord was produced after US President Jimmy Carter, Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin isolated themselves at the presidential retreat in Maryland, United States.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Is leader-to-leader diplomacy still relevant in world politics? Discuss.

3.2 Democratised Diplomacy

The elite and executive domineering character has changed in several ways. One result of democratised diplomacy is that diplomats are drawn from wider range of society and thus, more representatives of their nations. It also means, though they have lost the common frame of reference once provided by this similar cosmopolitan, elite backgrounds.

Diplomats have their attitudes rooted in their cultures and are more apt to suffer from antagonisms. The diplomats conduct public diplomacy aimed at influencing not just leaders but also the legislatures, interest groups, and public opinion in other countries. The former United Nations (UN) Secretary General has reportedly said if I can get the support of governments, then I get the support of the people. People move governments.”

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the relevance of democratic diplomacy.

3.3 Cultural Diplomacy

The phrase “citizen diplomacy” was first coined by David Hoffman in an article about Dr Fuller’s work, which appeared in *Co-Evolution* quarterly in 1981. Cultural diplomacy can be defined as a new way of making diplomacy by the involvement of nongovernmental and non-professional actors in the making of diplomacy. Through the structure of globalisation, culture plays a major role in the definition of identity and in the relations between people. Joseph Nye points out the importance of having a soft power besides a hard power. When conventional diplomacy fails, a better knowledge can help bridge the gap between different cultures. One of the pioneers of citizen diplomacy, physicist, Robert W. Fuller travelled frequently to the Soviet Union in the 1970s and 1980s in the effort to alleviate the Cold War. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Dr Fuller continued this work around the world and developed the idea of reducing rankism to promote peace. It has become a subject of academic studies based on historical essays on the United States (US), Europe and the Cold War.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Is cultural diplomacy still relevant in the 21st century? Discuss.

3.4 Parliamentary Diplomacy

Parliamentary diplomacy refers to debate and voting in international organisations. These sometimes supplant negotiation and compromise. The manoeuvring involved in parliamentary diplomacy was strongly evident in the UN with regard to North Korea during 1993 and 1994. The US had to proceed with care. With threats of UN-endorsed sanctions against North Korea because China and Russia were averse to sanctions and each possessed a veto “What will the Chinese do.” Assistant Secretary Gallucci rhetorically asked reporters at a briefing “Will you be able to pass a sanctions resolution?” If there is anybody in this room who knows things they know, if they are willing to give me odds, and I do not care in which direction, I’ll take them. I do not know what the Chinese are going to do.”

In May 1994, the five permanent members of the Security Council issued a joint statement calling on North Korea to provide evidence that it was not reprocessing spent nuclear reactor fuel rods into plutonium for weapons. Among other benefits, this statement indicated to Pyongyang that the five permanent members (P5) of the Security Council were united in opposition to a North Korean nuclear-weapons capability and that even Chinese and Russian patience was not vast. Parliamentary diplomacy was used by Dean Rusk to describe the negotiations and discussions carried out in international organisation in

accordance with its rule of procedure, but with special reference to the General Assembly and the security of the United Nations. Subsequently, Dean Rusk developed the basic idea and defined the term in details. It is a type of multilateral negotiations, which involves at least four factors.

First, a continuing organisation with interest and responsibilities, which are broader than the specific items that happen to appear upon the agenda at the particular conference in other words more than a traditional international conference, called to cover specific agenda. Second, a regular public debate expose to the media of mass communication and in touch, therefore with public opinion around the globe. Thirdly, there are rules of procedure which govern the process of debate, and which are subject to tactical manipulation to advance or oppose a point of view. And lastly, formal conclusions ordinarily expressed in resolution, which are reached by the majority votes of some description on a simple or two-third majority based on a financial contribution or economic stake-some and some without a veto.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

How relevant is the practice of parliamentary diplomacy in the international system?

3.5 Informal Diplomacy

Informal diplomacy has been used for centuries to communicate between powers. Most diplomats work to recruit figures in other nations who might be able to give informal access to a country's leadership. In some situations, the United States of America (US) and the People's Republic of China at a point adopted these using interlocutors such as academic members of think-tank. This occurs in situations where governments wish to express intentions or suggest methods of resolving a diplomatic situation, but do not wish to express a formal position. Informal diplomacy is known as Track II Diplomacy in which non-officials (academic scholars, retired civil and military officials, public figures, and social activists) engage in dialogue with the aim of conflict resolution or confidence building.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly state the importance of informal diplomacy.

3.6 Gunboat Diplomacy

This refers to the pursuit of foreign policy objectives with the aid of conspicuous display of military power implying or constituting a direct threat of warfare should terms not be agreeable to the superior force. The term comes from the period of colonial imperialism where the European powers would intimidate other states integrating trade through a demonstration of their superior military power. A country negotiating with a European power would notice that a warship has appeared off its coast.

The mere sight of such power usually had a considerable effect and it was rarely necessary for such boats to use other measures such as demonstrations of cannon fire. The British diplomat and naval thinker, James Cable, spelled out the nature of gunboat diplomacy in a series of works published between 1971 and 1994. In these, he defined the phenomenon as “the use or threat of limited naval force, otherwise than an act of war, in order to secure advantage or to avert loss, either in the furtherance of an international dispute or else against foreign nationals within the territory or the jurisdiction of their own state.”

He further broke down the concept into four key areas:

Definitive Force: the use of gunboat diplomacy to create or remove a fait accompli,

Purposeful Force: application of naval force to change the policy or character of the target government or group,

Catalytic Force: a mechanism designed to buy a breathing space or present policy makers with an increased range of options,

Expressive Force: use of navies to send a political message interestingly this aspect of gunboat diplomacy is undervalued and almost dismissed by cable.

Diplomatic points were made by the Clinton administration in the Yugoslav wars of the 1990s (in alliance with the United Kingdom [UK] during the Blair administration) using sea launched Tomahawk missiles and E-3 AWACS airborne surveillance aircraft in a more passive display of military presence. Gunboat diplomacy in the post Cold War world is still based mostly on naval forces; owing to the US Navy's overwhelming sea power. US administrations have frequently changed the disposition of their major naval fleets to influence opinion in foreign capitals.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are the arguments for and against gunboat diplomacy?

3.7 Defence Diplomacy

It is the peaceful application of resources from across the spectrum of defence to achieve positive outcomes in the development of bilateral and multilateral relationships. It does not include military operations, but subsumes such other defence activity as international personnel exchanges, ship and aircraft visits, high-level engagement (for example ministers, and senior defence personnel) training and exercises, security sector reformed, bilateral military staff talks, and so on.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Compare and contrast defence diplomacy with parliamentary diplomacy.

3.8 Multilateral Diplomacy

Conferences involving a number of nations occurred during the 19th Century; the practice has expanded in the modern era .Woodrow Wilson call for League of Nations symbolises the rise of multilateral diplomacy. There are a number of permanent world and regional international organisations. Ad-hoc conferences and treaties are also more apt to be multilateral. Multilateral diplomacy has increased for several reasons. Technological progress is one. Advances in travel and communications technology allow faster and more frequent contacts among countries. More countries and leaders realise that many global concerns, such as the environment cannot be solved by any one country. It is attractive to smaller countries as a method of influencing world politics beyond individual world power.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Is multilateral diplomacy still relevant? Discuss.

3.9 Regional Diplomacy

It refers to the conduct of relations between states that belong to a specialised geographic region. It has become a strong force in international relations. Globalisation and interdependence have made all states aware that neighbourhood cooperation works to mutual benefit. Small countries see the benefit of numbers, for economic and political advantage.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Do nations still adopt regional diplomacy? Discuss.

3.10 Public Diplomacy

It uses every available means of communication including cultural and educational exchanges, distribution of publications, press, and radio and television lectures. It is the task of public diplomacy to analyse the similar activity of foreign governments and see its influence on public opinion and on the formulation and carrying out of foreign policy.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Compare and contrast leader- to -leader diplomacy with multilateral diplomacy.

4.0 CONCLUSION

You must note in this concluding section that types of diplomacy continue to remain a tool actors used in advancing their interest. It is a means through which actors interact with other powers.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed types of diplomacy. You learnt how actors have been able to use diplomacy to achieve their various aims. You also learnt that types of diplomacy explain how actors have been able to interact with one another.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Compare and contrast leader -to- leader diplomacy with gunboat diplomacy.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Best, G. (1999). Peace Conferences and the Century of Total War: The 1899 Hague Conference and What came After.” *International Affairs*, 75:619-634.

Cable, J. (1971). *Gunboat Diplomacy Political application of Limited Naval Forces*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Dunn, H., (Ed.). (1996). *Diplomacy at the Highest Level: The Evolution of International Summitry*. New York: St Martin's.
- Kissinger, H. (1979) *The White House Years*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Nascimento, S. (1972). *Diplomacy in International Law*. A.W.Wijthoff Leyden: Rule of Law Press.
- New York Times*. Feb 3 1996, P.A11.
- New York Times*. March 3, 1998 p.E3.
- New York Times*. April 9, 1990, p.39.
- New York Times*. June 15 2000.
- Norman, D., et al. (2010). *International Relations third Revised Edition the World Community in Transition*. India: A.I.T.B.S Publishers.
- Rusk, D. (1955). Parliamentary Diplomacy: Debate versus Negotiation.” *Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. 26.
- Tunkin, G. I. (1972). *Theory of International Law*. London: George Allen and Unwin Limited.
- Washington Post, April 13, 1990, p.A7.
- Webster, C. (1952). *The Art and Practice of Diplomacy*. London.
- Wriston, H. (1956). *Diplomacy in a Democracy*. New York: Harper.

UNIT 4 ACTORS ON THE DIPLOMATIC STAGE

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 State
 - 3.2 State Foreign Minister
 - 3.3 Multinational Corporation
 - 3.4 Nongovernmental Organisation
 - 3.5 Liberation Movement
 - 3.6 Intergovernmental Organisation
 - 3.7 Individual
 - 3.8 Diplomatic and Consular Officers
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

International politics is a narrower field than international relations owing to the fact that the former entails the struggle for power. The latter connotes the sum total of relationships that take place in the international system. These relations include scientific, military economic, cultural, social and political relationships. Various actors play these roles on the diplomatic stage. This unit examines who these actors are, how they play these roles and why the roles are necessary. Actors on the stage of international diplomacy can be identified as any group of persons, individuals or entities that through their activities influence the operation of diplomatic practices on the international scene. Ojo (1988) suggested that they should be regarded as actors; all individuals, groups and other non-state entities, which independently enter into transactions that have political consequences and at the same time are international in scope.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define the role of actors on the diplomatic stage
- explain the interconnections between political, economic and legal dimensions of diplomacy

- explore the dynamics of contemporary international relations, including forces for change and continuity
- analyse how actors conduct their roles in the international system.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 State

It was until recently states were thought to be the only actors of international diplomacy. This is so because diplomacy as earlier noted comprises any means by which states establish or maintain mutual relationships, communicate with each other. Brownlie 1979 maintains that diplomacy involves the exchange of permanent or at least regular representative that are necessary for states to give substance to their membership of the United Nations (UN) and other major intergovernmental organisations and these representative are in their own right actors since they personify the states.

States personified by the heads are the principal actors of international diplomacy because they are always at the head of any diplomatic intercourse but when they are not so doing, they send individuals who act as embodiment of the head and states as their delegates and representatives. The head appends his signature to, commits the generality of the country. He is assumed a legitimate actor, being an embodiment of the whole people.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Is state a major factor in the diplomatic stage? Discuss.

3.2 State's Foreign Minister

A State's foreign minister is a highly regarded actor on the diplomatic stage. Though he works in consultation with the head of state and others as the case maybe, he is also a principal actor. In traditional autocratic forms of government, he is a trained official belonging to the diplomatic service. He could commit his country into agreements and treaties or even sign laws that govern diplomatic conduct. The foreign minister however deals with normal intercourse between governments; and in this, if he is an amateur or untravelled, he comes easily under the influence of the caste of diplomatists inside his office and his group abroad. Examples of permanent officials such as Sir Eyre Crowe in the British Foreign Office and Baron Von Holstein in the pre war German foreign office often dominated foreign policy was revealed from published foreign office documents. A foreign minister however may

resist or even control such influences if he has political power outside the world of officials. The policy of each minister is delimited not only by influence of professional officials and diplomatists but also by existing treaties and even current negotiations begun by a predecessor even when a change of party in control of the government takes place, the so called continuity of foreign policy holds good to a considerable degree. Other cabinet ministers are also actors when they are entrusted with the responsibility to act in that capacity. In such situations when they enter into agreements, it is assumed to be binding on their states because they are legitimately delegated. Other cabinet ministers are also actors when they are entrusted with the responsibility to act in that capacity. In such situations, whatever they bind is assumed to be binding on their states because they are legitimately delegated. Other cabinet ministers are also actors who are entrusted with responsibility to act in that capacity. In such situations, what they sign is assumed to be binding on their states because they are legitimately delegated.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Define the role of the state's foreign minister on the diplomatic stage.

3.3 Multinational Corporation

Multinational corporations are also actors on the diplomatic stage. They are transnational units that have continued to have significant impact on the international system. These corporations are according to Vernon (1977), clusters of corporations of different nationalities joined together by a parent company through the bonds of common ownership, which respond to a common strategy and draw from a common pool of financial and human resources. They spread across national boundaries linking the assets and activities of different national jurisdictions with an intimacy that seems to threaten the concept of the nation state as a sovereign unit. The amount of wealth these companies have, the magnitude of their operations and their near monopoly of the sensitive technology give them a lot of influence in the world, even more than exerted by many nations' states. They have played significant roles in the strengthening of relations between states. According to Gilpin (1987), American multinational corporations have also been regarded as a tool of diplomacy in most cases to the displeasure of their business leaders. The US government has tried to manipulate the activities of American corporations in order to induce or coerce other government to do its bidding.

The above quotation shows the ability of these corporations to play their part from behind the scenes and use diplomatic subtlety to further their good. Any government that ignores their behind-the-scene influence during certain negotiations does so at her own risk.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Are multinationals influential in the diplomatic stage? Discuss.

3.4 Liberation Movement

Liberation movements are in fact classed as subjects of international law. They have been directly and indirectly involved in diplomatic deals and they can never be ignored. They are not directly involved with the government they want to liberate themselves from, there is always a third (government) sympathetic to their cause who is directly involved. They carry their struggle everywhere and seek diplomatic recognition. For long, the PLO has been accorded observer status at the UN and her representatives accorded some diplomatic privileges. Similarly, the ANC representative enjoyed diplomatic privileges in Africa and some other countries around the world during the Apartheid. They have played a larger role in world politics than is usually acknowledged.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

How relevant are liberation movements in the international arena?

3.5 Non-Governmental Organisation

Non-government organisations (NGOs) of international repute such as Red Cross, Amnesty International, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller foundation and so on are also actors on the diplomatic stage because their reports and activities have caused governments to do something to retrace their steps and actions against their citizens and those of other states. These organisations consist of individuals from various countries who share common interests and concerns. These institutions are non-political; their activities have on several occasions affected the political behaviour of states and other actors in the international system.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

How influential are NGOs as non-state actors in the international system?

3.6 Intergovernmental Organisation

Intergovernmental organisations include such bodies as the UN, African Union (AU), and Organisation of America States. These bodies play major roles in the course of relationship between nations and their representatives are accorded immunities, privileges and protection due for any other diplomat. For instance, the Secretary-General of the UN is a powerful actor on the diplomatic stage. When conventions are fashioned by the body, the instrument of ratification is always deposited by every state with the secretary-general.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

How influential are the intergovernmental organisations in the international system?

3.7 Individuals

Individuals sometimes undertake certain actions without reference to their national government, aimed at influencing the behaviour of other actors. It is on record that James Donovan, a New York Attorney, negotiated the exchange of US pilot, France Gray Powers a convicted spy. The black American activist and Democratic Party nomination contender for the 1984 and 1988 US presidential elections Jesse Jackson negotiated the release of an American pilot whose plane was shot down over Syria controlled positions in Lebanon in early 1984.

The role played by Nelson Mandela in resolving the problem involving Libya, when she was under sanction for refusal to hand over two of her nationals for trial over bombing of an American airliner over Lockerbie is worthy of mention. The suspects were eventually handed over after Mandela's intervention while, he was no longer president of South Africa.

These talented individuals can be regarded as actors on the diplomatic stage because they are capable of influencing diplomatic opinion, which equally depends on the status, granted them by their states and other states.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Are individuals regarded agents of diplomatic stage? Discuss.

3.8 Diplomatic and Consular Officers

Diplomatic and consular officers are also actors on diplomatic stage. A diplomatic agent and his legation personify the state he represents; an act against him is assumed an action against his state. In his position and according to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961, he represents, protects, negotiates, ascertains by lawful means, and promotes the interests of the state. Diplomatic and consular officers play a major role on the diplomatic stage and most often, they have been a target of assassination attempts, kidnap and even murder and thus a subject of diplomatic tussle between nations. For an actor on the diplomatic stage to be able to carry out the functions stated above, he needs some protection.

In furtherance of this, both the 1961, and 1963 Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations all have entries for his privileges and immunities but strictly for the efficient performance of his duties or functions. In this regard, Articles 22,29,30,31 and 33 of the 1961 convention and Articles 27, 31 and 40 of the 1963 convention are relevant. Besides, steps have been taken as to the protection of the international actor especially in the New York Convention on Special Missions 1969 and the Convention on the Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons Including Diplomatic Agents, 1973.

In an address before the American-Japan Society in Tokyo, on November 22, 1938, Joseph C. Grew, US Ambassador to Japan, commenting on the work of the professional diplomat, thus explained the supreme purpose and duty of an ambassador:

He must be, first and foremost, an interpreter, and this function of interpreting acts both ways. First of all he tries to understand the country which he serves –its conditions, its mentality, its actions, and its underlying motives, and to explain these things clearly to his own government. And then, contrariwise, he seeks means of making known to the government and the people of the country to which he is accredited the purposes and hopes and desires of his native land. He is an agent of mutual adjustment between the ideas and forces upon which nations act.

From this statement, it can be held that diplomatic and consular officers have the eyes and ears of their government in other countries. Their functions are to execute the policies of their own country, to protect its interest and nationals, and to keep their government informed of major developments in the world. It is expected that they must have cultivated a wide variety of social contacts, with the ranking officials of the foreign office and of the foreign government in general, with their fellow diplomats, with influential persons in all walks of life, with articulate groups in the country.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Compare and contrast the role of states and diplomatic officers in the international system.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Actors in the diplomatic stage continue to remain a subject of discourse in the international system. They influence the operation of diplomatic practices on the international scene.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, efforts have been made to illustrate few examples of the contemporary individual manoeuvres in their private capacities to influence the course of world politics. The state remains the most consistent and important factor in the international system, the increasing role played by other actors cannot be ignored. It is also true that actions of most of these non-state actors are directly primarily at influencing the actions of government and are therefore important to the extent to which they are able to achieve their aim.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Who are actors on the diplomatic stage?

7.0 FURTHER READING/REFERENCE

Brownlie, I. (1979). *Principles of Public International Law*. London: Oxford Press.

Gilpin, R. (1987.) *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Joseph, G. (1944). *Ten Years in Japan*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ojo, O. (1988). *African International Relations*. New York: Longman.

Sen, B. (1979). *A Diplomatic Handbook of International Law and Practice*. London: Nighoff Publication.

Vernon, R. (1977). *Multinational Business and National Economic Goal*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

UNIT 5 PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Privileges and Immunities
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The previous unit described the role of actors on the diplomatic stage. This unit will look at privileges and immunities of diplomacy. The concept of privileges and immunities is an ancient one as can be seen indicated in the legal opening paragraph of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961, which is, “Recalling that people of all nations from ancient times have recognised the status of diplomatic agents.”

These privileges and immunities as mentioned in paragraph four of the preamble of the same convention is not meant to be benefit of individuals but to ensure efficient performance of their functions. The development of socio-political and economic relations among nations also necessitated the emergence of appropriate law and regulations to guide the actions of diplomats and the receiving states.

The guiding laws of diplomatic and consular relations clearly define, among others, what constitutes immunities and privileges of diplomatic agents and consular officers, as well as their obligation to the receiving states. These immunities and privileges include personal inviolability, immunity from civil and criminal jurisdiction and immunity from taxation and custom duties, among others.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the difference between the concepts of immunities, privileges and facilities, providing examples of each

- describe the legal basis of diplomatic privileges and immunities as it relates to individuals, states and representatives, diplomatic missions, and consular missions
- compare and contrast the privileges and immunities of diplomatic missions and agents with those of consular missions and agents
- explain the theoretical justifications for privileges and immunities and how regulation has evolved.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Privileges and Immunities

Indeed, it is a common saying that no man is an island .It is therefore true in the same vein, that no nation is an island. From these tow symbolical assertions, it can easily be seen why interactions among nations just like interpersonal interactions, are indispensable to human existence. It is this understanding that informed the establishment of diplomatic and consular relations among nations. This art of representation and negotiation is therefore ,as old as social relations which, in fact started as soon as families, clans, tribes and people came into contact with one another and sought to regulate marriage, customs and contracts, hunting trade, navigation communications, disagreements and wars. The 1961 Convention on Diplomatic Relations was created to enable diplomats conduct their duties to enjoy privileges and immunities to respect the laws and regulations of the receiving state and it is expected of them not to interfere in the internal affairs of the receiving state.

As stated in the preamble of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961:

“The purpose of such privileges and immunities is not to benefit individuals but to ensure the efficient performance of the functions of diplomatic missions as representing states.”

The above statement primarily means that these privileges and immunities are accorded diplomats not necessarily for who they are but for what they do. The justification for diplomatic immunity is because the diplomat is a representative of a sovereign or independent state or official of an international organisation. For this reason, he needs an atmosphere free of pressure to operate and negotiate. He may even serve in a country that is not necessarily friendly to his home country. The principles of privileges and immunities as early as 1883 became a principle in the decided case of Fisher vs. Berger; here it was held *inter alia* that the diplomatic documents were properly admitted in evidence.

Any diplomatic privilege that might attach to documents belongs to the ambassador and could not be raised by a Canadian citizen in a criminal proceeding brought against him by his government.

“Privilege” can be defined as a right or immunity granted as a special benefit, advantage or favour, special enjoyment or an exemption from an evil or burden. It can also be conceived as the legal concept of being entitled or authorised to do or not to do something as one pleases. Immunity on the other hand, has been defined by Walker to be “a state of freedom from certain legal rules.” The tasks of the diplomats are such that they need an atmosphere free of pressure and undue interruption to be effective. Based on this, international law has vested on them certain privileges and immunities which states are bound to observe, to facilitate the performance of diplomats within their territories.

The duty, which the receiving state owes under international law as regards the inviolability of diplomatic premises and the jurisdictional immunity of foreign representatives, is definite enough; manifestation of that duty however, is to be found in a municipal context. In the event of a breach of the duty, the sending state may have recourse through diplomatic channels to an official protest, and even possibly submission of a claim for reparation. The receiving state is required to ensure that the standards set by international law are met and may employ for the purpose whatever means or combination of means it chooses, whether administrative, legislative or judicial. As Satow puts it, the immunities and privileges of diplomatic agents extend to exemption from criminal, civil police, fiscal and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

The concept of privileges and immunities can be understood as explained by the following theories:

- 1) The theory of extra territoriality
- 2) The theory of representation
- 3) The theory of functional necessity

The Theory of Extra Territoriality

The theory of extra –territoriality emerged with the emergency of modern states in the international system. This was a time states set up permanent foreign missions. The implication is that the setting up of a foreign mission means the extension of a state’s territory in the land. The police in the receiving state have no right to enter the premises except with the permission of the head of mission (Article 22 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961).

This theory is based on two different and yet related legal fictions. These are:

- 1) The concept of territory where the diplomatic premises is considered as part and parcel of the territory of the sending state and
- 2) The concept of residence, which holds that the diplomat is not subject to local laws of the receiving state but he is residing in his own territory.

In the words of Satow, the term “extra –territoriality” is used to denote the immunities accorded to foreign sovereigns and to diplomatic agents...it is more in accordance with the actual position to interpret it as denoting that he is not subject to the authority or jurisdiction of the state to which he is accredited.

The Theory of Representation

The theory of representation emphasises that a diplomat is a personification of a sovereign state and therefore, if attacked, a sovereign state is attacked. According to Satow, these immunities are founded on common usage and tacit consent; they are essential to the conduct of relations between sovereign independent states. They are given on the understanding that they are reciprocally accorded, and their infringement by a state would lead to protest by the diplomatic body resident therein and would prejudicially affect its own representation abroad.

Satow’s view above does not only confirm the relevance of privileges and immunities in diplomatic and consular practice in a changing world but also introduces the concept of reciprocity, which is seen to be an effective tool for the enforcement of diplomatic and consular law. The theory of representation receives credence in the case of *Bergman vs. Desieyes* where it was held that a foreign minister enroute his post in another country is entitled to innocent passage through a third country, and is entitled to the same immunity from jurisdiction of the courts of a third country that he could have if he were resident therein.

The Theory of Functional Necessity

This theory is based on the fact that the independence of a state requires freedom of movement and communication for her diplomats in foreign territories to be effective. The interacting states are independent and sovereign, but far apart. According to Rebecca Wallace, diplomatic privileges and immunities have, as their *raison d'être* a functional objective the purpose of such privilege and immunities is not to benefit individuals but to ensure the efficient performance of the functions of diplomatic missions and representing states. This view emphasise that if states must interact, maintain their sovereignty and independence, diplomats will have to do it on their behalf. For them to be able to do this, they need privileges and immunities.

The duty, which the receiving state owes under international law as regards the inviolability of diplomatic premises and the jurisdictional immunity of foreign representatives, is definite enough; manifestation of that duty however, is to be found in a municipal context. Therefore, in the event of a breach of the duty, the sending state may have recourse through diplomatic channels to an official protest and even possibly the submission of a claim for reparation. The receiving state is required to ensure that the standards set by international law are met and may employ for the purpose whatever means or combination of means it chooses, whether administrative legislative or judicial. These restrictions placed on envoys to make up that body of international and national law known as diplomatic privileges and immunities.

The privileges and immunities of diplomats have been codified in several conventions some of these are:

- 1) The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961
- 2) The Vienna Convention on Consular Relations 1963
- 3) The Convention on Special Missions 1969
- 4) Privileges and Immunities of the UN 1946
- 5) Privileges and Immunities of Special Agencies 1947
- 6) Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons including Diplomatic Agents 1973

International law has provided for the personal inviolability of diplomats who shall also not be liable to arrest or detention. This protection extends to his private residence, his papers, correspondence and his property.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Privileges and immunities are meant for diplomats.
Discuss.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Privileges and immunities are extending to diplomats and consular officers who enable them carry out their duties satisfactorily, they must be free of certain restrictions, which local laws would otherwise impose. They enjoy exemption from direct taxes and customs duties, from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the countries to which they are accredited and in fact from the laws of the foreign state in general. They themselves their families and members of their staff are personally untouchable.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed what privileges and immunities are in diplomacy. We have looked at the definitions given by some authors. This is an important aspect guides for the diplomat in the conduct of relations when serving abroad.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Compare and contrast the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963 and the Convention on Special Missions 1969.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Encyclopedia Britannica (1968)

Hardy, M. (1968). *Modern Diplomatic Law Great*. Britain: Butler and Tanner Limited.

Satow, E (1959) *.Guide to Diplomatic Practice*. London: Longman Group.

US District of Southern District of New York 30, 1946.

Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961.

Walker, D. (1980). *The Oxford Companion to Law*. London: Clarendon Press.

Wallace, R. (1986). *International Law*. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
Webster New International Dictionary (3rd ed.).

MODULE 2 UNDERSTANDING AMERICAN DIPLOMACY

Unit 1	The Context of American Diplomacy
Unit 2	The United States of America and the First World War
Unit 3	The United States of America and the Second World War
Unit 4	The Rise of the United States of America

UNIT 1 THE CONTEXT OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction
2.0	Objectives
3.0	Main Content
3.1	The Nature of American Diplomacy
3.2	The Meaning of American Diplomacy
3.3	The Scope of American Diplomacy
3.4	Responsibility for the Conduct of American Diplomacy
4.0	Conclusion
5.0	Summary
6.0	Tutor-Marked Assignment
7.0	References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit forms the bedrock upon which other subsequent units and modules are hinged, and therefore demands that you give it the attention it deserves. Our major focus for this unit is American diplomacy. Diplomacy is a tool used by countries to advance their interest through peaceful means. Countries have used it as a form of instrument to interact among themselves. Diplomacy provides a means by which government learns about, speaks to, and negotiates with other powers. The diplomacy of the United States (US) like that of any state is shaped by political, economic, social and technological goals. America's past leaders see diplomacy as the proper way for independent nations to interact with each other. While this is true, America also believes in permanent and ad-hoc diplomacy, which is carried out by competent people and not left in the hands of every citizen. In this unit, you will be exposed to the meaning of American diplomacy in the 20th century; its scope and relevance.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- analyse how nations conduct their relations
- discuss the present state of the world and embark on the general survey of existing conditions and trends
- discuss the paradoxes, inconsistencies and conflicting trends that confront learners in international relations
- evaluate the basis of American diplomacy.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Nature of American Diplomacy

American diplomacy is diplomacy like any other practiced in the world. It may enjoy peculiarities in approach but the result is usually the same. Diplomacy entails negotiation and the end result is achieving objectives through peaceful means.

3.2 The Meaning of American Diplomacy

The foreign policy of the US is the policy by which she interacts with foreign nations and sets standards of interaction for its organisations, corporations and her citizens. The US is highly influential in the world. The US Secretary of State is the foreign minister and is officially charged with the state-to-state diplomacy. The president has ultimate authority over foreign policy, which includes defining the national interest of his country. Nicolson (1939) defines diplomacy as the process by which governments, act through official agents, communicate with one another; the second, of broader scope, refers to modes or techniques of foreign policy affecting the international system.

According to Satow (1917), “in the past it was believed that the narrower notion of diplomacy embraced all official contacts and connections of a peaceful nature between state units.” Concisely, diplomacy refers specifically to the use of accredited officials for intergovernmental communication, not simply to communication links between states.

According to Nicholson (1963), diplomacy is the management of international relations by negotiations. As soon as negotiation drops from such relations, diplomacy essentially takes a back seat. Very often, people confuse warfare with diplomacy of another kind. This perspective is erroneous. Admittedly, conflict is inevitable, and it is the

very reason why diplomacy is relevant in international relations. Conflict creates a base for diplomacy on one hand, achieving objectives of states through peaceful means is another base on the other hand. Nations do not have the same strength: militarily, politically, economically and even culturally. To relate, equals and non-equals need to do so in peace and that is, negotiation being preferred to aggression and warfare.

When negotiations breakdown and armed conflict takes over, diplomacy has failed. While armed conflict necessitates diplomacy at a very high level to resolve the crisis peacefully, armed conflict is not diplomacy and vice-versa. The UN charter provides for peaceful coexistence of member nations in its Articles 2 (3) and 2(4). This the charter says can be achieved by using peaceful means in international relations. This forms the basis for diplomacy in the charter. The charter specifically talks about pacific settlement of disputes. This is achieved through the instrumentality of diplomacy. International law is aware of this provision and accordingly gives a lot of protection to those chosen by states to play these vital roles of representation and negotiation both in permanent and ad-hoc diplomacy. Diplomacy can involve formal or informal negotiations. These negotiations can be conducted with the full knowledge of the world or in secret. It can be conducted on a bilateral basis between states, or on a multilateral basis involving three or more states.

National diplomats serve as communication links between their country and the rest of the world. As one scholar puts it, "Diplomats not only seek to represent their states to the world, but also seek to represent the world back to their respective states with the objective of keeping the whole ensemble together" (Sharp 1999:33).

Traditional diplomacy focused on the national interest. Writing in the 1400s Venetian Ambassador Ermola .O Barbaro asserted that "the first duty of an ambassador is ...to do, say, advice and think whatever may best serve the preservation and aggrandisement of his own state" (Craig and George 1995). According to Barston (2006) in *Modern Diplomacy*, "Diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of groups or states. It usually refers to international diplomacy, the conduct of international relations through the intercession of professional diplomats with regard to issues of peace-making, trade, war, economics, culture, environment and human rights". Diplomacy does not occur in a vacuum; rather, it is set in the international system in a specific diplomatic environment (hostile adversarial, coalition and mediation diplomacy) and in a domestic context. Diplomacy is a communication process that has three main

elements. The first is negotiating through direct or indirect discussions between two or more countries. The second is signaling. The third is public diplomacy.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Define American diplomacy.

3.3 The Scope of American Diplomacy

The US practices diplomacy by sending ambassadors abroad and making treaties with nations. Her first priority is to preserve and strengthen the position of her country as an independent and sovereign nation. In the Declaration of Independence, the US staked its claim “to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and God entitled to them.” Who is responsible in the conduct of American diplomacy?

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Write brief notes on the scope of American diplomacy that you have learnt.

3.4 Responsibility for the Conduct of American Diplomacy

There is the shared responsibility between the president and the senate giving them shared authority over the making of treaties and the extension of diplomatic recognition to other nations. The US constitution gives the Senate the power of advice and consent on treaties, which the president is responsible for negotiating. The Senate has the power of “advice and consent” in the appointment of ambassadors nominated by the president.

The president is thus the nation’s chief diplomat and the state department is his executing agency in the conduct of American diplomacy.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

How do nations engage themselves in the international system?

4.0 CONCLUSION

Diplomacy remains a tool, which countries use to advance their interest. Diplomacy continues to prove a means through which governments interact with other powers. The Diplomacy of the US like that of any state is shaped by political, economic, social and technological goals. American leaders believe that diplomacy remains the tool for independent nations to interact with each other. America believes that diplomacy should not be left for diplomats but that her citizenry should also have a role to play in promoting her country's values. Many scholars move back and forth between on the definition of diplomacy. However, diplomacy will continue to remain a tool in international politics.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed what American diplomacy is. You learnt that American diplomacy is the conducts of her relations with other nations. We also looked at different definitions of diplomacy by various authors. Diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of groups. The US Congress and the president are involved in the conduct of American diplomacy. American diplomacy is not conducted in isolation her ambassadors are sent abroad to make treaties with other nations.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss the relevance of the study of American diplomacy to you.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Arthur, A. (1966). *Ideas, Ideas and American Diplomacy: A History of Their Growth and Interaction*. New York: Meredith Publishing Co.

Barston, R. (2006). *Modern Diplomacy*. (3rd ed.). London: Longman Group.

Fareed, Z. (1999). *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual origins of America's World Role*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gasiokwu, M. U., et al. (1997). *Contemporary Issues and Basic Documents on Diplomatic and Consular Law*. Nigeria: Mono Expressions Limited.

- Glenn, P. (1996). *American Foreign Policy: Past Present, Future*. (3rd ed.). USA: Prentice Hall.
- Gordon, A. (1995). *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of our Time*. (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University.
- Gore-Booth (1979). *Satow's Guide to Diplomatic Practice*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hardy, M. (1968). *Modern Diplomatic Practice*. Great Britain: Butler and Tanner Limited.
- Johnson, E. A. (1967). *The Dimension of Diplomacy*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Mccormick, J. (2010). *American Foreign Policy and Process*. (5th ed.). USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Nicholas, O. (2008). *The New World of International Relations* .(7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Hall.
- Nicholson, H. (1963). *Diplomacy*. (3rd ed.). London: Oxford University Press.
- Nicolson, H. (1939). *1964 Diplomacy*. (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nicolson, H. (1962). *Evolution of Diplomatic Methods*. New York: Stevens and Sons Limited.
- Rourke, J. (2001). *International Politics on the world Stage*. (8th ed.). USA: McGraw-Hill Dushkin.
- Satow, M. (1917). *1962 A Guide to Diplomatic Practice*. (4th ed.). Edited by Neville Bland .London: Longman
- Sen, B. (1979). *Diplomatic Handbook of International Law and Practice*. London: Longman Group.
- Sharp, P. (1999). "For Diplomacy: Representation and the Study of International Relations" *International Studies Review*, 1:33-58.

UNIT 2 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE FIRST WORLD WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Meaning of the First World War
 - 3.2 The Role of the United States of American in the First World War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

You must have read the second unit of this module. If you have, then I believe you must have known what American diplomacy is. This unit is the third among the four constituent units of this module. Our discussion in this unit focuses on how America worked to stop the war through negotiation and other peaceful means. It is important to note that diplomacy is a foreign policy tool used by states to resolve conflict.

The US was unprepared for its entrance into the First World War (World War I). When the European continent erupted in conflict in 1914, President Wilson declared Americans' neutrality. He proposed an even – handed approach towards all the belligerents that was to be maintained in both “thought and deed.” The president maintained his hope of a peaceful solution to the conflict despite protestations of those (including former President Roosevelt) convinced that events in Europe would draw America into the war. The First World War formerly called the Great War was a major war centered in Europe, which began in the summer of 1914 and lasted until November 1918. It involved all of the world's great powers at that time.

They were assembled in two opposing alliances; it involved all of the world's great powers assembled in two opposing alliances: the Allies (Centered on the Triple Entente) and the Central powers. More than 70 million military personnel including 60 million Europeans were mobilised in one of the largest wars in history. More than nine million combatants were killed largely because of great technological advances in firepower without corresponding advances in mobility. It was the second deadliest conflict in the Western history.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- develop and refine the vital skills employed in the study of international relations
- explain the interconnections between political, economic and legal institutional dimensions of war
- discuss ideas, theories and information by oral and written means
- explain a survey of key events in America's relations with the rest of the world, with specific focus on the interplay between domestic pressures and external threats.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Meaning of the First World War

The First World War was a major war centered in Europe. It began on 28 July 1914 and lasted until November 11 1918. It involved all the world's powers, which were assembled in two opposing alliances: the Allies and the Central Powers .However 70 million military personnel including 60 million Europeans were mobilised, which was the largest wars in history. More than nine million combatants were killed because of great technological advances in firepower corresponding advances in mobility around the world. The assassination on June 28 1914 of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, was the proximate trigger of the war.

3.2 The Role of the United States of America in the First World War

The US during the course of First World War pursued a policy of non-intervention avoiding conflict while trying to broker a peace. A German U-boat sank the British Liner Lusitania in 1915 which carried 128 Americans aboard. The then US President, Woodrow Wilson vowed, "America is too proud to fight" and demanded an end to attacks on passenger ships. Germany complied. Wilson tried to mediate a settlement. He repeatedly warned that the US would not tolerate unrestricted submarine warfare in violation of international law and US idea of human rights. Wilson was under pressure from former President Theodore Roosevelt who denounced German acts as "Piracy." His desire to have a seat at negotiations at war end to advance the League of Nations also played a role.

In January 1917, Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare. The German Foreign Minister in his Zimmermann Telegram told Mexico that US entry was likely once unrestricted submarine warfare began; it thus invited Mexico to join the war as Germany's ally against the US. In return, the Germans would send Mexico money and help it recover the territories of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona that Mexico lost during the Mexican American war 70 years earlier. The President released the note to the public and American saw it as a *Casus belli*- a cause of war. He went before the congress, announcing the break in official relations with Germany on February 3 1917. The sinking of seven US merchant ships by submarines and publications of the Zimmerman telegram triggered the war on Germany, which the US congress declared on 6 April 1917.

The Allies looked up to America with the expectation that the industrial strength of the US would replenish the supply of war material necessary for victory. In most cases, these expectations were unrealistic. The US has not up to 800 airplanes prior to 1917. The French Premier called on the US to produce 2,000 airplanes per month. In addition, the Allies expected US to provide manpower for various divisions. America finally accepted to lend its forces. The President appointed General John J. Pershing with the mandate to cooperate with Allied forces under the following provision that the forces of the US are a separate and distinct component of the combined forces the identity of which must be preserved.

This means there would be no interference of American soldiers into the British and French armies as the Allied Commanders had expected. The US would fight under its own flag and its own leadership. This proved to be a cause of disagreement among the Allies for the rest of the war. However, American troops never found it easy in terms of materials and men. They were able to send the Germans packing and the head of the German Army, General Ludendorff was forced to resign and fled to Sweden. On November 11 1918, Germany signed an armistice ending the war.

With the end of the war in 1918, Germany wished to forget Europe's troubles and return to "the good old days." Congress did reject Wilson's call for participation in the League of Nations. The nation turned inward again. This remained unchallenged until Hitler's grab for European domination some 20 years later.

3.3 The Aftermath of the War

The effects of the war were the expansion of governmental powers and responsibilities in Britain, France, the US, and the dominions of the British Empire. In order to harness all the power of their societies, new government ministries and powers were created. New taxes were levied and laws enacted, all designed in France and Russia, in neutral Netherlands, and in the main three central powers. Britain was said to have cashed in its extensive investments in American railroads and borrowed extensively on Wall Street. President Wilson in late 1916 allowed a great increase in US government lending to the Allies.

The war had some economic consequences of the 60 million European soldiers who were mobilised from 1914-1918, eight million were killed, seven million were permanently disabled, and 15 million were seriously injured. Germany lost 15.1 per cent of its active male population, Austria Hungary lost 17.1 per cent and France lost 10.5 per cent.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Why did the US Congress support American participation in World War1?

4.0 CONCLUSION

The US intervention in the war as well as the Wilson administration became unpopular. This reflected in the US Senate's rejection of the Versailles Treaty and membership in the League of Nations. In the interwar period, a consensus arose that US intervention was a mistake and congress passed laws in an attempt to preserve US neutrality in any future conflict. Polls taken in 1937 and the opening months of World War Two established 60 per cent regarding the intervention as a mistake with only 28 per cent opposing that view.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you learnt that the First World War was a major war centered in Europe. It involved all the world's powers, which assembled in two opposing alliances: the Allies and the powers. You also learnt that 70 million personnel including 60 million Europeans, were mobilised which was the largest wars in history. However, more than nine million combatants were killed, because of great technological advances in firepower corresponding advances in mobility around the world.

The United States of America never had the intention of participating in the First World War, rather prefer to play a mediating role in the war. However when her citizens were killed in a British Liner Lusitania in 1915, the US became involved in the war. She led other allies against Germany and emerged victoriously.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What motivated American policy makers to abandon isolationism?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Brands, H. (1997). *T. R.: The Last Romantic*. New York: Basic Books.

Falls, C. (1960). *The First World War*. London: Longman Group.

Gale, W. (1950). "American Foreign Policy: Using the Past to Move Forward." *The American Scholar Summer*.

Gilbert, M. (2004). *The First World War: A Complete History*. Clearwater, Florida: Owl Books.

Heyman, N. (1997). *World War I: Guides to Historic Events of the Twentieth Century*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Karp, W. (1979). *The Politics of War*.

Keegan, J. (1998). *The First World War*. USA: Hutchinson.

Kennedy, D. (2004). *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*. London: Oxford University Press.

Lyons, M. (1999). *World War I: A Short History*. (2nd ed.). USA: Prentice Hall.

Martel, G. (2003). *The Origins of the First World War*. London: Pearson Longman, Harlow.

Meyer, G. (2006). *A World Undone: The Story of the Great War 1914 to 1918*. USA: Random House.

Millett, A. R. & Murray, W. (1988). *Military Effectiveness*. Boston: Allen Unwin.

Norman, S., et al. (1947). *A Cutz Rebuilding the World Economy*. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund.

Prior, R. (1999). *The First World War*. London: Cassel.

Tuchman, B. W. (1966). *The Zimmerman Telegram*. (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Wilmot, H. P. (2003). *World War I*. New York: Dorling Kindersley.

UNIT 3 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE SECOND WORLD WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Meaning of the Second World War
 - 3.2 The Role of the United States of America in the Second World War
 - 3.3 The Aftermath of the Second World War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The previous unit described the role the United States of America (US) played in the First World War. This unit will look at the role of the US in the Second World War. Each of these wars exemplified the failure of diplomacy at least while they lasted.

Second World War (World War II) was a global military conflict, which started from 1939 to 1945. It involved most of the world's nations including all of the great powers: eventually forming two opposing military alliances, the Allies, which comprises of the Soviet Union, US, China, France Poland and the Axis, which comprises Germany, Japan, Italy, Hungary and Romania. It was the most widespread war in history, with more than 100 million military personnel mobilised. In a state of war, the major participants placed their entire economic, industrial, and scientific capabilities at the service of the war effort, erasing the distinction between civilian and military resources. This was marked by significant events involving the mass death of civilians, including the Holocaust and the use of nuclear weapons in warfare. It was the deadliest conflict in human history resulting in 50 million to over 70 million fatalities. In this unit, we will be able to know the US involvement in the Second World War.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss the political, social, economic and cultural history of the Second World War
- state the dynamics of contemporary international relations including forces of change and continuity
- explain ideas, theories and information by oral and written means
- distinguish key events in America's relations with the rest of the world with specific focus on the interplay between domestic pressures and external threats.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Meaning of the Second World War

The Second World War was a global military conflict lasting from 1939 to 1945. It involved most of the nations including all of the great powers. There were two opposing military alliances, the allies and axis powers. Major participants placed their entire economic, industrial, and scientific capabilities at the service of the war effort, erasing the distinction between civilian and military resources.

3.2 The role of the United States of America in the Second World War

The Second World War (World War II) is a good example of how war made diplomacy very necessary. Rather than fight, diplomacy makes more sense to negotiate to achieve yet peaceful results. It will be erroneous to assume that war is diplomacy. It is not, though it makes way for diplomacy to prevail. After the World War I, most Americans concluded that participating in international affairs had been a policy loss. They sought peace through isolation and throughout the 1920s advocated a policy of disarmament and non-intervention.

As Europe was becoming tensed, US continued to hold to its isolationist policy. The Congress, with the approval of Roosevelt and Secretary of the State, Cordell Hull, enacted a series of neutrality laws that legislated against the factors that took the US into World War I despite the role of other countries at that time. US congress passed the Neutrality Act of 1935, on the shipment of arms to either aggressor or victim. The Neutrality Act had been enforced until when the Japanese's aircraft sank a US gunboat in the Yangtze River, thoughts of reprisal were stifled by public apathy and by Japan's offer of apologies and indemnities. With

strong public opposition to foreign interventions, the US focused on regional defence, with concentration on the navy and signing mutual security agreements with other governments in the North and South America.

The Second World War began on September 1, 1939, with the invasion of Poland by Germany and Slovakia. Germany's invasion of Poland sparked off World War II. Roosevelt called the congress into special session to revise the Neutrality Act to allow belligerents (Great Britain and France-both in the allied side) to purchase arms on a "cash and carry basis." With the fall of France to Germany in June 1940, Roosevelt with heavy public support threw the resources of the US behind the British. He ordered the war and navy departments to re-supply British divisions that had been rescued at Dunkirk, and in September of that year he agreed to exchange 50 obsolescent destroyers for 99 year leases on eight British naval and air bases in the western hemisphere.

The questions raised were how much and what type of additional aid should be given. It became a campaign issue in the election of 1940, in which Roosevelt ran for an unprecedented third term. With his return to office, Roosevelt continued to assist the allies in one way or the other but was careful enough not to participate in the war. US entry into World War II seemed inevitable in 1941 it was still the subject of great debate. Isolationism was a great political tool, and many influential individuals were determined that US aid policy stop war. Not until 1941 it became a subject of great debate that there was the need for the US to move from isolationism.

The war question was resolved with the events in the Pacific. The US was supporting China in its war against Japan, yet it continued to sell Japan products and commodities essential to the Japanese war effort. In July 1940, the US applied an embargo on the sale of aviation gas, lubricants, and prime scrap metal to Japan. When Japanese armies invaded French Indochina in September with the purpose of establishing bases for an attack on the East Indies, the US struck back by embargoing all types of scrap iron and steel and by extending a loan to China. Japan retaliated by signing a limited treaty of alliance, the tripartite pact, with Germany and Italy.

Roosevelt extended a much larger loan to China and in December embargoed iron ore, pig iron, and a variety of other products. Japan and the US entered into complex negotiations in the spring of 1941. Neither of the two countries-Japan and Germany would compromise on China; however, Japan refusing to withdraw and the US insisting upon it. Believing that Japan intended to attack the East Indies, the US stopped

exporting oil to Japan at the end of the summer. These resulted to Japan action in eliminating the US Pacific Fleet and conquered Southeast Asia, they becoming self- sufficient in crude oil and other vital resources.

In November 1941, Roosevelt and his military advisers got information of a possible military attack on her soil they expected it to be against the East Indies or the Philippines. To their astonishment, On December 7 Japan launched a surprise attack on the American naval and air base in Pearl Harbor, Oahu Island, Hawaii, citing America's recent trade embargo as justification.

In the attack, the Japanese aircraft destroyed 18 ships of war at Pearl Harbor, including the entire battleship force and 347 planes. Total US casualties amounted to 2,403 dead and 1,178 wounded making the failure of all negotiations. The following day, Franklin Roosevelt successfully urged a joint session of the Congress to declare war on Japan, calling December 7, 1941 "a date which will live in infamy." Following the attack on Pearl Harbor, on December 8, 1941, the Congress with one dissenting vote declared war against Japan. Three days later, Germany and Italy declared war against US. The bombing of the Pearl Harbor signaled the death of isolationism for the US. The US dropped the atomic bomb during World War II on Hiroshima, Japan, August 6, 1945. In the following months, the German armed forces collapsed and on 7 May, all German forces surrendered.

The war ended with the total victory of the Allies over Germany and Japan in 1945. World War II altered the political alignment and social structure of the world. The United Nations (UN) was established to foster international cooperation and prevent future conflicts. The Soviet Union and the US emerged as rival superpowers, setting the stage for the Cold War, which lasted for the next 46 years. Meanwhile, the influence of European great powers started to decline, while the decolonisation of Asia and Africa began. Most countries whose industries had been damaged moved towards economic recovery. Political integration, especially in Europe emerged as an effort to stabilise postwar relations.

3.3 The Aftermath of the Second World War

The Second World War provided the impetus for change. It was truly a global and brutal war, and one of its major "innovations" was to extend what the American General, William Tecumseh Sherman called "the hard hand of war" during the civil war to civilian populations. The allies discussed the problem throughout the war. The first formal subject was the Moscow declaration of 1943, which stated that Nazi officials guilty of atrocities, massacres and executions would be sent to the countries in

which they committed their crimes for trial and appropriate punishment. The global economy suffered heavily from the war; however, the World War II participants were affected differently. The US emerged much richer than any other nation; it had a baby boom and by 1950, its gross domestic product (GDP) per person was much higher than that of any of the other powers; thus, the US dominated the world economy.

The UK and United States pursued a policy of industrial disarmament in Western Germany in the years 1945-1948. Dependency on international trade led to European economic stagnation and delayed European recovery for several years. Recovery started in the mid-1948 currency reform in Western Germany, and was fastened up with the liberalisation of European economic policy that the Marshall plan (1948-1951) both directly and indirectly caused.

The post 1948 West Germany was called the German economic miracle. In addition, the Italian and French economies picked up. However, the UK was in a state of economic ruin, and continued relative economic decline for decades. The Soviet Union, despite enormous human and material losses, also experienced rapid increase in production in the immediate post-war era. The war can be identified to varying degrees as the catalyst for many continents, national and local phenomena such as the redrawing of European borders, the birth of the UK welfare state, the communist revolution in China and Eastern Europe, the creation of Israel and the division of Germany and Korea and Vietnam. In addition, many international organisations have roots in the Second World War, for example the UN, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). A multi-polar world was replaced by a bipolar one dominated by the two powerful victors, the US and Soviet Union which became known as super powers.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the role of public opinion on US involvement in the Second World War.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The US was able to emerge victorious after the Second World War. She became richer than any other nation. The US experienced a baby boom during this period and by 1950, her GDP per person was higher than that of any other nations. It dominated world economy.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that Second World War was a global military conflict lasting from 1939 to 1945, which involved most of the nations including all of the great powers eventually forming two opposing military alliances, the Allies and Axis. Major participants placed their entire economic, industrial and scientific capabilities during this period.

Most Americans felt that participating in international affairs had been a policy loss with the experience of the First World War. Taken into consideration the number of men and materials lost during the war. The US government saw the need to focus more on rebuilding their country then external engagement. The attack from Japan resulted to policy shift of isolation to engagement.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Explain the actions of the USA in the Second World War.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Adamthwaite, A. (1992). *The Making of the Second World War*. New York: Routledge.

Bradley, J. et al. (2000). *Flags of Our Fathers*. New York: Bantam.

Bullock, A. A. (1962). *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*. United Kingdom: Books.

Dornbusch, R., et al. (1993). *Postwar Economic Reconstruction and Lessons for the East Today*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

James S., et al. (2000). (Eds.). *The Good War: Readings in the History of World War II*. New York: Forbes Publishing.

Kitson, A. (2001). *Germany 1858–1990: Hope, Terror, and Revival*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murray, W., et al. (2001). *A War to be Won: Fighting the Second World War*. Harvard University Press.

- Nicholas, B. (1964) "Germany under Direct Controls: Economic Aspects of Industrial Disarmament 1945-1948", New York: Rutgers University Press.
- Shaw, A. (2000). *World War II Day by Day*. USA: MBI Publishing Company.
- Somerville, D. (2008). *The Complete Illustrated History of World War Two: An Authoritative Account of the Deadliest Conflict in Human History with Analysis of Decisive Encounters and Landmark Engagements*. United Kingdom: Lorenz Books.
- Vladimir, P. (1967). *Money and Conquest; Allied Occupation Currencies in World War II*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Weinberg, G. L. (1995). *A World at Arms: A Global History of World War II*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zalampas, M. (1989). *Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich in American magazines, 1923–1939*. Bowling Green University Popular Press.

UNIT 4 THE RISE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Rise of the United States of America
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit, you were introduced to the role of the United States of America (US) in the Second World War. This unit will further look at how America emerged as a super power after the First and Second World War. The focus of this unit is to examine the factors that contribute to US as a super power.

In its earliest years, the US has behaved as a global power, keeping an eye on the evolution of the global system and serving the world internationally with its military even though it has not always been capable of dispatching great fleets and mighty armies to every corner of the planet. The US has not always boasted about being the world's largest or most influential economy. She has always regarded trade in global terms, generally nudging the world towards economic integration. The US ideology has always been global, which is why the poet Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote of the first shot in the American Revolution as "the shot heard round the world" and as such, Americans have always thought that their religion and political value should prevail over the globe. In this unit, we will look at the factors that contribute to the rise of the US.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the factors that contributed to the US becoming a super power in the 20th century
- discuss the importance of political, economic, technology, military goals in accessing how powerful a nation is
- develop critical thinking skills, relating to decision making

- define the US relation with the world.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Rise of the United States of America

The end of the Second World War saw the collapse of the British Empire. The US foreign policy makers were faced with three options, 1) assist the British Empire, 2) ignore the problem and let the rest of the world go about its business 3) replace Britain and take on the task of enforcing world order. The US tried all the three options, ultimately taking Britain's place as the next super power, therefore shifting from "Pax Britannica" to "Pax Americana."

The US emerged as hegemony at the end of the Second World War. After the Second World War, the US promoted a diversity of institutions spanning the political, economic and security fields; a project that has been described as "remarkable and unprecedented". US officials, we are told, made a self-conscious effort to infuse their creation with a sense of legitimacy and reciprocal consent. This effort can be discerned in particular strategies of delegation, for example under the Marshall plan, when "the US self-consciously attempted to hand over its planning initiative to the European themselves" (Calleo, 1987).

It was not the series of institutions created in the second half of the 1940s possible only because a group of states had already accepted hegemony as the basic organising principle for their sphere of international society. It was within this constituency of allies and only there that the US hegemony came to enjoy reasonable certainly not absolute consent and acceptability. There remains something very distinctive about American action within this post-1945 Western system; it enjoyed recognition not by all the other great powers or by international society in general but only from within its coalitional group.

The rise of the US to superpower status followed from this global outlook. Super power can be defined as a state of a dominant position in the international system, which has the ability to influence events, and its own interests and project power on a world scale to protect their interests. Professor Alice Lyman Miller (Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School), defines a superpower as a country that has the capacity to project dominating power and influence anywhere in the world, and sometimes, in more than one region of the globe at a time, and so may plausibly attain the status of global hegemony. In the opinion of Professor Paul Dukes (2010), "a

superpower must be able to conduct a global strategy including the possibility of destroying the world; to command vast economic potential and influence; and to present a universal ideology.”

The rise of the US can be measured along five axes of power: military, economic, political, Technology and cultural.

Political

As a political power, the US exerted her influence as the founding nation of the UN which came into existence on October 24, 1945 when the Charter was ratified by the Republic of China, France, the Soviet Union, the UK, the US as well as a majority of other signatories.

The US is a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council. One of her states hosts the United Nations headquarters. Almost all countries have embassies in Washington and consulates around the country. The US is a superpower with influence in most international organisations around the world. The US also has strong ties with the Western Europe, Latin America, Commonwealth of Nations, and several East Asian countries. She is also home to many large global corporations.

The US also contributed to the Bretton Woods Conference. The goal of the conference was to create a new international monetary and trade regime, which would be stable and predictable. The new system opened world markets, promoted a liberal economy and was implemented through different institutions such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. As already mentioned, the US political goals include the acquisition of statehood and independence, legal recognition by others security and survival, peace power and influence. The US is the fourth largest country in the world (after the Soviet Union, Canada & China), with an area of approximately 9.37 million km². Her democracy had constitutional guarantees for freedom of speech and she allowed the existence of private mass media organs in the hands of civil society where virtually everything is published.

Economic

The US economic relations include, among other things, trade, aid, loan investments, money, balances of payments, trade and other forms of economic activity. Her economy is based on free market economic theory based on supply and demand. She believes that the subsistence of a people is the primary economic goal of her government. She has

sought economic cooperation with other nation in order to enhance her economic status. Her production is determined by customers' demands.

In conclusion, the US is by far the largest economy in the world. She has large resources of minerals, energy resources, metals and timber. Her economy boasts of a larger industrial base. The US dollar was the world dominant reserve currency under Bretton Woods Conference. She supported allied countries' economies via such programmes as the Marshal Plan.

Military

Military goals are part of the larger political and economic strategy of nations. It is of interest to note that the US is the world's formidable military power. Her military power has the ability to project power around the world. In reality, this requires not only a strong land army but also the air and sealift capabilities to deploy and supply that military in furtherance of national interests as well as public support for doing so. The US has a strong land army. She can boast of both air and sealift capabilities to deploy and supply her military .The emergence of the US as a military power can be traced to the Cold War era, when her army launched an artificial earth satellite in 1958 second to the Soviet Union who launched theirs in 1957. She was the first country to have nuclear weapons and used atomic bombs as seen during the Second World War where US bombed Japan. It went ahead to develop a new kind of atomic bomb called the hydrogen bomb. This was more powerful than the regular atomic bombs.

The creation of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) in 1949 during the Cold War period was a major step for the US towards becoming a military power. The US has one of the largest army in the world, one of the two largest and most advanced, air forces in the world. She has military allies in Western Europe (NATO) with their own nuclear weapons.

Cultural

Cultural relations take place not only because of direct and conscious policies formulated by government but also because people wish to interact with each other in a number of ways. Private citizens, business and governments relate to each other within a transitional community. Among the mutual communications among people and states are the ideological, behavioural, ethical, and value patterns transmitted by international contact through governmental programmes, cross-cultural

relations among those in the arts, the humanities, sciences business and religion.

Clearly among the cultural goals of the US are mutual friendship, understanding, prestige and emulation. The US has been able to pursue them with vigor.

Technology

The US has for long had a reputation as a pioneer ingenious technology from incandescent lights, sewing machines, and cotton gins to telephones, television equipment, computers, airplanes and spaceships. She has contributed to the world body of scientific and technological knowledge range from discoveries about subatomic particles. Earthquake prediction, clues to the origin and evolution of the sun and the planets to breakthroughs in the fight against cancer and heart disease, organ transplantation and substitution, genetic research and new sources of energy. Over the years, the US has been known for her contributions to research in basic and applied science.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Is the US a super power? Discuss.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The US was able to emerge as a global power after the Second World War. She was able to achieve this through the development of her political, economic, and social, technological factors. This assisted her to impose and maintain a stable globe order among states in the international system. She created and strengthens leading international institutions in cooperative solutions to economic matters and security threats.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that the US was able to take advantage of her position in the international arena. The US was able to emerge as a super power after the Second World War. She was able to use her position in the international system to influence events and its own interests and project her power on a world scale to protect their interest. The US continues to enjoy substantial, albeit qualified, primacy in international affairs, but without this currently translating into hegemony in any of the above forms. Indeed, most analysts would probably dismiss any idea of an American hegemony-understood as a condition of

legitimate US leadership within international society-as largely unattainable in present conditions.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Is economic might responsible for the rise of America in the 20th Century?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Aaron, R. (1974). *The Imperial Republic: The United States and the World, 1945-1973*. Cambridge: Winthrop.

Bennett, R. (1972). *Behind US Foreign Policy*. New York: Mentor Books.

Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. New York: Basic Books.

Callahan, P. (2004). *Logic of American Foreign Policy: Theories of America's world Role*. New York: Pearson Longman.

Calleo, D. (1987). *Beyond American Hegemony: The Future of America Alliance*. Brington: Wheatsheaf.

Geoffrey, B. (1978). *The Rise of the United States to World Power 1867to 1917*. London: Oxford Press.

Ikenberry, J. (2001). *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ikenberry, J. (2006). *Liberal Order and Imperial Ambition*. Cambridge: Polity.

Dumbbell, J. (1997). *American Foreign Policy: Carter to Clinton*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kennedy, P. (1988). *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*. USA: Random House.

Ogonor, M. (1998). *The Power of the Republic Strategic Policies and International Relations Volume One*. Nigeria: Rivers State Newspaper Corporation.

MODULE 3 HEGEMONIC EXPLOITS OF AMERICA IN THE 20TH CENTURY

Unit 1	The Concept of National Interest
Unit 2	National Interest and American Diplomacy in the Vietnam War
Unit 3	National Interest and American Diplomacy in the Afghanistan War
Unit 4	National Interest and American Diplomacy in Cuban Missile Crisis
Unit 5	America and the Cold War Era

UNIT 1 THE CONCEPT OF NATIONAL INTEREST

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction
2.0	Objectives
3.0	Main Content
3.1	The Concept of National Interest
4.0	Conclusion
5.0	Summary
6.0	Tutor- Marked Assignment
7.0	References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, our focus would be on what national interest is. It is also believed that independent state must serve its national interest even as others are also seeking to do the same thing. National interest, often referred to in French as *tuisson d'état* can be defined as a country's goal and ambition, it could be economic, military/political or cultural. The overriding primary objective is the survival of the state and security with pursuit of wealth, economic growth and power. In this unit, we will look at what national interest is.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define national interest
- differentiate between contrasting perspectives within political actors who engage themselves in the international system

- explain how contemporary international politics has influenced decisions nations take on behalf of their population
- discuss the dynamics of contemporary international politics as well as forces for change and continuity.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Concept of National Interest

The history of the concept of national interest can be traced to Niccolo Machiavelli who first elevated the interest of the state above that of religion or morality upon which rulers earlier justified their actions. However, the history of the practice is traced to France under Chief Minister, Cardinal Richelieu during the 30 years war. In this war, France intervened on the side of the Protestants, sacrificing its own Catholicism just to block the increasing power of the holy Roman Emperor. With Richelieu's prompting, Jean de Silhon upheld and defended the concept of *raison d'état* as "a means between what conscience permits and affairs required." However, the concept and practice of national interest took over the justification of actions of rulers, as the state then ceased to be derived from the divine order, but instead became subject to its own particular necessities. States began to embark on aggression, wars and imperial ventures in the national interest, and soon the Realist School engaged in propagating the idea of pursuing foreign policy based on national interest, instead of the old basis of religion, morality or tradition.

The concept of national interest is used in both political analysis and political action. As an analytical tool, it is employed to describe, explain or evaluate the sources or the adequacy of a nation's foreign policy. As an instrument of political action, national interest serves as a means of justifying, denouncing or proposing policies. Both usages in other words, refer to what is best for a national society. They also share a tendency to confine the intended meaning to what is best for a nation in foreign affairs. In a democracy, the national interest is simply the set of shared priorities regarding relations with the rest of the world. It is broader than strategic interests though they are part of it. It can include values such as human rights and democracy, if the public feels that those values are so important to its identity that it is willing to pay a price to promote them.

National interest has longer history as an instrument of action than as a tool of analysis. According to a historian who traced past use of the term, political actors made claims on behalf of the national interest as early as the 16th century in Italy and the 17th century in England. Bear

(1934) also found that the term “national interest” has been extensively employed by Americans since the establishment of the constitution.

Hans Morgenthau whose works advance a realist theory of international politics founded on the concept of national interest. Interest is the perennial standard by which political action must be judged and directed. Morgenthau (1948) therefore emphasised that the objectives of a foreign policy must be defined in terms of the national interest. National Interest is whatever the officials of a nation seek to preserve and enhance. As two leading spokesmen for this approach put it, “national interest is what the nation, that is, the decision maker decides it is.” (Furniss & Snyder, 1955).

Mac Ogonor (1998) defines national interest as the goals and ambitions a country pursues in the international system. It is multi-faceted; primary is the state’s survival and security. Also important is the pursuit of wealth and economic growth and power. Most states especially in modern times, regard the preservation of the nation’s culture as of great importance. Momoh (2005) simply posits, “National interest is the interest of the nation.” He added that national interest is not to be determined by a government official or an outfit in the president’s office, or by the judiciary, or even the legislature. The national interest of a state at present is a multi-faceted conception; primary is the state’s survival and security. Also important is the pursuit of wealth and economic growth and power. Many states especially in modern times regard the preservation of the nation’s culture as of great importance. From this simple definition, it is obvious as earlier noted that the national interest of a nation coordinates and systematically integrates the nation’s domestic and foreign policies.

For Brookings Institute, national interest is the general and continuing ends for which a nation acts. However, not all state actions qualify as national interest. Dudley was of the view that national interest is whatever the professionals who manage the state’s external relations say it is. This is an abandonist conceptualisation, dangerously leaving everything to the bureaucrats, forgetting public opinion, the intelligentsia, the private sector, ruling elite and so on, in a democratic setting.

National interest can be conceived as being the aggregation of the primary demands of a nation’s citizens abroad on its political leaders, introducing core values as security, welfare and social justice. National interest constitutes core values such as social welfare of citizens, national survival and security as well as social justice emphasises ethical values as critical components of the national interest of a nation. Roy Jones sees national interest as ...a term used in political debate within a

country to signal the case that the item of policy suggested will bring benefits not merely of its proponents but also to its opponents. The message in Jones' definition is that national interest must benefit both the domestic and foreign environments.

A foreign policy geared towards pursuing the national interest is the foundation of the realist school of international relations. The realist school reached its greatest heights with the practice of the balance of powers, which amounted to balancing the national interest of several great and lesser powers. The global structure of any nation's foreign relations reveals, in a more concrete manner, the relationship between foreign policy and international relations. The global structure lays down the blue print of the nation's national interest as they exist in different nations and regions of the world.

It is believed that nation state must serve its national interest even as other states are also seeking to do the same. An extreme view of fact is that the service of the national interest is a zero sum game, which global resources are evenly and totally divided up among the states in the international community. States can only rise on their shares at the expense of another. This view also puts one state or group of likely situated states against each other, which is "us" against "them"-a necessary conflict or competitive systems. This can be viewed in another way. The satisfaction of all national interests may be pursued in a positive sum-game, that is, all nations can share equally the surplus global resources since there is enough to go round. This view leads to the perception of a "one for all" and "all for one" position, which is the basis for friendship and cooperation.

Morgenthau (1948) believes that the argument concerning the national interest is vague and encompasses the whole world of nations. In an age of total war he said the national interest of a nation must be defined in terms compatible with other nations within the global community of nations. The concept of national interest pre-supposes neither a naturally harmonious peaceful world nor the inevitability of war because of the pursuit by all nations of their national interest. Quite to the contrary, Morgenthau argued that national interest assumes a continuous conflict and threats of war to be minimised through the continuous adjustment of conflicting interests by diplomatic action.

Examining it from the realist perspective, states are actors in global politics with separate national interests in a world without a central authority to regulate their activities. In such a world, states are often assumed rational or purposive actors pursuing various objectives understood to be consistent with their separate interests. The global

system presents opportunities for states to handle their job. It is a rhetorical device designed to justify the pursuit of a controversial policy.

National survival as a state is the minimum objective sometimes referred to as a core or vital interest common to all states. Survival as a state implies maintenance of its sovereign status. State is economic vitality and prosperity. In the world of fierce competition for scarce resources with emphasis on power politics and winner takes all tendencies, nations that do not in fact have robustly debated, well articulated and focused national interest have the course of being neglected in the scheme of things. These nations will actually lack the necessary focus and steam to excel vis-à-vis nations that laboured to put such corpus of national interest in place. However, Zimako rightly asserts that without national interest foreign policy is void. Economic prosperity is not only sought on behalf of citizens of a society, it is an important source of power in international affairs. Preservation of a society's core values can also be a vital interest in some nations. It could be democratic values. They are key elements of national identity. They not only reflect in the structure and functioning of the political system but also help in answering the question "who are we, and what do we stand for."

According to Zimako, national interest refers to the totality of interests of individuals and groups within a given nation... Even then, the impact of culture is highlighted either directly or indirectly. This mode of viewing national interest reminds us of two things. The first is that national interest cannot be the exclusive property of the political ruling elite, the incumbent chief Executive. Instead, it must accommodate the interest of all. The second is the role of (national) culture in national interest articulation.

From the above diverse definition, we can distil the meaning of national interest in these words: national interest comprises of the total gamut of those demo-based values articulated and pursued by a state to ensure, protect, and promote its survival, security, sovereign independence, peace, culture, development, power, and greatness. It also comprises the welfare and happiness of its people, while joining efforts and resources with other states to pursue mutually beneficial regional and global goals of peace, security, development and just order.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are the primary motives of the states when pursuing their interest?

4.0 CONCLUSION

Even though we have not offered a concrete definition of national interest in this course, and we do not advocate for the best definition of national interest, it can still be said that national interest comprises of the total gamut of those demo-based values articulated and pursued by a state to ensure, protect and promote its survival, security, sovereign independence, peace culture, development power and greatness. It encompasses the welfare and happiness of its people, while joining efforts and resources with other states to pursue mutually beneficial regional and global goals of peace, security development and just order.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have been introduced to the concept of national interest. National interest is the guiding principle for the policy making behavior of the governing elite. It coordinates and systematically integrates domestic and foreign policies. It is central to the continued survival of a nation and its people. Nations premise their national peace, security, development, greatness as well as the welfare and happiness of their citizens on knowledge and research and in which governance draws its nutrients from knowledge and competence.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss the relevance of national interest in international politics.

7.0 REFERENCE/FURTHER READING

Beard, A. (1934). *The Idea of National Interest: An Analytical Study in American Foreign Policy*. New York: Macmillan.

Church, W.F. (1973) *Richelieu and Reason of State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Furniss, E. S. & Snyder, R. C. (1955). *An Introduction to American Foreign Policy*. New York: Rinehart.

Harrington, F. (1950). "Bend's idea of National Interest and New Interpretations." *American Perspective* IV, 345.

James, D. (1985). *The Politics of American Foreign Policy*. New Jersey, Englewood Cliff: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Marshall, C. (1959). "The National Interest." In Robert A. Goldwin et al, (Eds.) *Readings in American Foreign Policy*. New York: Oxford University.

Morgenthau, H, (1952). "Another Great Debate: The National Interest of the United States American." *Political Science*, Vol. 66 (4): 961-98.

Morgenthau, H. (1948). *1954 Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics. Oxford University Press.

Walter C. T. (Ed). (2003). *A Handbook of International Relations*. London: Simmons Sage Publications.

UNIT 2 NATIONAL INTEREST AND AMERICAN DIPLOMACY IN THE VIETNAM WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Vietnam War
 - 3.2 The Aftermath of the Vietnam War on the Domestic Policy of the United States of America
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, attempt will be made to introduce you to the role of the United States of America (US) in the Vietnam War. The Vietnam War was a cold war era military conflict that occurred in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia from 1 November 1955 to the fall of Saigon on 30 April 1975. This war followed the First Indochina War and was fought between North Vietnam, supported by its communist allies, and the government of South Vietnam supported by the US and other anti-communist nations. The Viet Cong, a lightly armed South Vietnamese communist-controlled common front largely fought a guerrilla war against anti-communist forces in the region. The Vietnam People's Army (North Vietnamese Army) engaged in a more conventional war at times committing large units into battle. The US and South Vietnamese forces relied on air superiority and overwhelming firepower to search and destroy operations involving ground forces, artillery and airstrikes. The US government involvement in the war was seen as a way to prevent a communist takeover of South Vietnam and part of their wider strategy of containment. The North Vietnamese government viewed the war as a colonial war, fought initially against France, backed by the US and later against South Vietnam, which it regarded as a US puppet state. In this unit, we shall discuss how the US got involved in the Second World War.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss the US foreign policy-making process and how this affects foreign policy output
- analyse news reports and official US government statements regarding the US foreign policy
- discuss the US foreign policy during notable global events.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Vietnam War

The involvement of the US in the Vietnam War began at the end of the World War II and lasted for almost 30 years with the evacuation of American embassy personnel from Saigon at the end of April 1975. It covered six administrations from Truman's to Ford's. It produced a foreign policy to defeat for the US.

President Roosevelt gave the first hint of American interest in Indochina with his preference for an international trusteeship arrangement over the countries that today are Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam near the end of World War II. The events of the immediate postwar years and rise of the Cold War propelled the US in a different direction.

The Truman administration had serious reservations about identifying itself with colonialism. However, the Soviet actions towards Eastern Europe, Communist success in China and uncertainty of the political leanings of Ho Chi Minh—the leader of the Vietnamese independence movement, the US had to assume distinctly pro-French neutrality. As a result, Truman began providing clandestine economic and military assistance to France in the late 40s in the war against the Vietminh (followers of Ho Chi Minh).

With the outbreak of the Korean War, (this seemed to confirm Washington's suspicions about soviet global intentions), American involvement deepened. \$133 million of military hardware was committed to the French for Indochina and another \$50million was sent in economic and technical assistance to the governments that they had established. Throughout his administration, the US provided more and more military and economic assistance until America aid constituted 40 per cent of the War's total cost.

The Eisenhower administration took the rationale for American involvement one step further by invoking much of the language of the

Cold War and by continuing to increase assistance to the non-communist, French –backed Vietnamese government. In a 1954 news conference, Eisenhower referred to the “falling dominoes” in Southeast Asia, and the Secretary of the State, John Foster Dulles, hinted the role of the Chinese Communists in causing the unrest. Yet, the administration did not do much beyond providing economic and military assistance and in fact explicitly ruled out the use of American forces to rescue the French from defeat at the decisive battle of Dien Bien Phu with the Vietminh in 1954. It sought a negotiated outcome at a 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina.

The conference called for an armistice between the parties, a temporary division of the country at the 17th parallel, and elections in 1956 to decide on reunification. The US neither actively participated in this conference nor did it sign the accords or endorse them. The proposed all -Vietnam election scheduled for 1956 was never held. The US quickly became the principal support of the noncommunist South Vietnamese government of Premier (later President) Ngo Dinh Diem, who came to be identified as “America’s Mandarin” he sought to replace French influence with close American ties. Moreover, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State, Dulles believed that Ngo Dinh Diem represented the best prospect for developing a non-communist Vietnam. In 1955 and 1961, the US provided \$1 billion in aid to Diem and by 1961, South Vietnam was the fifth largest recipient of US foreign assistance.

In 1961, President Kennedy expanded this military and economic assistance and contemplated sending in American military forces to prevent the fall of South Vietnam. He increased the number of American military “advisors” from 685 when he took office to about 16,000 by the time of his death. On one account, Kennedy did not give an unqualified commitment to the goal of saving South Vietnam from communism. His action took the US further down the path to military involvement, and Kennedy may well have continued in that direction had he lived to remain in office.

President Lyndon Johnson fully transformed US involvement in South Vietnam from a political to a military one. He broadened and deepened America’s commitment to preserve a non-communist South Vietnam and it was ultimately he who decided to send in American combat forces. There was a coup against President Ngo Dinh Diem in November 1963 until February 1965). In addition, as North Vietnamese and Vietcong successes increased, the Johnson administration sought a new strategy .In early February 1964 American Clandestine operations were under -way against North Vietnam .These operations led to attacks by the North Vietnamese on two American destroyers, the Maddox and Turner Joy in the Gulf of Tonkin in North Vietnam in Aug 1964.

These attacks were used by the Johnson administration to seek congressional approval of an American military presence in Southeast Asia. In a matter of hours, the Congress approved the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which authorised the president to take all necessary measures in Southeast Asia. His impact within the US was immediate causing a sharp drop in American optimism. Indeed, the political pressure on President Johnson was severe in that in March 1968, he voluntarily withdrew from consideration as a candidate for reelection

President Richard Nixon adopted a different strategy. He began to decrease American military involvement through a policy of Vietnamisation where by South Vietnamese military would replace American soldiers and he pursued peace negotiations (began originally in mid 1968 in Paris) through both open and secret channels.

With Vietnamisation, America forces in Vietnam were reduced from about 543,000 after Nixon took office to about 25,000 by the end of his first term. As part of this strategy, the US invaded Cambodia in April 1970 with the express purpose of wiping out its North Vietnamese sanctuaries and safe havens. To many Americans, this action appeared to be a widening of the war.

The agreement on ending the war and restoring the peace was signed on Jan 27, 1973 with the loss of 58,000 American soldiers and countless Vietnamese lives. The ceasefire called for withdrawal of all American troops and return of prisoners of war. Although it reduced the level of fighting and gave room for US to bring its troops home, it did not end the war or US involvement in the war.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE 1

Discuss the Vietnam War.

3.2 The Aftermath of the Vietnam War on the Domestic Policy of the United States of America

At the end of the Vietnam War, Americans struggled to absorb lessons of military interventions. As General Maxwell Taylor one of the principal architects of the war, noted "First, we didn't know ourselves. We thought that we were going into another Korean War, but this was a different country. Secondly, we didn't know our South Vietnamese allies ...And we knew less about North Vietnam .Who was Ho Chi Minh? Nobody really knew. So, until we know the enemy and know our allies and know ourselves, we'd better keep out of this kind dirty business. It's very dangerous" (Griffith, 1963). The former US Secretary of the State, Henry Kissinger wrote in a secret memo to President Gerald Ford that "in terms of military tactics, we cannot help draw the conclusion that our armed forces are not suited to this kind of war. Even the Special Forces who had been designed for it could not prevail. Even the Secretary of Defence, Robert McNamara concluded that the achievement of a military victory by US forces in Vietnam was indeed a dangerous illusion.

Between 1965 and 1975, the US had spent \$111 billion on the war (\$686 billion in FY2008 dollars) this resulted in a large federal budget deficit. More than three million Americans served in the Vietnam War, some 1.5 million of whom actually saw combat in Vietnam. Entrance into the US Army had been controlled by the president since World War II, but ended in 1973. By the time the war ended, 58,220 soldiers were killed, more than 150,000 were wounded, and at least 21,000 were permanently disabled. According to Kueter (2007), 61 per cent of those killed were age 21 or younger. Of those killed in combat, 86.3 percent were white, 12.5 percent were black and the remainder from other races.

The decline in support for American policies in Vietnam has led to a perception that the war changed American public attitudes to foreign policy. Before the war, it seemed that a consensus existed among the populace concerning the Cold War threats that gave the president freedom of action in committing American troops abroad. The lasting lesson from the Vietnam War that the American public will not stand for foreign military ventures-while misleading-has been highly influential. Since the Vietnam War, policymakers have considered popular views much more carefully when committing American troops abroad and this has often determined their approach to particular issues.

The constraining effects of public opinion has undoubtedly been important as a result of Vietnam War; its greatest impact has been in making presidents and other leading policymakers fearful that there will be a public backlash against troops commitment abroad. Successive

presidents have followed an unwritten rule that the American people will not allow the US to become engaged in long-term conflicts in foreign countries where the risks to American soldier's lives outweigh any threat to US national security, as this is likely to lead to disaffection and call for withdrawal.

As Lunch and Sperlich succinctly put it:

No matter what the actual predisposition of public opinion about foreign policy, élites may constrain themselves if they believe a negative public reaction would be registered at the next election.

From Ronald Reagan's policies in the 1980s to George Bush's actions in the Gulf in the early 1990s and Bill Clinton's approach to crises in East Africa and the Balkans, all presidents felt the need to balance possible military actions in foreign lands with potentially negative reactions of domestic audience.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE 2

Discuss John Kennedy's role in the America's commitment to Vietnam?

4.0 CONCLUSION

While it is impossible to ascertain the full impact of the American public on Vietnam policy, it is clear that it was significant; however, this significance has been consistently misinterpreted. Support for withdrawal was low for much of the war, support for escalation was often high and the activities of antiwar protesters had a largely negative impact. The majority of the Americans wanted the US to win or at least see that the government was achieving its goals. The United States of America reduced their troops support in South Vietnam during the final years of "vietnamisation." Many US troops were removed from the region .Under the Paris Peace Accords between North Vietnamese Foreign Minister Le Tho and the US Secretary of the State Henry Kissinger and signed by South Vietnamese President, US military forces withdrew from South Vietnam, and prisoners were exchanged.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have been introduced to what the Vietnam War was. It was a military conflict, which occurred in the cold war era in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia from November 1, 1955 to April 30, 1975. The reasons for the US involvement were to prevent a communist takeover of South Vietnam. The US involvement started after the Second World War. It covered six administrations from Truman to Ford. It produced a foreign policy defeat for the United States of America. The North Vietnamese viewed the war as a colonial war, fought against France backed by the US and later against South Vietnam, which it regarded as a US puppet state

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Richard Nixon came to office in 1968-69 promising “peace with honour” through his policy of “vietnamisation.” What does this mean in reality?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- George, C. (1986). *America's Longest War. The United States and Vietnam, 1952-1975*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- James, M. (Ed.). (1986). *A Reader in American Foreign Policy*. Itasca: Peacock Publishers Inc.
- Kueter, D. (2007). *Vietnam Sons: For Some the War Never Ended*. Author House: USA.
- Lawrence, A. T. (2009). *Crucible Vietnam: Memoir of an Infantry Lieutenant*. McFarland: Princeton Publisher.
- Leslie, H., et al. (1979). *The Irony of Vietnam: The Worked*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Morton, B., et al. (1977). *The Pentagon Papers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Moyar, M. (2006) *.Triumph Forsaken: the Vietnam War–1965*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlesinger, R. (1997). *A Time for War: The United States and Vietnam, 1941–1975*. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Stanley, K. (1983). *Vietnam: A History*. New York: Viking Press.
- Stanton, S. L. (2003). *Vietnam Order of Battle*. Stack Pole Book.

UNIT 3 NATIONAL INTEREST AND AMERICAN DIPLOMACY IN AFGHANISTAN WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Afghanistan War
 - 3.2 Effect of Afghanistan War on the US Foreign Policy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, attempt is made to see how the United States of America (US) was able to protect her interest in the Afghanistan war. The Soviet War was a nine-year conflict involving the Soviet Union ,supporting the Marxist-Leninist government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan against the indigenous Afghan Mujahedeen and foreign “Arab –Afghan” volunteers. The mujahedeen found other support from a variety of sources including the US, Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom (UK), Pakistan, Egypt, China and other nations. In this unit, we shall examine the role of the US in the Afghanistan War.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- analyse international relations in terms of values
- discuss the reasoning of international actors and in the justification of international action in the war
- highlight the roles of the countries that took part in the war
- explain force as a political instrument and its limitation.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Afghanistan War

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was created after the Saur Revolution on April 27, 1978. The government had a socialistic agenda. It had close relations with the Soviet Union. On December 5, 1978, a friendship treaty was signed with the Soviet Union. The US who was

aware of this alliance started conspiring to oust this government. On July 3, 1979, the US President Jimmy Carter signed the first directive for secret aid to the opponents of the pro-Soviet regime in Kabul. The aim of the US was to drag the Soviet Union into the "Afghan trap" as the US Secretary of the State Zbigniew Brezezinski termed it.

Russian military involvement in Afghanistan has a long history, dates back to Tsarist expansions in the so-called "Great Game" between Russia and Britain. This began in the 19th century with the Panjdeh incident, a military skirmish that occurred in 1885 when Russian forces seized Afghan territory south of the Oxus River around an oasis at Panjdeh. This interest in the region continued through the Soviet era, with billions in economic and military aid sent to Afghanistan between 1955 and 1978. In February 1979, the Islamic Revolution removed the American-backed Shah from Afghanistan's neighbour Iran and the US Ambassador to Afghanistan was kidnapped by Setami Milli militants, and was later killed during an assault carried out by the Afghan police, assisted by Soviet advisers.

The death of Ambassador Adolph Dubs ruined the Afghanistan. The US then deployed 20 ships to the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea including two aircraft carriers and there was a constant stream of threats of warfare between US and Iran. The anti-communist rebels gained support from the US. According to Former CIA director and Secretary of Defence in his memoirs *From the Shadows* that the US intelligence services provided financial aid to the rebel factions in Afghanistan six months before the Soviet deployment. On July 3, 1979, President Jimmy Carter signed an executive order authorising the CIA to conduct covert propaganda operations against the communist regime. Based on information from the KGB; Soviet leaders felt that Amin destabilised the situation in Afghanistan. Following Amin's initial coup against and killing of President Taraki, the KGB station in Kabul warned that his leadership would lead to "harsh repressions, and as a result, the activation and consolidation of the opposition."

The Soviets established a special commission on Afghanistan, of KGB chairman Yuri Andropov, Boris Ponomarev from the Central Committee and Dmitry Ustinov, the Minister of Defence. In late April 1978, they reported that Amin was purging his opponents, including Soviet loyalists; his loyalty to Moscow was in question; and that he was seeking diplomatic links with Pakistan and the People's Republic of China. Of specific concern were Amin's secret meetings with the US chargé d'affaires J. Bruce Amstutz, which, while never amounting to any agreement between Amin and the United States, sowed suspicion in the Kremlin.

The US started training insurgents in, and directing propaganda broadcasts into Afghanistan from Pakistan in 1978. According to Brzezinski, CIA financial aid to the insurgents within Afghanistan was approved in July 1979, six months before the Soviet invasion, though after the Soviets were already covertly engaged there. Arms were sent after the formal invasion. The US President Jimmy Carter insisted that what he termed "Soviet aggression" could not be viewed as an isolated event of limited geographical importance but had to be contested as a potential threat to US influence in the Persian Gulf region.

The US was also worried about the USSR gaining access on the Indian Ocean by coming to an arrangement with Pakistan. After the Soviet deployment, Pakistan's military ruler General Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq accepted financial aid from the western powers to aid the mujahedeen. In 1981, with the election of the US President Ronald Reagan aid for the mujahedeen through Zia's Pakistan increased, it was due to the efforts of Texas Congressman Charlie Wilson and CIA Officer Gust Avrakotos. Michael Pillsbury; a senior Pentagon overcame bureaucratic resistances in 1985-1986 and persuades President Reagan to provide hundreds of Stinger missiles.

The US, the UK, and Saudi Arabia were major financial contributors. US donated \$600 million in aid per year, with a matching amount coming from the Persian Gulf states. The People's Republic of China also sold Type 59 tanks, Type 68 assault rifles, Type 56 assault rifles, Type 69 RPGs, and much more to mujahedeen in co-operation with the CIA, as did Egypt with assault rifles. The donation of US-made FIM-92 Stinger anti-aircraft missile systems caused a notable increase in aircraft losses of the Soviet Air Force. The impact that it made, however, was the change it led in Soviet tactics – helicopters increasingly stayed over friendly forces and limited daytime flights, jet craft were forced to fly higher, and other contingency measures were put in place.

In March 1985, the US government adopted National Security Decision Directive (NSDD) 166, which set a goal of military victory for the Mujahedeen. After 1985, the CIA and Inter-services Intelligence (ISI) placed greater pressure on the Mujahedeen to attack government strongholds. The CIA initiated programs for training Afghans in techniques such as car bombs and assassinations and in engaging in cross-border raids into the USSR. Pakistan's ISI and Special Service Group (SSG) were actively involved in the conflict, and in cooperation with the CIA and the US Army Special Forces as well as the British Special Air Service supported the mujahedeen.

The stealing of large sums of aid and weapons spurred Pakistan's economic growth, but along with the war in general had devastating side

effects on the country. The siphoning of aid weapons in the port city of Karachi contributed to disorder and violence while heroin entering from Afghanistan to pay for arms contributed to addiction problems. In revenge for Pakistan's assistance to the insurgents, the KHAD Afghan security service, under leader Mohammad Najibullah carried out (according to the Mitrokhin archives and other sources) a large number of operations against Pakistan. In 1987, 127 incidents resulted in 234 deaths in Pakistan. In April 1988, an ammunition depot outside the Pakistani capital of Islamabad was blown up killing 100 and injuring more than 1000 people. The KHAD and KGB were suspected in the perpetration of these acts.

Pakistan took in millions of Afghan refugees mostly Pashtun fleeing the soviet occupation. However, the refugees were controlled within Pakistan's largest province, Baluchistan under then- martial law ruler General Rahimuddin Khan. The influx of so many refugees was believed to be the largest refugee population in the world as at then. All of this had a great impact on Pakistan and its effects continued to this day. Pakistan, through its support for the mujahedeen, played a significant role in the eventual withdrawal of Soviet military personnel from Afghanistan. Pakistan went to the point of maintaining a limited air war against Afghan/Soviet forces,

In 1989 the Soviets withdrew and the US interest in Afghanistan ceased. The US decided not to help with reconstruction of the country and instead they handed over the interests of the country to US allies, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. Pakistan quickly took advantage of this opportunity and forged relations with warlords and later the Taliban, to secure trade interests and routes.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What was the Afghanistan War all about?

3.2 Effect of Afghanistan War on the US Foreign Policy

The US President Jimmy Carter maintained that the Soviet invasion was the most serious incursion, the most serious threat to peace since the Second World War..He placed a trade embargo against the Soviet Union on shipments of commodities such as grain and weapons. The international diplomatic response was severe, ranging from stern warnings to a US- led boycott of the 1980 Olympics in Moscow.

The invasion along with other events such as Iranian revolution and the US hostage and standoff that accompanied it, the Iran-Iraq war, the 1982 Israel –Lebanon war contributed to making the Middle East an

extremely violent and turbulent during the 1980s. The non-aligned movement was divided between those who supported that soviet deployment was legal and others considered it an illegal invasion.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the reason of America's involvement in the Afghanistan War.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the Afghan war made the US to follow suit. The US decided not to help with the rebuilding of the country and handed over the interests of the country to her allies in Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. The civil war continued despite the withdrawal of both countries. This has affected Afghanistan in term of political and economic development to this day.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that the US involvement in the Afghanistan War had to do with the death of her Ambassador by Setami Milli militants. This resulted to the breakdown of diplomatic relationship of both countries. At that time of the crisis there were two factions existing in the country. You also learnt that the US supported one faction against the other in terms of human and material resources. The US aim was to drag the Soviet Union into the Afghan trap. The reason was that the Soviet Union supported the Marxist Leninist government against the other faction.

6.0 TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Examine the reason for the America's involvement in the war.

7.0 REFERENCE/FURTHER READING

- Andrew, C., et al. (1999). *The Sword and the Shield: The Mitrokhin Archive and the Secret History of the KGB*. New York: Basic Books.
- Coll, S. (2004). *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Crile, G. (2003). *Charlie Wilson's War: the extraordinary story of the largest covert operation in history*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Galeotti, M. (1995). *Afghanistan: The Soviet Union's Last War*. London: Frank Cass.
- Gates, R. (1997). *From the Shadows: The Ultimate Insider's Story of Five Presidents and How They Won the Cold War*. USA: Simon & Schuster.
- Harrison, S., et al. (1995). *Out of Afghanistan: The Inside Story of the Soviet withdrawal*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heymann, P. (2008). *Living the Policy Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kepel, G. (2002). *Jihad*. Cambridge: Belknap.
- Kuperman, A. (1999). "The Stinger Missile and U.S. Intervention in Afghanistan." *Political Science Quarterly* 114 (2): 219–263.
- Lohbeck, K. (1993). *Holy War, Unholy Victory: Eyewitness to the CIA's Secret War in Afghanistan*. Washington: Regnery Publishing.
- Maley, W., et al. (1989). *The Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prados, J. (1996). *Presidents' Secret Wars: CIA and Pentagon covert operations from World War II through the Persian Gulf*. Chicago.
- Robert, K. (2000). *Soldiers of God with Islamic Warriors in Afghanistan and Pakistan* New York: Vintage Books.
- Rubin, R. (1995). *The Fragmentation of Afghanistan*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Valenta, J. (1980). "From Prague to Kabul: The Soviet Style of Invasion." *International Security Fall*, Vol 5 (2).

Vincent J, (1998). "Interview with Brzezinski." *La Nouvelle Observateur*, 15–21:76.

Walker, M. (1994). *The Cold War - A History*. Toronto, Canada: Stoddart.

Weiner, T. (1990). *Blank Check: The Pentagon's Black Budget*. New York: Warner Books.

Weisman, S. (1987). "Afghans down a Pakistani F-16, Saying Fighter Jet Crossed Border". *The New York Time*.

UNIT 4 NATIONAL INTEREST AND AMERICAN DIPLOMACY IN THE CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Cuba Missile Crisis
 - 3.2 Aftermath of the Cuba Missile Crisis
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, we will be looking at how the Cuba missile crisis held the international community to a standstill. The Cuban missile crisis known as The October Crisis was a confrontation among the Soviet Union, Cuba and the United States of America (US) in October 1962, during the Cold War. In September 1962, after some unsuccessful operations by the US to overthrow the Cuban regime (Bay of Pigs, Operation Mongoose), the Cuban and Soviet governments began to secretly build bases in Cuba for a number of medium-range and intermediate-range ballistic nuclear missiles (MRBMs and IRBMs) with the ability to strike most of the continental US. This action followed the 1958 deployment of Thor IRBMs in the United Kingdom (UK) (Project Emily) and Jupiter IRBMs to Italy and Turkey in 1961 – more than 100 US.-built missiles having the capability to strike Moscow with nuclear warheads. On October 14, 1962, a United States Air Force U-2 plane on a photoreconnaissance mission captured photographic proof of Soviet missile bases under construction in Cuba. In this unit, we will look at the how the US got involved in the Cuba missile crisis.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss both the Cuban missile crisis and a host of other foreign policy dilemmas
- explain force as a political instrument and its limitation
- analyse the threat of the Cuban missile crisis and the use of force in the international system.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Cuba Missile Crisis

The Cuban missile crisis stands as a seminal event people will not forget 13th October 1962 when the US and the Soviet Union paused at the nuclear Precipice. Never before would one have expected a high probability that so many lives would have been lost. Had war come, it would have meant the death of 100 million Americans and more than 100 million Russians and millions of Europeans as well. Other catastrophes and inhumanities of history would have faded into insignificance. President Kennedy estimated as between one out of three and even our escape is staggering (Steel 1969; 22).

For thirteen days both countries stood eyeball to eyeball each with the power of mutual distribution in hand. The Soviet Government provided arms to Cuba in the autumn of 1959. The Soviets and Cubans negotiated the next phase of military assistance in early 1962. The Soviet presidium approved Cuban requests for additional weapons in April 1962 and the Soviets resumed arms shipments at a markedly increase pace in late July. By September 1, Soviet arms in Cuba included surface to air missiles coastal defence 'spoke' cruise missiles, patrol boats armed with anti-ship missiles and more than 5,000 Soviet technicians and military personnel.

The first Soviet nuclear ballistic missiles reached Cuban soil on September 8, 1962. The medium range ballistic missiles (MRBMs) were secretly transported to Cuba. Beneath the decks of Soviet ships additional MRBMs, missile trailers fuelling trucks, special radar vans, missile erectors and nuclear warhead storage bunkers arrived and were rushed to construction sites. Unknown to the US, Cuba received nuclear warheads for the MRBMs on October 4, along with dozens of nuclear warheads for the Sopka coastal defence cruise missiles, six nuclear bombs for 11-28 medium jet bombers, and 12 nuclear warheads for short range tactical nuclear rockets.

However, one of the Soviet Union staff planners, Gribkov, on arrival in Cuba to inspect work on October 18, Gen Issa Pliyau, the group force commander received bad news: the Americans have discovered the missiles. A U-2 had flown over the areas where the missiles were deployed. On October 14, Soviet air defences had observed the over flights but not taken action. There had been more over flights on 15 and 17 October, which presumably were observed too.

On October 15-16, 1962, American President Kennedy and his advisers were informed that the US had discovered Soviet ballistic missiles in

Cuba. The president and most of his advisers were shocked at what Kennedy called “this secret swift and extraordinary build up of communist missiles” which posed troubling questions. The Soviet Union as a powerful country and one of its allies, Cuba, faces the risk of attack by a powerful country. One of the first memos the CIA produced after the discovery of missiles in Cuba explained: The Soviet leaders decision to deploy ballistic missiles to Cuba testifies to their determination to deter any active US intervention to weaken or remove the Fidel Castro regime, which they apparently regard as likely and imminent. However, because the 1961 effort to invade Cuba with a force of CIA trained Cuban exiles had failed disastrously, the Soviet Union had substantial reason to believe that the United States might return to do the job right.

If the US accepted the build-up, it would lose the confidence of its allies in Latin America and around the world. Secretary of State Dean Rusk concluded that the “hardliner boys have moved into the ascendancy – so one of the things that we have to be concerned about is not just the missiles, but the entire development of Soviet policy as it affects our situation around the globe.” (May and Zelikow 1997:255).

After discovering ballistic missiles in Cuba, the America government organised its crisis decision-making around an informed ally selected inner circle of advisers, which met either at the White House or at the State Department from 16 October to 19 October 1962.

On Monday, October 15, the Cuban President delivered a speech to the National Press club addressing the Soviet activity in Cuba and arguing that the build-up was defensive in character. Kennedy was determined to stand fast. To fail to act forcibly could produce a number of undesirable outcomes. First, it would undermine the confidence of the members of his administration; especially those who in previous weeks had so firmly defended his policy towards Cuba. Second, it would convince the rest of the government that the administration had no leader, encouraging others to challenge his policies and destroy his reputation in Congress.

Weakness in the face of the crisis would cut the ground out from under fellow democrats who were standing for re-election on Kennedy’s Cuban policy. Failing to act forcibly would also drive the public to doubt Kennedy’s words and this will shake Kennedy’s confidence in his own leadership.

On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy delivered the major foreign policy address of his career. Disclosing the American discovery of the presence of the Soviet strategic missiles in Cuba, the president declared strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba and demanded that chairman Khrushchev halt and eliminate this clandestine reckless and provocative threat to world peace.

The blockade began on the morning of October 24, 500 miles off the coast of Cuba. The first Soviet ships carrying weapons would pass that line during the night of October 23-24 and under this plan, they would be intercepted at dawn so the American navy could conduct operations in daylight. The first Soviet ships approached the quarantine line on Wednesday, October 24 but halted and turned around just before challenging it.

Khrushchev opened the presidium session on Sunday, morning of October 28 with yet another about face in his assessment of the American danger. This time he told his presidium colleague that they were face-to-face with the danger of war and of nuclear catastrophe with the possible result of destroying the human race. He went on, "In order to save the world, we must retreat."

On Sunday, October 28, Soviet leaders broadcast an urgent message over the radio, announcing that they would withdraw their missiles from Cuba. In summary, the blockade did not change Khrushchev's mind. Only when coupled with the threat of further action in the form of alternatives did it succeed in forcing Soviet withdrawal of the missiles?

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the Cuban Missile Crisis.

3.1 The Aftermath of the Cuba Missile Crisis

The compromise was a sharp embarrassment for Khrushchev and the Soviet Union because the withdrawal of the US missiles from Italy and Turkey was made public. It was a secret deal between Kennedy and Khrushchev. The Soviets were seen as retreating from circumstances that they had started – if played well, it could have looked just the opposite. Khrushchev's fall from power two years after the crisis can be linked to Soviet Politburo embarrassment at both his eventual concessions to the US and his ineptitude in precipitating the crisis in the first place.

Cuba saw it as a partial betrayal by the Soviets; given that decisions on how to resolve the crisis had been made exclusively by Kennedy and Khrushchev. Castro was especially upset that certain issues of interest to Cuba such as the status of Guantanamo Bay were not addressed. This led Cuban-Soviet relations to deteriorate for years to come. However, on the other hand Cuba continued to be protected from invasion. One US military commander was not happy with the result either. General Lemay told the president that it was "the greatest defeat in our history" and that the US should have immediately invaded Cuba.

Critics including Seymour Melman and Seymour Hersh suggested that the Cuban missile crisis encouraged US use of military means, such as in the Vietnam War. The Russo-American confrontations were happening at the same time with Sino-Indian War, dating from the US military quarantine of Cuba.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What role did the Soviet Union play in the Cuba crisis?

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Cuban missile crisis exerted a significant influence on the minds of all Americans. It lent a dramatic vividness to the fact that a nuclear war could happen. This “eyeball -to-eyeball” strategic confrontation suggested that nuclear that the nation was actively deterrence might not always deter an aggressor, that it was possible for the leader of a nuclear power to embark on a course of action that could rapidly propel the US into a nuclear war, the kind of war that the nation was actively attempting to avert through the acquisition of more and more arms. There was a terrifying iron in the fact that, in a crisis situation, actions that were taken to maintain the credibility of nuclear deterrence could generate a momentum toward war that it might be impossible to restrain. In October 1962, the unthinkable suddenly became thinkable because for 13 days, it looked like nuclear deterrence might fail to deter. Following the missile crisis, American’s strategic nuclear arms continued to be considered an important military resource, but the assurance that weapons enhanced security suddenly became alarming less certain. The US armed forces were at their highest state of readiness and Soviet field commanders in Cuba were prepared to use battlefield nuclear weapons to defend the island if it was invaded. However, President Kennedy and Premier Nikita Khrushchev averted the war.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that the Cuban missile crisis was a confrontation among the Soviet Union, Cuba and the US in October 1962. You also learnt that if wars were to occur, that would mean the death of 100 million Americans and more than 100 million Russians and millions of Europeans as well. Other catastrophes and inhumanities of history would have faded into insignificance.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Put yourself in the position of the American president: How would you have acted to resolve the Cuban missile crisis?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Blight, J. (1990). *On the Brink: Americans and Soviets Reexamine the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Noonday Press.

Blight, J., et al. (2002). *Cuba on the Brink Lanham*. Maryland: Rowland and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Chang, L., et al. (Eds). (1998). "Introduction." *The Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962: A National Security Archive Documents Reader* (2nd ed.). New York: New Press.

Dobbs, M. (2008). *One Minute to Midnight: Kennedy, Khrushchev, and Castro on the Brink of Nuclear War*. New York: Alfred A.Knopf.

Glantz, D.M. (2001). *The Military Strategy of the Soviet Union: A History*. London: Rutledge.

Ignacio, R. (2007). *Fidel Castro: My Life*. United Kingdom: Penguin Books.

Kennedy, R. F. (1969). *Thirteen days: A Memoir of the Cuban Missile Crisis*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Melman, S. (1988). *The Demilitarised Society: Disarmament and Conversion*. Montreal: Harvest House.

Nathan, J.A. (Ed.). *1992 The Cuban Missile Crisis Revisited*. New York: St. Martins Press.

Stern, S. (2003). *Averting the Final Failure: John F. Kennedy and the Secret Cuban Missile Crisis Meetings*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Weldes, J. (1999). *Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

UNIT 5 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE COLD WAR ERA

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Meaning of the Cold War
 - 3.1.2 Background of the Cold War
 - 3.1.3 The Aftermath of the Cold war
 - 3.2 The Relevance of American Diplomacy in the 20th Century
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Cold War was the continuing state of political conflict ,military tension ,proxy wars economic competition between the communist world -primarily the soviet union and its satellite states and the powers of the western world ,primarily the United States and its allies. However the primary participants' military force never officially clashed directly, they expressed the conflict through military coalitions, strategic conventional force deployments, extensive aid to states deemed vulnerable, proxy wars ,espionage ,propaganda, conventional and nuclear arms races ,appeals to neutral nations, rivalry at sports events, and technological competitions such as the Space Race. The Cold War did not result in a major war but rather increased a lot of tension in the international system at that time. As one writer put it, War is an extension of peace using other means.” This could be said about the Cold War, which was one of the critical aftermaths of the Second World War.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define the Cold War
- discuss the recurring political patterns that dominate politics in the international arena at that time
- distinguish American relationship with other nations
- analyse the framework of the US foreign policy.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Meaning of the Cold War

An English author and journalist George Orwell used the term “Cold War” in his essay “You and the Atomic Bomb,” Published October 19, 1945, in the *British Tribune Newspaper*. Contemplating a world living in the shadow of the threat of nuclear warfare, he warned of a “Peace that is no peace,” which he called a permanent “Cold War.” Orwell referred to the war as the ideological confrontation between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers (Geiger, 2004). Moreover, in *The Observer* of March 10, 1946, Orwell wrote, “after the Moscow conference last December, Russia began to make a ‘Cold War’ on Britain and the British Empire.” In South Carolina on April 16 1947, he delivered a speech (by journalist Herbert Bayard Swope (Safire William October 1 2006) saying, “Let us not be deceived: We are today in the midst of a Cold War.” Newspaper reporter-columnist Walter Lippmann gave the term wide currency, with the book *Cold War 1947*.

3.2 Background of the Cold War

The end of the Second World War emerged a bipolar world in which the power shifted to the US and Soviet Union. After the war, there existed suspicion and envy between the Soviet Union and the US. This was ironic in the view that they both belonged to the coalition force (allied force) but were unable to agree on many issues resulting from post war settlement. As a result of this, they became passively antagonistic of one another and were sharply divided over major post war issues. It led to a sharp division of Europe and indeed the whole world into ideological camps. The first of the camp was started by the US with Capitalism as its foundation, while on the other hand the Soviet Union with “Socialism/Communism” as its underlining political and economic philosophy. These two camps started to make allies. The Soviet Union is made up of Eastern Europe such as Bulgaria, Czech Republic, East Germany, Poland, Ukraine, Yugoslavia; Cuba. The United States on the other hand had major allies in Western Europe, Britain, France, West Germany, Belgium, and Spain. The cold war did not result in a major war, but it led to crisis that could have been averted such as Berlin Crisis of 1948, the Cuba Missile Crisis, Afghanistan Crisis, the Vietnam War, Korean War between the North and South. In spite of the fact that both the Soviet Union and the US were allies against the Axis powers in the Second World War, they disagreed about political philosophy and the configuration of the post-war world while occupying most of Europe. The Soviet Union formed the Eastern Bloc with the Eastern European countries it occupied, annexing some and maintaining others as satellite states, some of which were later consolidated as the Warsaw Pact

(1955–1991). The US and its allies used containment of communism as a main strategy, establishing alliances such as NATO to that end.

The Cold war can be identified from five major phases.

Post World War Two Phase (1945-1953): This represents the most aggressive era in the history of the Cold War. The reason being that it was the immediate post Second World War period when tension, bitterness, suspicion were still raging in the hearts of all warring parties. The major actors in the war such as Stalin, Mussolini were still alive. These men pursued post world war politics with the same haste and devastating frame of mind with which they led the world into the war. It reduced with the death of Stalin in 1955. He was the brain behind the Berlin crisis in which he erected the “Berlin Wall” to prevent West Germany from getting food supplies from East Germany.

Post Stalin Phase (1953-1968): This period witnessed less aggression because the leaders in Soviet Union and the US were not ready to create unnecessary tension in world politics. This was the era of conscious approach. The Cuban missile crisis of 1962 also occurred during this period.

Détente Phase (1968-1982): This was the era where the two super powers decided to embark on dialogue with each other. They agreed to increase trade with each other and work on scientific and cultural projects. Most importantly, they agreed to arms control, or limiting the number of weapons that each nation could have. The agreement signed by Richard Nixon and Brezhnev of Soviet Union limited the number of nuclear, or atomic, missiles on each side. This marked the beginning of the period of détente or easing of tensions between the super powers.

The Era of the Arms Race (1982-1989): This period observed the resurgence of tension in the system. The US and Soviet Union tried to build more weapons. Leaders of each country believed that having more weapons and being the most powerful would keep their country safe. It started with the atom bombs. The Soviet Union knew what atom bombs had done to the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It feared the power of the US to destroy a whole city with one bomb. Soon the Soviet Union was building its own atom bombs.

After the Soviet Union had the atom bomb, the US made an even more powerful bomb. Scientists said that the hydrogen bomb or the H-bomb was a thousand times more powerful than the atom bomb dropped on Japan during the World War Two. Other atomic bombs were made too. By the 1960s the superpowers had missiles that could carry bombs to target half way around the world. Both the Americans and the Soviets

lived in fear during the Cold War. Some Americans built special shelters below ground as protection in case of an attack.

The End of Cold War and collapse of the Soviet Union (1990): At this, a young dynamic and visionary leader had emerged as the Russian leader. His name, Mikhail Gorbachev. He wanted a change in Russia's political and economic philosophy. Socialism was no longer a viable option as seen with the heavy debt incurred by the Russian government. He called for "perestroika" or "reconstructing" and "glasnost" or "openness" of the Soviet government and economy. In 1989, the new President of the US, George Bush, met Gorbachev and after discussing about the changes in Europe and Soviet Union, they left amicably and signaled the end of the war. The Cold War ended after the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, leaving the US as the dominant military power, and Russia possessing most of the Soviet Union's nuclear arsenal. The Cold War and its events have had a significant impact on the world today, and it is commonly referred to in popular culture.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the Cold War.

3.2 Aftermath of the Cold War

The aftermath of the Cold War did influence world affairs. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the post Cold War is widely seen as unipolarity with the US. The Cold War also marked the apex of peacetime military-industrial complexes, especially in the USA, and large-scale military funding of science. These complexes, though their origins may be found as early as the 19th Century, have grown considerably during the Cold War. The military-industrial complexes have great impact on their countries and help shape their society, policy and foreign relation. Military expenditures by the US during the Cold War years were estimated to have been \$8 trillion, while nearly 100,000 Americans lost their lives in the Korean War and Vietnam War.

However, the loss of lives among Soviet soldiers is difficult to estimate, as a share of their gross national product the financial cost for the Soviet Union was far higher than that incurred by the US. In addition to the loss of lives by uniformed soldiers, millions died in the superpowers' proxy wars around the globe, most notably in Southeast Asia. Most of the proxy wars and subsidies for local conflicts ended along with the Cold War; interstate wars, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars, as well as refugee and displaced persons crises have declined sharply in the post-Cold War years.

The aftermath of Cold War conflict, however, is not always easy to forget, as many of the economic and social tensions that were exploited to fuel Cold War competition in parts of the Third World remain acute. The breakdown of state control in a number of areas formerly ruled by Communist governments has produced new civil and ethnic conflicts, particularly in the former Yugoslavia. In Eastern Europe, the end of the Cold War has ushered in an era of economic growth and a large increase in the number of liberal democracies, while in other parts of the world, such as Afghanistan, independence was accompanied by state failure.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Examine the factors that led to the Cold War.

3.2 The Relevance of American Diplomacy in the 20th Century

The US has proven to the world that she has the strength and dynamism to shape the world. The US like all countries carries primary responsibility for its own welfare. Americans like to think of their country as the goddess of liberty, holding high the torch of freedom as a beacon light to all the peoples of the world. Communist propagandists see America as a ruthless imperialist power trying to prop up her rotten system by exporting her troubles to the rest of the world and to force all other nations to accept her dictates. Some friendlier critics speak of her as a reluctant dragon with brute strength but with little mind. The interesting thing about them is not that they misrepresent or obscure the real US but they all appraise her in terms of foreign policy.

Beyond that, little in history tells a great power, even a super power, how to behave, except that it must always define and defend its interests, precisely and historically calculated. In the words of Roosevelt, the presidency is a "bully pulpit." When the president speaks just about everybody listens. A US president who understands opportunities available can explain to the American people and the world in general. This has put America in a leadership position. It is a source of pride to the Americans that their President can appeal to and lead other nations.

Throughout the 20th Century, the US conducted her diplomacy through the using her political, economic, technological power. As a result, the US exercised her power with the creation of multilateral institutions to support the maintenance and facilitation of the public good of free trade. That period saw the creation of such institutions as the Bretton Woods system such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, all which supported balance of payments, free trade, and reserve currency stability.

The fall of the Soviet Union in 1991 saw the replacement of a bipolar international system with an American-led one. As such, this emphasis on exercising American leadership through multilateralism, collective action, and international institutions has increased. She has been able to exercise her power internationally by linking leadership to methods of coercion that are both intellectual and moral in character.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Is America still a super power? Discuss.

3.2.1 The United States of America's Cooperation with Other Nations

The US unique quality is that she takes into account each country, her problems, her developments or underdevelopments and the political tensions amongst other countries. She has supported countries in trouble as history depicts. She has also participated in issues and conflict areas of other countries such as Japan in relation to China, Pakistan in respect to India and Saudi Arabia in relation to Iran. She has served other countries to maintain peaceful cooperative relationship. The works of the US and the dedication of Americans towards maintaining global peace show how willing her leaders were to support the international communities. At the initial stage, the US is seen as the leaders of other nations as it is more powerful and stronger as compared with other countries of the world. The world when faced by crisis whether politically, socially or economically, search for an alternative solution and refer to the authorities of the US. American leaders do welcome them, participate in their issues, and provide alternative solutions for them to act on.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Has unipolarity affected American diplomacy in the 20th Century? Explain.

4.0 CONCLUSION

During the Cold War, two different objectives of the US - first making the world safe for capitalism, and second, ensuring its hegemony with the capitalist world - reinforced one another. This was possible because Western European governments and Japan shared a common perception that the Soviet Union and 'evil' communism presented a mutual threat that could be contained only with US leadership. It also provided the US the ample opportunity to consider her interest first, sufficient benefits flowed to the propertied class in enough countries in making the US to be acting in the interest of other countries. Thus, as a student of American diplomacy, you must be able to adapt to the changes of events in international politics.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you learnt that the US has been able to influence the world with her political, economic, social, technological goals. You also learnt that the US helped sharpen ideals and aspirations in international politics. She has been able to exercise her power internationally by linking her leadership to methods of coercion that are both intellectual and moral in character. The end of the Cold War created an opportunity for the US to organise international politics around its preferred choices with the removal of coercive effects of the East-west contest for world influence.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Would you describe the new world order as a positive development for Africa?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Arthur, A. (1966). *Ideas, Ideas and American Diplomacy: A History of Their Growth and Interaction*. New York: Meredith Publishing Co.
- Christopher, L. (2006). *The Peace of illusions: America Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present* Ithaca. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Craig, G., et al. (1995). *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of our Time*. (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Diehl, P. (Ed.). (1996). *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organisations in an Interdependent World*. Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner.
- Fareed, Z. (1999). *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual origins of America's World Role*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Friedman, N. (2007). *The Fifty-Year War: Conflict and Strategy in the Cold War*. USA: Naval Institute Press.
- Gaddis, J. (1997). *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gaddis, J. (1990). *Russia, the Soviet Union and the United States. An Interpretative History*. USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Gaddis, J. (2005). *The Cold War: A New History*. London: Penguin Press.
- Garthoff, R (1994). *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan*. Washington D.C: Brookings Institution Press.
- Geiger, T. (2004). *Britain and the Economic Problem of the Cold War*. London: Ashgate Publishing.
- Glenn, P. (1996). *American Foreign Policy: Past, Present, Future*. (3rd ed.). USA: Prentice –Hall.
- Kort, M. (2001). *The Columbia Guide to the Cold War*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Leffler, M. (1992). *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War*. USA: Stanford University Press.
- Lundestad, G. (2005). “East, West, North, South: Major Developments in International Politics since 1945.” Orwell, G, *The Observer*, March 10, 1946.
- Rourke, J. (2001). *International Politics on the World Stage*. (8th ed.). USA: McGraw-Hill Dushkin.
- Sharp, P. (1999) “For Diplomacy: Representation and the Study of International Relations.” *International Studies Review* 1:33-58.

MODULE 4 THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

- Unit 1 The Contribution of the United States of America in the Formation of International Organisations
- Unit 2 Global Institutions
- Unit 3 Regional Institution
- Unit 4 Sub-regional Institution

UNIT 1 CONTRIBUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE FORMATION OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Concept of International Organisation
 - 3.2 The Contribution of the United States of America in the Formation of International organisations
 - 3.3 Reasons for the Creation of International Organisations
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The US is a primary actor in world politics and she understands the relevance of international organisations. Many observers believe that global, regional and specialised international organisations can and should begin to authoritatively regulate the behaviour of states. Advocates of strengthened international organisation believe that it is time to address world problems by working towards global solutions through global organizations. Those who take this view would join in the counsel given by Shakespeare in Henry VI Part III: “now join your hands and with your hands and with your hands your hearts.” However, people see the relevance of international organisation in the development of relations among nations .In this unit, we shall examine the contribution of the US in the emergence of international organisations.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- identify the governments and politics of American states
- discuss the roles of non- state actor play in international politics
- define international organisation
- explain the functions of international organisation.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Concept of International Organisation

One of the promising developments of the 20th century in interstate relations has been the proliferation of international organisations. For the first time in history, permanent organisations of a nearly universal type emerge. Professor Pitman B. Potter distinguished six special forms of international organisation, namely, diplomacy, treaty negotiations, international law, conference, administration and adjudication-one general form, international federation. The classification relates more to procedure in international intercourse than to varieties of international organisations. The term “international organisation” is defined as “any cooperative arrangement instituted among states, usually by a basic agreement to perform some mutually advantageous functions implemented through periodic meetings and state activities.”

According to Prof Potter’s conception, international organisation has existed in at least primitive form through most of recorded history. There are many lesser international organisation associated with today’s general international organisation. Some of these are specialised agencies, which are equally broad in membership but more limited in function. Outside the United Nations (UN) structure, there are regional organisation of a general character, the Organisation of American States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) - Sub regional structure of a character North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

International organisations are transnational organisations created by two or more sovereign states represented by the accredited representatives of member states when they meet. Member states meet regularly to discuss issues of common interests to them and agree on resolutions, which constitute policy measure by member states. However, membership in an international organisation is voluntary; decisions once taken are expected to be respected by members.

According to Godspeed (1967), international organisations are not created to threaten the sovereignty of member states, in practice by belonging to an international organisation; a state has by implication restricted the full extent of its sovereignty. However, membership in an international organisation is voluntary; decisions once taken are expected to be binding on member states. In practice, by becoming a member of an international organisation, a state has by implication restricted the full extent of its sovereignty.

The creation of international organisations was the expanding governmental functions are being dealt with by international organisations. If you review the major departments and ministries of your national government and the subjects they address, it is almost certain that you would be able to find one or two dealing with international level. According to Abbot et al. (1998:29), states take advantage of international organisations; states are able to achieve goals that they cannot accomplish alone.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the concept of international organisation.

3.2 The Contribution of the United States of America in the Formation of International Organisations

International affairs are seen as the choice of method that can serve to advertise a country's good faith or disinterestedness. Most states act both unilaterally and multilaterally at times: the former in defence of their national security or in their immediate backyard, the latter in pursuit of global causes. The larger a country's backyard, however, the greater the temptation to act unilaterally across .It is a problem most acute in the case of the US; hence, the need for international organisation, which the US government recognised.

“All the world is a stage and all the men and women merely players.” William Shakespeare (1564-1616). These lines are used here to help us convey how international organisations came into existence. The US after the Second World War saw the need to establish international organisations in dealing with problems among nations.

The 20th century experience of growth in international organisations both in number and in scope of activity is the result of a number of forces. These forces were summarised by two scholars who examined why states act through international organisations. Their conclusion was that “by taking advantage of international organisation states are able to

achieve goals that they cannot accomplish alone” (Abbot et al., 1998:29). In other words, the growth of international organisations has occurred because countries have found that they need them and that they work.

The two schools of thought as one realist scholar puts it “international organisations (IGOs) are basically a reflection of the distribution of power in the world. They are based on the self-interested calculations of the great powers...have no independent effects on state behaviour ... (and) therefore... are not an important cause of peace” (Mearsheimer, 1995:7). Further, idealist contend that IGOs are “essential if states are to have any hope of sustained cooperation and that “international institution ...will be components of any lasting peace” (Keohane, et al., 1995:47, 50).

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Examine the role the US played in the formation of international organisations.

3.3 Reasons for the Creation of International Organisations

The following factors were responsible for the creation of international organisation by the US:

- The world’s increased interdependence especially in the economic sphere, which led to the creation of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank are two examples, regional trade and monetary organisations, cartels and to a degree multinational corporations are other examples. This was expected to bring solutions to states.
- The failure of state to provide security: The agony of two world wars for instance convinced many nations that peace was not safe in the hands of nation states .The continuing problems in health, food, human rights and other areas have spurred the role of the US.
- Small states will be able to gain strength through joint action, especially with the concentration of military and economic power in a handful of countries has led less powerful actors to join coalitions in an attempt to influence events.

Thus, the US foreign policy has become as much a matter of managing global issues as managing bilateral ones. At the same time, the concept of nation state as self- sufficient is also weakening. However, state

remains the primary political unit; most citizens understand that it cannot do everything on its own.

To function in the world, people have to deal with institutions and individuals beyond their country's borders. American jobs depend not only on local firms and factories, but also on faraway markets, grants of licenses and access from foreign governments, international trade rules that ensure the free movement of goods and persons, and international financial institutions that ensure stability. These led to the establishment of the UN and a host of other international organisations, which will be discussed in details in subsequent units.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Can states be independent without international organisations? Discuss.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The US understands the importance of international organisations. Many scholars assert that global regional and specialised international organisations can authoritatively address world problems by working towards global solutions through global organisations. Moreover, people acknowledge the need for international organisation in the development of relations among nations. The US foreign policy has however become as much a matter of managing global issues as managing bilateral ones. At the same time, the concept of nation state as self-sufficient is also weakening. Nevertheless, the state remains the primary political unit; most citizens understand that it cannot do everything on its own.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that the US after the Second World War saw the need for international organisations in addressing problems of nations. You also learnt that the growth of international organisations in the 20th century has increased both in number and in activity. States have been able to conduct their activities through the help of international organisations.

6.0 TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Has international organisations solved problems of nation states? Discuss.

6.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Abbot, K., et al. (1998). "Why States Act through Formal International Organisation." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42 (1).
- Allulis, J., et al. (1996). *Shakespeare's Political Pageant: Essays in Politics and Literature*. Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Barnett M., et al. (1999). "The Politics, Power and Pathologies of International Organisations." *International Organisation*, 53 (4).
- Fareed, Z. (1999). *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual origins of America's World Role*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- James, D. (1985). *The Politics of American Foreign Policy*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliff Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Krasner, S. (1991). "Global Communications and National Power: Life on the Pareto frontier." *World Politics*, 43 (3): 336-66.
- Michael, G.R., et al. (2008). *The New World of International Relations*. (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Hall.
- Mitchell, R., et al. (2001). "Reciprocity Coercion or Exchange Symmetry Asymmetry and Power in Institutional Design." *International Organisation*, 55 (4).
- Young, R. (1999) *Governance in World Affairs*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

UNIT 2 GLOBAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The United Nations
 - 3.3.1 The General Assembly
 - 3.3.2 The Security Council
 - 3.3.3 The Secretariat
 - 3.2 The International Monetary Fund (MF)
 - 3.2.1 Membership
 - 3.3 The World Bank
 - 3.3.1 Membership
 - 3.3.2 The Secretariat
 - 3.3.3 Voting Powers
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor- Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit, we talked about the role the United States of America (US) played in the creation of international organisations. In this unit, you will be introduced to how the United Nations (UN), International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank were formed as global institutions. The UN was established to replace the flawed League of Nations in 1945 to maintain international peace and promote cooperation in solving international economic, social and humanitarian problems. The earlier concrete plan for a new world organisation started under the aegis of the US State Department in 1939. Franklin D. Roosevelt first coined the term 'United Nations' as a term to describe the Allied countries. This term was officially used on January 1, 1942 where 26 governments signed the Atlantic Charter, pledging to continue the war effort.

On April 25, 1945, the UN Conference on International Organisation held in San Francisco which was attended by 50 governments and a number of non-governmental organisations were involved in the drafting of the charter of the UN. The UN officially came into existence on October 4, 1945 upon ratification of the charter by the five permanent members of the Security Council France, the Republic of China, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom (UK) and the US and by a majority

of the 46 signatories. The first meeting of the General Assembly with 51 nations represented and the Security Council took place in Westminster Central Hall in London in January 1946.

The IMF is an intergovernmental organisation that oversees the global financial system by adopting the macroeconomic policies of its member countries; in particular, those with an impact on exchange rate and the balance of payments. Its objectives are to stabilise international exchange rates and facilitate development through the encouragement of liberalising economic policies in other countries as a condition of loans, debt relief, and aid. It also offers loans with varying levels of conditionality, mainly to poorer countries. Its headquarters is in Washington, DC. The IMF's relatively high influence in world affairs and development has drawn heavy criticism from some sources.

The World Bank was founded in 1944 at the Bretton Woods meetings, New Hampshire in the US as part of a new world financial and economic system. It is worth noting that at the meeting, the two major multilateral financial institutions were established- the World Bank and IMF. The World Bank was established to give aid to European countries to enable them come out from the ruins of the first and the second world wars, in terms of reconstructing their economies. The World Bank was to assist finance antipoverty projects such as agriculture, rural development, energy development, health, industry, mining, population planning, technical assistance, transportation, telecommunications, urban development and water supply.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- analyse the role of international organisations in the world
- discuss the relations between government and international organisations
- define the role of domestic politics among countries in the creation of international organisations
- identify the promotion of international peace and economic development as exemplified by the UN, IMF and the World bank.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The United Nations

The United Nations (UN) was an outgrowth of the Atlantic Charter; it appeared in the Declaration by the United Nations on January 1, 1942, which 26 nations pledged to continue to fight the axis powers. Their main inspiration was the League of Nations; however, their goals were to rectify the League's imperfections to create an organisation that would be "the primary vehicle for maintaining peace and stability."

Roosevelt's main role was to persuade the different allies, especially Winston Churchill of the UK and Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union to join the new organisation. The negotiations took place during the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the Yalta Conference where the three world leaders tried to reach an agreement concerning the UN structure, purposes and principles. It will interest you to note that Roosevelt saw the UN as the crowning achievement of his political career.

In 1945, representatives from 50 countries met in San Francisco for the United Nations Conference on International Organisation. They discuss on proposals that had been drafted by representatives of the Republic of China, the Soviet Union, the UK and the UN at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference between August and October of 1944. Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin reviewed the Dumbarton Oaks proposal during the Yalta Conference in February 1945. The goal of the conference was to discuss post-war settlements and to reach a final agreement concerning the UN's structure and membership and set the date of the San Francisco organising conference.

The world leaders accepted Roosevelt's proposal to give certain members a veto power so that the organisation could take no important action without their joint consent. Though the veto power question created a lot of disagreement among the different signatories, its inclusion in the charter was never a matter of negotiation for Roosevelt and his allies.

Finally, during the Yalta conference, Stalin agreed to make the USSR a member of the UN. The UN was the first international organisation to receive significant support from the US. Its forerunner, the League of Nations, had been championed by Woodrow Wilson after World War I to prevent future conflicts. While it was supported by most European nations, it was never ratified by the Hitchcock Reservations.

The UN system is based on five principal organs, namely, General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the Secretariat and the International Court of Justice, the Trusteeship Council, which has suspended operations in 1994 upon independence of Palau. However, four of the five principal organs are located at UN headquarters in New York. The International Court of Justice is located in The Hague.

3.2.1 The General Assembly

Membership of the UN is open to all peace-loving nations, which accept the obligations of the charter and are willing and able to carry out these obligations. The General Assembly admits new member states on the recommendation of the Security Council. General Assembly is the main deliberative of the UN. It composed of all UN member states; the assembly meets in regular yearly sessions under a president elected from among member states.

Over a two-week period at the start of each session, all members have the opportunity to address the Assembly. Traditionally, the Secretary-General makes the first statement, followed by the president of the Assembly. The first session was convened on January 10, 1946 in the Westminster Hall, London and included representatives of 51 nations.

The General Assembly votes on important questions, two-thirds of the majority of those present and voting is required. Examples of important questions include recommendations on peace and security; election of members to organs; admission, suspension, and expulsion of members; and, budgetary matters. All other questions are decided by the majority vote. Each member country has one vote. Apart from approval of budgetary matters, resolutions are not binding on the members. The Assembly may make recommendations on any matters within the scope of the UN, except matters of peace and security that are under Security Council consideration. The one state, one vote power structure could enable states comprising just 80 per cent of the world population to pass a resolution by a two-third vote. However, as no more than recommendations, it is difficult to imagine a situation in which a recommendation.

3.2.2 The Security Council

The Security Council is responsible for the maintenance of peace and security among countries. While other organs of the UN can only make 'recommendations' to member governments, the Security Council has the power to make binding decisions that member governments have

agreed to carry out, under the terms of Charter Article 25 (UN Charter :Chapter V). The decisions of the Council are known as United Security Council resolutions.

The Security Council is made up of 15 member states, consisting of five permanent members: China, France, Russia, the UK and the US -and 10 non-permanent members, currently- Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Colombia, Gabon, Germany, India, Lebanon, Nigeria, Portugal, South Africa. The five permanent members hold veto power over substantive but not procedural resolutions allowing a permanent member to block adoption but not to block the debate of a resolution unacceptable to it. The 10 temporary seats are held for two-year terms with member states voted in by the General Assembly on a regional basis. The presidency of the Security Council is rotated alphabetically each month.

3.3.3 The Secretariat

The UN Secretariat is headed by the Secretary General assisted by a staff of international civil servants worldwide. It provides studies, information, and facilities needed by the UN bodies for their meetings. It also carries out tasks as directed by the UN Security Council, the UN General Assembly, the UN Economic and Social Council, and other UN bodies. The UN Charter provides that the staff be chosen by application of the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity, with due regard for the importance of recruiting on a wide geographical basis.

The Charter provides that the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any authority other than the UN. Each UN member country is enjoined to respect the international character of the Secretariat and not seek to influence its staff. The Secretary-General alone is responsible for staff selection.

The Secretary-General's duties include helping resolve international disputes, administering peacekeeping operations, organising international conferences, gathering information on the implementation of Security Council decisions, and consulting with member governments regarding various initiatives. Key Secretariat offices in this area include the Office of the Coordinator of Humanitarian Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter that, in his or her opinion, may threaten international peace and security.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the role of the Security Council.

3.2 The International Monetary Fund (IMF)

At the end of the Second World War, many trading nations in Western Europe and Northern America were forced by the global depression to introduce trade restrictions. Some restricted imports and controlled the use of foreign exchange, while others devalued their currencies. Taken together, the restrictions on trade caused further economic decline in terms of world trade, output and employment. It is important to note that dollar hegemony had been strategic to the future of American global dominance, which was made possible by the twin disasters of the great depression and the war, which forced a reconstruction of the world's economy. This gave a new life to capitalism and placed the US at the centre of affairs both in political and economic leadership and to dictate how the world order would be organised. The IMF met in July 1944 during the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference. The representatives of 45 governments met in Mount Washington Hotel in the area of Bretton Woods, New Hampshire. The US along with delegates to the conference agreed on a framework for international economic cooperation, designed in part, to prevent the mutually destructive policies that prevailed in the 1930s.

The IMF was formally organised on December 27, 1945, when the first 29 countries signed its Articles of Agreement. It came up with a goal to stabilise exchange rates and assist the reconstruction of the world's international payment system. Its influence in the global economy steadily increased as it accumulated more members. It began operations on March 1, 1947 later that year; France became the first country to borrow from the IMF. Between 1945 and 1971, the IMF promoted exchange rate stability under the Bretton Woods arrangement under which the US guaranteed the value of the dollar in terms of gold, while other countries pegged their currencies to the dollar.

In support of this goal, the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) focused on implementing and defending the Bretton Woods systems. The IMF managing director has been European. Executive directors, who confirm the managing director, are voted in by finance ministers from countries they represent. The first deputy managing director of the IMF, the second in command has traditionally been (and is today) an American.

The primary mission of the IMF is to provide financial assistance to countries that experience serious financial and economic difficulties using funds deposited with the IMF from the institution's 187 member countries. Member states with balance of payments problems, which often arise from these difficulties, may request loans to help fill gaps between what countries earn and or are able to borrow from other official lenders and what countries must spend to operate, including covering the cost of importing basic goods and services. In return, countries are usually required to launch certain reforms, which have often been dubbed by the Washington consensus.

These reforms are thought to be beneficial to countries with fixed exchange rate policies that may engage in fiscal, monetary, and political practices that may lead to the crisis itself. For example, nations with severe budget deficits, rampant inflation, strict price controls, or significantly overvalued or undervalued currencies run the risk of facing balance-of-payment crises. Thus, the structural adjustment programs are at least ostensibly intended to ensure that the IMF is actually helping to prevent financial crises rather than merely funding financial recklessness.

The IMF is for the most part controlled by the major Western powers with voting rights on the executive board based on a quota derived from the relative size of a country in the global economy. Critics claim that the board rarely votes and passes issues contradicting the will of the US or Europeans, which combined represent the largest bloc of shareholders in the IMF. By contrast, executive directors that represent emerging and developing countries have many times strongly defended the group of nations in their constituency.

3.2.1 Membership

For a state to become a member of the IMF, her application will be considered first by the IMF's executive board. After its consideration, the board will submit a report to the board of governors of the IMF with recommendations in the form of a membership resolution. These recommendations cover the amount of quota in the IMF, the form of payment of the subscription, and other customary terms and conditions of membership. After the board of governors has adopted the membership resolution, the applicant state needs to take the legal steps required under its own law to enable it to sign the IMF's Articles of Agreement and to fulfill the obligations of the IMF membership.

The expansion of the IMF membership, together with the changes in the world economy, has required the IMF to adapt in a variety of ways to

continue serving its purposes effectively. All member states participate directly in the IMF. Member states are represented on a 24-member executive board (five executive directors are appointed by the five members with the largest quotas, nineteen executive directors are elected by the remaining members), and all members appoint a governor to the IMF's board of governors. A member's quota in the IMF determines the amount of its subscription, its voting weight, its access to IMF financing, and its allocation of Special Drawing Rights (SDR). A member state cannot unilaterally increase its quota—increases must be approved by the Executive Board of IMF and are linked to formulas that include many variables such as the size of a country in the world economy.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain the role of the IMF in the 20th Century.

3.3 The World Bank

The Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 deliberated on the organisation of post-war international economic relations. Its most important recommendation was the creation of the three international institutions. These are: the World Bank, to perform the role of a development bank in the development and restructuring of war ravaged and underdeveloped countries; the IMF, to play the role of short term lender to member countries experiencing balance of payment deficits and adviser on exchange rate matters and the International Trade Organisation to promote orderly development of international trade and employment.

Our focus here is the World Bank. The World Bank is an international financial institution that provides loans to developing countries for capital programmes. The World Bank official goal is the reduction of poverty. By law, all of its decisions are guided by a commitment to promote foreign investment, international trade and facilitate capital investment. The World Bank is by custom headed by an American. Its headquarters is based in Washington. For the poorest in the world, the bank's assistance plans are based on poverty reduction strategies. By combining a cross-section of local groups with an extensive analysis of the country's financial and economic situation, the World Bank develops a strategy pertaining uniquely to the country in question. The government then identifies the country's priorities and targets for the reduction of poverty, and the World Bank aligns its aid efforts correspondingly.

The World Bank is seen as a political organisation that must meet the demands of donor and borrowing governments, private capital markets, and other international organisations. In the 1990s, the World Bank and the IMF adopted the Washington Consensus policies, which included deregulation and liberalisation of markets, privatisation and the downscaling of government. Though the Washington Consensus was conceived as a policy that would best promote development, it was criticized for ignoring equity, employment and how reforms like privatisation were carried out. Many now agree that the Washington Consensus placed too much emphasis on the growth of GDP, and not enough on the permanence of growth or on whether growth contributed to better living standards.

3.3.1 Membership

The organisation that make up the World Bank are owned by the governments of member nations, which have the ultimate decision making power within the organisations on all matters including policy, financial issues. Member countries govern the World Bank Group the Board of Governors and the Boards of Executive Directors. They make all major decisions for the organisation. For a country to become a member of the World Bank, she must first be a member of the IMF. Member countries govern the World Bank Group through the Board of Governors and the Boards of Executive Directors. These bodies make all major decisions for the organisations.

3.3.2 The Secretariat

The President of the World Bank is responsible for chairing the meetings of the Boards of Directors and for overall management of the World Bank. Traditionally, the World Bank President has always been a US citizen nominated by the US government, the largest shareholder in the bank. The nominee is subject to confirmation by the Board of Governors, to serve for a five-year, renewable term. The Executive Directors, representing the World Bank member countries, make up the Board of Directors, usually meeting twice a week to oversee activities such as the approval of loans and guarantees, new policies, the administrative budget, country assistance strategies and borrowing and financing decisions.

The Vice Presidents of the World Bank are its principal managers, in charge of regions, sectors, networks and functions. There are 24 Vice-Presidents, three Senior Vice Presidents and two Executive Vice Presidents.

3.3.3 Voting Powers

The World Bank adopted a weighted system of voting. According to IBRD Articles of Agreement, membership in the World Bank is open to all members of the IMF. A country applying for membership in the IMF is required to supply data on its economy, which are compared with data from other member countries whose economies are similar in size. A quota is assigned which is based on the country's subscription to the IMF, and it determines its voting power in the fund. Each new member country of the World Bank is allotted 250 votes plus one additional vote for each share it holds in the World Bank capital stock. The quota assigned by the IMF is used to determine the number of shares allotted to each new member country of the World Bank.

Five Executive Directors are appointed by the members with the five largest numbers of shares (currently the US, Japan, Germany, France and the UK). China, the Russian Federation, and Saudi Arabia each elect its own Executive Director. The other Executive Directors are elected by the other members. The voting power distribution differs from agency to agency within the World Bank Group.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the role the US played in the formation of the World Bank.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The founding fathers of these institutions believe that the institutions would help in the promotion of peace and economic development; however, the outbreak of the Cold War made peacekeeping agreements extremely difficult because of the division of the world into hostile camps. Following the end of the Cold War, there were renewed calls for the UN to become the agency for achieving world peace, as there are several dozen ongoing conflicts that continue to rage around the globe. The UN has also drawn criticism for failures. The World Bank played a big role in the post war period contributing significantly to the reconstruction and development of member states. Critics claim that IMF is run solely by the US and European countries and other developing countries are not given the privilege to participate.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that the UN, IMF and the World Bank are global institutions whose stated aims are to facilitate cooperation in

international law, international security, economic development, social progress, human rights, and achievements of world peace.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss American influence in the United Nations.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Berch, B. (2003). "Globalisation of Capital and the Nation State: Imperialism, Class struggle and the State in the age of global Capitalism."

Cyle, D. (1969). *The United Nations and How It Works*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Devesh, K., et al. (1997). *The World Bank: Its First half Century, Volume 2 Perspectives*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Graham, R. (2003). *The IMF and the Future: Issues and Options Facing the Fund*. London: Routledge.

Gustav, R., et al. (2006). *Globalisation and the Nation State: The Impact of the Impact of the IMF and the World Bank*. London: Routledge.

Hertz, N. (2004). *I.O.U.: The Debt Threat and Why We Must Defuse It*. London: Harper Perennial.

Morrison, J.R. (1998). "Financial Organisation and Operations of the IMF." Issue 45 of Pamphlet Series.

Vreeland, J. R. (2003). *The IMF and Economic Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jean, K. (1990). "Beyond the Cold War Foreign Affairs." Vol. 69, N0.1.

Keith, S. (1986). "Reshaping the Global Agenda." The United Nations at Forty United Nations Association of Australia.

Leon, G. (Ed). (1978). *The United Nations in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Maurice, B. (1997). *The United Nations: Past, Present and Future*. Martinis Nijhoff Publishers.
- Michael, G. (2006). *Imperial Nature: The World Bank and Struggles for Social Justice in the Age of Globalisation*. Yale: Yale University Press.
- Miles, C. (1969). *The Game of Nations*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Monbiot, G. (2004). *The Age of Consent*. London: Harper Perennial.
- Mosley, P., et al. (1991). *Aid and Power: The World Bank and Policy-Based Lending*. London: Routledge.
- Stiglitz, J. (2006). *Making Globalisation Work*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Stone, D. (Ed.). (2006). *The World Bank and Governance: A Decade of Reform and Reaction*. Rutledge.
- Sullivan, A. (2003). *Economics: Principles in action*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- “The United Nations at Forty (1985) –A Foundation to Build on United Nations Publication.”
- Toussaint, E. (1998). *Your Money or Your Life! The Tyranny of Global Finance*. London: Pluto Press.
- Townsend, H., et al. (1997). *FDR and the Creation of the UN*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Weaver, C. (2004). *Hypocrisy Trap: The World Bank and the Poverty of Reform*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Woods, N. (2006). *The Globalisers: The IMF, the World Bank, and Their Borrowers*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

UNIT 3 REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Organisation of American States
 - 3.1.1 The General Assembly
 - 3.1.2 The Permanent Council
 - 3.1.3 The Inter American Council for Integral Development
 - 3.2 The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
 - 3.2.1 The Secretariat
 - 3.2.2 The NATO Council
 - 3.2.3 The NATO Parliamentary Assembly
 - 3.2.4 Military Structures
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The previous unit sought to introduce you to how the United Nations (UN) was established as a global institution .In this unit, you will again be introduced to how the Organization of American States and North Atlantic Treaty Organisation was formed as a regional institution. The formation of Organisation of American states dates back to the First International Conference of American States, held in Washington, DC from October 1889 to April 1890. The meeting approved the establishment of the International Union of American Republics, and the stage was set for the weaving of a web of provisions and institutions that came to be known as the inter-American system, the oldest international institutional system.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able:

- explain the roles regional organisations play in global politics
- discuss how regional organisation shape some aspect of transnational relations
- distinguish how states and non-state actors create institutions that help them achieve their interests

- discuss the ideas and norms in international politics which influence the creation of regional organisations.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Organisation of American States

The formation of Organisation of American States (OAS) dates back to the First International Conference of American States, held in Washington, DC from October 1889 to April 1890. The meeting approved the establishment of the International Union of American Republics. The stage was set for the weaving of a web of provisions and institutions that came to be known as the inter-American system, the oldest international institutional system.

The OAS came into being in 1948 with the signing in Bogotá, Colombia, of the [Charter of the OAS](#), which entered into force in December 1951. The Organisation was established to achieve among its member states—as stipulated in Article 1 of the Charter—"an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence."

Today, the OAS brings together all 35 [independent states](#) of the America and constitutes the main political, juridical, and social governmental forum in the Hemisphere. In addition, it has granted observer status to 67 states, as well as to the [European Union](#) (EU).

The OAS uses a four-pronged approach to effectively implement its essential purposes, based on its main pillars: democracy, human rights, security, and development.

3.1.1 The General Assembly

The General Assembly is the supreme organ of the OAS. It is comprised of delegations of the member states, usually headed by the 34 ministers of foreign affairs of the nations of the America. The General Assembly convenes once a year in regular session, and in special sessions, which are convoked by the Permanent Council of the Organisation.

3.1.2 The Permanent Council

The Permanent Council of the Organisation has the powers assigned to it in Chapter XII of the OAS Charter and the other inter-American instruments, as well as the functions entrusted to it by the General Assembly and the Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers.

Article 84 of the OAS Charter states that the Permanent Council shall keep vigilance over the maintenance of friendly relations among the member states and assist them in the peaceful settlement of their disputes. The Council carries out the mandates of the General Assembly or of the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs whose implementation has not been assigned to any other body. The Council also serves as the Preparatory Committee to the General Assembly.

At the request of member states, the Permanent Council prepares draft agreements to promote and facilitate cooperation between the OAS, the United Nations, and other inter-American institutions. The Council considers the reports of the organs, agencies, and entities of the inter-American system and presents to the General Assembly any observations and recommendations it deems necessary.

The Council ensures that the general standards to govern the operations of the General Secretariat are observed and applied, and when the General Assembly is not in session, the Council approves regulatory provisions that enable the General Secretariat carry out its administrative functions.

3.1.3 The Inter-American Council for Integral Development

It is an organ of the OAS that reports directly to the General Assembly. It was established when the Protocol of Managua entered into force on January 29, 1996, and it has decision-making authority in matters related to partnership for development. Its functions are detailed in Chapter XIII of the OAS Charter. Its subsidiary bodies are the Permanent Executive Committee of the Inter-American Council for Integral Development (CEPCIDI), the Inter-American Agency for Cooperation and Development (IACD), the Nonpermanent Specialized Committees (CENPES), and the Inter-American Committees.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Has OAS been alive to its responsibility in the 20th century? Discuss.

3.2 The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) is an intergovernmental military alliance based on the North Atlantic Treaty, which was signed on April 4, 1949. The NATO headquarters is based in Brussels. The organisation constitutes a system of collective defence whereby its member states agree on mutual defence in response to an attack by an external party. The alliance includes 28 members in North America and Europe, with most recent being Albania and Croatia who joined in April 2009. An additional 122 countries participate in NATO's partnership for peace while 15 other countries engage in institutionalised dialogue programs.

For its first few years, NATO was not much more than a political association. However, the Korean War galvanised the member states, and an integrated military structure was built up under the direction of the two US supreme commanders. The course of the Cold War led to a rivalry with nations of the Warsaw pact, formed in 1955. The first NATO Secretary General Lord Ismay famously stated that the organisation's initial goal was "to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the German down. Doubts over the strength of the relationship between the European states and the United States ebbed and flowed, along with doubts over credibility of the NATO defense against a prospective soviet invasion-doubt that led to the development of the independent French nuclear deterrent and the withdrawal of the French from NATO's military structure in 1966.

NATO has added new members seven times since first forming in 1949 (the last two in 2009). NATO comprises 28 members: Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, the UK, and the US. New membership in the alliance has been largely from Eastern and the Balkans including former members of the Warsaw pact. At the 2008 summit in Bucharest, three countries were promised future invitations: Republic of Macedonia, Georgia and Ukraine.

3.2.1 The Secretariat

The main headquarters of NATO is located in Brussels, Belgium. The staff at the headquarters is composed of national delegations of member countries; it includes civilian and military liaison offices and officers or diplomatic missions and diplomats of partner countries as well as the

international staff and international military staff filled from serving members of the armed forces of member states.

3.2.2 The NATO Council

Like any alliance, NATO is ultimately governed by its 28-member state. However, the North Atlantic Treaty and other agreements outline how decisions are to be made within NATO. Each of the 28 members sends a delegation or mission to NATO's headquarters or mission to NATO's headquarters in Brussels, Belgium. The senior permanent member of each delegation is known as the permanent representative and is generally a senior civil servant or an experienced ambassador (and holding that diplomatic rank). Several countries have diplomatic mission to NATO through embassies in Belgium.

The NATO together with the permanent members form the North Atlantic Council (NAC) a body which meets together at least once a week and has effective governance authority and powers of decision in NATO. From time to time, the Council also meets at higher-level meetings involving foreign ministers, defence ministers or heads of state or government (HOSG). It is at these meetings that major decisions regarding NATO's policies are taken. However, it is worth noting that the council has the same authority and powers of decision-making and its decisions have the same status and validity at whatever levels. It meets NATO's summits also form a further venue for decisions on complex issues such as enlargement.

The meetings of the NAC are chaired by the Secretary General of NATO and when decisions have to be made; action is agreed upon based on unanimity and common accord. There is no voting or decision by majority. Each nation represented at council table or on any of its subordinate committees retains complete sovereignty and responsibility for its own decision.

3.2.3 The NATO Parliamentary Assembly

The NATO ministers of defence and of foreign affairs meet at NATO headquarters in Brussels. The body that sets broad strategic goals for NATO is the NATO parliamentary Assembly which meets at the annual session, and one other during the year, and is the organ that directly interacts with the parliamentary structures of national government of the member states which appoint permanent members or ambassadors to NATO. It is however officially a different structure from NATO, and has as aim to join deputies of NATO countries to discuss security policies on the NATO Council.

The Assembly is the political integration body of NATO that generates political policy agenda setting for the NATO Council via reports of its five committees:

- Committee on Civil Dimension of Security
- Defense and Security Committee
- Economic and Security Committee
- Political Committee
- Science and Technology Committee

These reports provide impetus and direction as agreed upon by the national governments of the member states through their own national political processes and influences to the administrative and executive organizational entities.

3.2.4 Military Structures

The second pivotal member of each country's delegation is the military representative, a senior officer from each country's armed forces, supported by the international military staff. Together with the military representative forms the military committee, a body responsible for recommending to NATO's political authorities those measures considered necessary for the common defense of the NATO area. Its principal role is to provide direction and advice on military policy and strategy. It provided guidance on military matters to the NATO strategic commanders, whose representative attend its meetings, and is responsible for the overall conduct of military affairs of the alliance under the authority of the council. Like the council, from time to time the military committee also meets at higher level, namely at the level of chiefs of defence, the most senior military officers in each nation's armed forces.

NATO's military operations are directed by the chairman of the NATO military committee and split into two strategic commands commanded by a senior US officer and a senior French Officer assisted by a staff drawn from across NATO. The strategic commander is responsible to the military committee for the overall direction and conduct of all alliance military matters within their areas of command. The military committee in turn directs two principal NATO organisations: the allied command operations responsible for the strategic, operational and tactical management of combat and combat support forces of NATO members, and the allied command transformation organisation is responsible for the induction of the new member states forces in NATO forces research and training capacity.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss the role of NATO.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The US understood that OAS was the best solution to address challenges it was facing at the regional level, although there is an increasing perception that the OAS is biased towards US concerns and influences in non-US states and countries.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt the purpose of OAS. It was to strengthen the peace and security of the continent. It was to promote and consolidate representative democracy with due respect for the principle of non-intervention. You will agree with me that it gave a new life to capitalism and placed the US at the centre of affairs, both of political and economic leadership in the continent.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss the US interest in the formation of the NATO.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Abbot, K et al. (1998). "Why States Act through Formal International Organisation." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42 (1).

Allulis, J. (Ed.). (1996) *Shakespeare's Political Pageant: Essays in Politics and Literature*. Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield.

Barnett, M. (1999). "The Politics, Power and Pathologies of International Organisations." *International Organization*, 53 (4).

Espen, B., et al. (Spring 2005). "Should NATO Play a more political role?" *NATO Review*.

Fareed, Z. (1999). *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual origins of America's World Role*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gearson, J. (2002). *The Berlin Wall Crisis: Perspective on Cold War Alliances*. Palgrave: Macmillan.

- Gheciu, A. (2005) *NATO in the New Europe*. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Gordon, M. (1996). *Foreign Policy and Regionalism in the Americas*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- James, D. (1985). *The Politics of American Foreign Policy*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliff Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Krasner, S. (1991). "Global Communications and National Power: Life on the Pareto Frontier." *World Politics*.43 (3) 336-66.
- Mansfield, D, et al. (1999). "The New wave of Regionalism." *International Organisation*, 53: 589-628.
- Michael, G., et al. (2008). *The New World of International Relations*. (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.
- Oggood, R. (1962). *NATO: The Entangling Alliance* University of Chicago Press.
- Park, W. (1986). *Defending the West: A history of NATO*. Westview Press.
- Smith, J. (Ed.). (1990). *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe: International Perspective*. Yale University.

UNIT 4 SUB REGIONAL INSTITUTION

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Meaning of North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)
 - 3.2 Membership
 - 3.3 The Secretariat
 - 3.4 The NAFTA Working Group and Committee
 - 3.5 The NAFTA Trade Commission
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The previous unit sought to introduce you to how Organisation of American States was established as a regional institution. In this unit, you will again be introduced to how the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was formed. The NAFTA is an agreement signed by the governments of Canada, México, and the US, creating a trilateral trade bloc in North America. The agreement was enforce on January 1, 1994.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- analyse the role of sub regional organisation
- discuss the relations between government and sub regional organisations
- define the role of domestic politics among countries in the creation of sub regional organisation
- identify the promotion of trade as exemplified by the NAFTA

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Meaning of North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)

Three leaders met in San Antonio Texas based on diplomatic negotiations on December 17, 1992 to sign NAFTA dating back to 1986. The US President, George Bush, Canadian Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney and Mexican President Carlos Salinas, each responsible for spearheading and promoting the agreement, ceremonially signed it. The agreement then needed to be ratified by each nation's legislative or parliamentary branch. Before the negotiations were finalised, Bill Clinton came into office in the US, and Kim Campbell in Canada and before the agreement became law, Jean Chrétien had taken office in Canada.

The proposed Canada-US trade agreement had been extremely controversial and divisive in Canada, and the 1988 Canadian election was fought almost exclusively on that issue. In that election, more Canadians voted for anti-free trade parties (the Liberals and the New Democrats) but more seats in parliament were won by the pro-free trade Progressive Conservatives (PCs). Mulroney and the PCs had a parliamentary majority and were able to easily pass the Canada-US FTA and NAFTA bills. However, Mulroney himself had become deeply unpopular and resigned on June 25, 1993. He was replaced as conservative leader and prime minister by Kim Campbell, who then led the PC party into the 1993 election where they were decimated by the Liberal Party under Jean Chrétien. Chrétien had campaigned on a promise to renegotiate or abrogate NAFTA, but instead negotiated the two supplemental agreements with the new US president. In the US, President George Bush, who had worked to "fast track" the signing prior to the end of his term, ran out of time, and had to pass the required ratification and signing into law to incoming president Bill Clinton.

Prior to sending it to the US Senate, Bill Clinton introduced clauses to protect American workers and allay the concerns of many House members. It also required US partners to adhere to environmental practices and regulations similar to its own. With much consideration and emotional discussion, the House of Representatives approved NAFTA on November 17, 1993, by a vote of 234 to 200. The agreement's supporters included 132 Republicans and 102 Democrats. NAFTA passed the Senate 61-38. Senate supporters were 34 Republicans and 27 Democrats. Bill Clinton signed it into law on December 8, 1993; it went into effect on January 1, 1994. Bill Clinton while signing the NAFTA bill stated: "...NAFTA means jobs- American

jobs and good-paying American jobs. If I didn't believe that, I wouldn't support this agreement."

Provisions

The goal of NAFTA was to eliminate barriers to trade and investment between the US, Canada, and Mexico. The implementation of NAFTA on January 1, 1994 brought the immediate elimination of tariffs on more than one-half of the US imports from Mexico and more than one-third of the US exports to Mexico. Within 10 years of implementation of the agreement, all US-Mexico tariffs would be removed except for some US agricultural exports to Mexico that were to be phased out within 15 years. Most US-Canada trade was already duty free. NAFTA also seeks to eliminate non-tariff trade barriers.

Mechanism

Chapter 20 made provisions for interstate resolution of dispute over the application and interpretation of the NAFTA. It was modelled after Chapter 18 of the Canada United States Free Trade agreement.

Investor State Dispute Settlement obligations contained in Chapter 11 of the NAFTA. Chapter 11 allows corporations or individuals to sue Mexico, Canada or the US for compensation when actions taken by those governments (or by those for whom they are responsible at international law, such as provincial, state or municipal governments) have adversely affected their investments. However, this Chapter has been invoked in cases where governments have passed laws or regulations with intent to protect their constituents and their resident businesses profits. Language in the chapter defining its scope states that it cannot be used to "to prevent a party from providing a service or performing a function such as law enforcement, correctional services, income security or insurance, social security, social welfare, public education public training health, and child care in a manner that is not inconsistent with this chapter.

Chapter 19 is also contended is NAFTA's chapter 19, which subjects antidumping and countervailing duty (AD/CVD) determinations with bi-national panel review instead of, or in addition to, conventional judicial review. For example, in the United States, review of agency decisions imposing antidumping and countervailing duties are normally heard before the U.S court of international trade and Article 111 court.

The NAFTA parties however have the option of appealing the decisions of bi-national panels composed of five citizens from the two relevant

NAFTA countries. The panelists are generally lawyers experienced in international trade law. Since the NAFTA does not include substantive provisions concerning AD/CVD, the panel is charged with determining whether final agency determinations involving AD/CVD conform to the country's domestic law.

The specific areas raised earlier became early subjects of NAFTA concern. One of these was the environmental impact of the agreement and the result was a supplement to the NAFTA accord, the North American Agreement for Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC), which sought to mollify environmentalists by creating several mechanisms to deal with environmental concerns: a North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC), which sought to mollify environmentalist by creating several mechanisms to deal with environmental concerns a North American Development Bank (NADBank) to fund investments in pollution reduction and a border.

3.2 Membership of NAFTA

Membership of NAFTA comprises of Canada, Mexico, and the US.

3.3 The Secretariat

The NAFTA Secretariat is an independent agency that is responsible for the impartial administration of the dispute settlement provisions of the NAFTA. It has a Canadian, a Mexican, and a US section, each headed by a national secretary with offices in each national capital. The Secretariat is accountable to the NAFTA Free Trade Commission, which comprises the ministers responsible for international trade in the three NAFTA partner countries.

3.4 NAFTA Working Group and Committees

Over 30 working groups and committees have been established to facilitate trade and investment and to ensure the effective implementation and administration of NAFTA key areas of work include trade in goods, rules of origin, customs, agricultural trade and subsidies, standards, government procurement investment and services, cross-border movement of business people and alternative dispute resolution.

3.5 NAFTA Trade Commission

It is made up of ministerial representatives from NAFTA partners. They supervise the implementation and further elaboration of the agreement and helps resolve dispute arising from its interpretation.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss and assess the general arguments about free trade. How has the NAFTA debate reflected the general debate?

4.0 CONCLUSION

The US understood the importance of NAFTA, which has helped to eliminate tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade and investment between Canada, the US, and México. It has established a strong and reliable framework for investment; it has helped in creating environment of confidence and stability required for long term investment.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that the NAFTA is best suited to promoting cooperation among states rather than trying to replace state centered system. Still others contend that sub regional organisation should concentrate on performing limited functional activities with the hope of building a habit of cooperation and trust can be built upon.

6.0 TUTOR- MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss America role in the creation of the NAFTA.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Angeles, V. (2010). "NAFTA *and the Mexican Economy* Congressional Research Service." RL34733.

Clyde, H. (2005). *NAFTA Revisited: Achievements and Challenges*. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.

David, B. (2004). *The Children of NAFTA: Labor wars on the U.S./Mexico Border*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gantz, D. A. (1999). "Dispute Settlement under the NAFTA and the WTO: Choice of Forum Opportunities and Risks for the NAFTA

Parties”, *American University International Law Review* 14 (4): 1025–1106.

Hufbauer, G. (2005). *NAFTA Revisited*. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.

Lederman, D., et al. (2005). *Lessons from NAFTA for Latin America and the Caribbean*. Palo Alto, CA, USA: Stanford University Press.

Maxwell, A., et al. (2002). *The Making of NAFTA: How the Deal was Done*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Weintraub, S. (2004). *NAFTA's Impact on North America the First Decade*. Washington, DC, USA: CSIS Press.