

Cornerstones of American Foreign Policy: Change Over Time

John P. Irish

Seven Lakes High School - Katy ISD



Recent Publications:

Instructors Resource Guide to The American Pageant (13/e) & (14/e, forthcoming)

The Quizbook: A Test Manual for Instructors to The American Pageant (13/e) & (14/e, forthcoming)

Edward Bellamy: *Looking Backward* (Fall - 2006: The Center for Learning)

AP U.S. History Workbooks (revised edition, 3 volumes) - The Center for Learning, forthcoming

Seven Lakes High School
9251 S. Fry Road
Katy, Texas 77494

A Bit O' Irish:

www.orgsites.com/tx/ap-us-and-european-history/index.html

johnirish@katyisd.org

johnpirish@gmail.com

A. Instructional Strategy: *Jigsaw*

This is a cooperative learning strategy. Students work in learning teams made up of experts who are responsible for researching subtopics of a larger topic. Experts from each learning team meet to discuss their findings, and then return home to their original team to teach their research findings to the group.

B. In Practice - How It's Used in Class

Students are put into "expert groups" and given short reading selections to read and discuss within their "expert group". They are also given a set of **Basic Questions** to explain to the class once the "expert group" is prepared to teach the class. After each group has presented their information, the class (as a whole) considers **Discussion Questions** to talk about and consider. These discussion questions give the entire group the chance to take the information to a higher level of analysis.

1. **Basic Questions**: to be explained by the "expert group" as they present the information to the class.

- Explain the basic principles of each of the excerpts you read and discussed in your group?
- How do these excerpts fit together to explain the concept you are teaching?
- Connect the time period to the concepts (i.e., what is going on in American History at the time) - does this help explain the concept?

2. **Discussion Questions**: to be discussed by the class after all groups have presented their information.

- To what extent is American foreign policy simply a by-product of historical circumstances, or is it brought about as a result of fundamental ideological changes?
- Is there a pattern to American foreign policy; is the change over time cyclical or linear?
- What would you say are the "cornerstones" of American foreign policy? Why?
- At what point was America at its most powerful position within the world community, at what point was America at its most weakest? In other words, when did America (historically speaking) have the potential to exert the most influence on world affairs?
- If we could have added an additional concept to the lesson - what would it have been? Why?
- What is America's future, what role do you see America playing in international affairs over the 21st century?

C. Internet Sources for this Lesson on American Foreign Policy:

Documents on American Foreign Policy:

<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pre1898.htm>

The American President Project:

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php>

Concept 1: American Neutrality

- ✚ The Constitution declares among other things that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the army and navy of the U.S. and of the Militia of the several states when called into the actual service of the U.S., that he shall have power by and with the advice of the senate to make treaties; . . . the issuing of a proclamation of neutrality is merely an Executive Act. The President is the constitutional EXECUTOR of the laws. Our Treaties and the laws of Nations form a part of the law of the land. He who is to execute the laws must first judge for himself of their meaning. In order to the observance of that conduct, which the laws of nations combined with our treaties prescribed to this country, in reference to the present War in Europe, it was necessary for the President to judge for himself whether there was any thing in our treaties incompatible with an adherence to neutrality. Having judged that there was not, he had a right, and if in his opinion the interests of the Nation required it, it was his duty, as Executor of the laws, to proclaim the neutrality of the Nation¹
- ✚ If we consult for a moment, the nature and operation of the two powers to declare war and make treaties, it will be impossible not to see that they can never fall within a proper definition of executive powers. The natural province of the executive magistrate is to execute laws, as that of the legislature is to make laws. All his acts therefore, properly executive, must pre-suppose the existence of the laws to be executed. A treaty is not an execution of laws: it does not pre-suppose the existence of laws. It is, on the contrary, to have itself the force of a law, and to be carried into execution, like all other laws, by the executive magistrate. To say then that the power of making treaties which are confessedly laws, belongs naturally to the department which is to execute laws, is to say, that the executive department naturally includes a legislative power. In theory, this is an absurdity - in practice a tyranny. The power to declare war is subject to similar reasoning.²
- ✚ Observe good faith and justice towards all Nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. . . . In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular Nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. . . . The Great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign Nations is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. . . . Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, . . . Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European Ambition, Rivalship, Interest, Humour or Caprice? 'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent Alliances, with any portion of the foreign world.³

¹ Hamilton, Alexander. *Pacificus* No. 1, 1793.

² Madison, James. *Helvidius*, No. 1, 1793.

³ Washington, George. Farewell Address, 1796.

Concept 2: The Monroe Doctrine

- ✚ What has America done for the benefit of mankind? Let our answer be this: America, with the same voice which spoke herself into existence as a nation, proclaimed to mankind the inextinguishable rights of human nature, and the only lawful foundations of government. America, in the assembly of nations, since her admission among them, has invariably, though often fruitlessly, held forth to them the hand of honest friendship, of equal freedom, of generous reciprocity. She has uniformly spoken among them, though often to heedless and often to disdainful ears, the language of equal liberty, of equal justice, and of equal rights. She has, in the lapse of nearly half a century, without a single exception, respected the independence of other nations while asserting and maintaining her own. She has abstained from interference in the concerns of others, even when conflict has been for principles to which she clings, as to the last vital drop that visits the heart. . . . Wherever the standard of freedom and Independence has been or shall be unfurled, there will her heart, her benedictions and her prayers be. But she goes not abroad, in search of monsters to destroy. . . . She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy, and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standard of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. . . . She might become the dictatress of the world. She would be no longer the ruler of her own spirit. . . . [America's] glory is not dominion, but liberty. Her march is the march of the mind. She has a spear and a shield: but the motto upon her shield is, *Freedom, Independence, Peace*.⁴
- ✚ [As] a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. . . . The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow-men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. . . . We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. . . . we declare our neutrality . . . and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security.⁵

⁴ Adams, John Quincy. Address of July 4, 1821.

⁵ Monroe, James. Seventh Annual Address, Dec. 2, 1823.

Concept 3: Manifest Destiny

- ✚ The condition and ulterior destiny of the Indian tribes within the limits of some of our States have become objects of much interest and importance. It has long been the policy of Government to introduce among them the arts of civilization, in the hope of gradually reclaiming them from a wandering life. This policy has, however, been coupled with another wholly incompatible with its success. Professing a desire to civilize and settle them, we have at the same time lost no opportunity to purchase their lands and thrust them farther into the wilderness. By this means they have not only been kept in a wandering state, but been led to look upon us as unjust and indifferent to their fate. . . . As a means of effecting this end I suggest for your consideration the propriety of setting apart an ample district west of the Mississippi, and without the limits of any State or Territory now formed, to be guaranteed to the Indian tribes as long as they shall occupy it, each tribe having a distinct control over the portion designated for its use. There they may be secured in the enjoyment of governments of their own choice, subject to no other control from the United States than such as may be necessary to preserve peace on the frontier and between the several tribes. There the benevolent may endeavor to teach them the arts of civilization, and, by promoting union and harmony among them, to raise up an interesting commonwealth, destined to perpetuate the race and to attest the humanity and justice of this Government. . . . This emigration should be voluntary, for it would be as cruel as unjust to compel the aborigines to abandon the graves of their fathers and seek a home in a distant land. But they should be distinctly informed that if they remain within the limits of the States they must be subject to their laws. In return for their obedience as individuals they will without doubt be protected in the enjoyment of those possessions which they have improved by their industry.⁶
- ✚ The far-reaching, the boundless future will be the era of American greatness. In its magnificent domain of space and time, the nation of many nations is destined to manifest to mankind the excellence of divine principles; to establish on earth the noblest temple ever dedicated to the worship of the Most High -- the Sacred and the True. Its floor shall be a hemisphere -- its roof the firmament of the star-studded heavens, and its congregation an Union of many Republics, comprising hundreds of happy millions, calling, owning no man master, but governed by God's natural and moral law of equality, the law of brotherhood -- of *peace and good will amongst men* . . . Yes, we are the nation of progress, of individual freedom, of universal enfranchisement. . . . We must onward to the fulfillment of our mission -- to the entire development of the principle of our organization -- freedom of conscience, freedom of person, freedom of trade and business pursuits, universality of freedom and equality. This is our high destiny, and in nature's eternal, inevitable decree of cause and effect we must accomplish it. All this will be our future history, to establish on earth the moral dignity and salvation of man -- the immutable truth and beneficence of God. For this blessed mission to the nations of the world, which are shut out from the life-giving light of truth, has America been chosen; and her high example shall smite unto death the tyranny of kings, hierarchs, and oligarchs, and carry the glad tidings of peace and good will where myriads now endure an existence scarcely more enviable than that of beasts of the field. Who, then, can doubt that our country is destined to be *the great nation of futurity?*⁷ It is time now for opposition to the Annexation of Texas to cease . . . Texas is now ours. . . . Texas has been absorbed into the Union in the inevitable fulfillment of the general law which is rolling our population westward.⁸
- ✚ The existing war with Mexico was neither desired nor provoked by the United States. On the contrary, all honorable means were resorted to avert it. After years of endurance of aggravated and unredressed wrongs on our part, Mexico, in violation of solemn treaty stipulations and of every principle of justice recognized by civilized nations, commenced hostilities, and thus by her own act forced the war upon us. . . . The annexation of Texas to the United States constituted no just cause of offense to Mexico. The pretext that it did so is wholly inconsistent and irreconcilable with well-authenticated facts connected with the revolution by which Texas became independent of Mexico. . . . The United States never attempted to acquire Texas by conquest. On the contrary, at an early period after the people of Texas had achieved their independence they sought to be annexed to the United States. . . . Every honorable effort has been used by me to avoid the war which followed, but all have proved vain. All our attempts to preserve peace have been met by insult and resistance on the part of Mexico. . . . The war has not been waged with a view to conquest, but, having been commenced by Mexico, it has been carried into the enemy's country and will be vigorously prosecuted there with a view to obtain an honorable peace, and thereby secure ample indemnity for the expenses of the war, as well as to our much-injured citizens, who hold large pecuniary demands against Mexico.⁹

⁶ Jackson, Andrew. First Annual Message to Congress, Dec. 8, 1829.

⁷ O'Sullivan, John. "The Great Nation of Futurity," *The United States Democratic Review* (1839).

⁸ O'Sullivan, John. "Annexation," *The United States Democratic Review* (1845).

⁹ Polk, James K. Second Annual Message to Congress, Dec. 8, 1846.

Concept 4: American Imperialism

- ✚ It seems to me that God, with infinite wisdom and skill, is training the Anglo-Saxon race for an hour sure to come in the world's future. . . . The unoccupied arable lands of the earth are limited, and will soon be taken. . . . Then will the world enter upon a new stage of its history - the final competition of races, for which the Anglo-Saxon is being schooled. . . . Then this race of unequalled energy, with all the majesty of numbers and the might of wealth behind it - the representative, let us hope, of the largest liberty, the purest Christianity, the highest civilization . . . will spread itself over the earth. If I read not amiss, this powerful race will move down upon Mexico, down upon Central and South America, out upon the islands of the sea, over upon Africa and beyond. And can any one doubt that the result of this competition of races will be the "survival of the fittest"?¹⁰
- ✚ To turn now from the particular lessons drawn from the history of the past to the general question of the influence of government upon the sea career of its people, it is seen that that influence can work in two distinct but closely related ways. First, in peace: The government by its policy can favor the natural growth of a people's industries and its tendencies to seek adventure and gain by way of the sea; or it can try to develop such industries and such sea-going bent, when they do not naturally exist; or, on the other hand, the government may, by mistaken action check and fetter the progress which the people left to themselves would make. In any one of these ways the influence of the government will be felt, making or marring the sea power of the country in the matter of peaceful commerce; upon which alone, it cannot be too often insisted, a thoroughly strong navy can be based. Second, in war: The influence of the government will be felt in its most legitimate manner in maintaining an armed navy, of a size commensurate with the growth of its shipping and the importance of the interests connected with it. More important even than the size of the navy is the question of its institutions, favoring a healthful spirit and activity, and providing for rapid development in time of war by an adequate reserve of men and of ships and by measures for drawing out that general reserve power which has before been pointed to, when considering the character and pursuits of the people. . . . Having therefore no foreign establishments, either colonial or military, the ships of war of the United States, in war, will be like land birds, unable to fly far from their own shores. To provide resting-places for them, where they can coal and repair, would be one of the first duties of a government proposing to itself the development of the power of the nation at sea. . . . The question is eminently one in which the influence of the government should make itself felt, to build up for the nation a navy which, if not capable of reaching distant countries, shall at least be able to keep clear the chief approaches to its own. The eyes of the country have for a quarter of a century been turned from the sea; the results of such a policy and of its opposite will be shown in the instance of France and of England. Without asserting a narrow parallelism between the case of the United States and either of these, it may safely be said that it is essential to the welfare of the whole country that the conditions of trade and commerce should remain, as far as possible, unaffected by an external war. In order to do this, the enemy must be kept not only out of our ports, but far away from our coasts.¹¹
- ✚ This question is deeper than any question of party politics; deeper than any question of the isolated policy of our country even; deeper even than any question of constitutional power. It is elemental. It is racial. God has not been preparing the English speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. Were it not for such a force as this the world would relapse into barbarism and night. And of all our race He has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world. This is the divine mission of America, and it holds for us all the profit, all the glory, all the happiness possible to man. We are trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace.¹²
- ✚ It is not true that the United States feels any land hunger or entertains any projects as regards the other nations of the Western Hemisphere save such as are for their welfare. All that this country desires is to see the neighboring countries stable, orderly, and prosperous. Any country whose people conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendship. If a nation shows that it knows how to act with reasonable efficiency and decency in social and political matters, if it keeps order and pays its obligations, it need fear no interference from the United States. Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power.¹³

¹⁰ Strong, Josiah. *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis*, 1885.

¹¹ Mahan, Alfred Thayer. *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History*, 1897.

¹² Beveridge, Albert J. *Congressional Record*, 56th Congress, 1st Session, 1900.

¹³ Roosevelt, Theodore. Fourth Annual Message to Congress, 1904.

Concept 5: American Isolationism

- ✚ We hold that the policy known as imperialism is hostile to liberty and tends toward militarism, an evil from which it has been our glory to be free. We regret that it has become necessary in the land of Washington and Lincoln to reaffirm that all men, of whatever race or color, are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We maintain that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We insist that the subjugation of any people is "criminal aggression" and open disloyalty to the distinctive principles of our Government. . . . The United States have always protested against the doctrine of international law which permits the subjugation of the weak by the strong. A self-governing state cannot accept sovereignty over an unwilling people. The United States cannot act upon the ancient heresy that might makes right.¹⁴
- ✚ When you raise the flag over the Philippine Islands as an emblem of dominion and acquisition you take it down from Independence Hall. . . . Over every clause, syllable, and letter of the Constitution the Declaration of Independence pours its blazing torchlight. . . . The power to conquer alien peoples and hold them in subjection is nowhere expressly granted.¹⁵
- ✚ Those who would have this nation enter upon a career of empire must consider not only the effect of imperialism on the Filipinos, but they must also calculate its effects upon our won nation. We cannot repudiate the principle of self-government in the Philippines without weakening that principle here . . . The Filipino cannot be a subject without endangering our form of government. A republic can have no subjects. A subject is possible only in a government resting upon force; he is unknown in a government derived without consent and taxation without representation. . . . Compare, if you will, the swaggering, bullying, brutal doctrine of imperialism with the golden rule and the commandment "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thy self." Love, not force, was the weapon of the Nazarene; sacrifice for others, not the exploitation of them, was His method of reaching the human heart.¹⁶
- ✚ It is well for us to remember that war is always cruel; that its iron tread means destruction and devastation, whether its march is across Europe or from Atlanta to the sea; that war arouses all the fiercest human passions; that there are always cases of brutality and outrage - and that usually there is quite as much of it on one side as upon the other.¹⁷ Believing in democracy, in the right of self-government - ready to defend the precious heritage of our own sovereignty - let us here and now resolve and declare that we will never permit the armed forces of the United States to be used to despoil our sister republics of their property, interfere with their right to govern themselves according to their own standards or violate their sovereignty - as sacred to them as American sovereignty is to us.¹⁸ I am not an extremist, I do not say there may not be supreme principles for which men must fight to the death as a last resort. But I do believe that as organized society in its slow evolution has developed more rational means of settling individual differences than brute force, so must the nations of the world ultimately find other ways of deciding their disagreements than war.¹⁹
- ✚ Our eyes never will be blind to a developing menace, our ears never deaf to the call of civilization. We recognize the new order in the world, with the closer contacts which progress has wrought. We sense the call of the human heart for fellowship, fraternity, and cooperation. We crave friendship and harbor no hate. But America, our America, the America builded on the foundation laid by the inspired fathers, can be a party to no permanent military alliance. It can enter into no political commitments, nor assume any economic obligations which will subject our decisions to any other than our own authority. We are ready to associate ourselves with the nations of the world, great and small, for conference, for counsel; to seek the expressed views of world opinion; to recommend a way to approximate disarmament and relieve the crushing burdens of military and naval establishments. We elect to participate in suggesting plans for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration, and would gladly join in that expressed conscience of progress, which seeks to clarify and write the laws of international relationship, and establish a world court for the disposition of such justiciable questions as nations are agreed to submit thereto. In expressing aspirations, in seeking practical plans, in translating humanity's new concept of righteousness and justice and its hatred of war into recommended action we are ready most heartily to unite, but every commitment must be made in the exercise of our national sovereignty. Since freedom impelled, and independence inspired, and nationality exalted, a world super-government is contrary to everything we cherish and can have no sanction by our Republic. This is not selfishness, it is sanctity. It is not aloofness, it is security. It is not suspicion of others, it is patriotic adherence to the things which made us what we are.²⁰

¹⁴ American Anti-Imperialist League, 1899.

¹⁵ Hoar, George F. Senate speech, January 1899.

¹⁶ Bryan, William Jennings. Democratic Presidential Acceptance Speech, August 1900.

¹⁷ La Follette, Robert M. *La Follette's Magazine*, October 1914.

¹⁸ La Follette, Robert M. Speech in U.S. Senate, July 1916.

¹⁹ La Follette, Robert M. *La Follette's Magazine*, March 1917.

²⁰ Harding, Warren G. Inaugural Address, March 1921.

Concept 6: The Cold War

- ✚ The first of these concepts is that of the innate antagonism between capitalism and Socialism. We have seen how deeply that concept has become imbedded in foundations of Soviet power. It has profound implications for Russia's conduct as a member of international society. It means that there can never be on Moscow's side any sincere assumption of a community of aims between the Soviet Union and powers which are regarded as capitalist. . . . The Soviet concept of power, which permits no focal points of organization outside the Party itself, requires that the Party leadership remain in theory the sole repository of truth. . . . In these circumstances it is clear that the main element of any United States policy toward the Soviet Union must be that of a long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies. . . . It is clear that the United States cannot expect in the foreseeable future to enjoy political intimacy with the Soviet regime. It must continue to regard the Soviet Union as a rival, not a partner, in the political arena. It must continue to expect that Soviet policies will reflect no abstract love of peace and stability, no real faith in the possibility of a permanent happy coexistence of the Socialist and capitalist worlds.²¹
- ✚ The truth of the matter is that Europe's requirements for the next 3 or 4 years of foreign food and other essential products - principally from America - are so much greater than her present ability to pay that she must have substantial additional help, or face economic, social, and political deterioration of a very grave character. The remedy lies in breaking the vicious circle and restoring the confidence of the European people in the economic future of their own countries and of Europe as a whole. . . . Aside from the demoralizing effect on the world at large and the possibilities of disturbances arising as a result of the desperation of the people concerned, the consequences to the economy of the United States should be apparent to all. It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist. Such assistance, I am convinced, must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crises develop. Any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative. Any government that is willing to assist in the task of recovery will find full cooperation, I am sure, on the part of the United States Government. Any government which maneuvers to block the recovery of other countries cannot expect help from us. Furthermore, governments, political parties, or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit from them politically or otherwise will encounter the opposition of the United States.²²
- ✚ Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement, and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt both at home and abroad. Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology--global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle--with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our chartered course toward permanent peace and human betterment. . . . A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.²³

²¹ Kennan, George F. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs*, Spring 1947.

²² Marshall, George C. Speech at Harvard University, June 5, 1947.

²³ Eisenhower, Dwight D. Farewell Address, Jan. 17, 1961.

Section 7: The War on Terror

- ✚ This is an historic moment. We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict and Cold War. We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order, a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations. When we are successful, and we will be, we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.'s founders. We have no argument with the people of Iraq. Indeed, for the innocents caught in this conflict, I pray for their safety. Our goal is not the conquest of Iraq. It is the liberation of Kuwait. It is my hope that somehow the Iraqi people can, even now, convince their dictator that he must lay down his arms, leave Kuwait, and let Iraq itself rejoin the family of peace-loving nations. . . . But even as planes of the multinational forces attack Iraq, I prefer to think of peace, not war. I am convinced not only that we will prevail, but that out of the horror of combat will come the recognition that no nation can stand against a world united. No nation will be permitted to brutally assault its neighbor.²⁴
- ✚ Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated. Americans are asking, why do they hate us? They hate what we see right here in this chamber - a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms - our freedoms of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other. They want to overthrow existing governments in many Muslim countries . . . They want to drive Israel out of the Middle East. They want to drive Christians and Jews out of vast regions of Asia and Africa. These terrorists kill not merely to end lives, but to disrupt and end a way of life. With every atrocity, they hope that America grows fearful, retreating from the world and forsaking our friends. They stand against us, because we stand in their way. We are not deceived by their pretenses to piety. We have seen their kind before. They are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions - by abandoning every value except the will to power - they follow in the path of fascism, and Nazism, and totalitarianism. And they will follow the path all the way, to where it ends: in history's unmarked grave of discarded lies. . . . This is not, however, just America's fight. And what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom. . . . The civilized world is rallying to America's side. They understand that if this terror goes unpunished, their own cities, their own citizens may be next. Terror, unanswered, can not only bring down buildings, it can threaten the stability of legitimate governments. And you know what - we're not going to allow it. . . . I will not forget this wound to our country or those who inflicted it. I will not yield; I will not rest; I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security for the American people. The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them. Fellow citizens, we'll meet violence with patient justice - assured of the rightness of our cause and confident of the victories to come. In all that lies before us, may God grant us wisdom, and may He watch over the United States of America.²⁵

²⁴ George H.W. Bush's January 16, 1991 address to the nation announcing military action in the Persian Gulf.

²⁵ George W. Bush's "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People," September 20, 2001.

Selected Bibliography - American Foreign Policy

A. Sources for the Excerpts: in order of appearance

- ✚ Frish, Morton J. (Editor) *The Pacificus - Helvidius Debates of 1793 - 1794*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2007.
- ✚ Rhodehamel, John. (Editor) *George Washington: Writings*. New York: Literary Classics of the United States (Library of America), 1997.
- ✚ Lafeber, Walter. (Editor) *John Quincy Adams and American Continental Empire: Letters, Speeches, & Papers*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965.
- ✚ Lucier, James P. (Editor) *The Political Writings of James Monroe*. Washington: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2001.
- ✚ Jackson, Andrew. **The American President Project**: www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php
- ✚ O'Sullivan, John. **The Making of America (Cornell University Library)**: <http://cdl.library.cornell.edu/moa/>
- ✚ Polk, James K. **The American President Project**: www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php
- ✚ Strong, Josiah. *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis*. New York: Baker & Taylor, Co., 1891.
- ✚ Mahan, Alfred Thayer. *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660-1783*. New York: Dover Publications.
- ✚ Roosevelt, Theodore. **The American President Project**: www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php
- ✚ Bryan, William Jennings. *Speeches of William Jennings Bryan*. (2 vols) New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1909.
- ✚ Torelle, Ellen. (Editor) *The Political Philosophy of Robert M. La Follette*. Madison: The Robert M. La Follette Co., 1920.
- ✚ Harding, Warren G. **The American President Project**: www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php
- ✚ Eisenhower, Dwight D. **The American President Project**: www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php

B. Primary Source Anthologies on American Foreign Policy:

- ✚ Merrill, Dennis and Patterson, Thomas G. (Editor) *Major Problems in American Foreign Relations*. (6/e) Volume One. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 2005.
- ✚ Merrill, Dennis and Patterson, Thomas G. (Editor) *Major Problems in American Foreign Relations*. (6/e) Volume Two. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 2005.

C. Secondary Sources / Histories of American Foreign Policy:

- ✚ Bennett, Andrew. (Editor) *Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in American Foreign Policy*. McGraw-Hill/Dushkin, 2005.
- ✚ Callahan, Patrick. *Logics of American Foreign Policy: Theories of America's World Role*. Longman, 2003.
- ✚ Hastedt, Glenn P. (Editor) *Annual Editions: American Foreign Policy 06/07*. McGraw-Hill/Dushkin, 2005.
- ✚ Lieber, Robert J. *The American Era: Power and Strategy for the 21st Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- ✚ Papp, Daniel S. *American Foreign Policy: History, Politics, and Policy*. Longman, 2004.