

## **Case Study 1**

Group 3

Shane Cincotta, Ryan Layne, Ryan Motchkavitz, Dylan Rosenthal, Collin Sutrick, Cameron Cupples

**Answer the following questions:**

a. Hook argues that a central problem of the U.S. foreign policy process is that Americans (both policymakers and the general population) are torn over how their country should interact with the rest of the world. Hook then goes on to identify two broad “camps” (or positions) on the issue. What are these two? Briefly describe the central claims of each side and how they relate to one another (Remember we talked about how people today don’t really talk about it in these terms anymore but use different designations. You can mention these here as well).

The two camps that Hook describes are the exemplarists and the vindicators. Today, these two camps are usually referred to as isolationists (exemplarists) and interventionists (vindicators). Exemplarists claim that the US shouldn’t act as the world’s police. In other words, the US should “mind its own business” when it comes to foreign relations. Exemplarists believe that the US should focus more on domestic issues before we lend our aid to other countries, and we should only intervene in the affairs of other countries if there is a clear and imminent danger to the US. An important distinction should be made about exemplarists, they are not pacifists. An exemplarist would likely still be in favor of being involved in another country’s affairs as long as there was a clear and present danger if the US did not act. The exemplarist position can be seen in the events leading up to the US entering WWII. Up until 1941, the US was attempting to stay out of the conflict happening in Europe. The US had managed to do so for 2 years (WWII starting in 1939), this changed when Japan attacked the U.S homeland on December 7th. Prior to Pearl Harbour, the war in Europe/The Pacific did not pose an immediate threat to the US. Japan attacking the US proved there was a very real and present danger, which forced the US into action. A real life example of an exemplarist is Noam Chomsky.

Vindicators claim that the US has a central role in world affairs, they believe the US has a duty as a world superpower to act as the world’s police. A vindicator would become involved in another country’s affairs even if that country didn’t pose a direct threat to the US. The reasons for becoming involved can vary, one reason might be to topple a dictator. One example of this would be the Vietnam War. The vietcong didn’t pose a direct military threat to the US, but the US got involved regardless in order to stop the spread of communism. A real life example of a vindicator would be Dick Cheney.

These two positions play an important role in the geopolitical sphere. A balance must be found between the two. If a country is too interventionist and exerts its power in too many countries, it’s resources will be spread too thin and it won’t be able to govern effectively. It may also inspire revolt and contempt for said country. By the same token, if a country is too isolationist, it blocks itself off from foreign partnerships. These partnerships can be very advantageous between two countries. There may exist policies which can be a mutual benefit, such as free trade. Security can also be available as both countries now have a reason to protect each other.

b. Provide a historical example that highlights how the U.S. shifted its foreign policy in response to these two diverging camps; moving from one position to the other over time.

From its inception, the US has shifted its foreign policy many times between isolationism and interventionism. A prime example of this occurrence is when the US joined WWII. From 1939-1941 the US was reluctant to becoming involved in the war. This changed on December 7th, when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. This forced the US to abandon its policy of isolationism and move towards interventionism.

On the other hand, the US has shifted its foreign policy from an interventionist to an isolationist view. Towards the end of the Vietnam war in the 1970's, anti-war sentiment was at its peak. Incidents such as the Kent State shooting help make the war exceedingly unpopular. The war's unpopularity eventually led to the US pulling support from Vietnam during a process referred to as "Vietnamization".

This shift relates has certain parallels to the debate between the the vindicators and the exemplarists. The decision to invade Vietnam was done so under the notion that it was so stop the spread of communism. This is an interventionist/vindicator approach as we are attacking a country which didn't directly harm us. As the war dragged on, anti war sentiment was growing in the US, families wanted their loved ones back. During the process of vietnamization, the US began withdrawing troops in varying intervals. Withdrawing from Vietnam is an isolationist policy because it pulls the influence of the US away from other countries.

c. Explain how the Rose and Anton readings relate to this debate. Can you identify arguments that connect directly to the two camps Hook mentions? And what is each author saying about the relationship between the US and the liberal world order (or liberalism in general)? (Make sure you tell us what the liberal international order actually is!)

Both of the chosen readings have strong base arguments relating to the two contrasting points of view on American foreign policy. The general point of emphasis is on the Liberal International Order, for which Anton describes to be that it is the post World War Two Consensus among the nations that landed on the winning side. It exists as the guideline from which foreign policy on a global scale is enacted and what the general shifts and similarities between nations foreign policy stances are. Anton does not seem to specifically choose Exemplarist against Vindicator, instead seeming to take advantage of whichever fits better with increasing the United States' power levels on the international stage. He instead advocates for either scrapping the LIO as we know it, or reforming it to the point that it maximizes the potential gains of America, regardless of its impact on other nation-states.

Rose however, carries a different opinion and altogether different view on what the Liberal International Orders forming and pathway through the 20th century exists as. He agrees with Anton that as it stands the LIO cannot work, but that it already shifts to meet the needs of the current issues of the time. And instead of the order starting out of the ashes of world war

two, he points to Wilson and World War 1 as the actual starting point of the original form of the LIO, where it proceeded to shift after World War 2 and again after the Cold War. The problem stemming from Trumpism and related nationalist movements around the world hinders and corrodes the conventional LIO, which definitely ties into stating that Trump would fit in the exemplarist camp, but he also says that in order for the LIO to get re-established in the post-Trump world, concessions would need to be made and broken promises fixed, which definitely sounds like the Vindicator camp.

d. Bringing all this together, tell me which position is more sensible in your opinion. It's okay if your group cannot agree on this, in that case you can just give me a pro and con argument for each side

Reformed LIO - Pros: Would put America in the best position economically and domestically, potential to reinstate the reputation as the dominant world power

Reformed LIO - Cons: Will damage relations with allies, and hamper other countries that could potentially become allies from reaching their potential. Could damage trade relations by making demands that some countries will be unwilling to acquiesce to.

Pros of LIO	Cons of LIO
-Pro-democratic governments and institutions; alliances such as NATO and the United Nations work to maintain peace and promote the expansion and protection of human rights.	-Some view organizations such as NATO and the UN as often having a particular political agenda that shuts out states which have different forms of governments. Some also argue that these bodies are not what keeps peace, and that the UN is somewhat selective in calling out states when they act up
-Economic interconnectedness can help improve the economic status of developing states. The LIO promotes free trade and breaking down barriers to free trade, which as a whole promotes a greater number of trade alliances. This helps states improve and expand their economies across the globe.	-Some are opposed to the interconnectedness that comes along with the LIO; they argue that while it has lifted certain states up in terms of economics, a global economy could be dangerous. As states become more connected through their economies, recessions and depressions will have exponentially larger impacts that can be seen throughout the world.