



THE NEW AMERICAN WORLD ORDER



Hunter Boyett

HONORS 230B 13 DECEMBER 2016

Hunter Boyett

Honors 230B

Professor Kenneth Pyle

12 December 2016

The American World Order

Intervention has plagued generations of both victims and offenders for centuries. Deep ethical questions are often associated with this controversial topic. Questions that immediately dominate any remote discussion on the topic include 1) why do nations intervene 2) is it morally right to intervene 3) does intervention bring benefits, 4) is there a clear victim and villain in intervention? Regardless of any stance on ethics, subject of opinion or academic training, one conclusion can be drawn- interventions do affect both the intervener as well as the intervenee.

Recent events in modern history, namely the wars and contentions involving the United States in the Persian Gulf, the intervention of Iraq and events in the Arab Spring, have brought the United States front and center in moral discussions concerning intervention. Thus, it now seems rare to discuss intervention without conjuring an image of the United States. Inevitably, the United States has become the scapegoat of international intervention policy.

This discussion aims to provide an analysis of international intervention through examining and challenging the emergence of the American world order which emerged after the Second World War. Before such analysis takes place, key arguments of intervention are examined.

Reasons for Non-Intervention¹

Non-intervention has been the default choice in foreign policy for much of the world's history. Every intervention brings with it unique challenges. Although difficult to pilot an extensive list of reasons for non-intervention, the most widespread arguments in accordance with non-intervention are explored below.

I. Risk of War

Intervention heightens a risk of war. Not only is there a high chance that war is common protocol before an intervention of a nation into another nation, the outbreak of war within the country in the form of civil war is also very possible. Evidence of this can be seen during periods of colonialism. Many Western countries in the modern world have a dark, imperialist past. The United States colonized the Philippines. Much of Europe colonized Africa during the scramble for Africa following the Berlin Treaty in 1884. Not only were the initial wars to induce intervention harmful, but when the intervention ends, civil wars often occur. This is seen through

¹ See Chapter 1 in "The Question of Intervention" by Michael W. Doyle. Doyle analyses and discusses John Stuart Mill's essay "A Few Words on Non-Intervention" and also challenges the 'responsibility to protect' introduced by the UN. It is interesting to note the philosophical nature of Mill's essay. Mill addresses intervention in light of the building of the Suez Canal, and the Crimean War. Unsurprisingly, the world's current view at the time of intervention was not well viewed. Mill uses these events to construct an analysis of the circumstances necessary to justify intervention of one nation into another nation. Although Mill takes a conservative stance on intervention, it is interesting to note he was a liberalist in supporting the expansion of the British empire and British imperialism. Doyle too takes a conservative approach to intervention. Doyle specializes in examining world democratic peace. Perhaps his most cited and examined article, "Liberalism and World Politics", he observes and analyses the costs and benefits of a liberalist national foreign policy. Additionally, affiliations with and serving as the chair of the United Nations Democracy Fund perhaps hint at his views of intervention. The UNDF states that democracy is a universal value, and will not be imposed on a country. Such standards are in line with his arguments in many of his essays and publications. The arguments for non-intervention and the arguments that override intervention are based on the discussion given here, and the discussion by John Stuart Mill. Doyle, Michael W., The Question of Intervention- John Stuart Mill and the Responsibility to Protect (Yale University Press, 2015)

the bloody histories of many African countries such as Rwanda or Congo after European occupation.

II. Sociopolitical Rights

Intervention removes the power of change from the intervenee's people. Does a nation incapable of accomplishing a cause worth intervention deserve that cause? Are they capable of defending that cause without foreign assistance? Intervention risks creating a social change that local populations are unable to support without international help.

Furthermore, intervention has the capacity of robbing nations of their identity and cultural norms. Although democracy was widely accepted by the Japanese after the close of the Second World War, the American intervention rendered Japanese democracy void of inherent Japanese values. Japan historically had the longest feudal government which spanned over six centuries. Their culture is immersed greatly in ancient traditions. Is the Japanese democracy a true Japanese democracy, or an American democracy in Japan run by the Japanese? Had Japan been given the right to restructure themselves, perhaps with guidelines, it would have had the possibility of retaining core Japanese values in a purely Japanese democracy.

III. Unnecessary Casualties

Generally, there is a positive correlation between intervention and casualties. Civilians, as well as combatants from both the intervener and intervenee are both at risk. Additionally, the risk of civil unrest and additional casualties through civil war and political turmoil heightens the strength of this argument. The American intervention of Iraq exhibits this concept. Without intervention, perhaps killing would still occur, however the total lives lost would most likely be less than the initial investment.

Reasons the Above can be Overruled

Regardless of how convincing the above arguments are, the following arguments theoretically override non-intervention. Though the concept of non-intervention is appealing, remaining neutral and not intervening can sometimes prove to be as ethically fatal as intervention.

I. National Interests

Intervention may be the only way to promote national interests without promoting war between two countries. A country may intervene in order to rescue a citizen in emergency in foreign territory. Additionally, intervention may be supported to accomplish national interests. American armed forces briefly intervened in Pakistan in order to kill Osama Bin Laden. A declaration of war would not have been justified, however an intervention allowed relative peace between the two nations, and a fulfillment of American national interests.

In addition, a country may engage in intervention when ideological warfare necessitates. Following the end of the Second World War, political tensions between the United States and the USSR were alarmingly high. The United States was pro-democracy whereas the USSR was pro-socialist. This allowed the stance of non-intervention to be overridden, and the United States intervened in West Germany in part to promote democracy and restructuring across Europe.

II. Ending Civil War

The case of non-intervention may be overruled in the case of a non-progressing civil war. In some cases, a civil war may continue for a long period of time without any progression towards change or political freedom. Such a case warrants foreign intervention to establish and support a cause which effectively brings the war to an end. If intervention did not occur, the drain of human lives may be endless.

III. Humanitarian Intervention

Despite the potential ethical dilemmas facing intervention, non-intervention may allow an individual or nation to carry out atrocious humanitarian crimes. Such examples include the Holocaust, the Killing Fields of Cambodia, as well as the Rwandan genocide. These are all dark chapters in these respective countries' history. Could intervention have spared people, and resulted in less devastating effects? Probably.

Retaining the right to fight for political and social change does not hold when that change is against the betterment of humanity. As the United Nations recently introduced, certain countries have a "right to protect"² in such instances.

Additionally, following the outbreak of war, intervention may be necessary as a form of 'reparation' in helping rebuild a country, or where extensive damage has occurred. Examples of this are Germany after the Second World War as well as Japan. Iraq to some degree experienced this with differing success.

The Pattern of Intervention

In its broadest sense, intervention has a long history. Much of modern history after the common era involved a European hegemonic world, with European powers, namely the Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, British and French, establishing respective global empires. The Spanish and Portuguese colonized much of the Americas. European powers colonized much of Africa between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Intervention aimed to achieve similar results, without many of the moral dilemmas regarding traditional colonialism. Intervention was a means of promoting national world-bettering values abroad, without stunting the growth of other countries, or resulting in a loss of aggregate human rights or lives.

² Doyle, "The Question of Intervention- John Stuart Mill & The Responsibility to Protect" pp. 109-146

Arguably, the first ‘pure’ American intervention was the intervention of the Philippines. The American intervention of the Philippines marked the start of American foreign intervention. However, this intervention differed little from the brutal methods of colonialism.³ Further interventions in the Caribbean had similar results.

True modern American intervention policy originates from the aftermath of the First World War. As stated above, during the First World War, the United States was intervening to promote national values for the betterment of the world. Intervention became a way to promote core values unique to the United States. Intervention was no longer a permanent invasion, but a means to educate nations in American values and ideals, which would ultimately improve global American relations, and aid economic growth. It became a means of advancement of an international revolution towards world democracy and perceived American freedom and happiness. However, despite these lofty aims, questions have arisen which question the degree to

³ Attorney Romeo T. Capulong, one of the Philippines leading human rights lawyers gave a speech entitled ‘Philippine-American History: A Century of Crimes Against the American People’ at the Public Interest Law Center, World Tribunal for Iraq Trial in New York City, August 25, 2004. In this speech, Capulong refers to the many “crimes” committed by the American people against the Filipinos during the intervention. The speech contains many emotionally charged phrases, and is clear that some Filipinos, including Capulong himself, view themselves and their nation as victims of American brutality during this period. References to mass killings, and the fatalities of both women and children support Capulong’s claims of brutality, and suggest this intervention differed little from colonization which occurred in much of Africa and Southeast Asia between the nineteenth to twentieth centuries. Capulong, “Philippine-American History: A Century of Crimes Against the American People”, Public Interest Law Center, World Tribunal for Iraq Trial in New York City, August 25, 2004, <<http://www.thefilipinomind.com/2006/01/philippine-revolution-american.html>> (November 20, 2016). For additional information on Attorney Romeo T. Capulong see The United Nations General Assembly, “Curriculum vitae of Romeo T. Capulong”, Curricula vitae of candidates nominated by States Members of the United Nations and by non-member States maintaining permanent observer missions at United Nations Headquarters, 6 , <<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/55/a55919a2.pdf>>, (November 20, 2016)

which the United States intervenes for its personal benefit, or the target nation of American intervention.

American Core Values⁴ and the Fourteen Points

At the end of the First World War, America had moved out of its isolationist past, and intervened largely in Europe to assist in defeating Germany. The First World War was, at the time, the most horrific and brutal war humanity had seen. Advanced technology and warfare had been combined with lethal results. Much of Europe and those involved were scarred from the its effects. Thus, the United States, which perceived itself as savior of the world, sought for world peace and cooperation and subsequently decided to declare war on Germany, after it had repeatedly sunk American ships in-route to Europe.

President Wilson, the president of the United States during and following the First World War, delivered a speech to the American congress which outlined points that, if taken, would achieve these goals. Though received by much criticism and disagreement, these values became crucial in forming an American ideal which could be advanced abroad. Additionally, the League of Nations also supported and advanced similar ideals through its participating members. Though the points are individualistic, the ideas presented can be summarized succinctly in the three following ideals:

Free Trade

⁴ These three values are derived from the speech given by President Woodrow Wilson entitled "The Fourteen Points". The speech contains fourteen points which Wilson believed would contribute to world peace and cooperation at the close of the First World War. The summarizing of these fourteen points into these three subdivisions comes from Kenneth B. Pyle's book "Japan Rising" which discusses the impacts of these points, and the relative implications and importance of each points to Japan specifically and the world in a broader sense. Pyle, Kenneth B., Japan Rising (The Century Foundation, 1997) pp.143-149

Free trade encouraged greater cooperation between nations, and would facilitate peace to preserve economies. Barriers to trade created international tensions, and the formation of trade allies. These relationships had the potential of creating tension between nations and could encourage warfare for economic reasons. Coincidentally, the United States was a potential economic superpower, and decreased barriers of trade would strengthen American industry. Some would argue the beginning of Pearl Harbor was initiated when the United States declared a trade embargo of oil with Japan in 1939.

Disarmament

Disarmament in theory would decrease the chance of an outbreak of physical warfare, and would encourage international communication instead. In practice however this was never really achieved in the large scale which Wilson had hoped. Even today, the subject of disarmament of weapons is still very heated and controversial. Countries such as Costa Rica or the Vatican, which claim to not have armed forces, are significantly different from world powers. Where a small country may be able to survive with limited armed forces, large world powers claim they cannot disarm without other countries invading.

Democracy and Freedom

This value was purely American. American roots were founded on the idea of political, economic and social freedom from a governing power. American values suggest that every man is free, and free to act under the dictates of his own conscience, providing he does not negatively affect society. Furthermore, Americans assume that this freedom, provided through democracy, is sure to bring happiness and wellbeing. This disregards the long-held traditions of many nations which have an extensive history into antiquity. Furthermore, Americans assumed democracies do

not engage in warfare with other democracies. Advancing this principle would, according to Wilson, promote greater and broader peace, and facilitate global sociopolitical progression.

The United States Enters the Second World War

During the First World War, the American economy boomed and American confidence surged. It appeared as if the United States was the new world power. Wilson's views reflected the confidence of the American citizen. The United States did not only excel domestically, but it also excelled abroad. American involvement helped the Europeans win the war. The world's view of the United States was relatively positive. This surge of confidence led the United States with the confidence to advocate American ideologies abroad. America stepped out of its traditional isolationist shell.

However, just over a decade after the First World War, the United States soon plummeted into an economic recession. The Great Depression soon infected American confidence, and the United States soon withdrew back to its isolationist past. Rather than intervening and assisting Europe, and other nations around the globe, the United States focused on its domestic economy, increased employment and a strengthened domestic industry. When the Second World War erupted in Europe, the United States was content to still focus on domestic policy.

Perhaps the United States would have remained in this state of isolation, however on December 7, 1941, the Japanese launched a surprise attack on the American Pacific fleet stationed at Pearl Harbor. The following day, the United States declared war on Japan and subsequently entered the Second World War as one of the Allies fighting against the Axis powers.

The United States quickly abandoned its traditional isolationist tendencies to the polar extreme. In addition to declaring war, President Franklin D. Roosevelt demanded an end to the

war via unconditional surrender. This was a key turning point in the history of the Second World War, as well as for the future world order. Every war in the United States' history had been fought to a negotiated peace. The brutality exhibited by the Japanese during the attack at Pearl Harbor was countered with President Roosevelt's brutal demands of unconditional surrender as the only end to the war. Without the acceptance of the United States' surrender conditions, the war would continue.

Unconditional surrender resulted in unconditional Japanese resistance. The military played a key role in Japanese society since the beginning of the Meiji restoration in 1868. The military played a central role in the development of this restoration of imperial control. Phrases such as "enrich the country, strengthen the military" became commonplace. Japan sought to expand its empire and to attain a greater sphere of influence and domain. Japan put these beliefs into practice by engaging in the Sino- and Russo- Japanese wars. Both times they conquered formidable adversaries, namely China and Russia respectively. Their success did not go unnoticed. During the Second World War, Japan had much of the same core militaristic values⁵.

Fatality statistics also illustrate the concept of unconditional Japanese resistance. Japanese fatality statistics were eerily high. In some battles in the Pacific against American adversaries, fatality rates approached 96, 98, and 97 percent respectively of the total fighting forces. American statistics usually hovered around 60 percent. Fatality rates show the degree to which the citizens of both countries were willing to fight to the death, and how far they were

⁵ For a more in depth analysis of Japanese military mentality and culture, the essay "Trained in the Hardest School" featured in "In the Service of the Emperor" by Edward J. Drea provides a useful description. The essay exhibits Japan military culture in which the military unit and commanding officers were portrayed similarly to a family unit. Additionally, it portrays the change in public opinion of the military, showing the public applauded and even encouraged young men who were unable to do traditional work to enlist in the military. Drea, Edward J., In the Service of the Emperor (First Nebraska paperback Printing, 2003) pp. 75-90

willing to go despite their losses. Fatality rates nearing one hundred percent show that opposition was far more than a strategy; it was an ideal adopted by the Japanese in hopes of destroying the United States.

Furthermore, the demand of total war when the United States were preparing to invade Honshu plays an important role in understanding Japanese mentality. When the Japanese were assuming the Americans would attempt an invasion on Honshu, they encouraged all citizens regardless of gender and age, to bear arms to assist in the battle against the Americans. Additionally, leagues of kamikaze fighters and other suicide squads armed with explosives, or in submarines further show effects of unconditional Japanese resistance. Combined, these were the adverse effects of demanding unconditional surrender. Unconditional resistance would not have existed without the demand of unconditional surrender.

Atomic Bombs Dropped on Japan

Another symptom of unconditional surrender was that the United States justified unconditional brutality to stop the war. Before the United States' entry into the Second World War, practices of carpet and fire-bombing were considered inhumane war crimes and acts of terrorism which the London Charter banned. However, at the height of the war and some of the bloodiest battles in the history of modern warfare, the United States gave approval to carpet and fire bomb Tokyo despite knowing fully about the certainty of civilian casualties and deaths of the elderly, children and women. The United States conducted extensive research and executed detailed planning, and finally on the evenings of the 9-10th March 1945 carried out a bombing raid on Tokyo⁶.

⁶ References to, and information on the firebombing can be found in greater detail in Richard Franks' "Downfall". The first chapter explains the effects and feelings of the firebombing well, and portrays the brutality of its entirety. The Americans did not just decide to bomb the city of

Most obvious, the greatest sign of American unconditional brutality was the dropping of the atomic bombs⁷. The death tolls of these two bombings were a staggering 100-150,000⁸ lives. Accounts of the survivors of these abhorrent events paint an even more vivid picture of what

Tokyo, but did extensive research into the exact area where there would be the most damage and greatest devastation. Fire bombs were dropped in areas composed almost entirely of houses with paper doors and wooden structures which caused mass destruction. Additionally, a windy night was chosen to carry the flames throughout the city. Frank, Richard B., Downfall (Penguin Books 1999) pp. 3-20

⁷ This is a very controversial subject. The dropping of the atomic bombs, and the reasons behind the dropping of the atomic bombs are still, and have long been, debated. Formidable theories include: 1). The dropping of the atomic bombs would save American lives, and decrease the number of fatalities between the Japanese and the United States compared to an invasion of the Japanese homeland 2). Dropping the bombs would result in a quickened end to the war- the war had continued for the duration of at least 3 years for the United States, and soldiers and the public were losing hope. Rather than keep fighting an endless war, and draining resources, the atomic bombs would present a quickened surrender 3). The United States wanted to show Russia the development of its atomic energy, and make a statement that they were indeed a formidable world power 4). The Americans had invested hours and billions of dollars into the development of the bomb- not using the bomb would be a waste 5). The atomic bomb could act as a psychological weapon and affect Japanese morale, causing them to accept the conditions of the Potsdam Conference. Opinions differ, and all documents from Japan, the United States and the former Soviet Union are not unclassified, therefore it is impossible to know precisely the process of deciding if the atomic bombs were justified. This discussion in its fullest is not within the scope of my paper; however, the implications of the bombing had a drastic effect on the United States' occupation on Japan. Without the bombs, American occupation may not have occurred, which in itself may have altered current American foreign policy and its stance on intervention.

⁸ Perhaps just as complex, the calculation of the death toll varies widely between scholars. Because of the surprise nature of the bomb, a full census of total deaths at time of impact, immediately after, or shortly after is unrealistic to demand, and infeasible. Additionally, the Japanese were not able to immediately calculate accurate losses in the wake of war. Thus, educated estimates in most cases have been made. Additionally, the nature of what constitutes a death caused by the atomic bombs is under close scrutiny. What constitutes a fatality due to atomic bombing? Are the people that died on impact the only fatalities of the atomic bombs? Are people that died due to radiation sickness within a week or month of the bomb considered fatalities? Are people that died years, or decades after considered fatalities of the atomic bomb? Are children born with defects and early deaths considered fatalities of the atomic bomb? Depending on the scholar's stance on these questions, and what constituted a fatality of the atomic bombing, the numbers and estimates vary greatly. However, there is a general consensus with the numbers quoted in this paper. Effectively, I like to look of them as a median of scholarly estimated.

humanity endured in these two cities. When taking these accounts into consideration, it is impossible not to consider the dropping of the atomic bombs an atrocity, regardless of the reasoning for their use.

The bombing of Tokyo and other Japanese cities, in addition to the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki set the stage for a successful American intervention. These events both caused large and widespread devastation across the greater Japanese homeland. Firebombing and the atomic bombs also destroyed infrastructure which was essential to transport materials throughout the country, and perhaps most paramount, was needed to transport food to a starving population⁹. Combined with a knowledge of losing the war, this created an environment where the United States could effectively build up the nation of Japan from nothing, and with little resistance¹⁰.

American Occupation of Japan and Outcomes

Following the surrender of Japan, and the signing of the peace treaty with the United States, the United States began its occupation of Japan. The United States contributed greatly to the reconstruction of Japan. At the start of the occupation, the United States redrafted and wrote the Japanese constitution. Although the Japanese Diet and Emperor were retained, many American values and elements could be traced from the form of government and democracy that

⁹ It is estimated that the Japanese people went from eating a typical 2000 calorie pre-war diet to a 12-1600 calorie diet approaching the end of the Second World War. Rice and salt rationing were in full effect. The Americans, though perhaps not fully aware of its severity, were aware that there were food shortages in Japan. The United States had embargoed trade between the United States and Japan, and also planted minefields to make importing from other countries into Japan relatively difficult, and perhaps impossible.

¹⁰ This refers to the majority of Japan. Intervention and occupation of some areas, Okinawa specifically were met with resistance and in many cases the Japanese were resentful and unpleasant. This statement refers to the aggregate attitude of Japan as a whole, and does not encompass these anomalies.

Japan now had. In addition to writing the constitution, the United States also had control over the press of Japan. Most notably the United States monitored its image carefully in Japan.

Discussions about the atomic bombing, and a negative portrayal of Americans, especially during the war, was not allowed. The Americans aided in the disarmament of Japan, and unsurprisingly, Japan emerged as a nation uninterested in developing or encouraging nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, the United States executed war trials throughout the country.

The occupation of Japan was a relative success. Since the demand of total surrender, the United States had spent a great deal of planning for an intervention in Japan. This planning and research invested into Japan proved useful during the invasion. This meant the United States knew how to react and what was necessary to have a successful intervention.

Despite the United States' best efforts and execution of the occupation, partial credit is due to the Japanese people and culture that already existed in Japan. Japan was an ideal country to restructure. The Meiji Restoration¹¹ in the past, proved that Japan was able to revolutionize and change themselves- they were not lacking in ability to change their government, core values or financial management. This made the occupation of Japan relatively easily compared to a possible intervention in another nation. Additionally, the humility and acceptance of wrong

¹¹ The Meiji Restoration was a movement to restore total power to the emperor of Japan and abandon the shogunate system. This meant that loyalty was to the emperor and none else. Under this restoration, Japan emerged as an industrial world power. They were the first Asian nation in modern history to defeat a Western power, and proved their military prowess by defeating the Chinese and USSR respectively in the Sino- and Russo-Japanese wars. These victories, as well as the economic success of Japan pushed Japan into the stage of imperialism which swept the world at the time. It was during this restoration (which began in 1868 and ended in the 1890s) that Japan emerged as a world power, and proved that within in a generation it was capable of immense inner change. Additionally, Japan was seeking a capitalist state. It wanted to be involved with the West and revered as a power industrial power. Because this was the general trajectory of Japan before the war, the American occupation to complete this goal was generally accepted.

doing was a key element in Japanese culture. Apologies carried a heavy weighting and were revered by the public¹². After American intervention, the Japanese humbly accepted that they were the culprits of continuing the Pacific War. The public acceptance of this in Japan made the American occupation rather peaceful. Civil wars did not emerge and there was little, if any, resistance or uprising. The Japanese were peaceful, and eager to change.

The result of the American occupation of Japan was relatively positive. Over half a century later, Japan has one of the most advanced economies and societies in the world. Technology booms, as does pop culture. Japan is also regarded as one of the world's top earning nations. After the American intervention, the Japanese were able to maintain peace and maintain their democracy.

Arguably, the American intervention of Japan was justified. The United States had a responsibility to assist in the rebuilding of Japan as it had used nuclear weapons, and engaged in inhumane warfare. The United States also justifiably intervened in order to promote national interests. Had they not intervened, the USSR may have intervened, having negative repercussions on global freedom and democracy, which were both traditional American aims.

New American World Order

¹² For a more in-depth discussion and analysis of the meaning of an apology to the Japanese refer to "The Mushroom Cloud and National Psyches: Japanese Perceptions of the A-Bomb Decision, 1945-1995". The portrayal of the Japanese, as well as the deep desire of a heartfelt apology by the Americans for the dropping of the atomic bombs, show how enrooted the concept of apology is in Japanese culture, and how much it is revered. This article hints that if the United States were to apologize for the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan would apologize for the devastation of Pearl Harbor. This significantly gives us insight into the Japanese view of apologies. Asada Sadao, "The Mushroom Cloud and National Psyches: Japanese Perceptions of the A-Bomb Decision, 1945-1995", The Journal of American-East Asian Relations, Vol. 4 No. 2 (Summer 1995), pp. 95-116

For the first time, the United States had finally risen as the indisputable world power. The defeat of Japan, the successful detonation of atomic weapons, and the defeat of the Axis powers all contributed to the new American world order. Never before in the world's history had a nation come out on top economically, socially and politically as the United States after the Second World War. Despite involvement in the Second World War in Europe, the fall of the Axis powers, specifically Germany, was not solely due to American intervention. It was a combined effort between the Allied powers. Japan however, had limited international involvement with the Allies, and was predominantly an American battle with the East.

The Japanese intervention was unique to the United States. No other world powers had been involved in Japan's surrender. Though the USSR had joined the war as peace negotiations were occurring, and did invade some of Japan's territory before final surrender, it was not a key player in Japan's surrender. If the intervention went well, the United States were able to take credit for it. However, if it failed, the United States were to blame. The intervention was a success, and the corresponding American attitudes were high with national pride and patriotism. In their eyes, they had promoted democracy and freedom to a former enemy. They viewed themselves as humanitarians.

The successful occupation of, and intervention in Japan had many lasting effects on the United States' foreign policy. With the success of the Japanese intervention¹³, the United States' perceived self-image changed from a mere global player to a global protectorate and advocate of

¹³ The success of the German intervention, though not solely the doings of the United States impacted this image as well. The difference between the intervention of Germany and Japan, was the intervention of Germany could not be claimed wholly by the United States. Though the United States was a participant, the United Kingdom and France also played a key role in the influence and success of the German occupation.

freedom through democracy. The United States viewed this as the only way of having a successful nation and economy, and a happy people.

Future Interventions

The core American values mentioned above, in addition to the establishment of the relatively modern American world order laid a foundation for American confidence and future intervention in other countries. A long history of interventions followed the end of the Second World War¹⁴. Notable examples include Vietnam, Cambodia, Korea and Iraq. Because of the success of Japan and its fully recovered economy and advanced technology, the United States assumed intervention was a method which guaranteed foreign reform, and increased democratic states.

As mentioned above, the success of the Japanese occupation was largely due to the Japanese and their ability to reorganize and revolutionize themselves. The assumption that intervention could advance American values and improve global freedom was fatal. This was demonstrated in Iraq.

Perhaps the most recognized American intervention second to Japan was the intervention in Iraq. Following the attacks of terrorists on American soil on September 11th, 2001, the United States declared war on Iraq. George W. Bush declared a war on terrorism, and the CIA and other sources suspected there to be a correlation between Al-Qaeda terrorists and Iraq's dictator, Saddam Hussain. Though the interventions and origination of both interventions in Japan and Iraq, the two were strikingly different.

¹⁴ McFaul, Michael, Advancing Democracy Abroad (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers INC, 2010), pp 205-208

The intervention in Japan was an intervention which involved restricting a nation's government, and helping the Japanese population as a whole. Though a difficult task, this was a task that could be accomplished. It was not impossible. However, the intervention of Iraq was far more difficult. The history of Iraq dated back to antiquity. The country of Iraq consisted of multiple ethnic groups that could not be targeted individually logistically, and who were distributed throughout many different regions throughout Iraq and the Middle East as a whole. Whereas the intervention in Japan singled the intervention to benefit a single race, a single ethnicity and a single nation, the intervention in Iraq spanned a greater geographic area and covered multiple ethnic groups and races throughout the Middle East. Intervention in order to target and eliminate these peoples while trying to establish a democratic government was logistically and statistically impossible. Furthermore, the intervention of Iraq was poorly planned, and when compared to Japan, was a last-minute intervention in retaliation towards Al-Qaeda. Poor planning and execution led to a less than successful intervention in Iraq.

The significance of considering the American intervention of Iraq was the link made between the two by former President George W. Bush, which delivered a speech comparing the intervention of the United States in Japan to the necessary intervention in Iraq¹⁵. Though similar, they differ greatly. Iraq had no significant similarities with Japan to justify intervention.

Reflections

The study of intervention leads to a variety of different outcomes. Perhaps one of the most difficult elements of studying intervention is that analysis and comparison between two

¹⁵ George W. Bush Jr., "Transcript of President Bush's Speech at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Convention", The New York Times, (August 22, 2007)

interventions is nearly impossible. The unique histories and values of each country- both the intervening and the country being intervened- provide endless possibilities from each situation.

When considering the United States' foreign policy, and stance on intervention, one must consider the following questions, namely; 1). Will intervention lead to other countries becoming like America? 2). Is there a difference between intervention and avocation of democracy? 3). Is the American dream a universal dream of the human race?

Will Other Countries Become like America?

Despite the efforts of the United States, American democracy is not a concept that can be forced on other peoples and nations. American democracy is unique to the United States, and does not suit all nationalities. American democracy is a relatively new ideal, and when compared to countries which have an ancient history, may not be the most efficient way to govern a country. Although countries such as China, or Russia have consistently changed their form of government over time, a historic presence of their ancient cultures can still be detected in their governments. The Chinese still place a heavy influence on memorization and education which correlates to their past history with Confucianism and ancient Song and Ming dynasties¹⁶. Additionally, the importance of brute strength and military power is an element unique to Russia's distant past, and is still felt today, as is their perceived talent for the physical sciences¹⁷. Though China and Russia's government has changed over time from including in no particular order monarchies, republics, communist regimes and democracies, distinct elements unique to their culture still remain. Furthermore, ancient forms of government still exist and are difficult to change, and perhaps needless to change. Many Middle Eastern governments still have some

¹⁶ references from background information from current enrollment in JSIS 200, fall quarter

¹⁷ references from background information from current enrollment in JSIS 200, fall quarter

degree of discrimination of birthright. Connections or birth into the correct clan, or tribe awards one with inherent benefits. Likewise, being born to the wrong family can have devastating effects. Elements of this system have existed since antiquity. To change them through intervention is fiction. Forcing the American ideal of American democracy on such countries, and other ancient countries and systems in the Middle East, prove ineffective. Such practices are impossible.

Intervention verses Avocation

There is a distinct difference between avocation and intervention. Intervention involves intentional action and insertion of moral values into another country. Typically, this necessitates physical entry into another country. This causes a plethora of different problems. Avocation however, suggests the stressing of the same values by example, and not interfering in international affairs. Does intervention support American values of disarmament, free trade and freedom? No. A more effective approach is arguable avocation by example. Switzerland is a promising example. Often regarded as one of the most liberal and peaceful countries in the world, Switzerland advocates peace by living peacefully. News regarding Swiss intervention abroad is rare, if not unheard of. Successful demonstration of core American values, inside the United States, would arguably over time be more efficient and have less of a toll abroad than current avocation of these values through intervention.

Is the American Dream Universal?

The American dream, achieved and made possible by American democracy is not universal. Since the beginning of American history, the people attracted to the United States and the American dream were people who wanted greater financial success and the chance of a high economic standing. In large degree, these people were from Western society in Europe.

Countries with a much more ancient past, such as countries in the Middle East, or Asia, may gauge success and happiness by the size of their family and posterity, their adherence to ancient rituals, or their existence and participation within a society as a whole. Economic success has little, or nothing with the achievement of these goals. Advancing these values that bring fulfillment to American society would be akin to an Islamist country forcing the practice of daily scheduled prayer throughout the day and night to a practicing Christian. It has little or no value, nor does it increase perceived happiness.

Conclusion

If there were a reason to intervene and occupy Japan, it was because of the atrocities the United States committed towards Japan. It was their moral duty to help the only victim of nuclear warfare in world history. However, global American responsibility ended there. Further interventions abroad wherever they had been, in East Asian or the Middle East were not warranted and not justified. The intervention of Japan was an anomaly, and it was unrealistic to intervene abroad in all instances since. Perhaps Max Boot states it most clearly when he states “Compared with the grasping old imperialism of the past, America’s ‘liberal imperialism’ pursues far different, and more ambitious, goals. It aims to instill democracy in lands that have known tyranny, in the hope that doing so will short-circuit terrorism, military aggression, and weapons proliferation.” The United States, who put forth effort to increase global freedom and democracy, has ironically come full circle and has restarted another chapter in history as an imperialist¹⁸.

¹⁸ Max Boot, “Neither New nor Nefarious: The Liberal Empire Strikes Back”, Current History, (November 2003), p 361

Bibliographic Essay

Whereas the materials I used to research my essay were resourceful and helpful, the field of historiography poses a difficult dilemma. There are seemingly endless volumes of books and immense amounts of information, however every author has their degree and opinion. Whereas sciences and mathematics are more easily unified and agreeing, historiography poses the same information in astoundingly different view. Thus, rather than quoting particular sources and examples from various volumes in great detail, I opted to read a greater range of books and publications and form my own opinions from the wide range of various opinions offered.

The contents publications used in class and later discussed were of particular use in forming opinions whilst still obtaining concrete background knowledge simultaneously. Rather than focusing on the information being presented, the discussions regarding validity, the author's background and political stance were helpful as well. The heavy reading load posed a challenge as my average reading pace is much lower than average due to dyslexia. Thus, the way I have used my sources has been through extensive reading and sifting through materials to form my own analysis and opinions of the respected material. I have then attempted to provide a personal analysis from personal opinions whilst backing it up with sources.

In general, I would classify myself as extremely conservative when discussing foreign intervention. Thus, many of the sources I have used have leaned towards conservatism. However, the relatively balanced argument and discussion of Michael Doyle and Stuart Mill

were useful sources of information. For my essay, I found Dower's work to be helpful and factual, however strictly biased. His use of descriptive language and arguments seemed to appeal to a greater audience for entertaining reading rather than a real scholarly analysis.

The compilation of information to write knowledgeably about the intervention of America in Iraq was a daunting task. The Iraqi invasion is arguably just as controversial as the American intervention in Japan. Because of time constraints, and the other background reading I did, I was not able to get as in-depth knowledge of the subject as I would have liked. However, Dower's book did accomplish the purpose of giving me a sound background and analysis, especially between the comparisons between the American invasions of both Japan and Iraq. When I got up to that point of my essay, I realized I did not have the pages to offer as an in-depth analysis as I would have liked. However, hopefully the succinct analysis is sufficient to show that the Iraqi intervention differed significantly from the Japanese occupation.

Bibliography

Books without specific page numbers were read in their entirety and contributed to my personal view of intervention abroad.

Capulong, "Philippine-American History: A Century of Crimes Against the American People", Public Interest Law Center, World Tribunal for Iraq Trial in New York City, August 25, 2004, <<http://www.thefilipinomind.com/2006/01/philippine-revolution-american.html>> (November 20, 2016)

Dower, John W., Cultures of War (W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2010)

Doyle, Michael W., The Question of Intervention- John Stuart Mill and the Responsibility to Protect (Yale University Press, 2015)

Drea, Edward J., In the Service of the Emperor (First Nebraska paperback Printing, 2003) pp. 75-90

Frank, Richard B., Downfall (Penguin Books 1999) pp. 3-20

Max Boot, “Neither New nor Nefarious: The Liberal Empire Strikes Back”, Current History, (November 2003), p 361

McFaul, Michael, Advancing Democracy Abroad (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers INC, 2010)

Pyle, Kenneth B., Japan Rising (The Century Foundation, 1997) pp.143-149

Sadao, Asada, “The Mushroom Cloud and National Psyches: Japanese Perceptions of the A-Bomb Decision, 1945-1995”, The Journal of American-East Asian Relations, Vol. 4 No. 2 (Summer 1995), pp. 95-116

The United Nations General Assembly, “Curriculum vitae of Romeo T. Capulong”, Curricula vitae of candidates nominated by States Members of the United Nations and by non-member States maintaining permanent observer missions at United Nations Headquarters, 6 , <<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/55/a55919a2.pdf>>, (November 20, 2016)