

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Amar Thelidji University of Laghouat
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English



A Descriptive Account on the Accomplishments and the Failures of US Foreign Policy: Korea 1950-1953.

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for Master Degree in Literature and Civilization.

Presented By:

Chaib Ahmed Karim

Board of Examiners:

- Mr. Naoumi Mohammed University of Laghouat, Chairman.
- Dr. Mr. Seddiki Mohammed Cherif, University of Laghouat, Supervisor.
- Mrs. Bederina Sara, University of Laghouat, Examiner.

2019-2020

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Mr. Seddiki Mohammed Cherif who has my eternal respect and gratitude, and for the efforts he has made to accomplish this work.

Further, I would like to pay my special regards to all my teachers of the academic journey. Thank you for guiding me through the path of knowledge.

Dedication

This work is especially dedicated to my departed mother

To my father whom I respect very much

To my respectful family

To my both uncles

To all my beloved friends of the academic journey.

Abstract

Since the turn of the twentieth century, the American foreign policy has driven a rising interest on several topics. The swing from total isolationism to direct interventionism was a significant event that requires consideration. From this point onward, the United States foreign policy played a major role on the international scene. Eventually, the end of WWII and the outbreak of the Cold War was the emergence of the U.S. alongside the Soviet Union as superpowers competing to dominate the globe. This led to military confrontation starting with the Korean War 1950-1953 to escalation in other parts of the world. The concern of this paper is to exhibit the type of the American foreign policy toward the Soviet Union after 1945 during the Korean War. The latter was a battleground that gathered the two superpowers. In particular, the U.S. aim behind the intervention was the containment of the communist spread in the Peninsula and eventually reunify it under friendly government. Thus, one would wonder: did the U.S. achieve its ultimate goal? Was the intervention justified? To what extent was the American intervention a success for the goals set? Through a descriptive and analytical approach, this work attempts to contemplate the U.S foreign policy in the first years of the Cold War and particularly in the Korean War. Furthermore, this work explains how effective the American intervention was in containing Communism. Therefore, it is to be concluded that, though incomplete, the success of such intervention was significant. Overall, this work analyzes, examines, and hence evaluates the U.S. foreign policies towards Korea during the war (1950-1953). It does, as well, provide a ground floor for some future studies on the troubled U.S and North Korean relations during and after the Cold War.

Keywords: The United States, U.S. foreign policy, Korean War, Cold War.

Résumé

Depuis le début du XXe siècle, la politique étrangère américaine a été un sujet brûlant pour plusieurs sujets. Le passage de l'isolationnisme total à l'interventionnisme direct a été un événement important qui doit être pris en considération. À partir de ce moment, la politique étrangère des États-Unis a joué un rôle majeur sur la scène internationale. Finalement, la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale et le déclenchement de la guerre froide ont été l'émergence des États-Unis aux côtés de l'Union soviétique en tant que superpuissances en compétition pour dominer le monde. Cela a conduit à une confrontation militaire à partir de la guerre de Corée 1950-1953 à une escalade dans d'autres parties du monde. Le souci de cette thèse est d'exposer le type de la politique étrangère américaine envers l'Union soviétique après 1945 pendant la guerre de Corée. Ce dernier était un champ de bataille regroupant les deux superpuissances. En particulier, le but américain derrière l'intervention était de contenir la propagation communiste dans la péninsule et de la réunifier finalement sous un gouvernement ami. Ainsi, on se demanderait : les États-Unis ont-ils atteint leur objectif ultime ? L'intervention était-elle justifiée ? Dans quelle mesure l'intervention américaine a-t-elle été un succès pour les objectifs fixés ? Par une approche descriptive et analytique, ce travail tente de contempler la politique étrangère américaine dans les premières années de la guerre froide et en particulier pendant la guerre de Corée. En outre, ce travail explique l'efficacité de l'intervention américaine pour contenir le communisme. Par conséquent, il faut en conclure que, bien qu'incomplète, le succès d'une telle intervention a été significatif. Dans l'ensemble, ce travail analyse, examine et donc évalue les politiques étrangères américaines à l'égard de la Corée pendant la guerre (1950-1953). Il fournit également une base pour certaines études futures sur les relations troubles entre les États-Unis et la Corée du Nord pendant et après la guerre froide.

Mot-clé : Les États Unis, Politique étrangère américaine, la guerre du Corée

ملخص

منذ مطلع القرن العشرين، كانت السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية موضوعاً ساخناً لعدة مواضيع. كان التآرجح من الانعزالية الكاملة إلى التدخل المباشر حدثاً مهماً يتطلب النظر. من هذه النقطة فصاعداً، لعبت السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة دوراً رئيسياً على الساحة الدولية. في نهاية المطاف، كانت نهاية الحرب العالمية الثانية واندلاع الحرب الباردة هي ظهور الولايات المتحدة إلى جانب الاتحاد السوفيتي كقوى عظمى تتنافس للسيطرة على العالم. أدى ذلك إلى مواجهة عسكرية بدأت مع الحرب الكورية 1950-1953 إلى التصعيد في أجزاء أخرى من العالم. يتمثل اهتمام هذه الورقة في عرض نوع السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية تجاه الاتحاد السوفيتي بعد عام 1945 أثناء الحرب الكورية. كانت الأخيرة ساحة معركة جمعت القوتين العظميين. على وجه الخصوص، كان هدف الولايات المتحدة من وراء التدخل هو احتواء انتشار الشيوعيين في شبه الجزيرة وإعادة توحيد في نهاية المطاف في ظل حكومة صديقة. وبالتالي، قد يتساءل المرء: هل حققت الولايات المتحدة هدفها النهائي؟ هل التدخل مبرر؟ إلى أي مدى كان التدخل الأمريكي ناجحاً للأهداف الموضوعية؟ من خلال نهج وصفي وتحليلي، يحاول هذا العمل التفكير في السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة في السنوات الأولى من الحرب الباردة وخاصة في الحرب الكورية. علاوة على ذلك، يشرح هذا العمل مدى فعالية التدخل الأمريكي في احتواء الشيوعية. لذلك، يجب أن نستنتج أن نجاح مثل هذا التدخل، على الرغم من عدم اكتماله، كان كبيراً. بشكل عام، يحلل هذا العمل ويفحص ويقيم السياسات الخارجية للولايات المتحدة تجاه كوريا خلال الحرب (1950-1953). كما أنه يوفر أرضية لبعض الدراسات المستقبلية حول العلاقات المضطربة بين الولايات المتحدة وكوريا الشمالية أثناء وبعد الحرب الباردة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الولايات المتحدة السياسة الأمريكية الخارجية الحرب الكورية.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

DRNK: Democratic Republic of North Korea.

ECA: Economic Corporation Administration.

GPD: Gross Domestic Product.

KPG: Korean Provisional Government.

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

NCC: Navy Coordinating Committee.

R.O.K: Republic of Korea

R.S.K: Republic of South Korea.

U.S.: The United States.

U.S.S.R: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

UN: United Nations.

WWI: First World War

WWII: Second World War

Table of contents

Table of contents

Acknowledgement	I
Dedication	II
Abstract	III
Résumé	IV
الملخص	V
List of Abbreviations	VI
General Introduction	01
<i>Chapter one: Historical Background on U.S. Foreign Affairs</i>	
1.1 Introduction.....	07
1.2. Foreign Policy.....	07
1.2.1 The Theoretical Approaches to Analyse Foreign Policy.....	08
1.2.2 Foreign Policy Decision Making	09
1.2.3 The Purpose of Foreign Policy.....	10
1.3.US Foreign Policy 1945 As a Sample	11
1.3.1 Isolationism.....	11
1.3.1.1 American Isolationism.....	12
1.3.1.2 Repercussions of American isolationism.....	13
1.3.2 Interventionism.....	14
1.3.2.1 Repercussions of American interventionism.....	16
1.4 U.S. Foreign Policy During the Two World Wars	17
1.4.1 World War I	17
1.4.2 Post War 1918.....	18
1.4.3 World War II	19
1.5 Postwar U.S. Foreign Policy (1945 Onward)	20
1.5.1 The Cold War.....	21
1.5.1.1 Reasons Behind the Cold War.....	21

1.5.2 Western Camp against USSR.....	22
1.5.2.1 Western Camp.....	22
1.5.2.2 Eastern Camp.....	23
1.5.3 Effects of the Cold War on US Foreign Policy.....	24
1.5.3.1 U.S. Foreign Policy toward the USSR.....	24
1.6 Conclusion.....	25

Chapter two: U.S. Foreign Policy in Korea 1950-1953

2.1 Introduction.....	27
2.2 Insights Upon Korea in post Second World War Era.....	27
2.2.1 The Decolonization and the Division of Korea.....	27
2.2.2 The Creation of a New Regimes.....	29
2.2.3 US foreign policy Toward Korean Peninsula 1945-1950	31
2.3 The Embodiment of the Containment Policy in Korea:	32
2.3.1 The Containment policy.....	32
2.3.1.1 The Evolution of the Containment in Asia	32
2.4 The Outbreak of “The Korean War” and the US Reaction.....	33
2.4.1 The U.S. Involvement in the Korean War.....	35
2.4.3 Feasibility of the U.S. Involvement in the Korean War.....	36
2.4.3.1 In the Korean peninsula.....	36
2.4.3.2 At the Domestic Level.....	37
2.4.3.3 At the International Level:	38
2.5 Conclusion.....	39

Chapter three: The Ramifications of the Korean War on the U.S.

3.1 Introduction.....	41
3.2 Reassessing the Ramifications of the Korean War on the U.S.....	41
3.2.1 US Foreign policy and the Korean War.....	41
3.2.2 Pre Korean war US Foreign policies.....	42
3.2.3 Post Korean war US Foreign policies.....	43

3.3 The Role of the Containment in the Korean War.....	44
3.3.1 Effects of the US Intervention in the Korean War.....	45
3.3.2 Effects of the Containment in the Korean war on the Cold War.....	46
3.3.3 Effects of the Containment of the USSR.....	46
3.4 Consequences of the Korean War.....	47
3.4.1 US Achievements in the Korean War.....	48
3.4.2 US failures in the Korean war.....	48
3.5 Conclusion.....	50
General conclusion	52
Work cited	56



**GENERAL
INTRODUCTION**

General Introduction

The notion of foreign policy is considerable and significant, and it is usually interpreted as the course of events and the choices that a nation makes in its ties with other nations to accomplish their domestic goals and to support local interest. It involves values that affect behavior and goals. It also encompasses the aspects of consistency and transition that arise with shifting needs and focuses, also shifts in the domestic and foreign frameworks of a country. Furthermore, the word "foreign" primarily describes all of this. The global structure includes all the relations and acts of the country in the world; it demonstrates the connections and the help of the coalition of every country. It also includes policies such as commerce and defense. Hence, the objectives of the foreign policies are to secure local clout, state sovereignty that supports country's interests and foreign relations for peace. (Bojang 3)

During the post Second World War era, the world witnessed the end of the most epic global war and the beginning of another war under the name of the Cold War. This last was a competition on the world dominance and weaponry and military advancement between the U.S. and its allies, the west camp, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the eastern camp. Moreover, the rivalry's dimensions extended to the whole world, thus it had split to capitalist and Communist sections. The cold war remained cold, however, it witnessed a number of armed confrontations in several areas around the world; one of those confrontations was in the Korean peninsula in 1950-1953. The Korean War was a limited and proxy war, which was broken up due several reasons under the umbrella of the conflict of the world's superpowers.

The present work will concentrate on the American foreign policy in the World and in Korea in particular, and on the types of policies undertaken toward the allies and the Soviet rival in postwar era. Much of this study tends to highlight the policy of Containment after the Second World War; especially the Korean War. Moreover, this war was the first confrontation

between the U.S. and the USSR, which ended by an armistice in 1953. Many voices appeared arguing about the success or the failure of U.S. foreign policy, particularly the Containment policy, and its intervention in the war as well as the extent of success to contain Communism spread in the peninsula, in short and long term results.

This piece of work aims at demonstrating the type of the American foreign policy towards the Soviet Union after 1945. It focuses substantially as well on the policy practiced in East Asia. In addition, it demonstrates the change of the U.S. from isolationism to interventionism. Additionally, it sheds light on the political status of the Korean peninsula after the Japanese decolonization and the occupation by the world superpowers, America and The USSR. Besides, it tackles the implementation of the containment policy and the U.S. intervention in the Korean War. Also, it projects the ramifications of this war on the U.S. foreign policies. Therefor an important question would be raised: to what extent was the American intervention in Korea successful?

In order to support the development of this work, answering the following would be guiding:

Research sub-questions:

- 1) What are the major strategies of the U.S. foreign policies before and after 1945? What led to a swing in policies?
- 2) What policies did the United States make in use during the Korean War against the USSR?
- 3) What led America to intervene in the Korean War? Was it justified?
- 4) How did the Korean War shape the U.S. foreign policy? Was it a long term success?

Hypotheses:

- 1) The American foreign policy major strategies after 1945 were mainly based on containing Communism.

- 2) The American foreign policies against the U.S.S.R via the containment were interventionist and containing.
- 3) America's intervention in the Korean War was basically to protect south Korea and maintain peace.
- 4) The Korean War was a turning point in the U.S. foreign policies.

The coming analysis will demonstrate the American foreign policy in Korea. The methodology of the study paper is Descriptive Analytical in which qualitative data will be collected and examined considering the evolution of American foreign policies through history. Moreover, this paper contains definitions, viewpoints to explain the U.S. foreign policy in the twentieth century.

The topic of the research paper was selected among several interesting topics for many reasons. First, the Korean war was named "the Forgotten War" because it occurred between two major events, the WWII and the war in Vietnam. Also, the importance of this war in the history of the Cold War as a turning point. Also, it played a major role in shaping the American foreign policy regarding the Cold War. Finally, the war was not stopped by a peace treaty but only by an armistice, which put a current possibility of another outbreak of the war.

The current paper takes into account former studies, which were attempted to study the containment policy in the postwar era. Chalmers M, Roberts in his article, *How Containment Worked*, mentioned that "the concept was that postwar Russia's "expensive tendencies" could be contained by American policy and if so contained would, over time, be modified in a way that would lesson or minimize the seeming threat to the United States". He added, "I would argue that that containment remains to this day the principle basis of American foreign policy" (41). Another point that several studies have tackled was the impact of the Korean

War on the Cold War. In his article, *the impact of the Korean war on the cold war*, Jervis Robert states that “the Korean war shaped the course of the cold war...there few functional substitutes of Korea...thus without Korea, international history would have been different.” (563). Thus, the role of the Korean War on the Cold War course was notably significant. However, stating it clearly that the U.S. succeeded or failed still demands further investigations. The main objective is to reveal realities about the Korean War and its consequences on the United States.

The study will be consisted of three chapters, in addition to general introduction and general conclusion. The first chapter will tackle the theoretical study of the term foreign policy in general. In addition, introduce an overview about the historical framework of the U.S. foreign policy from the period of isolationism and non-interventionism until the shift to the interventionist policies toward the whole world. Moreover, it will trace the U.S. foreign policy during the first years of the cold in addition to the military escalation and the competition for an international domination.

The second chapter will provide an overview about the political status of the Korean peninsula, the U.S., the Soviet occupation, and the reasons behind the division of the peninsula. Additionally, it will focus on the outbreak of the Korean War and the American intervention in the war as protector of peace and rival to a communist aggression. Finally, it will investigate the feasibility of this action.

At last, the third chapter will evaluate and assess the U.S. prewar and postwar foreign policies. Also, it will explain the role and the effects of the containment policy in the Korean War as an American reaction. Finally, it will attempt to state the consequences of the Korean War on the United States.



CHAPTER ONE

Historical Background on U.S. Foreign Affairs

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides with a significant definition of the foreign policy in general. Then, embark talking about the U.S. foreign policy in particular. Next, endeavor to mention the essential periods of the American foreign policy throughout history starting by isolationism reaching interventionism and the two world wars. Furthermore, the end of major war and the start of another, introducing the cold war and its effects on the U.S. foreign policy. Finally, the chapter displays the split of the world into two global camps.

1.2 Foreign Policy

It is said that “if there is a state, there should be a foreign policy”. According to the quote it is important and necessary that any state in the world should have its foreign policy. In fact, foreign policy helps a state to improve its relations with other states. When trying to define this term, it is not easy to have a clear and precise definition. Though, many scholars attempted to define it.

Firstly, the expression "foreign" derives from the word "foris" and the Latin term denotes "out". According to Marolov 's article, *The Foreign Policy-Theoretical Summary*, foreign policy is “a state policy towards the subjects of international relations. It is a complexion of elements and processes in conducting social changes, where these changes and processes are conducted in relation with international subject”. (1) In other words, some scholars prefer to use international policy rather than foreign policy. Under this concept, foreign research is created among two important sections of the state and international organizations. These connections are formed through methods and resources, more precisely, through a system structured to promote the interests and objectives of a country by peaceful diplomatic means. (Grossup 3)

Furthermore, a significant interpretation of the word "foreign policy" by Modelski, who once said that the framework of actions formed by societies to modify the actions of other states and to change their own practices to the global environment. Foreign policy must shed light on how states are seeking to change and thrive in improving the actions of other states. (53)

Finally, foreign policy is a collaboration between states in order to satisfy the interests of the state by means and resources in line with standard and formal laws and customs.

1.2.1 The Theoretical Approaches to Analyze Foreign Policy

Obviously, the foreign policies of the nations are not arbitrarily constructed and formed. There have therefore been some approaches that have participated in the research and implementation of state foreign policy. To commence with, the first method is "affiliated with Aristotle and its interpretation of its geographical factors which had influenced the political shape of the city-states of ancient Greece." This method goes beyond the relationship between the geographical status and the 'political stance' of a particular state. It's called a geographical method. In addition, many social thinkers believe that this approach is important and appropriate in the research of politics, particularly today. (Mircev 9 and 11) In fact, there are two terms 'classical geopolitics' and 'modern geopolitics' in this method, and all of these terms addressed an issue. Classical geography deals with 'geographical and spatial factors,' while modern geopolitics focuses on the human factor. Second, the comparative strategy approach is another approach. Its roots stretch back to the aftermath of the WWII. It's a 'sub-discipline of political science.' From its name, it is observed that this approach is concerned about making a comparative study on the way which political systems are established and upon which context. It also addresses and evaluates concerns such as who rules, who wins and who fails. Another factor that helps shape foreign policy is the comparison between

'democratic systems and non-democratic systems,' which the authors refer to as 'Lipset, Eckstein, and Satori.'. Finally, the third approach to better understand and apply foreign policy is 'World Politics'. It addresses many parts of the world related to the economy, politics, culture, and so on. Thus, as Marolov noted, this approach explores "... factors such as nationalism and the role of national states, international organizations, international peace and security, the economy, global competitiveness and collaboration, the protection and recognition of human rights and human dignity." (Marlov 8-9)

1.2.2 Foreign Policy Decision Making

The process of making foreign policies entails three stages: the introduction, development and execution of foreign policy. The initiation stage is where government officials (more usually the president) and foreign policy bodies headed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or the State Department formulate foreign policy ideas: they are focused on national priorities, expectations, desires, priorities, opportunities and abilities. This is also regarded as the point of recognition and expressiveness of roles or the point of 'role' formation. This is what political and tactical steps should be taken to understand national interest in international affairs. This stage is accompanied closely by the formulation of policies. In the structure of a democratic republic, it is appropriate to apply a resolution to Parliament for discussion, review and approval, in which it shall report to the Executive for consent and ratifying. The last point is the execution. At this point, the Executive shall involve the foreign ministry and all other related ministries to ensure the enforcement of the program. In particular, the foreign ministry employs the foreign service made up of government and professional diplomats, as well as delegations and other diplomatic personnel employed in the area of diplomacy or economics. the execution stage can also be referred to as the 'roll assumption' point. (Folarin 1)

1.2.3 The Purpose of Foreign Policy

Any system in the world has a target aim to be achieved by the end. In this respect, Foreign policy's purposes differ and vary in terms of 'economy, national interest, stability, peace', and sometimes it is linked to leaders. One of the authors explains well the purpose of foreign policy when linked to leaders as "foreign policy leaders conceive of a national interest defined as maximizing their welfare and the security of that welfare. To further their interests, states will usually act to increase their own income and wealth" (Drezner 82). Also, in order to live in peace, foreign policy is necessary for citizenship. Linklater states that foreign policy is important when relates to international citizenship, thus it deals with the threats that terrorist organizations poses to 'national and personal security'. Marsh highlights that foreign policy seeks to increase its state's security through power. This power is in sorts of "force, diplomacy, duplicity, balancing power, and conduct contrary to democratic principles" (Marsh 3). Another key point, foreign policy purposes differ from state to another. For instance, the U.S.' foreign policy focuses on serving the national interest, establishing commercial agreements, and delivering and receiving ambassadors. Furthermore, another purpose of foreign policy is defense of national sovereignty (Swaine 81). To sum up, foreign policy avails the needs of both the state and its citizens.

In general, the issues of foreign policy are fundamentally complicated. The decision-making of foreign policy is also a dynamic activity with wide-ranging implications. Global policy decisions are taken by a single representative like the president, a party as Congress or a coalition such as parliamentary democracy. The foreign policy of a state is designed to protect and enhance its national interests in relationships with other nations; bilaterally and multilateral. It is a clear expression of the country's fundamental ideals and of its broader national policies, expectations, ambitions, and self-awareness. Therefore, foreign policies are also tactics, procedures, protocols, arrangements that are typically used by national

governments to conduct their acts in the global sphere. Finally, it is deduced that international relations attempts to explain the behaviors that occur across the boundaries of states. Also, it explains institutions such as private, state, governmental, non-governmental and intergovernmental oversee those interactions.

1.3. U.S. Foreign Policy before 1945 As A Sample

1.3.1 Isolationism

Isolationism, at the political stream, refers to the strategy or ideology of isolating one's country from the affairs of other nations through declining to enter into treaties, foreign trade commitments, diplomatic agreements, etc. it is about the attempting to commit all of one's country's energies to its own development and to stay at peace while preventing foreign interventions and duties. (Britannica). In the same way, the process of defining isolationism is even more complicated for two reasons behind that. There is, on the one side, a noticeable absence of any major or important Substantial literature on isolationism as a concept or as an international theoretical Policy. Consequently, Kenneth Thompson states, "The problem of isolationism has been that lacking roots in an enduring theory, it has taken root in ad hoc strategies and policies cast in the form of principles such as non-intervention and non-entanglement." The role, on the other side, is much more complicated by a multitude of interpretations related to isolationism. All that use the term without attempting to arrive at a valid, concrete argument of it. As a result, there are several other suggested definitions of isolationism which rise the scale of confusion and deformation of the concept and thus the policy. (Grosscup 10)

1.3.1.1 American Isolationism

George Washington, in his farewell address 1796, gave a precious piece of advice to his nation; it was important, but it wasn't strange or even unique. He advised the citizens and their representatives to stop permanent European alliances, Washington merely expressed a conviction of long standing, a sentiment even then almost hallowed by age. As a matter of fact, isolationism became a normal, even random reaction to social and political developments in Europe and, in particular against European military pursuit (Rippy 03). Washington advised,

“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 connections as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop. 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, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.” (G.W farewell Address)

Isolationism policy acted as the backbone the U.S. foreign policy for 150 years. In the first place, the concept that isolationism is the respected thing American foreign relations ‘tradition has ended up finding a warm reception among the wide and the diffuse populace. Also, it gained warm acceptance among both private and public sectors. Particularly at the present time, the belief that America's productive emergence as an independent country and its eventual rise to the status of world influence are largely attributed to its strategy of

isolation retains a powerful place in the center of American political theory. Overall, as it was noted, this policy was the principle that successfully drawn the line of the American foreign policy. (Grosscup 81)

1.3.1.2 Repercussions of American Isolationism

The policy of isolationism, which marked a long period of the U.S. foreign policy, was the manner that America painted its relations with the outer world. Isolationism granted several advantages to the new world foreign relations. First, it avoided any clear attachment with any country particularly the European ones; due to their desire to control U.S. political scene and exploit the colonial leaders' lack of experience. Second, America as a newly independent country was in weak status at all aspects, as well in dire need to grow and strengthen itself; in the same token, thanks to isolationism policy which allowed and gave enough time for America to strongly stand up without any foreign influence. Third, the denial of entangling alliances with many nations to avoid involving the new nation in harmful and untuneful relations except commercial dealings. Overall, isolated America kept away from the world, but progressively built itself. The embodiment of isolationism took a serious path in the American political arena, particularly the foreign political aspect. The founding fathers committed with isolationist point views, which was manifested in Washington farewell address as wise advice as well as the Neutrality Proclamation 1793 toward the war in Europe declaring that the United States would in fact remain neutral during the conflict. Thomas Jefferson in his inaugural pledge 1801 stated, "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." President J. Monroe declared the so-called the Monroe Doctrine 1823, which forbade European involvement in the American hemisphere, and thereby claimed U.S. neutrality in regard to the eventual European conflicts. Hence, American foreign policy during its early decades hardly adhered to the concept of isolationism, and acted carefully toward the world's conflicts and quarrels.

1.3.2 Interventionism

The term ‘intervention’ is used to characterize an action, anything that is going on in foreign relations: not just the notion that arises out of curiosity around them. The incident takes the shape as critical as the entrance. From one country to another in a hostile dispute, and as obviously trivial as an ill-chosen comment made by a statesman on the policies of a foreign power.

In the course of the 20th century, U.S. foreign policy between 1901 and 1941 may be described as usually trusting, often offensive and sometimes even careful. The two first decades of the century saw U.S. government follow boldly interventionist policies in coping with other nations. The next decade-and-a-half saw a gradual change towards wise non-entanglement, if not mere isolationism. Eventually, coinciding with the arrival of Franklin Roosevelt to the White House, the divide between the isolationist American electorate and newly internationalist policies has expanded. This void has briefly closed with Japan’s assault on Pearl Harbor, the Japanese aerial bombing to the American naval base in Pearl Harbor in Honolulu on 7th of December, 1941, and America's entrance into the Second World War. (Wilkison)

Thus, by the turn of the 20th century, Progressive imperialists realized that while the U.S. could resume abandoning entangled alliances, it could no longer deny "international broils" but must "speak softly and carry a big stick" internationally. As they recognized that industrialism and nationalism had spread the European equilibrium to an international order that the United States had a particular interest in maintaining, though at the same time defending its own maritime policy against all interests. To defend itself in a maritime, imperial world. The United States must become a naval, imperial power, albeit a "good

imperialist," committed to fighting poverty, ignorance, and chaos among the nations. (McDougall 22)

Theodor Roosevelt came to the White House on 14 of September 1901, he came to the presidency with the objective of increasing U.S. influence internationally and the expectation that America should be powerful and able to protect its interests across the globe. In general, his policies were chiefly interventionist and philosophically imperialistic justified by the pledge of protecting the U.S. interests abroad. His severe policies were manifested in, first, the proposition of creating a Central American Canal, connecting the Pacific to the Atlantic. In the year 1903, Roosevelt supported Panama's armed rebellion against the Colombian colonization resulted in the independence of Panama and the embarking of building the Canal by America. Second, in 1904, after the Dominican Republic missed a payment on its European debt, Roosevelt proposed the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, which asserted that the U.S. would actively interfere in every country in the Western Hemisphere accused of "vicious misconduct". Third, as Japan clashed with Russia for the occupation of Manchuria and Korea in 1905, Roosevelt arbitrated the conflict. TR secretly committed to Japanese invasion of Korea; in exchange, the Japanese promised to keep their hands off China, Hawaii, and the Philippines. This peaceful initiation by Roosevelt improved America's presence in Asia and the Pacific. Finally, in 1906, Roosevelt again negotiated peace, this time when France and Germany were struggling to control Morocco. Most claim that a peaceful solution to this crisis has postponed the outbreak of World War I by a decade. (TR's Foreign Policy)

During the second decade of the 20th century, the U.S. kept along the same lines, although more motivated by paternalism than by viciousness and opportunistic behavior. President Woodrow Wilson known by following Liberal Internationalism, as an idealist who didn't support political politics and vested desires, and eventually fought "war to end war"

and "making the world safe for democracy"(McDougall 23). Wilson announced, "It is America's duty and privilege to stand shoulder to shoulder to lift the burdens of mankind in the future and show the paths of freedom to the entire world. America is henceforth to stand for the assertion of the right of one nation to serve the other nations of the world." (65) Thus from this perspective, America continued its efforts to gain a place among the world's leaders and export democracy to the ends of the world. Additionally, a great deal of America's attention was focused on Asia, where the growing Japanese Empire competed with the old European empires for supremacy in China. Owing to preserve a "open door" to U.S trade with China; It has sought to counter the risks of either European or Japanese supremacy in that area. By the same token, preferred to describe his "Roosevelt Corollary" type policies as being in the best interests of the individual Latin American nation concerned. U.S. business interests were also easily replicated. That was the case in revolutionary Mexico, where American investors (mainly oil companies) owned more than 40% of the nation's properties. All in all, the United States under the administration of Wilson became more cautious about international relations and avoiding entangling with alliances.

1.3.2.1 Repercussions of American Interventionism

As shown above, the dawn of the 20th century witnessed the transformation of the United States from a growing isolated country to an interventionist and an internationally open country, which sought to prove its presence among the world's giants. President T. Roosevelt famous saying "speak softly and carry a big stick" was a severe policy in treating the outside world; while W. Wilson was questing for "make the world safe for democracy." Depicting the U.S as a strong country looking for a peaceful world vacant of wars and conflicts. The policy of interventionism, regardless to its dangerous effects, was the key point for America to demonstrate its power and clout for the world as well as controlling some new areas around the world. Again, the importance of the foreign policy comes to the front; as a

paramount tool in serving the country's interests and reaching objectives. Notably, both presidents, to a far extent, succeeded to achieve the goal of making the U.S. a world power thanks to the wise foreign policies. Consequently, America, and for the first time, clashed with a great European war; leaving it in confusing and ambivalent stance between neutrality and intervention.

1.3.3 U.S. Foreign Policy during the Two World Wars

1.3.3.1 World War I

The First World War started as a dispute between Austria-Hungary and Serbia. Austria-Hungary, supported by its German ally, declared war on Serbia on 4th of August 1914 in retaliation for the assassination of the Austrian heir to the throne on 28th of June by a Serbian citizen. By 1914, Europe was a fighting area, split into two main competing blocs: The Triple Entente of France, Russia, and England, and the Triple Coalition of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and less-than-reliable Italy. The coalition arrangements boosted the number of countries at war: Russia deployed on behalf of its Serbian partner and Germany on support of Austria-Hungary. In fact, Germany needed war in Europe so that it may have access to free trade routes by capturing land during the war that would stretch its national boundaries to the Atlantic. Germany enforced the strategy by threatening Luxembourg and then waging war on France and Belgium, which pulled Britain into the war due to its relations with the two latter countries. Too, some countries realized that the world war was an occasion for diplomatic and geographical benefits and, by the end of 1914, the allies extended what was initially a small war between Serbia and Austria-Hungary into a wider European conflict that took place in countries and colonies in the Middle East, Africa, Asia and North America. Generally speaking, it was pure European quarrel the stretched to the whole globe. (Odom and Birkhimer)

The United States, as the WWI was triggered, adopted policy of neutrality; letting the "European War" to continue in Europe and to be dealt with by the Europeans away from the Americans. Comparatively, President Woodrow Wilson said, "The United States must be impartial both in fact and in name." Even after 100 Americans died in Lusitania in May 1915, President Woodrow Wilson ignored the recommendation of his predecessors and held the United States out of the European bloodbath. Surprisingly, the U.S stance pertaining the war completely changed when the German declaration of the unregulated U-boat war in early 1917, the resulting loss of a number of U.S. ships in March, and the Zimmerman Telegram fiasco in April eventually compelled U.S. action. Wilson accepted on 2 April 1917 that the reality had been altered as he admitted, "Armed neutrality is impractical. The world must be made safe for democracy," (Zinn 313). He urged Congress to issue a declaration of war, and two days later Congress granted the President what the U.S. had averted effectively for 135 years: a clear intervention in a European war. In a word, Wilson directly rejected to place his country within the European conflict though some voices sneered on his policy and called for intervention; for America, it was the first time to intervene in an epic war, which required experience and bravery that lack the U.S army. (Paterson 18)

1.3.3.2 Post War (1918- onward)

Following the WWI, the United States viewed returning to isolationism is the best strategy to avoid war involvement. Due to the huge losses represented in more than 320,000 Americans was injured or killed between April 1917 and the end of November 1918. In the light of this catastrophe, the public opinion following the high price paid by their country was also strongly in favor of withdrawal and non-intervention. At the same stream, President Wilson endeavored to implement a new regime among the world community, which may help to avoid clashes between states. He proposed a collective government, the League of Nations and fostered the adaptation of democracy and human rights initiatives by all parties. However,

the United States. Congress would not hear any of it. Partly disturbed by the fact that senior congressional leaders were left out of the post-conflict Debates at Versailles, a congressional committee of Democrats and Republicans in Congress forcefully fought against U.S. participation in the League of Nations. Altogether, isolationism, especially from the complicated politics of Europe, would continue to be US foreign policy primary concern. (Paterson 19)

1.3.3.3 World War II

On the 1st September 1939 the German attack on Poland launched and triggered a declaration of war against Germany by the United Kingdom, France, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa. Germany and the Soviet Union did agree on a dual strike on West and East Poland, which left Poland incapable protect itself. Equally important, the war of the oceans was an essential part of the war between Germany and the Allies. The battles between naval vessels, attack merchant vessel, and the use of warships in the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans proceeded from 1939 until Germany surrendered in May 1945, drawing in many Baltic and Scandinavian countries. In a word, it was the bloodiest war, which humanity has ever seen and was marked by the participation of the whole countries alongside colonies. (Weinberg 11)

Less than fifteen years later, Europe collapsed. This is the second international crisis. Like the First World War, the U.S. determinedly opposed engagement in the Second World War. However, in this case, Congress has anticipated the President's authority to deploy U.S. forces in a set of ways. Neutrality Acts of the 1930s, banning the sale of guns, munitions and weaponry from the United States to overseas warring countries., which might limit U.S. involvement in the war. As was the case in 1918, both Democrats and Republican leaders endorsed non-interventionism. For instance, the Neutrality Act of 1936, with several other

acts, forbade all loans or aid to any of the warring sides in Europe. Though America biased to the Allies, the turning point was the deadly attack on the Pacific Fleet in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, in December 1941, would have forced the United States must abandon its continental isolationism and enter the war. The United States tried as possible to remain neutral for both sides, although strongly aiding the Allies, but the attack was only an excuse to enter the war while the true reasons were due to the Nazi prevalence on the ground, and the fear of losing the war, which would result in controlling the world by the Germans.

Generally Speaking, the U.S foreign policy during the first half of the 20th was cautious, bold and successful. First, the whole change from isolationism to interventionism and imperialism. Secondly, fixing its position as a giant country politically and economically. Thirdly, the policies set by the governments concerning the two World Wars, which positively reflected on the country safety and the assurance of the national and international interests. Finally, by the end of WWII America became the world's biggest power, along with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This last mentioned competition eventually led to a quarrel called the "Cold War" between the west camp and the Soviet Union.

1.4 Postwar U.S. Foreign Policy (1945- onward)

Almost for half a century since 1945, the Cold War has shaped foreign politics. The Cold War was characterized as a period of extreme competition between the major powers, also defined by mutual rivalry and involvement in a secret war and a proxy war as a means of defending one's interests against the other. It might not have been a tough war, but it was a risky era. Likewise, it really managed to remain cold, when nuclear weapons development permitted a careless endeavor to turn to war. Either side would be totally devastated by such an eventuality. The confrontation between the two sides was thus conducted by indirect means, often at considerable cost, and the resultant tensions assured that both sides

maintained a good and constant state of preparedness for war. as a matter of fact, the massive investment on research and innovation in nuclear capabilities and supply trucks on both sides led to a spiraling arms race that might, in essence, culminate in a holocaust as a result in misjudgment on one side or the other. (Paterson 33)

1.4.1 The Cold War

The Cold War refers to the period of collision between the U.S. and the USSR from 1945 to 1991. It was an open but confined competition that emerged after World War II between the United States and the Soviet Union and their allies. The Cold war was started on diplomatic, economic and propaganda fronts, and the use of arms was reduced. The concept was first used by the English writer George Orwell in an essay written in 1945 to refer to what he believed would be a nuclear deadlock between "two or three gigantic super-states, each having a bomb that could wipe out millions of civilians in a matter of seconds." There was a high level of mistrust; both of them had different ideals, strategic goals, and domestic interests, these difficulties led to unleash root of the Cold War. (McMahon 25)

1.4.1.1 The Reasons behind the Cold War

Again after the defeat of Nazi Germany in May 1945 at the end of the Second World War, the tense coalition between the United States and Great Britain. On the one side, and the Soviet Union, on the other, started to crumble. By 1948, the Soviets had formed left-wing regimes in the Eastern European countries that had been freed by the Red Army. The U.S. and Britain worried by the eventual Soviet dominance in Eastern Europe and the possibility in Soviet-influenced Communist parties taking power in Western Europe's democracies. In the other hand, the Soviets were keen to keep control of Eastern Europe in order to defend themselves from any potential revived invasion from Germany, and they were determined to expand communism across the world, largely for ideological purposes. The Cold War

hardened in 1947–48, when U.S. assistance given to Western Europe under the Marshall Plan, was a U.S. program providing aid to Western Europe following the devastation of World War II, had placed those states under American manipulation, and the Soviets had publicly formed communist dictatorships in Eastern Europe. (Cold War)

1.4.2 The Western Camp against the USSR

1.4.2.1 The Western Camp

The western Camp formed by the United States and west Europe countries after the Second World War. This Camp adopted the ideology of Capitalism, which is This is the system of creativity, growth, wealth creation, and social progress created opportunities to billions of people. Capitalism is a socio-economic system in which private actors own and control property in accord with their interests, and demand and supply freely set prices in markets in a way that can serve the best interests of society. Eventually, Europe was divided by an "Iron Curtain" as the nations of Eastern Europe fell increasingly under Soviet control; as the British prime minister Churchill had proclaimed in 1946. This action meant to build a barrier against the communist swiping toward Eastern Europe. For America, particularly, did endorsed the Trumann Doctrine, which universalized the promise that the United States has legally vowed to protect all citizens whose independence has been violated. Furthermore, Congress replied with \$400 million for Greece and Turkey, and then billions more for European Recovery Funds under the Marshall Plan. In 1949, Congress also reversed Washington's "Great Rule" by ratifying North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the country's first enduring peacetime coalition, by a vote of 82 to 13. To sum up, all the American political and economic pursuits in Europe and the whole globe are pressured by the fear of Communist expansions, and aimed at confronting and surrounding the Soviets' strategies as well.

1.4.2.2 The Eastern Camp

With the triumph of Lenin's October Revolution in 1917, Soviet Russia became the center of world communism. However, regardless to its vast land mass and huge population, and amid aspirations for a European-wide transition in the immediate post-1918 period, the new state and its ruling Communist Party been a negligible force in world relations for more than two decades. USSR joined the Allies during WWII against Nazi Germany, where the relations was quietly good. Though, after the war it was apparent the USSR and U.S. relations won't meet as the past. Thus, Soviets started to expand their Communist ideology to outer world, starting by the surrounding nations' whom eventually joined the union. As a matter of fact, Communists had drawn strategies to control the Globe at any cost; their strategy was viewed in controlling Eastern Europe, refuting the western ideologies of capitalism, permeating the Western Camp and spreading Communist ideas as well as supporting the liberating movement in the third world. As has been noted, the USSR emerged as a tough foe to the west in the war of grabbing the world.

In essence, both parties had different ideologies and strategies though aimed to reach the peak of the power and sovereignty of the world. Thus, they entered a huge nuclear arm race resulted in a sophisticated and advanced nuclear weapons, which threatened the globe's safety. Notably. The clash of the foreign policies during the Cold War was horrific; U.S was endeavoring on resisting and seizing Communism as well as protecting the nation from Soviet threat, which contradicted with principles of democracy and freedom.

1.4.3 The Effects of the Cold War on U.S. Foreign Policy

The cold war has brought about changes to the administration of the United States. These shifts were influenced by internal and external factors. Outwardly, politicians used anti-communist paranoia to campaign on a solid, right-wing basis, sometimes accusing the new administration of softness in order to boost their results. Moreover, Robert Taft accused Truman of wanting a congress “dominated by a policy of appeasing the Russians abroad and of fostering communism at home”. (McDougall 96) American foreign policy had been that of containment as it responded to the Cold War. As the shared confidence between the two nations diminished, a kind of chess game emerged using the world map as its table. The United States has supported oppressive and anti-democratic policies, but they are pleasant to America. Meanwhile, the Soviets supported organizations that were favorable to their own needs. The cold war as a competition to superpower and clout, took all U.S’ foreign policy attention to resist Communism. (Naranjo)

The ideology of the Cold War and anti-communist propaganda dominated foreign policy. In frightening "the hell out of the American people," Truman unleashed an enthusiasm that would become part of American life and transform current ties with the outside world. American allies relied almost entirely on their influence on communism. The same refers to international policies. (Naranjo)

1.4.3.1 The U.S. Foreign Policy towards the USSR

By 1945, The United States originally tried to collaborate with the Soviet Union, did not initially put a lot of pressure on communist groups outside the Soviet sphere, and then attempted to pursue communist groups that threatened to dismantle Soviet influence. However, instead, the decision of the United States to challenge the Soviets resulted from the allocation of power. U.S. policy moved to a confrontational stance as the balance of power in

Eurasia turned in favor of the Soviet Union. In comparison, U.S. politicians appeared to behave and function in a way compatible with the principle of balance of power. The supremacy of power over ideology in U.S. policy making indicates that perceived power issues are the most significant influences in creating and forming combative foreign policy. As shown above, the United States at first tried to avoid collision with the Soviets but eventually the two world poles clashed. (Avey 13)

The American foreign policymakers, after 1945, saw that the best way to deal with the Soviet threat was through the policy of containment. This last was meant to blockade the Communist expansion strategies. Furthermore, Containment was a strategy to limit Soviets' clout on the whole globe, protecting The west and, in particular, American interests, and winning the weaponry race of nuclear power.

1.5 Conclusion

Overall, the rise of the United States as a global super power was only the product of prudent foreign policy actions, which contributed to the national and international priorities and goals of the nation. Concisely, this chapter offered a general overview of American foreign policy from independence until the end of World War II and the major change from an isolated and neutral state to an interventionist superpower. Moreover, after 1945, the U.S. dominated the Western Camp toward the Soviet Union in the Cold War, which was marked by extreme competition and mutual escalation. as a continuation, the next chapter will discover and investigate the American foreign policy in Korea during the Korean War as the first armed confrontation between the super-powers in an international proxy war.



CHAPTER TWO

U.S. Foreign Policy in Korea 1950-1953

2.1. Introduction

As a progression, this chapter tries to denote the historical status of the Korean Peninsula between the post-war period of 1945 and the broke up of the Korean War in 1950; by discussing and analyzing the occupation of the region by the U.S. and the U.S. and the origin of the terrible division. Furthermore, it tackles the U.S. Containment policy, which was adopted in the Korean War by President Harry Trumann, the reason that let commit the containment, and the American decision to intervene in the war. At the last, this chapter attempts to investigate the feasibility of the U.S intervention in the Korean War.

2.2 Insights Concerning Korea in post-Second World War Era

Korea's freedom from Japanese control was followed by its tremendous national disaster, a split of the nation. A variety of changes during the final years of WWII proved to be crucial to the development of this split. The most prominent among all were the contingencies of the alliances. As the war officially ended, there was a growing competition between the Soviets and the United States, and the fragmented and split essence of the Korean nationalist wave. Consequently, the Korean peninsula went through gloomy and unexpected path, which conducted it into wars and ceaseless escalations. (Seth 305)

2.2.1 The Decolonization and the Division of Korea

The Japanese Empire conquered Korea by 1910 after many attempts to control the peninsula; this last was under control of the Japanese imperial power till its decolonization in 1945 thanks to the U.S and Communist Soviets assistance as well as the devastation of Japan by Allies at the end of WWII. Korea's decolonization, at first, was sponsored by the Korean Provisional Government (KPG) which called for anticommunist and friendly Korea; though the Cairo Declaration demonstrated that the U.S. and the Allies, with the Soviets' reticence, aimed at putting it under a trusteeship with China for thirty or twenty years planning the

colony for its total independence that was set for 1946. In a word, Korea wasn't particular importance or value to the United States or Britain, but Roosevelt had the notion that it should be put under trusteeship. (Seth 305-306)

The notion of occupying Korea by U.S. and USSR has always been part of the post-war peace scheme, as the division of Korea was the result of opportunism. After the surrender of Japan in WW Promptly, the State War Colonel Dean Rusk and Charles Bonesteel were assigned to the Navy Coordinating Committee (NCC), that on the night of August 10-11 to draw up a line for the occupation of Korea by The American and the Soviet forces. Furthermore, with the Soviet entrance to north Kora and the American fears losing control over the Peninsula, the NCC was obliged to find a resolution to limit the Soviet rapid deeds. Hence, they viewed the 38 parallel divide the country into approximately equal halves, Yet Seoul remained in the southern half under the U.S possession. On 13 August 1945, Truman authenticated the plan, and the USSR endorsed it even though they targeted all of Korea. In fact, as George M. McCune, chief of the Korean section in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs in the U.S. commented on the 38 Parallel as “an arbitrary line, chosen by staff officers for military purposes without political or other considerations.” (Seth 306)

The decolonization and the division of Korea was a shift from the occupation of an imperial power to the control of the world's powerful States; this marked the coming of the Cold war to the nation. In particular, the peninsula was a target point by the American foreign policy makers in order to secure East Asia, limit the Soviets cupidity of the Asian territory, and protecting the U.S economic relations with Asian countries. In addition, the issue of mistrust between the two poles obliged United States to remain alert and cautious about the Soviet moves in the area in anticipation of any emergency.

2.2.2 The Creation of New Regimes

The United States after Korea's division sought hardly to establish a new pro system, which eventually serves its interests in the area. The USAMGIK had a less confident sense of conduction than the Soviets; however, it headed toward the creation of a detached, authoritarian system under American leadership. Hence, first, on 14 February 1946, the Representative Democratic Council was formed with the aim of representing the different viewpoints. Moreover, the USAMGIK revealed plans for the creation of an Interim Legislative Assembly headed by Kim Kyu-sik. Second, The USAMGIK has founded the Korean National Police to preserve law and order, as well as the creation of the Korean Military Academy. Third, the change in strategies by the Communists was a big challenge for the USAMGIK, which went from efforts to collaborate with other parties in the South to efforts to overthrow the military regime exploiting the economic suffering of the southerners. (Seth 315) At the same stream, the UN had its print in South Korea as it has proclaimed its first task is to organize an UN-sponsored election for a new Korean government. In spite of the fact that the Soviets declined to engage in this initiative, in effect, that it creates a government only for South Korea. Consequently, the Republic of Korea (R.O.K.) was officially established in the South (Hwang 222) The United States, after occupying South Korea, created a democratic system through the UN initiations regardless to the political economic hardships as well as the Soviet attempts to foil the U.S. plans.

For the northern part of Korea, the Communist dictatorship was soon set in position in the Soviet region at the beginning of 1946. When he arrived in North Korea, Soviet commander Colonel General Ivan M. Chistiakov announced:

Korean people! Remember that you have future happiness in your own hands. You have attained liberty and independence. Now everything is

up to you. The Soviet Army will provide the Korean people with all conditions for the free and creative ventures you are bound to embark on. Koreans must make themselves the creators of their own happiness. (Suh 297)

On February 8, 1946, the Soviets established a North Korea Provisional People's Committee to introduce series of reforms; it was basically a large alliance of all the political parties, but in fact it was controlled by the Communists, who rapidly strengthened their power over the state. In reality, the northern regime was tyrannical in dealing with people in that area; it enacted oppressing laws, imposed heavy taxes, and caused many people to flee south of 38 parallel. Furthermore, In June, the North Korean Branch Bureau of the Communist Party of Korea the faction led by Kim Il Sung became the North Korean Workers' Party; along with other procommunist parties a national government with sections at every state level took form. In 1948, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) was officially established in the north. In the meantime, the Soviets continued to endorse Kim Il Sung as dictator, Placing his image in open area with that of Stalin (Seth 314). North Korea was officially controlled and sponsored by the USSR, whom implanted a pure communist centralized regime keening to oppose and challenge capitalistic existing in the South.

East Asia was strategically important to the United States and the USSR, thus the military mobilization and occupation of the Korean Peninsula was an explicit obligation aimed at serving number of foreign interest in the area. Furthermore, the U.S. occupation of South Korea took place due to the Communist expansion in East Asia, and due to the fear of Soviet's control of Korea. Another reason was to protect the newly independent nations, as president Trumann argued: "The attack upon Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that Communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and

will now use armed invasion and war. It has defied the orders of the Security Council of the United Nations issued to preserve international peace and security". (Trumann)

2.2.3 The U.S. Foreign Policy toward the Korean Peninsula 1945-1950

The Korean Peninsula presents greatly different possibilities and risks to the American foreign policy's interests in Northeast Asia. First, the East Asian territory deemed with the U.S. as a hot spot in the quarrel with USSR after the WWII. Furthermore, the military occupation in the South of Korea abled them to strengthen the western existence besides the Communists camps such as North Korea and China. Second, the US undertook the responsibility of protecting newly independent nations from external dangers, also the protection of Human rights and democracy as it the case in South Korea in return of several concessions that serves the US interests. Third, Korea was the first ground that gathered the two world's poles. Thus, it offered dangerous possibilities for the U.S. in its pursuit of balancing power in the world. In a word, strategies drawn by U.S. foreign policy makers in the Korean peninsula was not an easy task to be fulfilled; and the northern part formed a huge obstacle in front of American perspectives.

In general, Korea after 1945 witnessed a tremendous transformation at every scale. The direct occupation by the Soviets in the north after the liberation from the Japanese colonization, followed by the American occupation in the south. Besides, the horrific division of the peninsula which was an unexpected incident by any Korean. Moreover, the implementation of different regimes by the U.S. and the USSR was the first sign to allude the oncoming of the cold war to the Peninsula, and an open arena to the massive conflict of interests which eventually developed to an armed confrontation. As shown above, Korea was liberated from colonization found itself divided in the cold war's vortex.

2.3 The Embodiment of the Containment Policy in Korea

Containment used to be a tactic of international relations adopted by the U.S. in the Cold War. First set down in 1947 by George Kennan, this strategy claimed that communism ought to be controlled and separated, otherwise that it would expand to nearby nations. U.S. foreign policy experts assumed that if a nation succumbed under communism, any neighboring country would collapse too; this plan is labelled also as the Domino Theory. The Commitment to containment policies and Domino theory led directly to U.S. interference in several places around the globe. (Hickman)

2.3.1 The Containment Policy

The policy of containment, with its uncertainty and inaccuracy, was a significant tactic and driving philosophy of American foreign policy from immediately after the Second World War till the fall of the USSR of 1989–1991. In all its basic context, containment signifies the American attempt, by armed, economic and political methods, to prevent communist growth all over the globe. (Bernstein). The concept was proposed by George F. Kennan, who stated in an unidentified paper in the July 1947 topic of international relations that the United States must seek a "long-term, prudent yet strong and careful containment of Russian aggressive impulses" in the expectation that the system would melt or crumble. In essence, it was a strategic policy to limit and surrender the USSR. (Britannica).

2.3.1.1 The Evolution of the Containment in Asia

During the first years of the cold War, the U.S. foreign policy set Eastern Europe as a priority to focus while it had mainly deemed East Asia and particularly Korea, in terms of its own tactical interest in the sense of the U.S. armed notion of "total war". The military officials recognized, in the expectation of the policy-makers, that the next battle would include the

United States must be international conflict, in which situation "Korea would be of comparatively small significance." Hence, South Korea's safety was regarded mainly from the point of view of military policy, with the diplomatic importance of its safety never strongly contemplated. No further consideration has been given to the potential effects for U.S. foreign interests if the Communists were to spread their influence over all the South Korean territory, Since U.S. leaders have not ever expected an independent attack by the Communists, but instead speculated in terms of a worldwide conflict. However, the eventual events made the Americans to rethink about their interests in Asia and the status of South Korea. (Pillitter 32)

To sum up, as it is noted above, the policy containment that aimed at confronting the Communist expansion focused primarily on Eastern Europe due to the neighboring Communist countries that threatened the west. At the meantime, Asia was less important than Europe, and deemed as part of the Global acquisition of the world. However, eventually, all the speculations changed in one moment and South Korea became a paramount piece in the American Foreign Affairs since that time.

2.4 The Outbreak of “The Cold War” and the U.S. Reaction

Supported and armed by the Soviet Union, North Korea attacked South Korea on 25 June 1950, which was among the crucial points in the Cold War, under the pretext of unifying the peninsula. The North Korean invasion perpetrated Washington that Truman had unexpectedly abandoned the carefully considered strategy, which positioned Korea beyond the U.S. security zone, then transferring U.S. military forces to the protection of the Republic of South Korea. Furthermore, Interpreting the North Korean attack as an incident of Soviet violence, maybe the U.S. government believed that the dispute was a measure of Western

resolution and a newer and riskier stage has started with the Soviet Union. When he heard that North Korea had occupied the South, Harry marked his reflections. Truman the following:

'In my generation, this was not the first occasion when the strong had attacked the weak. I recalled some earlier instances: Manchuria, Ethiopia, Austria. I remembered how each time that the democracies failed to act it had encouraged the aggressors to keep going ahead. Communism was acting in Korea just as Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese had acted ten, fifteen, and twenty years earlier.' (Trumann Memoirs 333)

The U.S., it thought, needed to respond by gearing itself, both militarily and strategically, to face the next action of Soviet brutality. Generally, the attack warned the Americans and demonstrated the Soviet's intentions in Asia and the Whole world. (Weathersby 5)

Initially, the United States saw the attack on South Korea was the first eruption in a much wider war. U.S. intelligence information in the spring of 1950 had reported that "Communists in many parts of the world" were planning a pattern of conquest for [that] summer" given the information they got, hostility in Korea was considered by American decision-makers as just the first move in a big communist strike. Consequently, that analysis demonstrated the Diplomatic significance of South Korea's protection in American politics is undeniable. The administration thought like if the U.S. had not been willing to make an adequate solution to the crisis, there would be a far-reaching response. Truman and his advisors have assumed if the United States did not fulfill the burden of the Soviet Union, the Soviets may succeed. (Pilliter 33)

The American foreign policymakers after the invasion of South Korea were in a decisive moment, which would determine the direction of the Cold War and change the

balance power in the world. Thus the U.S., finally, decided to intervene in the Korean war under many pressures concerning its interests in the area.

2.4.1 The U.S. Involvement in the Korean War

President Trumann, without the congress ascent, commanded U.S. forces to support South Korea and persuaded the United Nations (sixteen countries) to put military assistance in what was referred to as "police intervention" in political fields. UN soldiers, mainly Americans, came under the commanded by General Douglas MacArthur, since the North Korean offensive really was a shock, the U.S. and South Korean armies were driven to the far southern section of the peninsula in September. At first, the Communist forces pushed forward rapidly. However, after three months of intense combat, the westerners forced them back over 38 parallels and marched deeper into North Korea. The American intervention in the was really supportive to South Korea from the Communist invasion. (O'Callaghan 118)

The U.S. sought uniting the Korean Peninsula via firing the Communist existence and expanding the territory of their friendly government. Another Communist ally had appeared to the United States, which was China by the leadership of Mao. He warned the U.S. not across the Chinese Borders after defeating the pro-American Kaishek in the long struggle of rule. Furthermore, after the American neglecting od the last warning, China sent troop to aid north Korea and eventually succeeded to push away the Advanced American soldiers. Consequently, another war broke up in the peninsula. (Brinkley 768) Given these points, the continuous Communism attacks against the U.S. and the UN extended the period of the war and hardened the burden of the containment policy.

On the whole, the United States looked further implementation of the containment policy in Asia, after being tried in Europe. The Soviets escalation embodied in the attack of North Korea led to a proxy war in the peninsula. In addition, the Korea war gathered many

nations from the globe to fight for different interest and purposes such as the main plea of the world's superpowers, commitment of the containment policy and spreading Communism ideologies. For America, at First it attempted to avoid the war as possible to evade unleashing a third world war though they deemed the attack as sign of test by the Soviets, which pushed the U.S. and the UN to intervene.

2.4.3 The Feasibility of the U.S. Involvement in the Korean War

Definitively, the Korean world did not end officially. While the Korean Armistice Declaration put a resolution to the conflict that murdered 2.5 million people on July 27,1953, the cessation never paved a way to a peace treaty. At the time, the leader of S. Korea declined to recognize the partition of Korea. The Foreign powers such as the U.S. had an influential print via its involvement in 1950. For sure, the U.S involvement had several feasibilities at home, in Korea, and in the worldwide.

2.4.3.1 In the Korean Peninsula

The U.S. policymakers before the involvement in the war had many strategic plans to undertake. After the Soviets unleashed their campaign to spread communism around the world aiming at controlling the world balance of power, the United States with its allies had the burden to confront and contain this sweeping campaign. Thus, the turn came to Korea to be protected and preserved; the American occupation in Korea abled them to embarking trapping communists in East Asia. President Truman once said, "Korea is the Greece of the Far East. If we are tough enough now, if we stand up to them like we did in Greece three years ago, they won't take any next steps." (Halstambam 92-93) Furthermore, the U.S. thought that it could succeed and expected that China would not really participate. They have intended to take benefit of the Soviet embargo of the UN to have the UN to offer to give foreign support to South Korea. The progress of communism abroad has eventually left

deeply focused. The American political and economic achievement in the peninsula were much acceptable regarding to the nature of the conflict on the area. Pillitter argues, “Despite the fact that it had achieved its original objective in Korea, having been denied a clear victory, America lost much of its self-assurance. The moral defeat incurred by the Communists in Korea, increased America's determination to stand up to the Communists to a point where it was to evolve into an obsession.” (41)

2.4.3.2 At the Domestic Level

From the viewpoint of the American citizens, the Korean War was perceived as the starting of increased U.S.-Soviet competition. Many advised the government that now was the time to "select a straight path "with regard to Soviet violence. Washington's reluctance to allow the Communist triumph in China provoked genuine anxiety about the prospects of democracy against the Communist challenge. In this sense, President Harry S. Truman and the American people were on the same page believing that the U.S. wanted to teach Moscow everything that they, the democracies, were not as vulnerable as we had been before. Besides this, westerners firmly suspected that the Korean War was a clear provocation for a greater strategy. In fact, politicians agreed to send soldiers in Korea, not only because Korea was strategically significant, but because Korea was meaningful to other U.S. collaborates in Europe and Asia. The public viewpoint had a crucial influence on the foreign policy makers that would affect foreign decisions. (Jung 3)

The American people, after South Korea was attacked, assumed that this strike was directed to the government of their nation. At first, above eighty percent of the population supported the U.S. intervention in the war; but approximately five and a half months just after war ended sixty percent of the nation wanted to drive the forces from Korea. This sharp change manifested the achievements of the war at the domestic scale, some assumed that

since the war ended and the communists were fired north 38 parallel the U.S. troops must return. The foreign policy choice concerns and affects the national public opinion as well as the domestic policy. (Crabtree)

2.4.3.3 At the International Level

The U.S. foreign policy makers after the WWII had planned strategies with Allies to control the World and balance the power under the ideology of democracy and Human rights. Thus, the American government clashed with the USSR on the race for clout and nuclear weaponry race and the first area of this clash was the Korean peninsula, in the so called “The Korean War”. This last was a chance to impose power and to and demonstrate the political and military abilities that was a result of the military escalation of the Cold War. As can be seen, the United States when intervened in the war wanted impose its dominance on the Globe starting by the first war in the Cold War as well as restrain the Soviet Campaigns.

In short, the pace at which the U.S. planned to respond in a military way after the North attack occurred in the list of choices that politicians suggested in front of them. Although the U.S. may have unilaterally imposed financial blockades against the D.R.N.K, the military operation was selected. It was a precise choice that the U.S. looked further to restrain the anticapitalistic allies to fulfil the planed Strategies. Furthermore, the Korean swap has been a dangerous trap for the U.S. and its allies but the American undertook the burden of spreading peace and do the impossible to restrict the Soviets. Korea, in their opinion, was not only a civil war, but also a challenge of the U.S. postwar era impact and probably the outbreak of a third global war. Finally, Rusk stated; “The North Korean attack seemed a direct challenge to the entire concept of collective security won at such cost during World War II.”. (McKay 16)

2.5 Conclusion

As a conclusion, this chapter focused primarily on the Korean case between 1945 and 1950 and the transition from the colonial era to the occupation and monopoly of the Cold War Superpowers. In addition, it projected on the containment policy or, as a term, "The Truman Doctrine" and the way it was applied in the Korean War. Finally, it traced the feasibility of U.S. involvement in the Korean War, both domestically and globally, which had a significant effect on the American foreign policy afterwards.



CHAPTER THREE

The Ramifications of the Korean War on the U.S.

3.1 Introduction

This chapter sheds light on the ramifications of the Korean War on the United States, on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and on the Stream of the Cold War. Furthermore, the changes occurred on the U.S. foreign policies are going to be discovered in postwar and prewar era. Moreover, it investigates the role played by the containment policy in the U.S. intervention in the Korean War, on the USSR and on the world. Finally, the chapter endeavors to trace the achievements and failures of the U.S. intervention.

3.2 Reassessing the Ramifications of the Korean War on the U.S.

The Korean War was already regarded as the "Forgotten War" by several other countries, and it is a "Forgotten War" there have been two severe famous conflicts, World War II and Vietnam. Through Korea's aggression, the strains between international rival powers have escalated as they continue to practice their privileges to safeguard their liberal and communist political beliefs, which has driven the U.S. to engage as an implementation of the containment strategy, which eventually caused China to wage quarrel in favor of Communist D.R.N.K, which contributed to the partition of the peninsula. Furthermore, Korea's War heightened the Cold War tensions between all the Communists nations and Pro-democracy governments. It has raised the value of the army and has contributed to generation of different arms, particularly nuclear weapons. Generally, this war was a Korean domestic conflict but surprisingly developed to a proxy war, which had crucially impacted many nations and defined the stream of the Cold War.

3.2.1 U.S. Foreign Policy and the Korean War

The postwar period 1945 was a time to the emergence of the intensive rivalry between the world's superpowers, the United States and the USSR, which led to high level of escalation the affected many countries around the world. U.S., in that period, undertook the

burden of protecting democracy and human rights, balancing powers, and confronting the Communist sweeping. Therefore, the American government adopted the policy of the containment or as some label it the “Trumann Doctrine”; which was first implemented in Europe then moved to East Asian part particularly in the Korean War. The postwar U.S. foreign polices ware not the same as those of the post Korean War. In brief, the ramification of the Korean proxy war had immensely shaped the U.S. foreign policies.

3.2.2 Pre-Korean War U.S. Foreign Policies

The prewar U.S. Foreign policies had mainly focused on the competition with soviets. The Americans under the plea of “making the world safer for democracy” intended to expand their clout on the whole globe to achieve power dominance. These policies had pivoted mainly on the Containment policy; aimed at containing Communism. Thus, America focused hugely on the European side by supporting nations such as Turkey and Greece, while the Asian one was less important. However, Korean peninsula after the fall of Japan was occupied by the two superpowers resulted in dividing the peninsula. In a word, America sought to prove its dominance and clout on the world and defeating the Soviet Communism in political and military competition.

After 1945, American leaders established two separate strategies towards Korea: one was a conservatorship of the department of State; another was a proposal of an "executive and strategic government organization" built by the American Military administration in Korea. Despite the fact that the two strategies had different consequences from the viewpoint of discussions with the Soviets, the goals were all the same: a new Korean administration that would preserve a mutually beneficial relationship with America and have strong influence over the entire Korean Peninsula. The aim was not updated until the Korean War. In addition, the R.O.K economic integration Administration Strategy was planned to permit Korea to

restore its economic structure. U.S. leaders found the ECA strategy to be a way to boost South Korea's legitimacy and control of communism in both the liberated World and the Korean Peninsula. (Park 90)

3.2.3 Post-Korean War U.S. Foreign Policies

The severe Korean War had huge influences on the American foreign policy in East Asia and the world as well. After the Korean Armistice 1953, U.S. policies had to be reevaluated according to the incidents of the war. After the American intervention, it was clear that the communist existence was not an easy task to expel from the Korean peninsula; the objective of the intervention was to contain and protect South Korea from the northern attack. However, some politicians suggested that the American support for Korea was not fully scrupulous. In addition, the American assistance to South Korea was merely militarily unlike the interventions in Europe, which used to be economic as well. Thus, U.S. foreign policies had been affected by the war in terms of selecting strategies, decision-making and setting objective.

In South Korea, The U.S. has sought to control communist consequences through social and strategic application. Financial means, as it had been applied in Western Europe, which was not for relaxation, but for Rehabilitation. The U.S. regarded the chance that the Korean Peninsula will be reunited in the immediate future therefor they designed ECA plan was planned. Also, the new strategies to South Korea under the Eisenhower government reveals context of the U.S. load-down strategy of the Korean military forces and American forces situated in South Korea in the 1950s. It is possible to learn at the same time the explanation why the strategy of load-down has not been enforced. Between the fresh view and the containment positions against Communist China, it was not easy for U.S. policy

makers to reduce forces in South Korea in the 1950s although two divisions of South Korean Army were reduced. (Park 103)

As an evaluation, American policies and after the Korean war 1953 had partly shifted from military assistance toward the psychological and economic support. Also, the Korean war was the first limited war that the two superpowers met in a third place, it represented a chance for the U.S. to investigate the Containment efficiency since Asia was different from Europe as well as differences in adopting strategies in both continents. Without Korea, U.S. behavior may have been very limited, because there were no occurrences on the surface that may have been practical replacements for war. The foreign or American national structure may have "ordered" large military expenditure, the modernization of U.S. alliances, and the militarization of NATO, but these trends appeared only in the aftermath of Korea.

3.3 The Role of the Containment in the Korean War

The containment policy used to be the primary Cold War tactic of the United States and its allies to discourage communism from expanding worldwide. This strategy was a reaction to a number of attempts by the soviets to expand communist control in many places around the globe. Containment portrayed a middle ground role between calming tense diplomatic ties and demanding a shift in the key policies of the country, generally through changing the governing system. Furthermore, it allows the adversary to select the time and location of every battle. Finally, during the Cold War, it was taking steps to discourage the propagation of Communism to neighboring nations, however not to invade nations that were already Communists.

3.3.1 The Effects of the U.S. Intervention in the Korean War

The Korean war was unleashed by the North Korean Attack supported by communist leaders; America was informed therefor president Trumann promptly ordered the U.S. troops to head toward the Korean peninsula with dozens of allied countries, without returning to the congress. After the American intervention in the War, the U.S. intervention in the war resulted in the following: first, it proved their existence in the peninsula as a “policy action”, peacemakers, and protectors of democracy and human rights. Second, the situation of the war had changed since the arrival of U.S. and UN troops. Third, South Korean part was to fall under the northerners’ control; however, they were eventually pushed up the north 38 parallel. Forth, the Americans managed to keep the Korean War “a limited war”, regardless to the Chinese entrance on the line. Finally, and most important, the Soviets received a clear reaction by the westerns, whom had exhibited their strong and sincere broad aim of containing Communism and demonstrated their readiness to any condition.

The U.S. policies in the Korean War used to be careful as the intervention affected the south part positively because the intervention in the war has been characterized by coordinated efforts, careful strategy and retributive behavior. Moreover, Truman’s government activated the UN equipment for its entrance into the war and was diligent to bring his partners with him in order to make them a group effort to deter "aggression". The other element of the strategy of the United States was to follow a rather prudent policy to preserve the fighting was limited to the territories of Korea. All in all, the American intervention managed to change the future of the war.

3.3.2 The Effects of the Containment Policy in the Korean War on the Cold War

The implementation of the containment policy in the Korean conflict had immensely affected the path of the Cold war. The containment shaped the course of the cold war by both resolving the incoherence, which characterized U.S. foreign and defense efforts in the period 1946-1950 and establishing important new lines of policy. Furthermore, if there was a battle and the U.S. have not intervened, no other incidents that were expected to have happened would have resulted the consequences that Korea has created. In comparison to many other shifting cases like the British exit from Greece and Turkey in 1947, there have been few practical replacements for Korea. Therefore, without Korea, there would be a very distinct history of the Cold War. The attempts to contain the Communist spread had effectively changed the timeline of the Cold War. (Jervis 563)

The previous mentioned ramifications of the Containment on the Cold war had come existence due to several factors. First a higher extent of tension with the Soviet Union since the postwar era. Second, a big alleged danger of conflict and the determination to confront the threat. Third, the U.S. put heavy military expenditures on the war serving to apply the containment policy. Finally, the trust that small wars is a big risk, which would conduct to a global conflict with advanced weaponry as well as pro-capitalistic commitments around the world. (Jervis 564)

3.3.3 The Effects of the Containment of the USSR

The Communist USSR after the Second World War had become a world superpower alike with the United States. The USSR unleashed his campaign to spread communist ideologies and possess the international clout. However, it clashed with U.S. containment policy, which was designed to stop communist spread. In the Korean War, the USSR

supported the North to invade the South as an application to his campaign but it clashed with the containment policy. Furthermore, this policy stood a shield protecting the South and attempted to fail the Soviets endeavors to expand on the Peninsula. During the war, the Containment formed the turning point in the course of the armed confrontation in Korea and was the key point to defeat North Korea in the south part.

The USSR was hardly effected by the containment policy, which was the reason of several fiascos around the entire world and led, in the end, to the fall of the union. In particular, the Korean War was a false destination during the cold war course.

3.4. The Consequences of the Korean War

The end of the Second World War paved the way to the emergence of two superpowers, the United States and the Union Soviet Socialist Republics, and the demise of the old imperialist powers. Therefor the world was divided ideologically and politically under the two world's poles. Eventually, the quarrel was heightened due to conflict of interests around the globe; under the name of the Cold War. In particular, the first ground that witnessed the first confrontation between the U.S. and the USSR was in the Korean War 1950-1553. This war had heavy effects on both sides, on the Cold War, and on the whole world. Writings appeared about the success and failure of the America foreign policy in the Korean War, which was demonstrated in the containment policy. In a word, there have been no decisive result concerning whether the U.S. succeeded or failed to fulfill the objectives of its intervention in the Korean War.

3.4.1 The U.S. Achievements in the Korean War

The United States set many objectives to be achieved in the Korean War; however not all these objectives had been accomplished. First, the North Korean invasion to the South enabled them to possess large territories and almost controlling the peninsula; after the U.S. and the UN arrival, the south part was liberated progressively. Thus, the United States succeeded to limit the Communist spread in the peninsula. Moreover, the Korean War had given the American source of proud to enter other wars around the world to contain Communism. Also, the Korean war led America to put more focus on the Asian and shifted from being inferior to priority in the U.S. foreign policy. Finally, the war resulted in enhancing the GDP growth via government expenditure shifted to restricted expenditure and demand. All in all, the U.S. intervention had fulfilled some of the drown objectives and reflected its intentions toward the Soviets.

Another sing of the U.S. success in the Korean war, in the long term outcome, is the developed nation of South Korea we wetness nowadays; compared to the less developed North Korea due to the remnants of the tyrannical Soviet Union regime in the state. Furthermore, the United States succeeded to preserve democracy and Human rights in the South by implementing friendly government since 1948 and was reinforced and supported in the Korean War. In fact, the U.S. managed to achieve some of the desired purposes of its involvement in the war, however marked other failures along and after the war.

3.4.2.1 The U.S. Failures in the Korean War

The United States managed to achieve some of the desirable aims in the Korean war, however there have been points of failure that accompanied its foreign policy in Korea. First, during the war the United States changed their paramount aim from liberating South Korea to the desire to reunify the Korean peninsula under their friendly capitalistic government.

Moreover, by the armistice in 1953 the Korean peninsula remained divided which meant the failure of the Americans to unify the peninsula, doubling the defeat of the Soviets, and achieving the Koreans' dream to unify their nation under one flag. This point was evaded by the Americans especially after the Chinese intervention to the war in order to keep the war limited and avoid triggering a nuclear Third World War.

Another failure was remarked on the aspect of the U.S. intelligences; this last failed to contemplate the North Korean attack of the South Korea in 1950 as well as failing to foresee the Chinese intervention in November 1950. These shortcomings were the consequence of many reasons, such as the postwar weakening of the wartime intelligence structure, extreme pressure to cut military spending, a willingness to concentrate all available intelligence services on the Soviet Union, and a reluctance to challenge the false presumption that all socialist countries were operating only in the perspective of the eastern bloc. (Topp)

Some American voices expressed another point of view exemplified in the idea that the Containment policy implemented in Asia was a perversion of the U.S. foreign policy. This strategy has been updated in reaction to recent incidents that have taken place around the globe, and in order to accomplish the primary task of the U.S. government. This transition was also essential to bring the strategy into effect in Korea. Moreover, the policy of the United States in Korea based on more armed instead of economic policy. Consequently, the strategy formulated by George Kennan just was not the same as that followed by the U.S. government along the Korean conflict.

The United States had managed to fulfill some aimed points but failed in other points. The Korean war was historically a turning point as well as it granted the western camp the chance to recapitulate and evaluate the Containment policy to confront the spread of Communism.

In the long run, the ramifications of the Korean war on the on The United States was strongly heavy; even though it is named a “Forgotten War”. Mainly because it was the start of the armed conflicts of the Cold War; it shaped the process of the cold war as it resulted in several other armed confrontations such as in Vietnam and the fall of China under Socialist control. Therefore, the effect of the Korean War was also seen important and decisive on the international sphere.

3.5 Conclusion

As conclusion, this chapter was interested in estimating and analyzing the reflections and ramifications of the Korean War on U.S. foreign policy, on the Soviet Union as the key contender to the United States, and on the Cold War period as a critical turning point. In particular, the ramifications of the Korean War on the US were seen by the Americans as a turning point in shaping the Cold War era, uncovering America 's actions in the region and across the globe as a whole, and the truth that this war influenced US foreign policy throughout the Cold War era. These evaluations and estimations were made considering the conventional interpretation of the cold war, which reinforce the legitimacy of Truman’s opinion that Korea was a Communist prepared measure of American determination, suggests that there have been many possible alternatives to Korea.



GENERAL CONCLUSION

General Conclusion

To conclude, this study paper had the aim of investigating the U.S. foreign policies since its independence, which was characterized by isolationism and shifted to interventionism due to the escalation of the Cold War. This paper attempted to introduce a thoughtful introduction about the term “foreign policy” in general. Besides, it paved the way to acquainting a historical overview about the U.S. foreign policy since its independence until post-WWII and the coming of the Cold War era. During this long period of time, the United States committed to Washington’s piece of advice, which was proved in the policy of isolationism, non-interventionism, and neutrality. By the turn of the twentieth century, American presidents, starting from Theodor Roosevelt onward, sought to place their country among the international powers and undertake the burden of possessing the world’s control. Eventually, the end of the WWII witnessed the emergence of two international camps, the western camp of America and its Allies while the eastern camp of the USSR, who quarreled under the name of the “Cold War”. Additionally, America, instead, exemplified the protector of peace, democracy, and human rights. Throughout this area, the U.S. sought hardly to empower its position with the Allies and with the whole free world as a paramount element in improving its foreign policy.

During the Cold War era, the United States with its allies firmly confronted the Soviet campaign to spread Communism around the world as well as becoming the only international superpower. Particularly, America made in use the containment policy to trap and limit the spread of Communism; this political strategy was tested in Asia. Containment was first widely used in Asia after the outbreak of the Korean War; during that time there was no suggestion that the strategy was to become the foundation for the American policies in

Asia overall. Moreover, this policy was meant to stop the Communist spread in the Korean peninsula in the period between 1950 and 1953.

The second chapter sheds light on the American foreign policy in the Korean peninsula, more specifically in the events of the Korean War. Furthermore, it projects the occupation of the area by the world's two superpowers of the time, the U.S. and U.S.S.R, which eventually resulted in a dramatic division of Korea in an unexpected event. In addition, this chapter tackled the American intervention along with the UN in the Korean War after its outbreak in 1950 as a reaction to the Communist aggression via the North Korean soldiers. This move was as response to the alleged communist test to the Americans to discover their intentions and determinations in the area, and as "police action" to protect democracy and maintain peace. Consequently, from this point onward, the Asian foreign policy for America became of great importance.

The events of the Korean War needed more contemplation. Therefore, an analysis and evaluation of the events took place in the third chapter. The U.S. intervention in the Korean peninsula changed the course of the war, as a clear and eloquent sign to confront the communist existence in Korea, as well as in the whole world. The Americans nominated themselves as the protectors of South Korea and as the chief of the East Asian sphere, and of the world overall. At the time, the American administration would do the impossible and use whatever strategy, regardless the costs, only to defeat the U.S.S.R and remove its presence in the world.

Consequently, the U.S. foreign policy in Korea 1950-1953, specifically during the Korean War, aimed generally at containing Communism in the peninsula. The U.S. intervention was a reaction to the Communist test of their intentions and determinations as well as a police action to preserve peace and protect democracy in South Korea. Eventually

the U.S. administration under President Harry S. Truman, to a far extent, managed to achieve success, though incomplete, to contain communism in whole Korea during the Korean War, as the peninsula remained divided as it was before the war because it would be considered as a total failure if it became unified under the control of North Korea. Furthermore, the American intervention in the war was successful and effective compared to other interventions against Communism such as the war in Vietnam, which witnessed total fiasco. The long term of this success could be seen in the friendly developed South Korea nation; which was the fruit of implementation and the protection of the American hegemonic ideologies and objectives.

This study would be a precursor for possible future studies concerning the U.S. foreign relations with South Korea and North Korea. Moreover, this study would pave the way to analyze and evaluate the main historical point that led to the Korean conflict, military escalation on North Korea, and reciprocal threats and tensions between all the three nations, the U.S., South Korea, and North Korea.



WORKS CITED

Books:

Brinkley, Alan. *The Unfinished Nation: A concise History of American People*. McGraw-Hill, 1993.

Hwang, Kyung Moon. *A History of Korea*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

McDougall, Walter A. *The Constitutional History of U.S. Foreign Policy: 222 Years of Tension in The Twilight Zone*. Philadelphia: Foreign Policy Research Institute, September 2010.

McMahon, Robert. *The Cold War a Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

O’Callaghan, Bryn. *An Illustrated History of the USA*. Longman, 1990.

Paterson, Pat. *Origins of U.S. Foreign Policy*. Washington, D.C.: Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies, February 2018.

Rippy, James Fred. and Debo, Angie. *The historical background of the American policy of isolation*. Massachusetts: Department of History of Smith College Northampton, 1924.

Seth, Michael J. *A Concise History of Modern Korea from the Late Nineteenth Century to the Present*. London: Rowman& Littlefield, 2010.

Suh, Dae-Sook. *The Korean Communist Movement 1918–1948*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1967.

Trumann, Harry S. *Memoirs.Years of Trial and Hope*. Vol. 2. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday Press, 1956.

Weinberg, Gerhard L. *World War II: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: November 2014.

Articles:

Jervis, Robert. “The Impact of the Korean War on the Cold War.” *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1980, pp. 563–592. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/173775. Retrieved 23 Sept. 2020.

Avey, Paul C. “Confronting Soviet Power: U.S. Policy during the Early Cold War.” *International Security*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2012, pp. 151–188., www.jstor.org/stable/41428123. Retrieved 12 Sept. 2020.

Erbas, Isa. “The Role of Foreign Policy and its Purpose in World Politics”. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*. Vol. 2, no. 11. October 2013, p.p. 43-44.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311987137_The_Role_of_Foreign_Policy_and_its_Purpose_in_World_Politics Retrieved 10 May 2020.

Folarin, Sheriff. "Student Feature - Foreign Policy". Ota: Covenant University. n.d. <https://www.e-ir.info/pdf/72077> Retrieved 10 September 2020.

. Marolov, Dejan. "The Foreign Policy - Theoretical Overview". Macedonia: GoceDelcev University, 2012. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235672056_The_Foreign_Policy_-_Theoretical_Overview Retrieved 15 May 2020.

Park, Tae-Gyun. "U.S. Policy Change toward South Korea in the 1940s and the 1950s." *Journal of International and Area Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2000, pp. 89–104. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/43111427 Retrieved 20 September 2020.

Roberts, Chalmers M., et al. "How Containment Worked." *Foreign Policy*, no. 7, 1972, pp. 41–53. www.jstor.org/stable/1147752. Retrieved 20 September 2020.

Dissertations:

Grosscup, George Charles. *ISOLATIONISM AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY*. 1972. Diss. University of Massachusetts, PhD dissertation. www.scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2918&context=dissertations_1 Retrieved 18 May 2020.

Hong, Hyun Woong. "American Foreign Policy Toward Korea, 1945-1950". May 2007. Diss. Oklahoma State University. www.citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.428.731&rep=rep1&type=pdf Retrieved 16 Aug 2020.

Pilliter, Richard John. "The evolution of the U.S. Containment Policy in Asia." Diss. 1969. University of Windsor. www.scholar.uwindsor.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7584&context=etd Retrieved 17 Aug 2020.

Websites:

Wilkison, Kyle. "Early Twentieth Century U.S. Foreign Policy, 1901-1941". Faculty. collin.edu. n.d. www.faculty.collin.edu/kwilkison/Resources%20for%20Students/ForeignPolicy.html Retrieved 7 September 2020.

"TR's Foreign Policy." American Experience, WGBH Educational Foundation. n.d. www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/trforeign/?fbclid=IwAR0uSVeFYGL14s110l43iZ5q5vhD9Rd5gBjLt0DWL6HjgVJLTAArjnnn_ew Retrieved 06 September 2020.

. Odom, Becky Preiss, and Lily Birkhimer. "A Brief Introduction to World War I" The United States World War One Central Commission, United States Foundation for the Commemoration of the World Wars, 03 January 2018, www.worldwar1centennial.org/index.php/ohio-in-ww1-articles.html Retrieved 08 September 2020.

"Cold War." Britannica. Encycloepadia Britannica, 20 July 1998, www.britannica.com/biography/John-Foster-Dulles Accessed 10 September 2020 Retrieved 09 September 2020.

Narajo, Roberto. "Historical analysis of the Cold War." Ehistory, The Ohio State University, n.d. www.ehistory.osu.edu/articles/historical-analysis-cold-war#:~:text=The%20Cold%20War%20shaped%20American,of%20expected%20conformity%20and%20normalcy.&text=The%20Cold%20War%20was%20to,death%20of%20the%20Soviet%20Union. Retrieved 09 September 2020.

"US Enters the Korean Conflict." National Archives, The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, 07 September 2010. www.archives.gov/education/lessons/koreanconflict?fbclid=IwAR3cyZHgUW6_VCwSXYqeI5H_tLPs_D69aAZ0haiEJGFXZy-p3sf9cZFEAQI Retrieved 15 September 2020.

McKay, Roland D. U.S. Decision-making in the Korean Conflict: "'Lessons of History' from Munich to Clinton". Diss. 2005. Macalester College. www.digitalcommons.macalester.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1000&context=history_honors Retrieved in 18 September 2020.

Hickman, Kennedy. "The History of Containment Policy George Kennan and American Foreign Policy During the Cold War." ThoughtCo, Dotdash, Aug. 28, 2020. www.thoughtco.com/definitionwofcontainment2361022#:~:text=Containment%20was%20a%20foreign%20policy,would%20spread%20to%20neighboring%20countries. Retrieved 17 September 2020.

Bernstein, Barton J. "Containment." American Foreign Relations, Advameg, Inc., n.d. www.americanforeignrelations.com/A-D/Containment.html. Retrieved 17 September 2020.

"Containment Foreign policy." Britannica, Encyclopedia Britannica, 26 Arch 2020. www.britannica.com/topic/containment-foreign-policy Retrieved 07 Sep 2020.

Jung, Soo-Ho. "The Korean War and US Public Opinion: June 1950 to January 1951". Honors Capstone Project HNRS-490-014H. 13 December 2010.

www.auislandora.wrlc.org/islandora/object/1011capstones%3A152/datastream/PDF/view

Retrieved 14 Aug 2020.

Crabtree, Steve. "The Gallup Brain: Americans and the Korean War." Gallup, Gallup, Inc., 4 February 2003. www.news.gallup.com/poll/7741/gallup-brain-americans-korean-war.aspx?fbclid=IwAR2oBI_Wf2PHJutKwAuMnw5PQYsnJJAP9DD_01hgrOJo_1IudFqxgroYsOe8 Retrieved 18 Aug 2020.