A Shift in Diplomacy: The Arming and Disarming of Foreign Policy

Michelle A. Ramos
Liberty University, maramos3@liberty.edu

Recommended Citation

Ramos, Michelle A. (2013) "A Shift in Diplomacy: The Arming and Disarming of Foreign Policy," *Strategic Informer: Student Publication of the Strategic Intelligence Society*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 2 , Article 2.
Available at: https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/si/vol1/iss2/2

A Shift in Diplomacy: The Arming and Disarming of Foreign Policy
Michelle A. Ramos

U.S. foreign relations have been marked by times of peace as well as times of tension. Despite interruptions of violence, the United States has attempted to promote peace while keeping its citizens abroad safe. Following the terrorist attack of 9/11, the U.S. created specialized forces to combat terrorism and spent billions to fund military operations. The U.S. followed the Bush Doctrine of foreign policy for eight years until the Obama administration reformed that type of diplomacy. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has introduced the idea of "smart power" and utilizing civilian emissaries in lieu of military forces under the Department of Defense. The militarization of foreign policy under the Bush administration eventually transitioned to a de-militarization policy by the Obama administration.

U.S. national defense has been drastically altered by the tragic events of 9/11. With the increased threat of terrorist acts from radical Islam, the U.S. responded with the Global War on Terror. Significant changes in the defense budget, military tactics, and foreign policy were implemented to prevent future attacks. Billions of dollars were allocated for defense spending in order to equip the military and improve counterterrorism efforts.[36]

According to the Bush doctrine, the U.S. has the right to preemptively engage a nation or group if it poses a threat to national security or presents a conflict of interest.[37] The attacks on 9/11 heightened sensitivity to possible international threats, inciting President Bush's aggressive policy. Under President Bush and then Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, there was a buildup and technological reform in the military that they wanted to utilize to establish U.S. dominance in the new century.

The Middle East was a prime target with multiple unstable countries in which to carry out this new policy.[38]

In 2001, the U.S. began to implement the pillars of the Bush Doctrine: pre-emption and extending freedom.[39] The concept of pre-emption was the idea of waging a preventative war. The U.S. attacked Afghanistan and Pakistan in order to destroy al-Qaeda training camps, thus preventing new recruit training for a time. Iraq was then invaded to depose Hussein's regime and prevent it from producing weapons of mass destruction.[40] Pre-emptive conflict also allowed the U.S. to fight on its own terms and expand its sphere of influence through military might. Rumsfeld summarized the position of the Bush administration when he said, "A major success in Iraq would enhance U.S. credibility and influence throughout the region."[41] The United States wanted to depict that it had sufficient military power to defend itself and to stop terrorists from carrying out attacks on home soil. At the same time, the concept of extending freedom was implemented to enforce basic human rights, introduce democratic government, and promote economic success in Middle Eastern countries.

While U.S. troops occupied parts of the Middle East, the U.S. government supplied $20.6 billion in international aid during the fiscal year of 2004.[42] Aggressive U.S. foreign policy called for the defense of its national security in the Middle East, which cost a significant amount of funding, but simultaneously providing aid to other countries. Military action was utilized before exhausting all diplomatic measures, thereby inciting negative response and an increasing debt.

---

[36] Cohen, Michael. "The Legacy of Sept. 11: Part I." *World Politics Review*. 08 September 2011. http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/9941/the-legacy-of-sept-11-part-I, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[37] Preble, Christopher. "The Bush Doctrine and 'Rogue' States." *Foreign Service Journal*. October 2005. http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/articles/preble_afsa_bush_doctrine_rogue_states.pdf, (accessed 3 January 2013), 27.

[38] Battle, Joyce. THE IRAQ WAR – PART I: *The U.S. Prepares for Conflict, 2001.* "U.S. Sets 'Decapitation of Government' As Early Goal of Combat." 22 September 2010. http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB326/index.htm, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[39] Philip Purpura, *Terrorism and Homeland Security: An Introduction with Application*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier, Inc., 2007, 110.

[40] Ibid, 111.

[41] Battle, "U.S. Sets 'Decapitation of Government' As Early Goal of Combat."

[42] Tarnoff, Curt and Larry Nowels. "Foreign Aid: An Introductory Overview of U.S. Programs and Policy." *CRS Report for Congress*. 15 April 2004. http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/98-916.pdf, (accessed 3 January 2013), 29.

In 2002, 94% of foreign policy activities were handled by the State Department and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID); by 2008, the Department of Defense handled 52% of foreign diplomacy work.[43] One of the reasons for this drastic change is that the DoD is able to deploy personnel and transport aid more quickly than civilian agencies. This brought about the militarization of foreign policy as the U.S. increasingly dealt with international problems by force instead of diplomacy. The approach to dealing with foreign nations was on a case-by-case implementation. The Bush administration hoped to discourage attacks on the United States by establishing military dominance and utilizing intervention in the Middle East.[44] In the fiscal year of 2005, USAID spent $23.4 million in foreign operations with $7 million being used to fund foreign military and development assistance.[45] In addition to USAID, the Department of Defense allocated $200 million in the 2006 fiscal year for Foreign Military Capacity Building, which would assist and train foreign militaries in counterterrorism efforts through detention institutions, police, and judicial procedures.[46] Increased funding for these programs allowed the Bush administration to increase military diplomacy in order to maintain foreign dominance.

While President Bush and the Department of Defense focused on multiple wars, the Secretary of State focused on foreign diplomacy. Directives under former Secretary of State Colin Powell emphasized the revival of U.S. diplomacy by reforming the State Department's organizational style and allotting resources for security teams, advanced technology, and improved facilities. Powell wanted to minimize global nuclear weapons; he achieved a major triumph in 2003 when Libya shut down its programs.[47] Developmental assistance doubled under his leadership and he was a propagator of the global fight against AIDS. He also believed that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict needed to be defused in order to achieve stability in the Middle East. This evolved into a foreign policy known as the "Road Map."[48] Powell stated, "What I want to do this visit is to assess [the road map] with the Palestinian side and the Israeli side...and make sure they understand the president's determination."[49] Ultimately, the Bush administration did not follow through with the commitment to the plan.

Directives slightly transitioned under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, who replaced Colin Powell during the second term of the Bush administration. Her policy was focused on *transformational diplomacy* which dealt with serious social and political issues such as epidemics, the drug trade, human trafficking, and reestablishing a U.S. presence in foreign countries.[50] Rice wanted to disperse American diplomats to more countries instead of concentrating a majority in specific regions. Her goal was, "…to work with our many partners around the world, to build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that will respond to the needs of their people and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system." [51] The U.S. needed to

[43] Hughes, Michael, "Ambassador Blasts U.S. Militarization of Foreign Policy and Development." 18 February 2011. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-hughes/ambassador-blasts-us-mili_b_824938.html, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[44] Caldwell, Dan. *The Vortex of Conflict: U.S. Policy Toward Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011, 97.

[45] "FY 2007 Foreign Operations Summary." State Department. http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/60643.pdf, (accessed 28 October 2012), 3-4.

[46] Serafino, Nina. "The Department of Defense Role in Foreign Assistance: Background, Major Issues, and Options for Congress." *CRS Report for Congress*. 25 August 2008. http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/110406.pdf, (accessed 28 October 2012), 5; 15.

[47] "Biographies of the Secretaries of State: Colin L. Powell." Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State. http://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/people/powell-colin-luther, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[48] "Biographies of the Secretaries of State: Colin L. Powell."

[49] "'Road map' talks on Powell's Mideast agenda," 11 May 2003. http://articles.cnn.com/2003-05-10/world/powell.mideast_1_powell-and-shalom-road-map-sharon-and-abbas/2?_s=PM:WORLD, (accessed 28 October 2012), 2.

[50] "Biographies of the Secretaries of State: Condoleezza Rice." Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State, http://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/people/rice-condoleezza, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[51] Rice, Condoleezza. "Transformational Diplomacy: Shaping US Diplomatic Posture in the 21st Century." Speech at Stanford University, 18 January 2006.

transition from post-Cold War problem nations to concerns in the Middle East and Southwest Asia. Diplomacy efforts need to constantly adjust to the emerging power countries in order to establish diplomatic ties and promote peaceful resolution to conflict.

Foreign policy has recently begun to shift from militarized policy to a more diplomatic policy. The United States has maintained a military presence in the Middle East but has slowly been withdrawing and instructing local forces on how to control their jurisdictions in Afghanistan and Iraq.[52] The U.S. is decreasing joint patrol operations with the locals and instead, leaving them with the tools that they need in order to control the area. American forces can no longer patrol and dominate Afghanistan as the main occupier, as this will disengage the local force and leave the locals defenseless when the U.S. military withdraws. The United States is slowly demilitarizing zones in the Middle East and alternatively trying diplomatic methods.

The Obama administration is restructuring the military by decreasing its budget and deploying smaller contingents around the world. President Obama also plans to downsize the Army by 80,000 soldiers.[53] A prime example of the new foreign policy direction occurred in the efforts to stop the massacre in Libya and bring down Qadaffi's regime. President Obama coordinated an international response to the conflict in support of the Libyan people. In order to maintain a friendly relationship with countries, the Obama administration has intervened only for the sake of democracy and has been more reactive instead of preemptive.[54]

There has been criticism of the military's involvement in humanitarian assistance because of the potential threat to aid workers. When locals see military personnel in uniform handing out supplies, they often associate the assistance with an impending military occupancy. This occurred in Afghanistan when civilian aid workers were attacked because they were considered to be part of the military effort.[55] Humanitarian efforts will be kept separate from military advances because of this potential disaster. Congress will potentially reinforce the supremacy of foreign diplomats by giving them the authority to approve all U.S. military assistance activities.[56] The coordination between the Department of Defense and the State Department is key in order for there to be a safe environment for humanitarian efforts. The U.S. is still seeking to extend freedom by aiding Arab nations without military force. Contrary to a militaristic foreign policy under the Bush administration, the Obama administration is attempting a more civilian-led, diplomatic approach.

The State Department's executive summary of the 2010 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review stated its focus on civilian power:

> Civilian power is the combined force of men and women across the U.S. government who are practicing diplomacy, implementing development projects, strengthening alliances and partnerships, preventing and responding to crises and conflict, and advancing America's core interests: security, prosperity, universal values—especially democracy and human rights—and a just international order.[57]

This directive promotes a more diplomatic policy that will be instrumental in the 21st century.

The State Department, with the help of USAID, wants to place trained civilians in

---

http://www.cfr.org/us-strategy-and-politics/transformational-diplomacy-shaping-us-diplomatic-posture-21st-century/p9637, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[52] Carstens, Roger D. "Stepping Back to Move Forward." *Foreign Policy*. 21 September 2012. http://afpak.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/09/21/stepping_back_to_move_forward, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[53] Rohde, David. "The Obama Doctrine." March/April 2012. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/27/the_obama_doctrine?page=0,4, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[54] "Foreign Policy." The White House. http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/foreign-policy, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[55] Boone, Jon. "The Worst Attack on Humanitarian Workers in 30 years." 10 August 2010. http://www.smh.com.au/world/worst-attack-on-humanitarian-workers-in-30-years-20100809-11u7j.html, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[56] Serafino, "The Department of Defense Role in Foreign Assistance: Background, Major Issues, and Options for Congress," 29.

[57] "Leading Through Civilian Power." The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, 2010. http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/153139.pdf, (accessed 28 October 2012), 2.

countries that were previously dominated by the U.S. military. In order to minister to a country in need, the U.S. must respect the existence of foreign culture trends while providing aid and the concept of democracy.[58] In addition to providing aid, the State Department assists countries with conflict resolution. The Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO) currently works in the Middle East, Burma, Central America and Kenya.[59] CSO seeks to end violence by diplomatic means, not military force, in these areas.

The utilization of State Department security personnel and private security contractors to protect American diplomats would enhance the security level in which the U.S. conducts its foreign diplomacy. Using Department of Defense resources and personnel on a very limited scale would also contribute to foreign diplomacy as it relates to security. The U.S would work in cooperation with the local force, but not replace it. Foreign policy should not be used as a means for conquering countries; rather, it should be utilized as a method for safer communication and avoiding military conflict.[60]

The current presidential administration seeks to retain a military presence in the world, but prevents it from handling diplomacy issues abroad. The White House stated, "[t]he President is committed to building our civilian national security capacity so that the burden for stability operations is not disproportionately absorbed by our military."[61] The military will be utilized in cases of counter-terrorism and self-defense but not as a dominant force in foreign policy.

Under President Obama, the focus will be on strengthening U.S. alliances, helping develop foreign countries' ability to solve their own issues, furthering engagement in the upcoming foreign influential centers, and promoting and protecting universal human rights.[62] Secretary of State Hillary Clinton introduced the concept of *smart power*, which calls for the use of responsible means to resolve foreign issues. Several tools are at the disposal of U.S. foreign policy including diplomacy, military, economic, and political methods.[63] *Smart power* stresses the need for special operations forces and civilian diplomats to be used properly in foreign affairs.[64]

The U.S is partnering with other countries to solve common problems with diplomatic solutions instead of resorting to military action in most cases. Countries such as North Korea and Iran will be handled by the military only if diplomatic means are exhausted. The militarization of U.S. foreign policy needs to be kept in moderation. Excessive military force will create unnecessary conflict while a lack of strength will diminish U.S. foreign diplomacy. Under current foreign policy, U.S. diplomats will turn to civilian forces to achieve what troops could not. The goal is to decrease spending and maintain peace with other nations through diplomatic means. Former Secretary of Defense (2008) Robert M. Gates predicted, "the most persistent and potentially dangerous threats will come less from emerging ambitious states, than from failing ones that cannot meet the basic needs -- much less the aspirations -- of their people."[65] In response, diplomacy must be used to influence such governments for the sake of a less aggressive existence.

[58] Wiarda, Howard. *The Crisis of American Foreign Policy: The Effects of a Divided America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006. 191.
[59] U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations. http://www.state.gov/j/cso/where/index.htm, (accessed 4 October 2012).
[60] Berman Ilan. "In Mideast, A Pivotal Proliferation Moment." *Defense News*. American Foreign Policy Council. 25 May 2009. http://afpc.org/publication_listings/viewArticle/669, (accessed 28 October 2012).
[61] "Defense." The White House. http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/defense, (accessed 28 October 2012).

[62] Clinton, Hillary. "Remarks on United States Foreign Policy." Remarks at Council on Foreign Relations, Washington D.C. 08 September 2010. http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/09/146917.htm, (accessed 28 October 2012).
[63] "Clinton: Use 'Smart Power' In Diplomacy." CBSNews. 18 June 2009. http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-250_162-4718044.html, (accessed 3 January 2013).
[64] Clinton, Hillary. Remarks at the Special Operations Command Gala Dinner. Tampa, Florida. 23 May 2012. http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2012/05/190805.htm, (accessed 3 January 2013)
[65] Tyson, Ann Scott. "Gates Warns of Militarized Policy." *Washington Post*. 16 July 2008. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/07/15/AR2008071502777.html, (accessed 28 October 2012).