



Ellias Aghili Dehnavi, Mohammad Alizadeh Jamal

*From Containment to
Americanism*



Copyright © 2020 Ellias Aghili Dehnavi, Mohammad Alizadeh Jamal

Publisher: tredition GmbH, Halenreie 40-44, 22359 Hamburg, Germany

ISBN

Paperback: 978-3-347-07320-3

Hardcover: 978-3-347-07321-0

eBook: 978-3-347-07322-7

Printed on demand in many countries

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law. For permission requests, write to the publisher.

From Containment to Americanism

To all of my lovely friends in Maryland and Virginia

Pamela Sinicrope, her family and Sara Oakleaf

Preface

The present book examines the national security strategies of the presidents of the United States of America after World War II. The main question that has been asked in this regard is what approaches have these national security strategies had after the World War II? The present project is an analytical descriptive study done through interviews and library sources . Research shows that each of the American presidents had a national strategy in the aftermath of World War II, and in the post-World War II period, the US National Security Strategy has always had a global approach. An assessment of each of these strategies shows that although they have been developed and implemented in response to short-term concerns, they have also constituted some of the fundamental aspects of US foreign policy and macro-strategy; so that the

next statesmen have followed its broad political goals and instructions. In other words, each of these strategies is based on previous strategies, which has led to political continuity and the benefit of the United States. In addition, it should be added that during the Trump administration, the national security strategy, due to its incompatibility with its allies and its strong priority over purely American interests, made this period noticeably different from previous periods.

Keywords: National Security Strategy, America, World War II, Cold War, Foreign Policy

1. Introduction

The United States, like any other country in its political history, has had different directions in diplomacy and foreign policy. The US National Security Strategy, which is based on the doctrines proposed by the government's intellectual and instrumental elites at the domestic and international levels, has always been and will continue to guarantee the national interests and security of this country. American citizens have witnessed various national security strategies over the past two and a half centuries. (Motahari Nia, 2005: 28-27).

World War II marked a turning point in American history and the beginning of a fundamental shift in US foreign policy toward globalization. Although World War I did not completely overshadow the doctrine of the American continents, but the new war led the irreversible diplomatic behavior of the United States to withdraw from the closed sphere of the Monroe Doctrine. The new doctrine after World War II, which with the name of President Harry of Truman, became known as the Truman National Security Strategy, no longer has the ability to administrate any limits on the implementation of the expansionist menus

of US foreign policy. The study seeks to examine and explain US national security strategies in the years following the end of World War II.

2. Harry S. Truman National Security Strategy (April 12, 1945 - January 20, 1953)

Harry S. Truman was the 33rd President of the United States and a member of the Democratic Party. Truman, who began working as Franklin Roosevelt's deputy chief executive in 1944, took over the presidency after his sudden death. In 1948, he defeated the Republican candidate, Thomas Dewey, to become President of the United States for the second time.

The new national security strategy was based on the confrontation between the two opposing ideologies of imperialism and communism, and relied on the enormous potential of the United States during the war. In fact, World War II served as a powerful catalyst for the potential abilities of the United States to become de facto ability, so that from now on we will have to use new words to describe the United States: the superpower!

In fact, internal (internal) integration was the new and external (international) competitiveness that changed the US behavioral, strategic, and diplomatic patterns in global interactions. Upon careful study, we find that these

causes and factors are all rooted in World War II, its evolution, and end.

From the beginning of the war, the United States has made military and security goals as its priorities. Thus, the United States began its power in the Pacific Ocean in 1941 and gradually expanded to the Atlantic Ocean. Then it was the turn for the Mediterranean.

He first deployed some troops in North Africa in 1942 and then went to Southern Europe in 1943. Finally, when the defeat of Germany was certain, and following

the opening of the Second Front in 1944, the United States succeeded in mobilizing 17 million troops and sending 10 million troops to the battlefields (p. Braillard Am, 1992: 39-33).

In addition, the abundance of "advanced" American equipment, even for the Soviet Union, was useful in winning the war. Finally, the success of the Manhattan project in fissioning the atomic nucleus (uranium and plutonium) and testing the first atomic bomb on July 16 at the Los Alamos Research Center in New Mexico made the United States extremely capable. (Kissinger, 1279) The criminal

act of atomic bombing of the cities of Hiroshima (August 6) and Nagasaki (August 9) leaves no doubt about the military use of this destructive weapon and its use for political and security purposes.

Following the entry of the United States into the war, a law was enacted on December 20, 1941, requiring all males between the ages of 20 and 24 to serve under the flag. One year later, on November 18, 1942, the age of military service was reduced to 18 years, according to an amendment to the Draft Act.

With the entry of the United States into the war, the government gradually took on the role of political leader of the Allies. Relying on economic and military capabilities, it enabled the United States to impose its political views on European friends from the very beginning of the war by concluding the Atlantic Charter. Even with regard to the leadership of the war, Washington managed to appoint its own candidate, General Eisenhower, under the command of Allied forces (other than the Soviet Union), contrary to the wishes of London.

In addition, United state played a leading role in all political consultations and multilateral conferences, and in terms of a disagreement, Washington's vote would take precedence over others. It also had a global approach from the beginning of the US foreign policy war. January 1942 is a good implication to the fusion of traditional continental politics and modern world politics; On that date, the United States was able to force 21 countries on the continent to sever ties with the central governments, on the one hand, and 26 countries on the other, to sign the United Nations Declaration.

From the beginning of the war, the United States, using past war experience, has made the necessary arrangements for the post-war world and its hegemonic role. Finally, with the surrender of Germany in April and Japan in August 1945, the United States, as a dormant giant that woke up, no longer wanted to leave the arena of world due to new interests and commitments. But this giant was not alone, but another counterpart in the East, claiming to be the real winner of the war.

With the conquest of Eurasia, half of Europe and, most importantly, the capital of

Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union sought to expand socialist views and ideas around the world. Meanwhile, Europe, which had previously shaped the international system through its interactions, was recognized as the biggest loser in the war and suffered devastation, distress, poverty and misery. These issues were causes of a good platform for the growth of looting votes and ideas.

Thus, during the post-war era, the united enemies' ranks of Nazism were torn apart. Interestingly, the fate of defeated Germany was the first cornerstone of a new animosity between former conquerors (R.P. PARING-AUX, 1994: 191-192). After that, Europe became another factor in heightening the conflict between the two new enemies. In his famous Fulton speech in 1946, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Churchill, mentioned the creation of the Iron Curtain from the Baltic to the Adriatic, which divided Europe in two parts. In contrast, the great Soviet theorist John, in 1947, mentioned the creation of two hostile camps of imperialism, with the aim of world domination and anti-imperialism, with the intention of overthrowing imperialism (S. PACTEAU et F- C. MOUGEL, 1993: 91).

With the creation of a new competition and the emergence of two superpowers that were the main actors in the international relations scene, a new system was formed based on the balance of bipolar powers. In this new world order, the United States, as the leader of the capitalist world, considered it as its duty to prevent the expansion of the Soviet-led socialist camp on the basis of modern foreign policy, which had previously been the responsibility of Britain and France.

Therefore, in the post-World War II era, there was a strong will to consider a new role for the United States on world politics: to share the collaborative efforts of the United States and Britain! In fact, Great Britain, with the dream of resuming its lost global sovereignty after the Reconstruction period, enjoyed many influential capabilities in the new direction of US foreign policy. On the one hand, it magnified the Soviet threat, and on the other hand, it hoped that the United Kingdom and the United States could work together to prevent the threat.

In this situation in the United States, governments such as Canan, Acheson, Marshall, Eisenhower, and even Truman, in order

to justify the continued presence of the United States in Europe and elsewhere, magnified the presence of Soviet threat too much and and by intimidating, they created a hysterical atmosphere against communism. The era of McCarthyism and the grabbing whatever which was left like, were the consequences of this programming flow (L. Marcou, 1987: 237).

In the end, Britain's dream of reclaiming the world did not come true, and the old colonizer was forced to leave the international arena for the new imperialist actor. Following the continuation of Soviet influence in sensitive areas such as Iran, Turkey, and Greece, the British government explicitly denounced the declaration and sought US assistance. On February 12, 1947, in secret notes from the London government, he declared his inability to counter the spread of communism. Thus, with the removal of the United Kingdom, a bipolar system based on American and Soviet acting theory was formed from this date.

In this situation, the US government, more purposeful than ever, decided to take a permanent place in its former ally at the top of

the capitalist world. Finally, on March 12, 1945, Harry Truman announced the new US foreign policy (Truman's doctrine). Considering its nuclear power, the new diplomatic and strategic principles of US, confrontation with the Soviet Union and the spread of communism were not within specific limits, but throughout the globe (Tabatabai, 2002: 11).

Thus, US global policy was based on deterrence or a barrier to Soviet expansion beyond the 1945 borders. However, a few years later, some extremist factions were interpreting the doctrine of a policy of going backwards which meant pushing back the Soviets, even to the pre-1945 borders.

In the end, it is worth mentioning that, with the exception of Truman, almost all US presidents have presented their doctrines since World War II! But all of them are derived from Truman's doctrine of deterrence and global politics, and their interpretation and modern analysis within their particular place and time, which have been based on the developments of the international system.

3. Dwight D. Eisenhower's National Security Strategy (January 20, 1953 - January 20, 1961)

Dwight D. Eisenhower was a five-star general and American politician who served as the 34th President of the United States from 1953 to 1961. In January 1957, on the eve of his second term in office, Eisenhower called on the US Congress to pass resolutions authorizing the President to use force to block the aggression of communism in the Middle East.

This action, called the Eisenhower Doctrine, required Congress to delegate the right of declaring war, which was traditionally a congressional right, to the President (Schulzinger, 2000: 445). In his message to Congress, Eisenhower proposed three types of action: a) strengthening the economic ability of the Middle East nations; b) Implementation of military assistance and cooperation programs; c) Armed support for territorial integrity and political independence of nations threatened by communism (Lenjanski, 1994: 77). Dwight D. Eisenhower of the Republican Party of America was victorious on the presidential election of November 1952 due to his reputation during World War II, as well as

McCarthyist propaganda about Truman's inability to contain communism due to Communist influence in the Democratic Party, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Security Services (Malakutian, 2001: 184-183).

Eisenhower called the Truman Barrier Doctrine a "Tread Mill Policy" and believed that it would keep the United States in a position in order to lose its incentive for dealing with international conspiracies and regional crises (Houshang Mahdavi, 2001: 59 - 55). He believed that the goal of the United States should not be peaceful coexistence with communism, but that it should be abolished by the United States (Malakutian, 2001: 184). Therefore, adopting the "New Look" and "The Great Revenge Doctrine" policy, he declared: "The United States is no longer required to use conventional weapons to fight the Soviet Union and multilaterally retaliate against any sudden and atomic attack." (Schulzinger, 2000: 416).

Thus, Eisenhower considered the development of the American model as the only optional choice of the people of the world, and to achieve this he concluded that regional trea-

ties in Southwest Asia, Southeast Asia, Australia, and New Zealand must be done. Eisenhower's goal was to develop the process that Truman had begun in Europe and to try to spread such collections and structures around the world (Mottaghi, 1997: 56).

Eisenhower's national security policy can be divided into two phases or periods that are somewhat in line with his presidency: the first period, in 1953 until 1957 that Eisenhower tried to keep the United States out of being as passive state and revive hope in the hearts of Western allies. Adopting the "New Look" policy was to some extent in the following of such a goal. The second period, which coincided with the years 1957-91, during which the Soviet Union was able to show not only equality but also to some extent superiority toward the United States by sending Sputnik missiles into space, also Eisenhower sought to counter Soviet domination in Africa and Asia by declaring his doctrine. (Darwish Seh Talani, 1997: 45-44).

The "New Look" policy, introduced in Document No. 2/162 of the US National Security Council in November 1953, was an

attempt to regain initiative in the global confrontation with the Soviet Union while at the same time reducing US defense costs. Thus, the fundamental orientation of the US Armed Forces changed from conventional ground forces to increasing the capacity of the US Strategic Bomber Fleet so that it could carry out both limited nuclear strikes and "Massive Retaliation." (Gaziurovsky, 1992: 164).

In fact, the New Look policy was a military move to coordinate the military's desire to increase its defense budget and the Treasury Department's request to prevent a general budget deficit. The New Look policy called on the Department of Defense to reduce the number of conventional forces and to rely on nuclear weapons to intimidate the Soviet Union and force it to reconcile with the United States. Thus, the Air Force had the highest defense costs with heavy bombers, while the army, and especially the infantry, had to be reduced from twenty divisions to fourteen divisions (Schulzinger, 2000: 415).

"... The United States no longer have to use conventional weapons to fight the Soviet Union," John Foster Dulles stated in a speech