

# American foreign policy: realpolitik vs. human rights



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

American Foreign Policy : Realpolitik vs. Human Rights (1) Should the U. S sometimes pursue realpolitik and sometimes human rights? In other words, is it acceptable for the U. S. to sometimes anything even support dictators, if it is good for the nation, sometimes pursue moral principles when it can reasonably do so?.

(2) I think the U. S. should do what is in the best interest of the United States for example, (3) Just one day after the French surrender at Dien Bien Phu, an international conference to settle the Indochina conflict began in Geneva, Switzerland. There , representatives of the French and Vietminh attempted to to map out Indochina's future.

Cambodia, Great Britain, Laos, the People's Republic of China, The Soviet, and the United States. Also with the Panama Canal Treaties and the Chilean Revolution. (4) The U. S. used realpolitik in The Geneva Conference because the United States negotiated with a communist country over another country. (5) On April 27, 1954, the Conference produced a declaration which supported the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Indochina thereby granting it independence from France.

In addition, the Conference declaration agreed upon the cessation of hostilities and foreign involvement (or troops) in internal Indochina affairs. Northern and southern zones were drawn into which opposing troops were to withdraw, to facilitate the cessation of hostilities between the Vietnamese forces and those that had supported the French. The Viet Minh, awaited unification on the basis of internationally supervised free elections to be held in July 1956. Most of the French Union forces evacuated Vietnam, although

much of the regional governmental infrastructure in the South was the same as it had been under the French administration.

An International Control Commission was set up to oversee the implementation of the Geneva Accords, but it was basically powerless to ensure compliance. It was to consist of India, Canada, and Poland. The agreement was between Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, France, Laos, and the People's Republic of China, the State of Vietnam, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom. The United States refused to participate in the conference or recognize the accords. (6) In my opinion The Geneva Conference was to obtain Indochina's independence from the French.

7) The United States used the realpolitik policy because if it used the human rights policy it would never cut aid to Chile. (8) In the presidential election of 1970, Salvador Allende gained the presidency of Chile. Allende was a Marxist and a member of Chile's Socialist Party, who headed the " Popular Unity" (UP) coalition of the Socialist, Communist, Radical, and Social-Democratic Parties, along with dissident Christian Democrats, the Popular Unitary Action Movement (MAPU), and the Independent Popular Action. His program included land reform and the nationalization of U. S. interests in Chile's major copper mines.

Allende had two main competitors in the election — Radomiro Tomic, representing the incumbent Christian Democratic Party, who ran a left-wing campaign with much the same theme as Allende's, and the right-wing former president Jorge Alessandri. Allende received a plurality of the votes cast,

<https://assignbuster.com/american-foreign-policy-realpolitik-vs-human-rights/>

getting 36% of the vote against Alessandri's 34% and Tomic's 27%. This was not the first time the leading candidate received less than half of the popular vote. Such had been the case in every post-war election, save that of 1964 — Alessandri himself was elected president in 1958 with 31%. In the absence of an absolute majority, the Chilean constitution required the president-elect to be confirmed by the Chilean parliament. This procedure had previously been a near-formality, yet became quite fraught in 1970.

After assurances of legality on Allende's part, and in spite of pressure from the U. S. government, Tomic's Christian Democrats voted together with Allende's supporters to confirm him as president. Indigenous and peasant forces across the country violently took control of ranches, forcibly fulfilling Allende's land redistribution promises. Immediately after the election, the United States expressed its disapproval and raised a number of economic sanctions against Chile.

In addition, the CIA's website reports that the agency aided three different Chilean opposition groups during that time period and "sought to instigate a coup to prevent Allende from taking office. By 1973, Chilean society had grown highly polarized, between strong opponents and equally strong supporters of Salvador Allende and his government. Military actions and movements, separate from the civilian authority, began to manifest in the countryside. A failed military coup was attempted against Allende in June 1973.

After the coup, Chileans witnessed a large-scale repression, which started as soon as October 1973, with at least 70 persons murdered by the Caravan of

Death. The four-man junta headed by General Augusto Pinochet abolished civil liberties, dissolved the national congress, banned union activities, prohibited strikes and collective bargaining, and erased the Allende administration's agrarian and economic reforms. The junta jailed, tortured, and executed thousands of Chileans. According to the Rettig commission and the Valech Report, close to 3, 200 were executed, murdered or "disappeared", and at least 29 000 imprisoned and tortured. The junta also set up at least six concentration camps. The regime outlawed or suspended all political parties and suspended dissident labor and peasant leaders and clergymen.

Eduardo Frei and other Christian Democratic leaders initially supported the coup. Later, they assumed the role of an opposition to the military rulers, but soon lost most of their influence. Meanwhile, left-wing Christian Democratic leaders like Radomiro Tomic were jailed or forced into exile. The church, which at first expressed its gratitude to the armed forces for saving the country from the danger of a "Marxist dictatorship," became increasingly critical of the regime's social and economic policies. Malnutrition affected half of the nation's children, and 60% of the population could not afford the minimum protein and food energy per day.

Infant mortality increased sharply. Beggars flooded the streets. (9) In my opinion I think the United States should have not intervene in Chile's way of governing because the U. S. would not like if another country like Mexico to tell them how to run their country, but it should have never cut aid to Chile because that left lots of people in poverty. (10) The U.

S. sed the human rights policy because I gave job to the people of Panama.

(11) President Jimmy Carter and Panamanian Chief of Government Omar Torrijos signed the Panama Canal Treaty and Neutrality Treaty on September 7, 1977. This agreement relinquishes American control over the canal by the year 2000 and guarantees its neutrality. On May 4, 1904, Panama granted the United States the right to build and operate the canal and control the five miles of land on either side of the water passage in exchange for annual payments.

This first treaty is officially titled The Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal and is commonly known as the Neutrality Treaty. Under this treaty, the U. S. retained the permanent right to defend the canal from any threat that might interfere with its continued neutral service to ships of all nations. The second treaty is titled The Panama Canal Treaty, and provided that as from 12: 00 on December 31, 1999, Panama would assume full control of canal operations and become primarily responsible for its defense. Both treaties were subsequently ratified in Panama by a two-thirds majority in a plebiscite held on October 23, 1977.

To allow for popular discussion of the treaties and in response to claims made by opponents of the treaty in the U. S. that Panama was incapable of democratically ratifying them, restrictions on the press and on political parties were lifted several weeks prior to the vote. On the day of the vote, ninety-six percent of Panama's eligible voters went to the polls, the highest voter turnout in Panama up to that time. The neutrality treaty was of major concern among voters, particularly on the political left, and was one reason why the treaties failed to obtain even greater popular support.

<https://assignbuster.com/american-foreign-policy-realpolitik-vs-human-rights/>

The United States Senate ratified the first treaty on March 16, 1978 and the second treaty on April 18. The treaties were the source of controversy in the United States, particularly among conservatives such as Strom Thurmond, William F. Buckley, Jr. and Jesse Helms who regarded them as the surrender of a strategic American asset to what they characterized as a hostile government.

In the year preceding the final transfer of canal assets there was an effort in the United States Congress, notably House Joint Resolution 77 introduced by Helen Chenoweth-Hage, to declare the Carter-Torrijos treaties null and void. Despite the fact that the pullout of the United States is now complete, there are still organizations (primarily conservative ones such as the John Birch Society) that urge the United States to declare the treaty null and void, saying that the Spanish text is different from the English text. (12) In my opinion the Panama Canal Treaty was a great idea because it benefits the United States for a long time and now it benefits Panama. (13) The United States of America should pursue realpolitik and human right both at the same time because they should not only think about the politics that involve the situation but also the people of the country they are dealing with, because they might cut off aid to a country because the leader of the country might be a dictator the people would have to live in poverty. (14) I think this would be the best position because everyone would benefit from the situation. (15) In the Geneva Conference the U.

S should have stayed out of Indochina's business. The Chilean Revolution they United States should have never cut off aid to Chile for the reason being that the citizens of Chile would live in poverty. In the Panama Canal the <https://assignbuster.com/american-foreign-policy-realpolitik-vs-human-rights/>

United States did the right thing because they built it and owned it for several years and then in the year 2000 it passed it to the government of Panama. (16)in conclusion the United States should keep working on being the leading country of the world and not bring anymore problems upon themselves.