

# America's security policy during pacific and korean wars



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

The main purpose of this paper is to foreign security of the US toward the Pacific and the Korean War. It answers questions like: Why did United States enter into the Korean War at the expense of 50, 000 casualties and 50 billion dollars? What were her aims for entering into the Korean War? Since the establishment of the country, economic interest was the major concern for the American foreign policy. For example, the Monroe Doctrine clearly showed the principle that economic concern was prior to national security.

This paper will examine the Acheson's speech to the national press club, and analyze how U. S policy was designed to play the strategic role as protector of Western Pacific. These themes will be discussed and analyzed to demonstrate the relationship of U. S and Japan, as well as to reevaluate U.

S role as directory of Korean War After World War II, the United States withdrew its troops. It was because the strategic importance of Korea was no more imperative. However, when the Korean War broke out the U. S concerned about influence of the war, especially she concerned about the Japan situation.

Yet, Washington's main goal on the Pacific region could be summed up as military security of the Japan. This project will address this question as well as these: Why did U. S consider it necessary to reaffirm the U. S commitment to the military defense of Japan? To answer these questions, first, we need to examine the U. S foreign policy during World War period.

After World War II, Influential sections of the governing elites in both countries had good reason to press for a restoration of the amicable diplomatic relations and reciprocally profitable economic intercourse that <https://assignbuster.com/americas-security-policy-during-pacific-and-korean-wars/>

had transpired during the 1920s(Keylor: 223). Before World War II, U. S policy was characterized as cycle of isolationism and interventionism. These characteristics were important routes to determine their foreign policy in East Asia, and the economic interests were important factors to determine their foreign policy.

Finally, analysis of these historical realities reflects that U. S foreign mechanism was more concentrated on economic advantages rather than world peace. After Japan's defeat in 1945, conversely, " a consensus gradually developed in Washington that the addition of China and the European possessions in Asia to the Japanese empire would constitute an unacceptable alteration of the balance of forces in Asia to the western Pacific as well as a severe menace to American economic interest in the region once these mutually incompatible perceptions of national interest became the basis of foreign policy (keyword 223). By understanding the framework of time and the U. S concern about economic interest, we can see East Asia is strategic boundary for U. S to protect their national purposes.

Finally, following analysis of historical realities, answers to the above questions tempered by Korean War perspectives, the Acheson's foreign policy will be evaluated for its relevancy as well as its true implementation behind the meaning of speech. Between 1945 and 1950, the world order was threatened by the struggle between democracy and communism. The Czech coup and Berlin Blockade in 1948, the communization of China by Mao in 1949 and the 1949 successful test of the first Soviet atomic bomb forced U. S foreign policy to redefine its analysis of its former World War II ally. On January 12, 1950, U.  
<https://assignbuster.com/americas-security-policy-during-pacific-and-korean-wars/>

U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson's speeches to the National Press Club proclaimed a "defense perimeter" in the western Pacific. In the Acheson's speech, he emphasizes Japan as a major interest with respect to security and proclaims "we can help only where we are wanted and only where conditions of help are really sensible and possible (50)". His voice clearly reveals U.S. foreign policy character; it reflects the factual theme about protecting U.S.

U.S. interests and influence in Japan. An analysis of Acheson's speech seems to mostly focus on protection of Japan and to maintain their influential position in the Pacific areas. His voice seems to guarantee Japan's national security and reaffirms that the Pacific region is America's Lake; their contribution to East Asia security expresses their special authoritative position in the region by attaching strong confidence voices, as well as implementing future role of the United States as protector of East Asia. During the Acheson's speeches, he proclaimed a defensive perimeter in the western Pacific that left Korea outside the line. Therefore, U.S. did not view Korea as a military strategic scope. However, Acheson affirmed in the speech that "the initial reliance must be on the people attacked to resist it and then upon the commitments of the commitments of the entire civilized world under the Charter of the United Nations when attack occur" (Cold War 64).

The diplomacy indicated here will address this question as well as these: Why then did Acheson permit the United Nations to undertake the security of Korea? The main assumption of his diplomacy is that the essence of the war is ingrained within the hands of politics. The other assumption of his speech can be reinterpreted from the background of policy establishment and to <https://assignbuster.com/americas-security-policy-during-pacific-and-korean-wars/>

reveal how these changes of the U. S policy affect the purpose of allies' military operations from the view point of politics and military affairs. Acheson focuses on the defense of South Korea by indicating that: "subversion and penetration cannot be stopped by military means" (65). At this point, we can question that what other solutions can stop the "penetration" other than military measure.

Acheson explained answered by stating that " the United State had special economic responsibilities", and " its allies' economies for a vast military effort" (104). Compare to its previous policies during time period, it has similarities relates to U. S Marshall Plan 1947. Truman's Marshall Plan provided economic assistance to prevent their allies' fall in the communism regime. From this observation, we can suggest that Acheson's policy and Marshall Plan have similar role of function from the viewpoint of politics and military affairs. Therefore, the study of Acheson's policies reveals the essence of this strategy for optimizing gains through political and economical means and the existing policy can be characterized by indirect Marshall Plan for Korea under the subject of " Containment Policy".

Lastly, the Washington's strategic goal on the peninsula could be summed up as curtailing peace while deterring war. In other words, it reflects that he considered Korea a test case of Soviet aggression and sought to respond by preparing militarily and politically to protect their vital interest in the region, which are Japan and Pacific areas. After World War II, the United States withdrew its troops. It was because the strategic importance of Korea was no more imperative. However, when the Korean War broke out the U.

S was concerned about influence of the war, especially on the Japan situation. Truman explained Korean War with regard to security of Pacific; he stated: " In these circumstance, it would be direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to United States forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area"(70). Once again, it appeared that Korea was not on the U. S strategic scope, and America's involvement in Korean War seems to protect their vital region rather than preserve Korea's internal security.

In this case of the Korean War, it is of little legal significance that war was declared for Korea. The other means by which Truman may have hoped to minimize risks and using the 38th parallel as the dividing line of Korea was due to the containment line against Communist bloc. The analysis of Acheson's decision that left Korea outside the line reveals U. S fundamental purposes to protect American prestige in Pacific and the throughout the world. In fact.

" U. S will continue to uphold the rule of law" (70), Truman indicate. The Washington's strategic goal on the peninsula could be summed up as maintaining their containment line with defensive perimeter. The DMZ on one hand serves as an advance base for Japanese defense while raising the strategic value of Korean peninsula. This signified that the Korean defense and the Japanese defense were converted to an equal standing.

The word " equal standing" can identify U. S strategic policy that Korea peninsula can only be part of buffer zone to protect Japan. This result concludes their strategy that Korea was just a subordinate variable factor

under the East Asia defensive perimeter. In conclusion, the main purpose of this paper was to show America's security policy toward the Pacific and the Korean War. These themes are analyzed to demonstrate the U.

S strategic purpose in Japan and Pacific areas, as well as to redefine U. S role in the Korean War. We can conclude that U. S had special interest in Pacific regions, and tried to maintain their role as protector of Pacific securities. If Japan was under the Soviet influence, her national security would be in danger.

So to speak, imaginary enemy could have attacked western region of United States. To prevent their security and prestige, U. S was involved in the Korean War, and set the Korea peninsula as double containment bloc to protect their defensive perimeter. Therefore, America aimed to limit the war and prevent the wavelength of war from affecting Japan, because Japan was necessary for the American national security.