According to a nationwide survey conducted in July 2004 by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press in association with the Council on Foreign Affairs 41% of those surveyed cited war, foreign policy and terrorism as the most important problems facing the United States of America. For the first time since the Vietnam era\(^1\) American voters are more concerned about international and defense issues than the economy or other domestic issues in the upcoming presidential election; thus the importance of foreign affairs in Democratic and Republican Parties’ platforms.

The purpose of this study is to compare the Democratic Party’s and Republican Party’s foreign affairs policies and to establish the major factors influencing the Democratic and the Republican position. In comparing both parties’ international policies the following questions will be posted:

1. How do the Democratic and Republican Parties view America’s role in the world?
2. How do both factions propose to solve the problem in Iraq?
3. What is the Democratic and Republican approach to North Korea and nuclear disarming?
4. What is both parties’ stance on energy policy?

\(^1\) Eroding Respect for America Seen as Major Problem. Foreign Policy Attitudes Now Driven by 9/11 and Iraq. Survey conducted by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press in association with Council on Foreign Relations, p. 5
5. How does the Republican Party and the Democratic Party view the issue of humanitarian intervention?

6. What is the Republican and Democratic perspective on free trade and international economics?

7. How do the opposing sides propose to continue the Middle East peace process?


9. What is the party’s in office and the opposition’s opinion on Europe and the European Union?

**AMERICA’S ROLE IN THE WORLD**

Since the fall of the Soviet empire the United States of America has undoubtedly become the world’s single superpower. Determining America’s role in the world is one of the main points of the Republican and the Democratic foreign policy.

Since the defeat of Woodrow Wilson’s League of Nations by Senate Republicans in 1919–1920, Republicans have traditionally been committed to a policy of isolationism and defense of American interests in the international forum rather than the expansion of democracy. In contrast to the traditional GOP foreign policy, the current Republican platform states that America must play a major role in the worldwide process of democratization, safekeeping and fighting terrorism.

According to Republican foreign policy, spreading democracy to states, which are governed by tyrannical leaders, should be one of the United States’ top priorities. The Republicans argue that autocratic and poverty stricken states give rise to radical movements, which threaten world security and peace. In democratic states, where the people are free, the threat of radical movements is trivial; hence the importance of democratization of authoritarian states.

The Republican Party platform not only accentuates the importance of spreading democracy to dictatorial countries but also stresses the importance of stimulating economical growth and development in underdeveloped states. The Republican strategy for economical development opposes giving financial development aid but supports stimulating growth in countries, which have made crucial
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4 Ibidem, p. 22–23
policy changes. The Republicans plan on providing help in the form of grants, improving the working of the World Bank, encouraging investment, aiding the development of agriculture.

In accordance with the Republican international policy, America should play the role of the safe keeper of the world. Keeping the world safe means fighting the ongoing war on terrorism and disrupting proliferation. Cutting financing, disabling terrorist networks, raiding terrorist hideouts are the methods the Republicans plan to use in the war on terror. The Republicans in their foreign doctrine have adopted a policy of no tolerance towards nations supporting terrorists and vow to destruct terrorism. On the issue of proliferation of the weapons of mass destruction the Republican Party supports the enforcement of international agreements against proliferation, stopping the creation and spread of the weapons of mass destruction, minimizing the effect of an attack on the U. S. and pre-emptive action. Although the role of United States' allies in the war on terrorism and proliferation is mentioned, the Republican platform accentuates the role of the United States as world leader.

The departure of the Republican platform from the traditional Republican isolationist policy and incline toward a more Reagan-like foreign policy of intervention has been undoubtedly caused by the terrorist attack of September 11th 2001 on the United States and the growing need for national and worldwide security. To the Republicans the need for security and safety determines America’s role as the safe keeper and advocate of democracy in the world.

Historically, the Democratic Party has adopted a doctrine of liberal internationalism as its foundation for foreign policy – a doctrine based on international cooperation in fighting for democracy and human rights; a doctrine emphasizing America’s role in the process of democratization and maintaining world stability. Following the principles of liberal internationalism, Woodrow Wilson created the League of Nations after WWII, Harry Truman oversaw the reconstruction of Europe by establishing the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, John F. Kennedy created the Peace Corps and signed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and Jimmy Carter negotiated the Camp David peace agreements between
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5 Ibidem, pp. 5–13
8 Ibidem, pp. 68–75
9 Ibidem, pp. 150–178
10 Ibidem, pp. 223–242
Egypt and Israel\textsuperscript{11}. The 2004 the Democratic Party's foreign affairs policy is a continuation of the historical liberal internationalism Democratic doctrine.

The Democratic Party sees America's role in the world as that of leader in the process of maintaining world peace and safety. But in contrast to the Republican foreign affairs policy, the leadership is based on strong alliances and international friendships\textsuperscript{12}. Senator John Kerry, the Democratic candidate for President, in a speech made on January 23rd, 2003 at Georgetown University\textsuperscript{13} criticized the Republican Administration's unilateralism in the effort to keep the world safe. Kerry argued that a unilateralist approach to foreign policy, which leads to alienating allies can have a dangerous effect: unilateralistic foreign policy leads to the isolation of the United States in the world and the spreading of an anti-American message around the world. According to the Democratic Platform and to a speech made at Westminster College on April 30\textsuperscript{th}, 2004 by John Kerry\textsuperscript{14}, to successfully play the role of the safe keeper of the world the United States must depart from the Republican foreign policy and build leadership based on international cooperation. International cooperation means working together with international organizations and winning their approval for intervention in the world. The Democratic Party states that the United States needs to share the political and military responsibilities for preserving peace and keeping the world safe.

In playing the role of the safe keeper of the world the United States must eliminate the threat of terrorism. This does not only mean abolishing terrorist groups but also improving the lives of the people of the Middle East. The democratic world should cooperate in bringing freedom, education, health, equality for women and economic development to the Middle Eastern region. According to the Democratic foreign policy, economic development in the Middle East should be based on sparking investment, trade and growth by opening up the region to the rest of the world. The Democrats propose building a duty free program like the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the Andean Trade Preference Act\textsuperscript{15}. An economically stable and democratic state poses a lesser threat to the rest of the world.

In comparing the Republican Party's and the Democratic Party's foreign affairs policy on the issue of America's role in the world a series of similarities are clearly visible. Both parties see America's role in the world as that of the safe keeper and to both parties this means eliminating terrorism and bringing peace, democracy and economical stability to authoritarian states. The difference is based on the parties'

\textsuperscript{11} Ibidem, pp. 300–330
\textsuperscript{12} 2004 Democratic National Platform: Stronger at Home, Respected Abroad, pp. 7–8
\textsuperscript{13} J. Kerry, *Speech at Georgetown University*, January 23, 2003
\textsuperscript{14} the same, *Speech at Westminster College*, August 30, 2004
\textsuperscript{15} the same, *Speech at Georgetown University*, January 23, 2003
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approach to the cooperation of rest of the world. While the Republican Party holds a unilateralistic approach to the world leadership of the United States, the Democratic Party strongly accentuates the need for international cooperation.

IRAQ

The invasion of Iraq by American forces began on March 19th 2003. After three weeks of fighting the Ba’athist government was overthrown and the occupation of Iraq began. With 130,000 American troops stationed in Iraq and the rebuilding of the country in progress, the problem of Iraq has become the main subject matter of both the Republican and the Democratic foreign policy.

United States President, George W. Bush decided to invade Iraq because of a suspected arsenal of weapons of mass destruction and the country’s supposed support of the al-Qaeda and other terrorist networks. The President and the rest of the Republican Party hold that this was a necessity for making the world safer and eliminating the threat of a terrorist attack

On September 23rd, 2004 during a Press Conference at the White House with Iraqi Prime Minister Allawi, President Bush outlined the Republican four-point strategy for the reconstruction and continued democratization of Iraq. The first step consisted of transferring full sovereignty to an Iraqi government and was achieved by coalition forces on June 28th, 2004. The second step of the Bush plan is based on implementing safety and security in Iraq. To achieve this, the Bush Administration does not plan on sending more American troops into Iraq but instead plans on keeping the stationed troops in Iraq until the reconstruction is done and on training Iraqi security forces so that they are able to defend their country. The Iraqi forces are to rise to 125,000 by the end of 2004 and 200,000 by the end of 2005. Forces from the United States, NATO, Jordan and the United Arab Emirates will do the training of the Iraqi security forces.

The third step of the Bush Administration’s plan for securing peace and democracy in Iraq consists of improving Iraq’s infrastructure by rebuilding schools, refurbishing hospitals, restoring telephone service and electricity. The fourth step is gaining international support for the rebuilding of Iraq and the fifth step consists of holding free elections in Iraq for a Transitional National Assembly that will designate a government and draft a constitution by January 2005. The Bush Administration has committed $7 billion to the reconstruction of Iraq, worked on Iraq’s debt reduction and has plans to hold a donor’s conference in Japan. The Republicans conclude

16 2004 Republican Platform, op.cit., pp. 5–11
that the reconstruction of Iraq is necessary to world safety and peace in the greater Middle East\textsuperscript{17}.

The Democratic Party has continuously criticized the Republican Administration for going into war with Sadam Hussein's regime because of an exaggerated threat of the creation and use of weapons of mass destruction by the Iraqi dictator and supposed links to the al-Qaeda. The Democrats disapprove of the Republicans going into war with weak alliances, lack of international support; without attempting to negotiate first and without a plan for the aftermath of war. But Democrats realize the necessity of stationing troops in Iraq until the country is rebuilt and no longer serves as a threat to world safety. In the Democrat's Platform a four-point plan is described, which calls for the internationalization of the security and reconstruction effort in Iraq.

The first point of the Democratic plan to bring peace to Iraq concerns the constituting of a secure setting in Iraq. To achieve this Americans must gain international support for the mission, especially the support of the permanent members of the U.N Security Council. International support is a necessity because the United States needs allies in the successful democratization of Iraq. The Democrats propose that other countries commit troops and resources in the effort to rebuild Iraq and justify their proposal by arguing that a politically stable and peaceful Iraq is important to the entire world. International troops must be treated with respect and must be enabled to share the benefits of the reconstruction. The Democratic Party intends on obtaining further military forces from NATO, which will enable the United States to reduce its troops.

The Democratic platform proposes the creation of an international High Commissioner, who will represent the international cause and work with the Iraqi people in the process of reconstruction. The High Commissioner would supervise elections, assist with the creation of a constitution and coordinate the reconstruction of Iraq. The Democrats call for less bureaucracy in Iraq, an increase in taking part by the Iraqis in the reconstruction projects and the enabling of the Iraqis to profit from their oil production. Securing the profits from oil production and putting them into the rebuilding of Iraq would reduce the cost of the mission on the United States. The Democratic Party also supports the creation of an Iraqi security force, which will join in on the peacekeeping and rebuilding in Iraq and which be able to preserve the peace after American troops withdraw from Iraq. Democratic presidential candidate John Kerry has also called for a conference with Iraq's neighbors to ensure their regard for Iraq's borders and the new democracy\textsuperscript{18}.

\textsuperscript{17} http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/09/20040923-8.html
\textsuperscript{18} 2004 Democratic Party Platform, op. cit., pp. 12–13
The Republican Party and the Democratic Party strongly disagree on the issue of going into war in Iraq, but both support the continued stationing of American troops in Iraq and the reconstruction effort. Both parties' platforms call for the training of an Iraqi security force, international cooperation and emphasize the importance of a democratic, stable and peaceful state of Iraq to the rest of the world.

NORTH KOREA AND NUCLEAR DISARMING

The ongoing antagonism between the United States and North Korea began in October 2002 after North Korea admitted to having a nuclear program developing uranium. North Korea's nuclear program breached a deal made in 1994 between the United States, South Korea, Japan and North Korea in which aid was promised for the nuclear disarming of North Korea. In answer to the violation of the 1994 deal, The United States stopped the oil deliveries that North Korea had been receiving since 1994. In turn, North Korea announced it would reopen a nuclear reactor at the nuclear complex in Yongbyon, removed surveillance cameras from the nuclear sites, dismissed international nuclear inspectors and withdrew from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.19

The problems in North Korea and the development of nuclear weapons is another threat to world security and one of the central points of the debate held between the Republicans and Democrats in the 2004 Presidential race.

In his 2002 State of the Union Address President Bush included North Korea in the “axis of evil”20 – a group of countries whose nuclear proliferation programs are a world threat. The unabashed trend towards North Korea is continued in the 2004 Republican Party Platform: “North Korea lies outside of the international system. Americans have shed their blood to stop North Korean aggression before and remain prepared to resist aggression today”.21

During the Presidential Debate held on September 30th, 2004 in Coral Gables, Florida22 President Bush stated the Republican Party’s aim was to solve the conflict with North Korea by holding multilateral talks with Kim Jong Il and the leaders of China, Japan, South Korea and Russia. The Republicans argue that the countries of
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19 http://www.cfr.org/background/background_northkorea_bg.php
21 2004 Republican Party Platform, op.cit., p. 32
the region must take part in the talks because a regional solution is needed. While the Republic of Korea is called a "valued democratic ally", the American-Japanese alliance is most emphasized, thus creating an especially strong role for Japan in the conflict solving process with North Korea. The Republicans decisively reject holding bilateral talks with Pyongyang, which have been proposed by the Democratic Party. The Republican Party argues that two-way talks with Kim Jong Il will make the multilateral talks fail, alienate American allies in Asia and make it easier for Kim Jong Il to force his way on the United States.

On the issue of nuclear disarming, the Republicans support George W. Bush's work towards the shutting down of the A. Q. Khan nuclear program. The Republican Party states, that during Bush's Administration the United States has been holding Iran to its nuclear treaty obligations, working with the International Atomic Energy Agency and developing the Proliferation Security Initiative, whose main goal is halting the shipment of nuclear materials and information. During the First Presidential Debate, President Bush stated that the Republican Administration has increased funding by 35% for disrupting nuclear proliferation and worked on developing the missile defense program.

The Democratic Party criticizes the Republican Party for its foreign policy dominated by Iraq and ignorant of North Korea – the Republicans have not been successful with the peaceful six-way talks, over the course of the Republican Administration American nuclear inspectors have been expelled from North Korea. In the First Presidential Debate, the Democratic Party's leader, John Kerry, stated that nuclear development was the most dangerous threat towards the security of the United States.

In the Democratic 2004 Platform, the Democrats propose a foreign policy centered on the cause of nuclear disarming. The Democrats suggest that multilateral talks with North Korea about nuclear disarmament should be continued, but that the United States should also hold direct negotiations with Kim Jong Il. The agreements must have rigorous confirmation and strive towards total elimination of North Korea's nuclear program.

On the issue of nuclear disarming the Democrats propose securing materials for making nuclear bombs, especially in Russia where the estimated number of nuclear weapons is 20,000 and the country has a capability of making 50,000 more. The Democratic Party demands ceasing the creation of new nuclear material, to be used in creating nuclear weapons and conducting a worldwide effort to remove
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23 2004 Republican Party Platform, op. cit., p. 32
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reserves of nuclear materials at research facilities. The Democrats find it necessary to strengthen the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and make inspections compulsory. The task of nuclear disarmament, as suggested by the Democratic Party, is planned to take four years.26 Democratic Leader John Kerry in the debate held on September 30th, 2004 has also mentioned the necessity of ending American nuclear programs, such as the research of bunker bursting nuclear weapons conducted during the Republican Administration.

In comparing the Republican and Democratic policy towards North Korea and nuclear disarmament it is evident that both parties have the same goal: eliminating the threat of a nuclear assault, from North Korea or any other state capable of attacking.

ENERGY

America’s dependency on foreign oil has risen from 28% in 1972 to 55% in 2003. Of the 55% of imported foreign oil, 25% comes from Persian Gulf Countries – 14. 5% from Saudi Arabia and 8% from Iraq.27 The dependency on Middle Eastern oil fuels the budgets of the countries that pose the greatest threat to the security of the United States, hence making the country more vulnerable and weaker.

The Republican Party realizes the dangers of foreign oil dependency and proposes to decrease the import of Middle Eastern oil by increasing energy production in the United States and supporting the development of alternative sources of energy. According to the Republican Platform the Republicans’ energy plan calls for:

- investing $2 billion over a ten year period in the research of clean coal technology
- investing $1.7 billion over 5 years in the development of the Freedom Car Partnership and Hydrogen Fuel Initiative – programs, which will develop hydrogen fueled cars and the infrastructure to support them
- exploring oil reserves in the United States, including continuing the extraction of oil from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge
- prolonging the production tax credit for ethanol, biodiesel, wind and biomass industries

26 Ibidem, p. 10
27 S. Mardesen, Stanford Report, Vantage Point: Crisis Underscores Need to Reduce Foreign Oil Dependency, October 24, 2003
– developing nuclear power and building nuclear power plants (Nuclear Power 2010 Initiative)
– exploring energy opportunities in the western hemisphere.  
Ending the growing dependence on Mideast oil is one of the four most important goals of the Democratic Party’s 2004 foreign affairs policy. The Democrats argue that the current Republican Administration has made the United States more dependent on Middle Eastern oil and more vulnerable to an attack. The Democrats accuse the Republican Bush Administration of taking campaign contributions from oil companies, delaying research into alternative sources of energy and putting the interests of the oil industry over the interests of the American people.

To reduce the American dependence on oil from the Middle East, the Democratic Party proposes the following plan.

– allocating royalties from corporations which pay for the right to drill for oil on public lands in a trust fund for the development of alternative sources of energy
– making vehicles more fuel efficient by raising fuel standards
– creating a hydrogen based energy economy by 2020
– forming a Hydrogen Institute responsible for the creation of 100,000 hydrogen powered cars by 2010 and two and a half million by 2020
– providing consumers with tax incentives for the purchase of energy efficient vehicles and producers with tax incentives for converting factories to build energy efficient vehicles
– developing renewable energy from the wind and sun
– increasing the supply of natural gas
– pursuing sources of oil in other parts of the world

HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION

As defined during a NATO seminar in Scheveningen, Germany in November 1999, humanitarian intervention is an armed intervention in another state, without the agreement of that state, to address (the threat of) a humanitarian disaster, in particular caused by grave and large-scale violations of fundamental human rights. During the Cold War era, a policy of nonintervention was prevalent in the Amer-
ican foreign relations doctrine; with the ending of the Cold War a policy of intervention became generally accepted by the Republicans and the Democrats.

This new agreement between the parties formed in the later years of the Clinton Administration, as the Democrats took a more conservative internationalist approach to the issue of humanitarian intervention. Both parties accepted United States’ special role in stopping humanitarian disasters, yet on a very limited and selective basis. Both parties also began to see a linkage between violations of human right and international security. This agreement on the issue of humanitarian intervention was continued through the Bush Administration of 2000–2004 and is evident in the current presidential race.  

The current Republican Administration’s policy of humanitarian intervention is centered around two basic principles: that intervening in troubled states is an abiding characteristic of American political culture and that anarchy ridden states pose a threat to America’s security. Humanitarian intervention is a necessity, but must be used cautiously because of the large risks, costs, and unpredictable consequences.

The Republicans propose initiating humanitarian intervention if a number of criteria are met. In the first place, intervention is only permissible to stop extreme brutalities such as genocide, mass murders, mass rape and other crimes against humanity. Only the cessation of these crimes justifies assaulting another state’s sovereignty. Secondly, military intervention can be used only if other methods of intervening such as diplomacy or embargoes have failed. Military intervention must be the final recourse. Third, intervention is allowable if it will have a long-lasting, positive effect on the future of the people against whom the crimes are committed and will not cause any more harms. Intervention must do more good than harm. Fourth, the United States must have a long-term policy for dealing with the problem so that a relapse into violence will not take place. Fifth, humanitarian intervention in a sovereign state must not damage the interests of the United States and its people. Sixth, the United States should make a resolute effort to enlist its allies in the humanitarian interventions. Multilateral actions are preferable to unilateral interventions – other countries should share the responsibility, cost and consequences of the intervention. Lastly, intervention should be undertaken only if Congress and the people of the United States support it.

The Republican Party intends to work on preventing genocide and mass murder from happening instead of only intervening when it has already taken place. The Republicans propose founding a post-conflict recovery network, which would be involved in the process of reconstructing institutions of democracy and justice and establishing economic stability. The Republican Party also proposes the develop-
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ment of civilian agencies, which would be more involved in the process of humanitarian intervention and helping regional agencies deal with the outbreak of violence.\footnote{S. Patrick, The Role of the U.S. Government in Humanitarian Intervention, April 5, 2004 http://www.state.gov/s/p/rem/31299.htm}

The Republicans support humanitarian intervention in the following countries:

a) \textbf{Liberia}

In August 2003 the Republican Congress sent three Navy ships and a force of 2,000 marines to stop the violence in Liberia. The force secured the port and airport in Monrovia to open the way for humanitarian aid and withdrew after 11 days. The United States contributed $10 million towards the peacekeeping mission in Liberia.

b) \textbf{Sudan}

The Republican Party lists making peace in Sudan one of the top priorities of its foreign policy. In June 2004 the Bush Administration proposed a UN Resolution calling for sanction against the government supported Janjaweed militias murdering villagers in the Darfur region of Sudan. Republicans support the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement and a Special Envoy has been appointed to discuss the signing of the Sudan Peace Act.

c) \textbf{Haiti}

In March 2004 the Bush Administration sent U. S. Marines to lead a multilateral force (Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Canada, Spain) to bring stability after the resignation of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. The United States plans to strengthen the democracy and constitutional government in Haiti.

The Democratic Party is traditionally a supporter of humanitarian intervention. During the last Democratic Administration, President Bill Clinton continued the internationalist ideals of Woodraw Wilson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt and vast humanitarian intervention was undertaken. The United States intervened in Bosnia, Kosovo, Haiti and Somalia.

The Democratic Party led by Massachusetts senator John Kerry maintains the same stance on the issue of humanitarian intervention. In the Democratic Platform, the Party cites the examples of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy as world leaders. The Democrats declare that one of the main goals of their Party is to,“help build a safer, more peaceful, more prosperous, more democratic world” and that one of the main challenges is,“the promotion of democracy and freedom around the world”.\footnote{S. Patrick, The Role of the U.S. Government in Humanitarian Intervention, April 5, 2004 http://www.state.gov/s/p/rem/31299.htm} The Democrats consider humanitarian intervention to be a moral responsibility of the United States and argue that the United States should take an active role in the process of bringing democracy, peace and
stability to violent states but have not outlined specific criteria for initiating humanitarian intervention.

The Democrats supported the Republican initiated intervention of the United States in Liberia. On the issue of humanitarian intervention in Sudan the Democrats criticize the Republicans for taking indeterminate action. During the NAACP Annual Convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on July 15th, 2004, Democratic Party leader John Kerry stated that the United States should ask the UN Security Council to sanction the criminals of genocide in Sudan and authorize an international humanitarian intervention. In answer to a question posted by debate mediator Jim Lehrer during the First Presidential Debate held on September 30, 2004 in Coral Gables, Florida about the issue of sending American troops to stop the genocide in Sudan John Kerry responded, that he opposed sending troops. Senator Kerry argued that if provided with the right logistical support, the problem could be solved through the African Union. Sending in American troops to intervene would not be possible since too many are stationed in Iraq. On the issue in Haiti, the Democratic Party has criticized the Bush Administration for not pursuing a diplomatic solution to the crisis and proposed U.S. military training of the policy force in Haiti.

FREE TRADE AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS

While developing as a country, the United States of America protected its industries by government-imposed tariffs and other legal restrictions. After 1945, when it became a monopoly in many manufacturing sectors, the United States switched from the traditional protectionism to free trade. Except for a decline in support for free trade in the 1970’s, the United States has since been committed to the doctrine of free trade.\(^\text{[35]}\)

Traditional Republicans of the WWII generation favored the theory of free trade. While running as Republican candidate for the office of President of the United States in 2000 George W. Bush declared that, “The steady opening of international trade around the globe is the product of sixty years of American leadership from Presidents and Congresses of both parties and is among the main reasons for the

\(^{35}\) 2004 Democratic Party Platform, op.cit., pp. 7–8

\(^{34}\) J. Kerry, Remarks at the NCAAP Annual Convention, July 15, 2004 http://www. cfr. org/campaign2004/pub7193/john_kerry/remarks_at_the_naacp_annual_convention. php?issue=7#p39

seventeen years of economic growth and... the trend toward peace and freedom we know today. Throughout his term President Bush has promoted open trade as a stimulus for building prosperity and economic growth. He has stated that free trade is good for the American people, economy and the world. The Bush Administration has negotiated trade agreements with 12 countries, including the Trade Act of 2002, introduced numerous anti-dumping orders, filed a case against China in the World Trade Organization for penalizing the U. S. textile industry, declared the will to build free trade relations with Chile, Singapore and Morocco and negotiate a Free Trade Area of the Americans. Yet in spite of its support of free trade, in March 2002 the Republican Administration imposed tariffs to protect the U. S. steel industry, which were removed after the World Trade Organization declared that they violated trade rules.

The Republican Party’s goal is to sustain America’s position as the strongest economy in the world. The Republicans plan to achieve this by rejecting economic isolationism and continuing the policy of free trade. Negotiating new trade agreements and upholding existing trade agreements is a central part of the Republican plan.

The Republican Party does not oppose outsourcing – the moving of American jobs to lower cost countries. Outsourcing has become a way of saving money by American businesses, which pay foreign workers much less than their American counterparts for doing the same job overseas. Republicans have called outsourcing a new type of trade but demand that countries, to which jobs are being outsourced, open their markets to American exports.

During the last Democratic Administration, the Administration of President Bill Clinton, free trade was widely practiced. This year the Democratic Party has proposed a new plan for the further expansion of free and fair trade and enforcement of existent trade laws. The six point plan call for:

- enforcing existing trade laws through the revived Super 301 process and the doubling of the U. S. Trade Representative’s trade enforcement budget
- reviewing existing trade agreements in the first 120 days of the Presidential term
- investigating the abuse of workers in China
- strengthening the competitiveness of small businesses
- stopping currency tampering by other countries, including China

The Democratic Party also proposes the inclusion of labor rights and environmental standards in free trade agreements, the opening of further export markets and the development of the Trade Adjustment Association programs. The Demo-

36 G. W. Bush, *Normal Trade Relations with China*, May 17 2000
37 2004 Republican Party Platform, op. cit., p. 45-67
crats have widely criticized the Republican Party for outsourcing American jobs and propose giving tax cuts to producers who retain jobs in the United States.  

THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS

Since the occupation of Palestine by Israel in 1967 the United States has been largely involved in solving the conflicts between Israel and the Palestinians. In September of 1978 U. S. President Jimmy Carter negotiated the signings of the Camp David Accords, which led to the diplomatic recognition of Israel by Egypt in exchange for the return of territories which had been occupied by the Israelis since 1967. The Camp David Accords were the foremost achievement of the Carter Administration and established the United States a major participator in the Middle East peace process.

During the Clinton Administration establishing peace between Israel and the Palestinians became one of the main goals of American foreign policy. On September 13, 1993 in Washington D. C., President Bill Clinton hosted the signing of the Declaration of Principals on Intermin Self-Government Arrangements (Oslo Accords) by Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. The declaration established the foundation for peace negotiations between Israel and Palestinians during the years 1993–2000. From the signings of the Oslo Accords Bill Clinton headed the peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians. While the Clinton led talks continued through 2000, a final agreement at the Camp David summit in July 2000 had not been reached. In September 2000 the Palestinians launched the al-Aqsa intifada, ending the Oslo Peace Process.

On the issue of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict the Republican Party is strongly pro-Israel. During a conference at the White House in April 14 2004 President Bush called Israel an ally and friend of the United States. The Republican Party emphasizes the right of the Israeli people to self-defense and its own commitment to the security of the state of Israel. The Republicans support Israel's plan to remove its settlements from the Gaza area and the West Bank but criticize the building of a security barrier by Israelis in Palestinian territory. The Republicans hold that a return to the armistice lines of 1949 is impossible.
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38 www.johnkerry.com/issues/economy/trade. html
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The Republican Party supports the creation of a peaceful, democratic, lawful Palestinian state with new leadership.\(^{42}\)

The Republican Party supports President George Bush’s Performance Based Roadmap to the Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. The Roadmap, launched in April 2003 and presented to Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and Palestinian Prime Minister Mahomiud Abbas, calls for peace in the Middle Eastern region and the establishment of a Palestinian State. The Roadmap consists of three phases:

- The first phase consists of ending violence between the Israelis and Palestinians, freezing Israeli settlements in the Gaza Strip and West Bank, and reforming Palestinian government.
- The second phase consists of establishing a provisional Palestinian state with temporary borders.
- The third phase consists of negotiating about the permanent borders of the Palestinian state and international recognition of Israel and Palestine.

The Roadmap is not an agreement but only the base for negotiations. It differs from the Oslo Agreements negotiated during the Clinton Administration in that both sides agree at the beginning of the negotiations that establishing a Palestinian state is the main goal of the Roadmap. The European Union, Russia and the United Nations support the Republican Roadmap and will take an active role in the enforcement of the Roadmap proposals.\(^{43}\)

Former United States Democratic President Jimmy Carter has criticized the Republicans for tilting America’s foreign policy in the Middle East peace process toward Israel. But the Democratic Party accentuates its support for Israel, calling the state a security ally of the United States. It is stated in the Democratic Platform, that Israel shares a commitment to democracy and has a right to defend itself against the brutality and terrorism of its neighbors. The Democrats declare that like the Clinton Administration they will work towards achieving peace between Israel and the Palestinians. The Democratic Party supports the creation of a Palestinian state, where the Palestinian refugees would be able to settle. But the new Palestinian state needs to have new, democratic leadership.\(^{44}\)

John Kerry, leader of the Democratic Party, has stated that Israel has a right to defend itself and unlike the Republicans supports the building of a security barrier by Israelis to stop terrorists from entering Israel. Kerry demands that America provides military and political support for the Israelis in their fight against terrorism. The United States must aid Israel in maintaining its military superiority over


\(^{43}\) The Road Map to Peace, July 24, 2003 http://www.cfr.org/background/mideast_roadmap.php

\(^{44}\) 2004 Democratic Party Platform, op. cit., p. 15

\(^{45}\) www.johnkerry.com
its neighbors. John Kerry calls for a strengthening of ties between the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the security departments in Israel. The United States should work toward the strengthening of the economy of Israel and develop trading with the Middle Eastern region by removing trade barriers and ending economic isolation. On the issue of Palestine, John Kerry calls for the removal of Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and a new and willing to cooperate Palestinian leadership. 

In comparing the Republican and Democratic foreign policies on the issue of the Middle Eastern peace process it becomes clear that both parties have a corresponding view of the conflict. Both the Democrats and the Republicans support working towards peace in the Israel-Palestine conflict, the aid and support of Israel and the removal of Yaser Arafat as the leader of Palestine.

THE UNITED NATIONS

In November 1943 in Teheran, Iran American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt proposed to Soviet Premier Josef Stalin the creation of an international organization made up of an assembly of all member states and a 10 member executive committee. In September of 1944 representatives from the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Union and China met to draft the charter of the international organization. A General Assembly of all member states and a Security Council was agreed upon while voting and veto procedures were finalized at the Yalta Conference in 1945. In April–June 1945 representatives from 50 countries met to complete the Charter of the United Nations. The Republican Party endorsed the participation of the United States in the international organization, thanks to which the UN had bipartisan support. Both houses of Congress approved the membership of the United States in the United Nations. 

After the 2002 invasion of Iraq without the consent of the UN Security Council relations between the United States and the Republican Administration of George Bush had been strained. United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan has said that the invasion of Iraq by the United States was illegal and violated the UN Charter.

The Republican Party has dealt with the criticism of going into war by the Bush Administration without UN approval by moving away from the United Nations.

---

46 T. Hooper, D. Brinkley, FDR and the Creation of the U. N., New Haven, 2000, pp. 10–48
47 http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3661134.stm
According to a poll conducted by the German Marshall Fund 69% of Republicans do not think it is essential to secure the approval of the UN before using military force and 62% of Republicans strongly agree that it was justified to bypass the UN when the country’s vital interests were threatened.48

The Republican Party’s moving away from the United Nations is evident in the Republican Platform. The Republicans emphasize the need to cooperate with the United Nations in the building of a democratic and free world but declare that the United Nations cannot lead the United States, veto the decisions of America’s leaders or command American troops. The Republican Party believes that the United States has been playing too vast a role in the share of dues to the United Nations and calls for a fair share and not an excessive payment of dues to the UN. The Republicans propose a reform of the United Nations, which would eliminate the wastefulness, corruption, and fraud that has obscured the institution. Republicans claim that a reform is necessary if the United Nations is to work correctly.49

In a speech given to the General Assembly of the UN on September 21, 2004, Republican leader and U. S. President George Bush hailed the United Nations for its protection of human rights and promotion of progress. President Bush called for U. S.–UN cooperation in the process of bringing peace and democracy to the world but did not outline a specific plan of action. In comparison to the Republican Platform Bush’s speech seems to be pro-UN and stated for the benefit of the international community.

In contrast to the Republican’s moving away from the United Nations, the Democratic Party is moving toward the United Nations. In the poll conducted by the German Marshall Fund, 81% of Democrats replied with a yes to the question of whether it is essential to secure the approval of the United Nations before using military force. Only 18% of Democrats strongly agreed that it was justified to bypass the United Nations when the country’s vital interests were threatened.50 Yet it must be mentioned that during the Clinton Administration, Democrats supported U. S. involvement in Kosovo, even though the attack did not have UN approval.

The Democratic Party declares its willingness to work together with the United Nations. Leader of the Democratic Party, John Kerry, has declared that the United Nations should be treated by the United States as a partner and not an interference in the war on terror and fight against AIDS and poverty. Kerry sees the necessity in regaining the respect of the United Nations, which has been lost because of the
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Republican policy of unilateral action in Iraq. The Democrats call for the reform of the United Nations and a reformation of its capacity.\textsuperscript{51}

On the issue of UN involvement in Iraq, the Democratic Party holds that it would prefer the invasion of Iraq to have the approval of the UN. The Democrats feel that it is necessary for the UN to be involved in the process of rebuilding Iraq and the setting up of a new, democratic government.

In the 2004 presidential election, the relations between the United States and the United Nations are seen differently by the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. The Republican Party hails cooperation with the UN while holding a strong belief about the right of the United States to decide intrinsically on issues of national security and preemptive war. The Democratic Party stresses the need for additional cooperation with the United Nations.

\textbf{EUROPE AND THE EUROPEAN UNION}

After WWII the United States strongly supported the integration of Western Europe. During the cold war era, the unification of Western Europe was necessary to counterbalance the influence of USSR in Eastern Europe. After the fall of USSR and the Eastern Bloc a unified Europe was not a necessity to the United States. In fact, a unified Europe had a somewhat negative impact on the political and economic interests of the United States. A unified Europe is more independent and influential in the international community, more able to function without the help of the United States. The negative effect of European integration on the economic interests of the United States deals with the fact that Europe has become more competitive in international trade, a competitor to the economic post WWII hegemony of the United States. Although the integration of Europe has had a somewhat disadvantageous effect on the United States, the U. S. supports the European Union.\textsuperscript{52}

Republican Party leader George Bush has stated that he supports the further unification of Europe and the further cooperation between the United States and the European Union on issues of security and justice.\textsuperscript{53} The Republican Party emphasizes the help of European countries in the war on terror, invasion of Iraq.
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and declares its commitment to the security of Europe. The Republicans extol the relationship of the United States with the United Kingdom and strive for peace in Northern Ireland. The Republicans support the enlargement of NATO.\textsuperscript{54}

The Democratic Party accuses the Republicans of breaking the traditional alliance with Europe and isolating the United States from its biggest ally. The Democrats plan to reestablish the relationship between the United States and Europe. One of the steps taken toward the revitalization of the relations with Europe will consists of holding a summit with European leaders to discuss terrorism and problems of the Muslim world. The Democrats look for the support of European countries in the occupation and rebuilding of Iraq.\textsuperscript{55}

CONCLUSIONS

Upon examination of the Republican and Democratic foreign policies it becomes evident that the policies share many similarities. Undoubtedly, there are many differences between the two parties – to cite an instance, Republicans favor a more unilateralist approach to foreign policy and are less concerned about European allies while the Democrats accentuate the need for cooperation with international institutions and allies. But the differences are overshadowed by striking similarities. Both the Republicans and the Democrats see the United States as the leader in the worldwide fight against terrorism and the safe keeper of the democratic world. Both parties hold that American troops in Iraq must be stationed until stability is attained and the state of Iraq is no longer a threat to the international community. Both parties call for an end to the dependency on Middle Eastern oil, consider humanitarian intervention to be a necessity used cautiously and selectively, support free trade and foster pro-Israel inclinations.

It must therefore be said that a new consent has evolved in the foreign policies of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. This new consent is a vow to renewed internationalism and has most certainly evolved as a result of the attack on the United States on September 11th, 2003. After the terrorist attack of 2003 both political parties in the United States have sought a way to protect their country and win the ongoing war on terror. Winning the war on terror is only possible through the involvement of the United States in the process of democratization.
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and the bringing of progress and economic stability to tyrannical and underdeveloped states. Consequently, both parties have rejected isolationism, support active participation of the United States in world affairs and have authored very similar political programs.