Allies in crisis : America's choice between security interests and democratic values

DK Nur Asyura Pg Hj Mohd Salleh

2019

DK Nur Asyura Pg Hj Mohd Salleh. (2019). Allies in crisis : America's choice between security interests and democratic values. Doctoral thesis, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/105774>

<https://doi.org/10.32657/10220/48830>

**NANYANG
TECHNOLOGICAL
UNIVERSITY**

**ALLIES IN CRISIS:
AMERICA'S CHOICE BETWEEN
SECURITY INTERESTS AND DEMOCRATIC VALUES**

DK NUR ASYURA PG HJ MOHD SALLEH

**S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Singapore**

Thesis submitted to the Nanyang Technological University in partial
fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

2019

Statement of Originality

I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis is the result of original research, is free of plagiarised materials, and has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

11 February 2019

.....

Date

.....
DK NUR ASYURA PG HJ MOHD SALLEH

Supervisor Declaration Statement

I have reviewed the content and presentation style of this thesis and declare it is free of plagiarism and of sufficient grammatical clarity to be examined. To the best of my knowledge, the research and writing are those of the candidate except as acknowledged in the Author Attribution Statement. I confirm that the investigations were conducted in accord with the ethics policies and integrity standards of Nanyang Technological University and that the research data are presented honestly and without prejudice.

11 February 2019

.....
Date

.....
Asst. Professor Evan Resnick

Authorship Attribution Statement

(A) This thesis **does not** contain any materials from papers published in peer-reviewed journals or from papers accepted at conferences in which I am listed as an author.

20 JUNE 2019

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Asyura Salleh', with a horizontal line underneath the name.

.....
Date

.....
DK NUR ASYURA PG HJ MOHD SALLEH

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisors Dr. Evan Resnick and Dr. Ralf Emmers for their close support and consistent feedback that were crucial in guiding me from the beginning of my research to the final stages of drafting. I am also extremely grateful to Dr. Farish Noor and Dr. Ian Storey for their consistent motivation and strong moral support. My sincere thanks also goes out to many people in RSIS, including Roxane and Yee Ming, whose helpful advice aided me as I navigated my way around the procedures and library resources. I would like to thank my friends and the PhD cohort for their research help and encouragement that sustained the momentum I needed to complete this thesis. I am also highly indebted to my parents, sisters, and husband Naveed Khan, who cheered and supported me all the way. Their undying belief and love fuelled the light I needed in times of struggle.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
2. Chapter 2: The Inductive Approach.....	7
2.1. Introduction.....	7
2.2. Literature Review.....	9
2.2.1. Defining Democracy.....	10
2.2.2. Debates in the Democracy Promotion Literature.....	13
2.3. Research Methodology.....	25
2.4. Conclusion.....	32
3. Chapter 3: Democracy Subversion in Chile, 1970-1973.....	35
3.1. Introduction.....	35
3.2. History.....	36
3.2.1. An American Ally.....	37
3.2.2. Chile's Political Crisis.....	41
3.2.3. America's Policy Response.....	45
3.3. Presidential Intent.....	53
3.4. Influence of Senior Policymakers.....	62
3.4.1. Resistance from the Policy Doves.....	62
3.4.2. The Nixon-Kissinger Partnership.....	68
3.4.3. The Bureaucratic Divide.....	72
3.5. Congressional Pressure.....	75
3.6. Capitalist Influence.....	78
3.7. Public Opinion and the US Media	84
3.8. Conclusion.....	87
4. Chapter 4: Passive Democracy Promotion in South Korea, 1979 - 1980.....	90
4.1. Introduction.....	90
4.2. History.....	91

4.2.1.	An American Ally.....	92
4.2.2.	South Korea's Political Crisis.....	96
4.2.3.	America's Policy Response.....	102
4.3.	Presidential Intent.....	109
4.4.	Influence of Senior Policymakers.....	114
4.4.1.	Avoiding "another Iran".....	115
4.4.2.	Deterring North Korea.....	115
4.4.3.	Clashing Foreign Policy Opinions.....	116
4.4.4.	Influential Individuals.....	119
4.5.	Congressional Pressure.....	122
4.6.	Capitalist Influence.....	126
4.7.	Public Opinion and the US Media.....	129
4.8.	Conclusion.....	131
5.	Chapter 5: Active Democracy Promotion in the Philippines, 1983-1986.....	136
5.1.	Introduction.....	136
5.2.	History.....	138
5.2.1.	An American Ally.....	138
5.2.2.	The Philippines' Political Crisis.....	141
5.2.3.	America's Policy Response.....	146
5.3.	Presidential Intent.....	152
5.4.	Influence of Senior Policymakers.....	160
5.4.1.	Competing Ideologies.....	161
5.4.2.	The Trigger Event.....	168
5.5.	Congressional Pressure.....	171
5.6.	Capitalist Influence.....	175
5.7.	Public Opinion and the US Media.....	181
5.8.	Conclusion.....	185
6.	Chapter 6: Conclusion - Analysing US Policy towards Allies in Crisis.....	190
6.1.	Introduction.....	190
6.2.	Domestic Actors.....	193
6.3.	Role of Ideas.....	197

6.4.	Economic Interests.....	201
6.5.	Centralising Decision-Making.....	204
6.6.	Direct Access to the President.....	207
6.7.	Trigger Events in the Allied State.....	210
6.8.	Media-Public Opinion Nexus.....	212
6.9.	The Passive Democracy Promotion Policy.....	214
6.10.	Future Research Avenues.....	218
6.11.	Conclusion.....	221
<i>Appendix I: Acronyms.....</i>		<i>224</i>
<i>Appendix II: Glossary of Persons.....</i>		<i>225</i>

LIST OF TABLES

1. Strategies that Characterise America's Policy Responses towards States with Democratic Crises.....	17
2. Main Macroeconomic Variables in Chile from 1970 to 1973 (%).....	44
3. Foreign Aid to Chile from US Government Agencies and International Institutions from 1970 to 1974 - Total of loans and grants (in millions of US dollars).....	50
4. Factors surrounding US Democracy Subversion Policy towards Chile, 1970 – 1973.....	87
5. Factors surrounding US Passive Democracy Promotion Policy towards South Korea, 1979 – 1980.....	133
6. Factors surrounding US Active Democracy Promotion Policy towards the Philippines, 1983-1986.....	186
7. Comparison of Factors Influencing US Policy Responses towards Allies in Crisis.....	193

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Spectrum of US Policy Responses towards Allies experiencing Democratic Crises.....16
2. US Investment in Chile's Manufacturing Industry, 1965-1970.....40
3. Imported Crude Oil Nominal Price (US\$/barrel), 1978 – 1980.....110
4. US Unemployment Rate and Inflation Rate (%), 1978 – 1980.....111

ABSTRACT

This study aims to highlight factors that are critical in shaping America's different policy responses towards allies experiencing a democratic crisis. In this crisis, the population of an allied state demonstrates a severe lack of trust in the ally's political leadership. By branching beyond international relations theory and adopting a heavily inductive approach which pursues a structured and focused comparison research method, this study investigates how various factors and domestic actors can influence different foreign policy outcomes in three case studies. These cases are America's democracy subversion, passive democracy promotion, and active democracy promotion policy responses towards Chile, South Korea, and the Philippines respectively. This study contributes to a very important but-understudied area on US foreign policy towards democratic progress in other countries. The research also aims to contribute to policy-relevant knowledge by helping academics and policy specialists better understand America's role in today's shifting liberal democratic order.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

On 25 January 2011, nationwide protests broke out across Egypt as protestors urged the authoritarian Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak to step down. Back in Washington, American policymakers were swept into a dilemma. The removal of Mubarak could impede America's long-standing informal alliance with Egypt, which America relied on to maintain United States (US) influence and stability in the Middle East. The then US President Barack Obama needed to urgently respond to the political crisis in Egypt. Should US policymakers support the pro-democracy protestors or back the Mubarak regime?

When an ally state struggles with a democratic crisis, this thesis shows that US policymakers would choose to respond in three different ways. A democratic crisis can take place when the population of a state demonstrates a severe lack of trust in the state's political institutions and governing policymakers.¹ As the state's legitimacy and institutional strength are weakened by the public's persistent call for a more democratic government, this can endanger the state's capability to fulfil its commitment to its alliance with the United States. Foreign policy history shows that America has responded to an ally in crisis by adopting three different policies: i) subverting democratic change, ii) passively promoting democracy, and iii) actively promoting democratic development.

¹ Jurgen Habermas, *Theory and Practice* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973)

Democracy promotion theorists have suggested that America's final policy response towards allies in crisis can be driven by several factors. Thomas Carothers argues that US policymakers will promote democracy only when it coincides with US security or economic interests and will downgrade democracy promotion to a secondary priority when it does not.² Meanwhile, Jonathan Monten acknowledges the role of ideology by arguing that American Exceptionalism can set a responsibility for US policymakers to promote democracy across the world.³ However, democracy promotion theorists have yet to argue how these factors can result in different policies that range from subverting democratic development to actively promoting democracy. By setting America's responses along a policy spectrum, theorists would be better able to understand how different factors can impact US policy towards allies in crisis.

This research seeks to achieve three major contributions to the fields of US democracy promotion and US foreign policy. First, this thesis illustrates that America's policy response is shaped by both domestic actors and factors present in the US political system and the allied state. Secondly, this thesis explores the passive democracy promotion policy, a policy option that is understudied in the existing literature. Lastly, this thesis highlights that there is not one group of domestic actor that is consistently more influential than the others.

I seek to make these contributions through a highly inductive research approach in which I conduct an observational assessment of the development of three distinct US foreign policies. My research methodology can most closely be

² Thomas Carothers, *Critical Mission: Essays on Democracy Promotion* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2004)

³ Jonathan Monten, "The Roots of the Bush Doctrine: Power, Nationalism, and Democracy Promotion in U.S. Strategy", *International Security* 29, no.4 (Spring, 2005), pp.112-156

associated with Alexander George's earlier formulation of the structured and focused comparison research method which he first began developing in the 1960s during his time at the RAND Corporation.⁴ Under this method, George converted descriptive explanations of historical case outcomes into analytic explanations. By reducing reliance on a single historical analogy, George could better identify prominent factors that had roles in producing different case outcomes. This analytic form of induction also allowed George to open the black boxes of decision-making and study the strategic interactions of US policymakers.⁵ The findings derived from such an inductive assessment would not be confined to a specific theory or school of thought and would not be used to test theoretical models or hypotheses. Similarly, my conclusions are derived inductively by comparing and contrasting how various factors have impacted America's foreign policy responses. By focusing on how the US foreign policymaking process is conducted in reality under the influence of a variety of factors and domestic actors, I aim to build more knowledge on the development of US foreign policy in three distinct case studies.

Another of my research contribution is to highlight America's capability to adopt a passive approach towards democracy promotion. America's passive policy has been explained away by international observers as "general inattention", "failure by neglect" and even "disengagement".⁶ However, the frequency of America's passive policy in foreign policy history indicates that the passive policy outcome could also be an independent foreign policy produced by

⁴ Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2005)

⁵ George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, op. cit.

⁶ Jonas Wolff, "What Role for Democracy Promotion? US Reactions to Contemporary Political Developments in South America", prepared for the 47th Annual ISA Convention: *The North-South Divide and International Studies*, San Diego, California, 22-25 March 2006

the US foreign policymaking process. A passive democracy promotion policy can be characterised by America's clear intent to encourage slow and gradual democratic transition under the authoritarian allied leadership. Under this policy, US policymakers would maintain minimal intervention in the ally's domestic politics and avoid expressing overt support for an immediate democratic transition in the allied state. Therefore, US policymakers would passively promote democracy through privately persuading officials in the allied state and avoiding punitive measures on the allied leadership.

In the case of the popular protests in Egypt, President Obama eventually chose to side with the pro-democracy protestors, but not before his delayed reaction was criticised as "amateurish" and "hesitant, inconsistent, confused and just plain wrong".⁷ As Mubarak violently cracked down on the protestors, the United States first stood by silently. Only three days later did Obama openly urge Mubarak to take "concrete steps" towards delivering democracy to the Egyptian people.⁸ A deeper look into domestic politics in the United States lends some explanation for this US policy shift from passive to active democracy promotion. The strategic importance of Egypt as an American ally convinced President Obama to first favour a passive policy that exercised caution.⁹ However, Obama's preferred policy was resisted by a group of US policymakers whom pressured Obama to abandon support for the Mubarak regime and to call for a quick "orderly transition" to democracy instead.¹⁰ This simple review of America's

⁷ Gabriella Schwarz, "Gingrich says Obama administration 'amateurish' on Egypt", *CNN Politics*, 7 February 2011 and Brian Montopoli, "John Bolton: Egyptian Democracy may be Bad News", *CBS News*, 14 February 2011

⁸ Joby Warrick and Perry Bacon Jr., "Obama urges Egypt to heed protests, pursue reforms", *Washington Post*, 29 January 2011

⁹ Maria do Ceu de Pinho Ferreira Pinto, "Mapping the Obama administration's response to the Arab Spring", *Revista Brasileira de Politica Internacional* 50, no.2 (December 2012), p.109

¹⁰ Stephen Zunes, "Obama's Shift on Egypt", *Huffington Post*, 31 January 2011

policy towards Egypt indicates the influence of key senior US policymakers in shifting America's policy response towards allies in crisis. This also demonstrates that factors such as national security interests or ideology are not always sufficient to comprehensively explain America's final policy response towards countries in democratic turmoil.

Therefore, the current research field on democracy promotion and US foreign policy would benefit from a study that highlighted a range of factors under which the United States would react differently towards allies struggling with a democratic crisis. By systematically comparing historical cases under which America adopted these three distinct policies, I seek to inductively analyse the process of US foreign policymaking in three different cases to uncover key factors that impacted the final policy outcomes. The findings produced in this research may not necessarily be generalised to America's reaction towards other allies in crisis, but are definitely relevant to America's policy towards these three particular cases. The three cases that I will be investigating are: i) the democracy subversion policy towards Chile (1970 - 1973); ii) passive democracy promotion towards South Korea (1979 - 1980); and iii) active democracy promotion in the Philippines (1983 - 1986). Additionally, I investigate factors that are organised around the role of several actors: i) presidential intent; ii) influence of senior foreign policymakers; iii) capitalist influence; iv) congressional pressure; and v) the influence of the American public and the US media. This approach will allow me to analyse the impact of these five factors and highlight other factors that emerge to play a prominent role in shaping America's final policy outcome.

The rest of my dissertation will proceed as follows. Chapter Two reviews the literature on US democracy promotion, discusses the structured and focused comparison research approach, and provides an overview of the three historical case studies. Chapters Three, Four, and Five are each dedicated to the development of US foreign policy towards Chile (1970 - 1973), South Korea (1979 - 1980), and the Philippines (1983 - 1986) respectively. Each of these chapters begin with a brief history of the country's alliance relationship with the United States, followed by an overview of events that led to the democratic crisis. and a description of America's policy response. In the subsequent sections, I inductively study the influence of these five factors on America's foreign policymaking process before summarising my findings at the end of each chapter.

In Chapter Six, I conduct a discussion of my findings of how domestic actors and other factors impacted the development of US foreign policy in each case. Domestic actors such as the US President, US senior policymakers, members of the US Congress, business representatives, the American public and the US media can all exert influence on America's policy response towards allies in crisis. However, their level of influence is also moderated by several factors such as competing ideas, the centralisation of foreign policy decision-making, ease of access to the President, events on the ground, and the dynamics between the US media and public opinion. This chapter studies the impact of these factors in moderating the influence of domestic actors on America's foreign policymaking process. Through this inductive and structured method of policy analysis, this research provides the foundation for future avenues of research and contributes to policy-relevant knowledge that can aid both policy specialists and academics.

CHAPTER TWO

THE INDUCTIVE APPROACH

2.1. Introduction

According to Alexander George, the impact of conditions on foreign policy can be discovered through an analytical exercise that compares policymaking processes in historical cases.¹¹ Similarly, I aim to analyse the factors that influenced the US foreign policymaking process in three different historical case studies. These case studies are selected for their shared political phenomena, which is an American ally experiencing a democratic crisis in the same critical time period. During the 1980s, America was beginning to shift support away from pro-US authoritarian regimes to embrace a foreign policy that better reflected America's identity as a promoter of democratic values worldwide. Yet, the United States also responded differently to these three unstable allies. Through a highly inductive approach, I seek to highlight the factors that were influential in driving these distinct policy outcomes.

In each of the three case studies, an allied state was faced with a political crisis in which the population demanded for more democratic reforms by demonstrating against the government and undermining the government's legitimacy. In Jurgen Habermas' definition of a political crisis, a crisis of trust is created when the government fails to meet these public demands. In most cases, this happens when the ruling leadership fails to manage challenges such as economic dislocation that are most commonly initiated by external factors.¹² This crisis of trust would manifest against political elites, political parties, or

¹¹ Alexander L. George, *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1993)

¹² Habermas, *Theory and Practice*, op. cit.

parliament members and eventually accumulate to form a crisis of democracy. The public's loss of trust in the political leadership can be expressed by a withdrawal of support from the government. Under heavy public pressure, the ruling leader eventually faces the prospect of losing his/her political authority and faces the risk of by being replaced by another leadership.

America's response towards an allied state in such a democratic crisis could have implications on the ally's political direction. For example, America's policy decision to passively promote democracy, as in Egypt in 2011 and South Korea in 1980, could delay the realisation of democratic changes in these allied states.¹³ On the other hand, the active support of democracy in the Philippines in 1986 encouraged an immediate democratic transition in which the authoritarian leadership was pressured to step down. Lastly, America's decision to abandon support for a democratically-elected allied leader such Salvador Allende of Chile could undermine the leader's credibility.

The rest of my chapter will proceed as follows. I begin with a review of the current research on US democracy promotion. The research field can be largely categorised into two sets of discussions, which are: i) the most effective methods and strategies to promote democracy, and ii) various factors that have led America to promote and stifle democracy in other countries. This last set of discussion demonstrates that the literature recognises America's capability to promote and subvert democracy in other countries. However, the research field has yet to study America's ability to adopt a middle ground posture of passively promoting democracy as well. I next look to the foreign policy literature to

¹³ Jackson Diehl, "Jackson Diehl: Is Obama to blame for the Arab Spring's failures?", The Washington Post, 24 June 2012

identify five domestic factors that are most commonly discussed to impact US foreign policy, which I will also choose to focus on in this study. This leads me to the third section on the structured and focused comparison research method, which will complement the inductive approach I use in this study. Under this method, I pose a series of five standardised questions to all three case studies. These questions reflect: i) the president's intended policy, ii) the influence of US senior foreign policymakers, iii) capitalist pressure from business groups and individuals, iv) pressure exerted by members of the US Congress, and v) the influence of the US public opinion and the US media.

By analysing the influence of various domestic political factors on US foreign policy towards allies in crisis, I aim to contribute to the research field on US democracy promotion in three ways. First, by recognising that America is capable of adopting three different policy responses, I argue that future research on US democracy promotion should acknowledge that linkages between and across domestic actors and various other factors that can shape US foreign policy. Secondly, I seek to highlight that passive democracy promotion should not be treated as an anomaly of state behaviour but should rather be studied as an independent US policy in itself. Thirdly, I hope to demonstrate that there is not one group of domestic actors that is consistently more influential than the others in shaping US foreign policy.

2.2. Literature Review

Before discussing the literature on US democracy promotion, it is first important to define democracy. While some theorists argue that the term "democracy" can be defined by electoral mechanisms, others insist that liberal

rights should also be included in the definition of democracy. After reaching a definition on democracy, I outline the democracy promotion strategies that are considered most effective before identifying factors which theorists argue have an impact on America's decision to promote democracy.

2.2.1. Defining Democracy

Scholars continue to remain divided over whether democracy should be defined by a simple electoral procedure or by liberal rights. A procedural definition focuses on ensuring that free and fair elections are in place to allow the people to elect their own government in power. To define democracy, Tony Smith and Francis Fukuyama adopt similar procedural definitions that focus on electoral mechanisms. Smith defines democracy as containing "free elections contested by freely organised parties under universal suffrage for control of the effective centres of government power" while Fukuyama describes democracy as a political system that "grants its people the right to choose their own government through periodic, secret-ballot, multi-party elections, on the basis of universal and equal adult suffrage."¹⁴ Other theorists also follow a procedural definition such as Joseph Schumpeter's definition of democracy as "that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of competitive struggle for the people's vote" and Samuel Huntington's view of democracy as "the selection of leaders through competitive elections by the people they govern."¹⁵ In all these definitions, democracy has been strictly characterised by the presence of electoral

¹⁴ Tony Smith, *America's Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012) and Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and The Last Man* (New York: Avon Books, Inc., 1992)

¹⁵ Joseph Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1943), p.269 and Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991), p.6

competition in which the people participate in to exercise their rights to choose their next country leaders.

However, other scholars insist that this procedural definition of democracy is not sufficient. Steve Smith argues that the definition of democracy should include elements that are culturally and historically sensitive to the local context it is situated within.¹⁶ Philippe Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl have also criticised the procedural definition as being too simplistic because it lacks mechanisms that would ensure the accountability of rulers and other forms of political competition.¹⁷ Schmitter and Karl thus offer a broader definition that characterises democracy as “a variety of competitive processes and channels for the expression of interests and values - associational as well as partisan, functional as well as territorial, collective as well as individual.”¹⁸

Due to these competing definitions of democracy, theorists have developed various classifications of democracy such as “liberal democracy”, “illiberal democracy”, and “capitalist polyarchy”. Fareed Zakaria argues that not all democracies are in the “liberal democracy” form, which he defines as “a political system marked not only by free and fair elections, but also by the rule of law, a separation of powers, and the protection of basic liberties of speech, assembly, religion and property.”¹⁹ Liberal democracy, which promotes civil liberties, should be differentiated from the basic form of democracy which only ensures that

¹⁶ Steve Smith, “US Democracy Promotion: Critical Questions” in Michael Cox, G. John Ikenberry and Takashi Inoguchi (editors) *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies and Impacts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 63-82

¹⁷ Philippe C. Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl, “What Democracy Is...And Is Not”, *Journal of Democracy* 2, no.3 (Summer, 1991), pp.75-88

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Fareed Zakaria, “The Rise of Illiberal Democracy”, *Foreign Affairs* 76, no.6 (November - December, 1997), pp.22-43

people have the political power to elect their leaders. Other forms of democracy include “illiberal democracy”, which violates civil liberties but continues to uphold popular participation in its domestic politics.²⁰ Illiberal democracy is also known as “low-intensity democracy”, which is described as a “half-way house between previous ‘unstable’ representative democratic systems in the Third World and the moribund and the counter-productive military dictatorships...which had often been established and maintained with US support.”²¹ According to Barry Gills and Joel Rocamora, the United States mostly promotes this type of democracy which prioritises an electoral mechanism. This is because a procedural requirement would allow broad popular participation within the state while upholding the anti-reformist traditions of its former authoritarian political system that also serves US interests.^{22,23}

As most of America’s democracy promotion strategies have a focus on building electoral mechanisms, my definition of democracy will also reflect this emphasis on procedures. US foreign policy history shows that the United States preferred a procedural democracy as an appealing alternative to traditional overt authoritarianism. Although some societal repression may continue to exist in these procedural democratic structures, these countries remain susceptible to US pressures as US policymakers are still able to influence the countries’ economic and social reforms.²⁴ During the democratic crises in countries such as the Philippines and Haiti, the United States consistently emphasised the importance

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Barry Gills and Joel Rocamora, “Low Intensity Democracy”, *Third World Quarterly* 13, no.3 (1992), p.504

²² Ibid

²³ William I. Robinson, “Promoting Capitalist Polyarchy: The Case of Latin America” in Michael Cox, G. John Ikenberry and Takashi Inoguchi (editors), *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies and Impacts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp.308-325

²⁴ Gills and Rocamora, “Low Intensity Democracy”, op. cit.

of building electoral mechanisms as a prerequisite to democracy.²⁵ My definition of democracy will thus reflect America's emphasis on electoral mechanisms. In doing so, this study will utilise Tony Smith's definition of democracy as "free elections contested by freely organised parties under universal suffrage for control of the effective centres of government power."²⁶

2.2.2. Debates in the Democracy Promotion Literature

The literature on US democracy promotion can be broadly divided into two major categories. The first set of studies investigates the different strategies of promoting democracy while the second group discusses factors that influence the US decision to promote democracy in other countries.

There is continuing debate on whether democracy is better promoted through a top-down or bottom-up approach. Theorists Larry Diamond and Timm Beichelt argue that democracy promotion should reflect a top-down approach in which external actors such as governments and international institutions work with domestic actors to overcome the authoritarian regime.²⁷ On the other hand, theorists such as Peter Burnell insist that the more effective strategy is a bottom-up approach in which domestic actors are empowered to establish domestic ownership of democracy-promoting initiatives in their own country.²⁸ To Burnell,

²⁵ Gerald M. Boyd, "U.S. urging a "Credible" Philippine Vote", *The New York Times*, 5 November 1985 and Elaine Sciolino, "Reagan and Democrats split on using Pressure on Haiti", *The New York Times*, 20 November 1987

²⁶ Smith, *America's Mission*, op. cit.

²⁷ More specifically, Diamond defines democracy promotion as the act of "offering moral, political, diplomatic and financial support to individuals and organization that are struggling to open up authoritarian regimes" while Beichelt defines democracy promotion as "a set of actions of non-domestic actors who intentionally try to overcome authoritarian power by supporting domestic actors who share the same objective." See Larry Diamond, "Promoting Democracy", *Foreign Policy*, no. 87 (Summer, 1992), p.27 and Timm Beichelt, "The Research Field of Democracy Promotion", *Living Reviews in Democracy* 3 (January, 2012), p.2

²⁸ Peter Burnell, *Promoting Democracy Abroad: Policy and Performance* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2011)

democracy promotion should be a genuine dialogue between international actors and their partners inside the countries to establish domestic ownership of democracy and democracy-promoting initiatives. America's democracy promotion approach would be considered a top-down strategy because the United States plays the role of an external promoter of democracy to other countries.

The debate on effective democracy promotion strategies is further compounded by the argument on whether indirect, direct, positive, or negative strategies are more effective as democracy promotion methods. Both indirect and direct methods aim to cultivate conducive conditions in the targeted state. Indirect strategies seek to develop structural conditions to sustain long-term democracy progress through methods such as fostering class transformation and boosting economic growth.²⁹ Meanwhile, direct strategies focus on short and medium-term solutions through efforts such as empowering voters and providing electoral assistance.³⁰ Another set of strategies are positive and negative mechanisms, which describe the type of inducements used to encourage democracy. Positive democracy promotion strategies provide material or strategic incentives such as conditional promises of membership in a regional organisation or offers of conditional loans to reward democracy progress.³¹ On the other hand, negative strategies rely on coercive measures such as military

²⁹ Steven E. Finkel, Anibal Perez-Linan and Mitchell A. Seligson, "The Effects of U.S. Foreign Assistance on Democracy Building, 1990-2003", *World Politics* 59, no. 3 (2007), pp. 404-440; and Amichai Magen, Thomas Risse and Michael A. McFaul (editors), *Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law: American and European Strategies* (Basingstoke, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Magen, Risse and McFaul, *Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law*, op. cit; Peter Burnell, "Democracy Promotion: The Elusive Quest for Grand Strategies", *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft* 204, no.3 (2004), pp.1001-1011; and Stephen D. Collins, "Can America Finance Freedom? Assessing US Democracy Promotion via Economic Statecraft", *Foreign Policy Analysis* 5, no.4 (2009), pp.367-389

interventions and economic sanctions to coerce the regime to adopt democratic practices. While some democracy promotion theorists have denounced negative strategies because of the harsh nature of these methods, coercion remains a part of US democracy promotion strategy.³² The United States has employed the use of force as a form of democracy promotion in other countries such as in Iraq in 2003.³³

The degree to which US policymakers adopt indirect, direct, positive, and negative methods to promote democracy in an unstable ally can indicate the type of policy response employed by the United States. By framing US policy in these terms, I define democracy promotion as *a set of indirect, direct, positive, and negative methods pursued by US policymakers to actively initiate the immediate transition of a political system towards a more democratic direction.*

On the other hand, subverting democratic change can be defined as *a set of indirect, direct, positive, and negative methods pursued by US policymakers to restrain democratic development in a political system.*

The third policy response, passive democracy promotion, can be defined as *a set of indirect, direct, positive, and negative methods pursued by US policymakers to support the slow and gradual transition of a political system towards a more democratic*

³² Burnell, *Promoting Democracy Abroad*, op. cit.

³³ Other coercive tools can include economic sanctions, covert intervention, paramilitary intervention, and military intervention. See Peter J. Schraeder, "The State of the Art in International Democracy Promotion: Results of a Joint European-North American Research Network", *Democratization* 10, no.2 (2003), pp. 21-44; Laurence Whitehead, "Losing 'the Force'? The 'Dark Side' of democratisation after Iraq", *Democratization* 16, no.2 (2009), pp.215-242; Francis Fukuyama and Michael McFaul, "Should democracy promotion be promoted or demoted?", *The Washington Quarterly* 31, no.1 (Winter, 2008), pp.23-45; and Mark Palmer, *Breaking the Real Axis of Evil: How to Oust the World's Last Dictators by 2025* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003)

direction. These three policies can be arranged along a policy spectrum, as depicted in Figure 1 below:

Figure 1.
Spectrum of US Policy Responses towards Allies experiencing Democratic Crises

When the United States stifles democratic change in the allied state, this can be recognised as a democracy subversion policy. On the other end of the spectrum, an active democracy promotion policy would indicate strong support for democratic change. Between the two policies is the passive democracy promotion policy, in which America would encourage a slow and gradual transition to democracy. To implement these policies, theorists have suggested several methods that can be categorised into assistance, diplomatic methods, socialisation strategies, and coercive strategies. Table 1 is a classification of the various strategies that can describe America's democracy subversion, passive democracy promotion, and active democracy promotion policies.

**Table 1. Strategies that Characterise America's Policy Responses
towards Democratic Crises**

Type of Strategy	Democracy Subversion	Passive Democracy Promotion	Active Democracy Promotion
Assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US retracts economic and social aid that has been designated for democracy progress in the state US refuses to extend development loans to fund projects that supported democracy prerequisites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US maintains the consistent disbursement of economic and social assistance to the state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US increases grant-aid support for democracy projects in the state US offers more projects and programmes to build preconditions for democracy in the state
Diplomacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US policymakers avoid persuading state officials to adopt democracy US does not impose any conditionalities to encourage democracy US retracts offers of trade and foreign investment from the democratic ally US refrains from supporting the democratic state in international organisations US encourages other external actors to isolate the democratic state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US does not impose any conditionalities to encourage democracy US avoids supporting the country's membership in international organisations US policymakers privately persuade political elites in the state to adopt democratic reforms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US policymakers actively encourage country officials to develop democratic institutions US provides overt or implied conditionalities to encourage democracy US offers trade and foreign investment to support economic growth and a capitalist market US offers the state membership in an international organization as an incentive to adopt democratic reforms
Socialisation Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US only supports a single party in the state and discourages voter support for other parties US refrains from using mass media to diffuse democracy norms in the state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US refrains from using mass media to diffuse democracy norms in the state US policymakers refrain from building civil society in the state US policymakers limit interaction with civil society to diffuse democracy habits, norms, and values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US policymakers actively diffuse democracy habits, norms, and values in the society US policymakers encourage civil society activities to improve the country's climate for multiparty political opposition US policymakers persuade the government to implement a regulatory framework for collective action to encourage civil participation
Coercive Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US imposes economic sanctions against the democratically-elected state US conducts covert, paramilitary, or military intervention aimed towards removing the democratically-elected government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US does not implement economic sanctions or covert, paramilitary, and military intervention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US imposes conditional economic sanctions to coerce leaders to adopt democratic reforms US conducts covert, paramilitary, or military intervention to remove or undermine the authoritarian ruling government

The second group of studies in the literature discusses various factors that could influence the US decision to promote democracy abroad. The major factors discussed are national security interests, ideas, bipartisan congressional support, bureaucratic resistance, public opinion and the media's perception, and the influence of private business groups on US policy.

Many US democracy promotion scholars begin their discussion with an analysis of the impact of national security interests on US foreign policy. During high levels of threat to national security interests, theorists argue that the United States would pursue democracy promotion in an allied state, especially if democracy promotion would also allow America to address its national security concerns. In a comprehensive study, John Owen discovered that when America perceives the need to expand its relative power, it will do so by actively imposing democracy on smaller states that are of strategic importance and are also undergoing domestic instability.³⁴ By imposing on weaker states with institutions that are easily amenable to American ideas, Owen argues that the United States can easily bring these states under US influence.³⁵ Thomas Carothers supports this argument when he forwards the semi-realism concept. Under this concept, America would likely forego democracy promotion if it threatens US economic and security interests.³⁶ Similarly, Carothers argues that the United States would only promote democracy if it can meet US interests.

The policy decisions of past US Presidents demonstrate the relevance of this argument. After the 9/11 attack heightened threat levels, former President

³⁴ John M. Owen IV, "The Foreign Imposition of Domestic Institutions", *International Organization* 56, no.2 (Spring, 2002), pp.375-409

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Carothers, *Critical Mission*, op. cit.

George W Bush elevated democracy promotion as a major US foreign policy agenda in the Middle East.³⁷ Bush's active democracy promotion approach is an example of the dual-track policy that aimed to address national security concerns while encouraging elections in other countries. Conversely, the events surrounding the resignation of Tunisia's autocratic leader Zine el Abidine bin Ali drove President Obama to respond by ceasing to encourage democratisation in Tunisia for fear that further political liberalisation could generate instability in the Middle East.³⁸

In addition to national security interests, the literature on US democracy promotion contains studies that focus on the impact of domestic political factors on America's policy response towards democracy in other countries.

A major factor that may influence America's decision to promote democracy is the role of ideas. Democracy promotion scholars such as Jonathan Monten have argued that nationalistic domestic ideology such as American Exceptionalism could encourage the United States to employ active and forcible democracy promotion strategies.³⁹ The idea of American Exceptionalism can be traced back to as early as 1630 when John Winthrop's description of America as a "city upon a hill" granted the United States with the responsibility to set an example for the rest of the world to follow.⁴⁰ Alexis de Tocqueville also observed America's exceptional nature when he highlighted how America is inherently distinct from

³⁷ Fukuyama and McFaul, "Should democracy promotion be promoted or demoted?", op. cit.

³⁸ Brieg Tomos Powel, "The Stability Syndrome: US and EU democracy promotion in Tunisia", *The Journal of North African Studies* 14, no.1 (March, 2009), pp.57-73

³⁹ Monten, "The Roots of the Bush Doctrine", op. cit.

⁴⁰ Uri Friedman, "'American Exceptionalism': A Short History", *Foreign Policy*, 18 June 2012, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2012/06/18/american-exceptionalism-a-short-history/> (accessed 24 June 2017)

the rest of the world:

The position of the Americans is therefore quite exceptional, and it may be believed that no democratic people will ever be placed in a similar one. Their strictly Puritanical origin, their exclusively commercial habits, even the country they inhabit, which seems to divert their minds from the pursuit of science, literature, and the arts, the proximity of Europe, which allows them to neglect these pursuits without relapsing into barbarism, a thousand special causes, of which I have only been able to point out the most important, have singularly concurred to fix the mind of the American upon purely practical objects.⁴¹

Tocqueville's description helped to transform the idea of American Exceptionalism into an element of American political identity and national purpose. Under the idea of American Exceptionalism, the United States is seen as a democratic example for other states to follow which lends US policymakers a "sacred mission" and moral obligation to promote democracy abroad."⁴² This missionary branch of American Exceptionalism was advocated by US Presidents such as Woodrow Wilson, whom justified that force should be used to elevate the human race. Wilson insisted that the United States no longer sought to expand territory as a conquest, but rather aimed to serve humanity as "it is not pretension on our part to say that we are privileged to stand for what every nation would wish to stand for, and speak for those things which all humanity must desire."⁴³

This belief is echoed in ideas such as neoconservatism which actively championed issues such as democracy and human rights. Former President Bill Clinton's first term was also characterised by numerous democracy promotion discourses that were largely informed by neoconservative ideas such as the

⁴¹ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America and Two Essays on America*, trans. Gerald E. Bevan, (London: Penguin Books, 2003)

⁴² Smith, *America's Mission*, op. cit.; Monten, "The Roots of the Bush Doctrine", op.cit.; and Michael Kammen, "The Problem of American Exceptionalism: A Reconsideration", *American Quarterly* 45, no.1 (March 1993), pp.1-43

⁴³ Woodrow Wilson, *Address at the Luncheon Tendered to the President by the Mayor's Committee in New York City*, 17 May 1915, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=117709>, (accessed 12 August 2017)

“democratic enlargement” doctrine.⁴⁴ Under this doctrine, there was an emphasis to abandon Cold War containment and focus towards expanding market democracies in the world.

However, ideas can also hamper democracy promotion efforts. The Kirkpatrick Doctrine, which justified that maintaining relationships with authoritarian but pro-American regimes were crucial to tackling the spread of communism, played a significant role in driving America to depart from its active democracy promotion posture.⁴⁵ At the start of the democratisation processes in the Philippines and South Korea, US Presidents Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter were influenced by the Kirkpatrick Doctrine which argued that a non-democratic ally could be favourable to US security interests.⁴⁶

However, there is also the argument that the influence of ideas can be moderated by national security priorities. Mark J. McClelland argues that the decline in bipolarity after the end of the Cold War granted America an unrivalled status in the international system. This allowed President Clinton to enforce a wide range of foreign policy driven by ideas, such as democracy promotion.⁴⁷ Additionally, Nicolas Bouchet argues that the threat posed to US national security interests during the Obama administration restrained President Obama from promoting democracy worldwide.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Mark J. McClelland, "Exporting virtue: neoconservatism, democracy promotion and the end of history", *The International Journal of Human Rights* 15, no.4 (2011), pp.520-532

⁴⁵ Jeane Kirkpatrick, "Dictatorships and Double Standards", *Commentary Magazine* 68, no.5 (November 1979), pp.34-45

⁴⁶ David Adesnik and Michael McFaul, "Engaging Autocratic Allies to Promote Democracy", *The Washington Quarterly* 29, no.2 (Spring 2006), pp.7-26

⁴⁷ McClelland, "Exporting virtue", op. cit.

⁴⁸ Nicolas Bouchet, "The democracy tradition in US foreign policy and the Obama presidency", *International Affairs* 89, no.1 (2013), pp.31-51

The literature also discusses how domestic actors in the United States can impact US foreign policy. Members in the US Congress can play an important role in shaping America's foreign policy behaviour by controlling budget appropriations. David Adesnik and Michael McFaul recognised the importance of congressional bipartisan support. They argued that the alliance formed between Liberal Democrats in the US Congress and US Senate added to the domestic pressure that eventually convinced US policymakers to remove support from Augusto Pinochet's dictatorship in Chile.⁴⁹

Another factor that could impede foreign policy development is bureaucratic resistance. This resistance can come in the form of policymakers that have competing ideas or US officials that are reluctant to implement policies. Sergio Fabbrini and Amr Youssef believe that the internally divided US political elite and competing views may have contributed to President Obama's inconsistent democracy promotion record in Egypt.⁵⁰ The reluctance of officials to translate policy into outcome could thus affect the implementation of US policy. Additionally, Eric Patterson observed how American officials in foreign embassies refrained from encouraging democratic reforms in their assigned countries as they feared that President Obama's rhetoric on democracy promotion would disrupt their relationship with the Ambassadors.⁵¹ This demonstrates that the President's preferred policy may not necessarily translate into the same policy outcome if met with resistance from officials in the foreign policy bureaucracy.

⁴⁹ Adesnik and McFaul, "Engaging Autocratic Allies to Promote Democracy", op. cit.

⁵⁰ Sergio Fabbrini and Amr Youssef, "Obama's wavering: US foreign policy on the Egyptian crisis, 2011-13", *Contemporary Arab Affairs* 8, no.1 (2015), pp.65-80

⁵¹ Eric Patterson, "Obama and Sustainable Democracy Promotion", *International Studies Perspective* 13, no.1 (February 2012), pp.26-42

Other studies have recognised the role of the American public opinion in shaping America's policy. As domestic support is critical for the US President to secure his political survival and remain in office, it is argued that it would not be in the President's best interest to implement a policy that would run counter to national public opinion, strengthen the domestic opposition, and jeopardise the presidency.⁵² However, according to Ole Holsti, the American people does not always favour democracy promotion as a high foreign policy priority.⁵³ In the aftermath of President Clinton's failed humanitarian intervention in Somalia which resulted in the 1993 Battle of Mogadishu, the American people demonstrated strong ambivalence against US-led democracy promotion strategies..⁵⁴ A negative public opinion can therefore impose high political costs on US policymakers and deter America from encouraging democratic reforms in other countries.⁵⁵ Similarly, a positive public opinion and strong domestic support for democracy promotion can encourage the President to promote democracy abroad.

Private business individuals or groups can also shape US foreign policy. The role of capitalist groups was first advanced by William Robinson, whom argued that democracy promotion is driven by transnational financial elites that also

⁵² James D. Morrow, "Arms versus Allies: Trade-offs in the Search for Security", *International Organization* 47, no.2 (Spring 1993), pp.207-233

⁵³ Ole R. Holsti, "Promotion of Democracy as a Popular Demand?" in Michael Cox, G. John Ikenberry and Takashi Inoguchi (editors), *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies and Impacts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp.308-325; and Fukuyama and McFaul, "Should democracy promotion be promoted or demoted?", op. cit.

⁵⁴ Steven W. Hook, "Inconsistent U.S. Efforts to Promote Democracy Abroad", in Peter J. Schraeder (ed.) *Exporting Democracy: Rhetoric vs. Reality* (Boulder, Colorado and Covent Garden, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002), pp.109-128

⁵⁵ Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and George W. Downs, "Intervention and Democracy", *International Organization* 60, no.3 (2006), pp.627-649

have the backing of military and political intervention from the United States.⁵⁶ These capitalist groups are highly influential because the structure of America's economy promotes free market capitalism, reduces state control, and encourages private enterprise. The free market system thus protects the interests of capitalist groups by ensuring the unfettered flow of capital across state borders and allowing private business firms to seek profit in economic opportunities in other countries. Therefore, when increased state control in another country threatens to undermine the overseas investments of businesses, the argument is that business firms could influence US policy towards these countries with outcomes that can sometimes be detrimental to democratic development. Khawaja Alqama and Rafida Nawaz echo Robinson's argument when they demonstrate that America's democracy promotion efforts towards Pakistan were driven by the interests of a global capitalist class which encouraged a political system that protected the interests of Pakistan's propertied class but was at the expense of democracy.⁵⁷

The literature on democracy promotion has identified various factors that can influence America's decision to promote democracy in other countries. These factors can include national security interests, the role of ideas, and the role of domestic political actors. However, there are two major gaps that need to be addressed in the democracy promotion literature. First, the democracy promotion literature has yet to study a range of other factors such as the presidential intent, the influence of key senior policymakers, and the impact of the American media's portrayal of democratic development in other countries.

⁵⁶ William I. Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalisation, US Intervention, and Hegemony* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

⁵⁷ Khawaja Alqama and Rafida Nawaz, "US Role in Bending Democracy during Cold War: A Case Study of Pakistan", *South Asian Studies* 25, no.1 (2010), pp.7-20

Secondly, most research on democracy promotion have focused only on America's promotion or suppression of democratic development in other states. There has yet to be a body of studies that makes the distinction between active and passive democracy promotion policies. For this reason, the literature would benefit from a study on America's passive promotion of democracy as an independent foreign policy. This research will be able to address both gaps by conducting a comprehensive overview of various factors surrounding the implementation of these three different US policy responses towards allies in crisis.

2.3. Research Methodology

First developed by Alexander George in the 1960s in response to the lack of available case study methodology, the structured and focused comparison research method provides researchers with an instrument to observe the impact of a series of factors on a specific phenomenon. George's research method is appreciated for its clear-cut steps, efficiency, and ability to transform historical narratives into analytical explanations. By using the same method, I conduct a policy analysis of the influence of five different factors on America's policy response towards allies faced with a democratic crisis. This section explains my application of the structured and focused comparison research method, introduces my three case studies, and articulates the five factors that I will be observing.⁵⁸

The three case studies that I will be investigating reflect America's different policy responses towards allies struggling with a democratic crisis. According to

⁵⁸ George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, op. cit.

Habermas, a crisis can be observed when the public demonstrates a severe lack of trust in the ally's political leadership, administration, and policymakers.⁵⁹ This crisis of trust can be initiated by external factors such as global economic patterns that soon evolve into a political crisis when the leadership fails to handle the rising economic challenges within the country. Disappointed in the leadership's failure, the public would withdraw their support from the political leadership. As citizens make demands for a more democratic political structure, the state system can become over-burdened with the demands and soon descend into ungovernability. Michel Crozier, Samuel Huntington, and Joji Watanuki have all recognised that an overload on decision-making systems can eventually produce a crisis of the state in which the leadership would eventually lose its political authority.⁶⁰

The three cases that I have selected share these elements of a democratic crisis. In each case, the ruling government is unable to meet public demands and thus risk descending into ungovernability as the public increasingly signal their severe lack of trust in the political leadership through popular demonstrations. In each case, America responded to the democratic crisis, but in three different ways. These three policy responses were: i) democracy subversion; where America obstructed the democratic election and leadership of Salvador Allende in Chile from 1970 to 1973; ii) passive democracy promotion; where America refrained from openly supporting pro-democracy public demonstrations and adopted a silent stand towards the suppression of the Kwangju Uprising in South Korea from 1979 to 1980, and iii) active democracy promotion; where although

⁵⁹ Habermas, *Theory and Practice*, op. cit.

⁶⁰ Michel J. Crozier, Samuel Huntington and Joji Watanuki, *The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*, (New York: New York University Press, 1975)

America first backed the authoritarian Filipino President Ferdinand Marcos, US foreign policy eventually shifted towards actively supporting the pro-democracy movement in the Philippines from 1983 to 1986.

In the first case study, the United States played a role in indirectly obstructing the election and leadership of Salvador Allende's government in Chile. The contentious election of Allende in 1970 had sparked concern amongst US policymakers and capitalist groups that Allende's socialist policies could result in the nationalisation of most of Chile's natural resource industries, drive Chile out of the capitalist sphere, and eventually undermine US regional influence in Latin America. Consequently, in a covert plan advocated by US President Richard Nixon, America attempted to obstruct Allende's election on 4 September 1970. When US strategies to hinder Allende's election failed, America continued to undermine Allende's leadership. Nixon supported strategies that cultivated public distrust in the Allende government which induced the Chilean people to protest against the Allende government, especially after Allende's failed economic policies in 1971. In September 1973, Allende was eventually removed in a military coup and was replaced by General Augusto Pinochet, a pro-US leader who retained a strong authoritarian grip over Chile for the next 16 years.

In the second case study, the United States maintained a passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea by refraining from an overt policy response towards the country's democratic crisis. In December 1979, a few weeks after the death of South Korean authoritarian leader Park Chung Hee, South Korea's political stability was rocked by a military coup orchestrated by General

Chun Doo Hwan. Back in Washington, US policymakers recognised that this unconstitutional seizure of power could incite South Korean citizens to reject General Chun's military leadership. As predicted, the South Korean public demanded for equal political representation and a more democratic political system. General Chun retaliated by consolidating his political authority through promoting himself as Director of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA), imposing martial law, and cracking down on opposition parties. In May 1980, the Kwangju Democracy Movement became the pinnacle of the democratisation movement in South Korea, as thousands of residents from the town of Kwangju protested against the Chun government. However, throughout the political crisis, US President Jimmy Carter established a distance from South Korea's domestic politics by remaining on the side-lines. US policymakers limited democracy promotion efforts to largely privately urging South Korean officials to consider democratic reform.

My last case study demonstrates how President Ronald Reagan first supported Ferdinand Marcos' authoritarian government but shifted towards an active democracy promotion policy by agreeing to support the demands of the pro-democracy movement in the Philippines instead. The sudden assassination of Filipino opposition leader Benigno Aquino sparked the democratisation process that eventually led to the February 1986 People Power Revolution which removed the Marcos government. As the economic and political situation in the Philippines gradually deteriorated, Filipino citizens grew resistant to the authoritarian Marcos leadership. In November 1985, Marcos confidently announced snap elections, hoping to strengthen his political authority. However, the elections were marred with claims of fraud being conducted by Marcos' party.

At this critical juncture, US policymakers were concerned that the outcome of the snap elections could shape the political direction of the Philippines. Although the United States had sustained long-standing support for the Marcos government for nearly 20 years, President Reagan eventually shifted this policy by joining the Filipino citizens in their call for Marcos to resign.

By using Alexander George's structured and focused comparison research method, I observe how the US foreign policymaking process produced three different policy responses towards three cases of democratic crises. Through George's research method, I aim to compare this phenomena in more than one case study by applying a structured framework of investigative questions. Researchers using this method are required to ask "a set of standardised, general questions of each case...These questions must be carefully developed to reflect the research objective and theoretical focus of the inquiry. The use of a set of general questions is necessary to ensure the acquisition of comparable data in comparative studies", that can then be used to derive patterns across the cases.⁶¹ By posing a set of five questions that analyse different factors in each of my case study, I inductively study how these factors may have contributed to different policy outcomes. I begin by assessing if and how each of these factors influenced the foreign policy decision-making process. I then conduct a cross-examination of all three case studies in the concluding chapter. The inductive method allows me to gauge the relative influence of each factor by relying on observations that are not based on theoretical arguments. This approach will also allow me to uncover other factors that may emerge beyond these five categories. To collect data, I rely largely on primary archived resources such as congressional papers

⁶¹ George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, op. cit.

and diplomatic cables found in the Foreign Relations of the United States series, and on secondary literature such as biographies, newspaper articles, and historical accounts

I have characterised the five factors in terms of the differing roles of actors that can impact the US foreign policymaking process: i) presidential intent, ii) influence of senior foreign policymakers, iii) capitalist pressure from business groups and individuals, iv) pressure from members of the US Congress, and v) the influence of the American public opinion and the US media..

To each case study, I pose five questions catered to these five factors:

1. Presidential Intent. What was the President's intended policy response?
What factors drove the President to support this policy?
2. Influence of Senior Policymakers. Did US policymakers with direct access to the President exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?
3. Congressional Pressure. Did members of the US Congress exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?
4. Capitalist Influence. Did private business groups or individuals exert influence on the US foreign policymaking process to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?
5. Public Opinion and US Media. Did the American public or the US media exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?

To identify the President's intended policy, I rely on several sources. The President's articulations and accounts by foreign diplomats and policymakers

can shed some light the President's preferred policy towards the ally's democratic turmoil.⁶² The President's decision may also be driven by ideas such as anti-Communism and concerns that the political upheaval in the allied state may contribute to regional instability and undermine US strategic and economic interests in a spillover effect, or the preference to preserve a personal relationship shared with the non-democratic allied leader. In other cases, the President's intended policy may also be absent because the democratic crisis was not considered enough of a strategic priority for America to respond to.

The remaining questions will then assess if various domestic political actors were able to influence America's foreign policymaking process by either facilitating or obstructing the President's intended policy. Key senior US policymakers would seek to influence the President's decision through mechanisms such as coalition building, direct persuasion, and gathering support from the American public and congressional members. Members of the US Congress also have their own methods of influencing the President's policy through legislative actions, congressional inquiries, amending budget requests, publicly expressing congressional opinion, and by conducting congressional visits to the allied country. Private business groups and individuals with high level of investments in the allied country could influence the final policy outcome through frequent meetings with the President and key policymakers and restricting foreign investment. Lastly, the American public and the US media's portrayal of the democratic crisis can also impact the level of domestic support for the President's intended policy. The public opinion can be gauged by

⁶² Raymond Cohen, "Threat Perception in International Crises", *Political Science Quarterly* 93, no.1 (Spring, 1978), pp.93-107

observing the activities of public interest groups, opinion polls, and public perspectives published in newspapers and magazine articles.

2.4. Conclusion

Foreign policy history demonstrates that America does not always actively promote democracy in allies that encounter a democratic crisis. In fact, the United States is also capable of passively promoting democracy and restraining democratic developments in its allies. The literature on democracy promotion have identified a few factors that could explain America's decision to promote or obstruct democracy in other countries. However, there has yet to be a comparative analysis of the various influence of these factors. Additionally, the literature has yet to recognise that the passive promotion of democracy should be treated as an independent foreign policy. This chapter reviewed the current literature on US democracy promotion and introduced the research methods that would be used to conduct my policy analysis.

To better understand America's varying policies towards allies in crisis, it is first important to establish a definition of democracy. While some theorists argue that it is sufficient to define democracy by election procedures, other theorists insist that the definition should be expanded to include other elements such as liberal rights. These different definitions have produced various classifications of democracy, including the procedural form that America frequently promotes in other countries.⁶³ To reflect America's preference to encourage electoral mechanisms, this study also uses the procedural definition to define democracy as "free elections contested by freely organised parties under universal suffrage

⁶³ Gills and Rocamora, "Low Intensity Democracy", op. cit.

for control of the effective centres of government power".⁶⁴

The literature on US democracy promotion, while broad, does not comprise enough research on America's three policy responses. There are currently two groups of discussion in the literature. The first category discusses the most efficient way to promote democracy, which has produced a classification of various methods and strategies. The second discussion addresses various factors that can influence the US policymakers' decision to promote democracy. The various factors that have been discussed in the literature include national security interests, ideas, congressional support, bureaucratic resistance, public opinion, and the influence of private business groups. However, most of these factors are studied in isolation from one another. There has yet to be a comprehensive study that investigates how these factors interact with one another to impact the US foreign policymaking process. Additionally, other factors such as presidential intent and the influence of key senior policymakers should be studied in greater detail.

The methodology section introduces the three case studies that this research exclusively focuses on. Each case study illustrates America's different policy responses towards allies experiencing democratic turmoil. These cases are: i) America's decision to subvert democracy in Chile in 1970, ii) America's passive democracy promotion towards South Korea from 1979 to 1980, and iii) America's active support for democracy in the Philippines in 1986. To observe how five different factors impacted the US foreign policymaking process in each of these case studies, I adopt an inductive structured and focused comparison research

⁶⁴ Smith, *America's Mission*, op. cit.

method. The research findings will be able to expand the body of knowledge on US foreign policy towards democratic crises in allied states. While the influential factors are exclusive to these three case studies and may not be generalised to other cases, these findings still provide a good indication of when the United States may adopt these policy responses.

The next three chapters comprise a policy analysis of how these five factors can shape America's different policy responses towards these three allies in crisis. The next chapter analyses the dynamics that took place behind President Nixon's decision to subvert Allende's leadership in Chile. This will be followed by two other chapters that focus on America's passive democracy promotion towards South Korea and the active democracy promotion policy towards the Philippines respectively.

CHAPTER THREE

DEMOCRACY SUBVERSION IN CHILE, 1970-1973

3.1. Introduction

On 11 September 1973, Salvador Allende, Chile's democratically-elected President, was overthrown in a military coup. Cornered in the La Moneda Presidential Palace in Santiago, Allende made his last radio broadcast to the Chilean people in which he blamed external powers, particularly the United States, for undermining his government for strategic and economic reasons.

In this defining moment, the last in which I can address you, I want you [the people of Chile] to learn the lesson: foreign capital and imperialism, united with the reaction, created the climate for the armed forces to break their tradition...in order to continue defending their profits and their privileges.⁶⁵

This chapter investigates domestic factors that drove President Nixon to adopt a democracy subversion policy towards the Allende government from 1970 to 1973. I begin by briefly outlining the close bilateral relationship between the United States and Chile which weakened after the resignation of Chile's former President Eduardo Frei in 1970. The United States responded to the change in Chile's political leadership with a subversive "cold but correct" policy that diplomatically isolated the incoming President Salvador Allende, spread propaganda, imposed economic pressure, and coordinated covert action which fostered a coup climate in Chile.

In this policy analysis, I first identify the policy that Nixon intended to adopt

⁶⁵ Prior to Allende's overthrow, Chile's armed forces was known for its traditional role as the "protector" and defender of Chile's constitution. Therefore, it was beyond the traditional scope of the Chilean armed forces to conduct a military coup that uprooted Allende's administration. This explains why the military coup in Chile caught the Chilean society and international observers by surprise. See Victor Figueroa Clark, *Salvador Allende: Revolutionary Democrat* (London: Pluto Press, 2013)

against Chile. I then investigate the pressures exerted by senior policymakers, members of the US Congress, private business entities, and the American public opinion. To identify presidential intent, I observe the impact of ideas such as the Nixon Doctrine on Nixon's posture towards the democratic crisis in Chile and the administration's assessment of threats in Latin America. In assessing the influence of domestic actors, I investigate how various domestic actors such as the National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger and US-owned multinational corporations such as Ancaonda supported Nixon's intended policy. I also analyse why other groups of domestic actors such as members of the US Congress and the American public were less influential in shaping America's policy response.

By analysing these five factors in a structured and focused comparison method, I demonstrate that the US democracy subversion policy towards Chile was an outcome of interactions between domestic actors in the United States. I also discover that while some domestic actors were more influential in driving US foreign policy, other actors were more restrained because of factors in the US political system and in the allied state.

3.2. History

America's alliance relationship with Chile began in 1947 as a mutual security framework to repel external powers from entering America's sphere of influence in Latin America. The bilateral relationship continued steadily until 1970, when Allende began to run as Chile's next President. This drove President Nixon and National Security Advisor Kissinger to respond with a policy that undermined Allende's leadership. In this section, I trace the history behind America's alliance with Chile, outline the political crisis that afflicted Chile, and detail the strategies

that characterised America's democracy subversion policy towards the Allende administration.

3.2.1. An American Ally

In 1947, Chile entered into the Rio Treaty which transformed Chile into a security ally partner of the United States and paved the way for increased US economic, military, and development assistance towards Chile.⁶⁶ However, with greater US assistance came stronger US ideological influence and intervention in Chile's domestic politics.

After the Rio Treaty, America continued to strengthen its relationship with Chile through several bilateral treaties. The Rio Treaty was first initiated by US President Harry Truman who hoped to retain Latin America under the US sphere of influence while European colonies around the world were collapsing.⁶⁷ The Rio Treaty thus pledged to provide collective defence to the Americas through mutual security assistance that would also retain US influence in Latin America.⁶⁸ Other bilateral and multilateral agreements quickly followed suit. In 1951, Chile entered into a Mutual Security Act which extended US military assistance to Chile and permitted Chile's military to participate in US-led training programmes.⁶⁹ From 1948 to 1951 alone, Chile received a total of US\$253.6 million

⁶⁶ The Rio Treaty is also known as the Inter-American Treaty of Mutual Assistance.

⁶⁷ Two years after the beginning of the Cold War, US President Harry Truman realised that the collapse of European empires around the world could destabilise the US-Soviet balance and threaten strategically important regions. To retain stability in the Latin American countries, Truman tried to maintain stability in the Western Hemisphere by establishing the Rio Treaty. See Carole K. Fink, *Cold War: An International History* (Boulder: Westview Press, 2014)

⁶⁸ The Organization of American States, "Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance", *The Organization of American States*, <http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/treaties/b-29.html>, (accessed 11 March 2017)

⁶⁹ Paul E. Sigmund, *The United States and Democracy in Chile* (London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993)

in economic assistance from the United States.⁷⁰

America further strengthened its alliance in 1961 by inviting Chile to join the Alliance for Progress framework. This framework, which was initiated by the US President John F. Kennedy, was driven by the belief that the United States could encourage democratic development in Latin America by helping to strengthen the democratic civic institutions of Latin American countries.⁷¹ With its strong democratic tradition, Chile soon developed into an exemplary model and a high priority for the Alliance for Progress.⁷²

Through this method of democracy promotion, the United States strengthened its alliance relationship with Chile to help repel the expanding Communist influence in Latin America. When the newly-installed Cuban revolutionary leader Fidel Castro turned to the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev for economic assistance, America feared that the Soviet Union (USSR) would seize the opportunity to challenge US dominance in Latin America.⁷³ To counter Castro's Communist ideology, US policymakers focused on encouraging democratic institutions in Chile. In 1964, the United States decided to intervene in Chile's presidential election by ensuring that the centrist candidate Eduardo Frei was elected as Chile's next President. The United States also refrained from

⁷⁰ Philip O'Brien, *Allende's Chile* (New York, Washington and London: Praeger Publishers, 1976)

⁷¹ Marcelo Garcia Silva, "The United States and the Promotion of Democracy in Latin America", *International Journal of Political Economy* 21, no.2 (Summer, 1991), pp.7-25

⁷² Cross-cultural studies during the 1960s placed Chile amongst the most advanced democracies in the world, comparable to Scandinavian countries, Britain and the United States. Under Jorge Alessandri, Chile was beginning to enjoy a vigorous democracy of multiple political parties, strong trade unions, regular elections, free press, open debate and a respect for the rule of law. See Peter D. Bell, "Democracy and Double Standards: The View from Chile", *World Policy Journal* 2, no.4 (Fall, 1985), pp.711-730

⁷³ America's dominance in Latin America was secured through the Monroe Doctrine, which declared that any external attempt to control states in North and South America would be viewed as "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States". See "Monroe Doctrine; December 2, 1823", http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/monroe.asp, (accessed 8 August 2017)

supporting other political parties in Chile such as Allende's Socialist Party and Julio Duran's Radical Party. From 1963 to 1964, the United States directed over US\$12,000,000 towards Frei's Christian Democratic Party (CDP) through the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). With US assistance, Frei won the election with 56 percent of votes, compared to Allende's 39 percent and Duran's 5 percent.⁷⁴ In a statement that closely tied US foreign intervention to Chile's domestic politics, Frei's victory was declared as "one of the advances made by the [US-led] Alliance for Progress."⁷⁵

After Frei's election, US intervention in Chile's domestic politics and economy intensified. The former US President Lyndon Johnson encouraged close US-Chile ties by advocating the Mann Doctrine which asserted that the United States should conduct its foreign policy in a pragmatic manner that prioritised economic interests. Consequently, President Johnson focused on strengthening bilateral economic relations to ensure that Chile maintained a capitalist-oriented administration under Frei.⁷⁶ Under the Mann Doctrine, US investments poured into Chile's economy and boosted Chile's manufacturing industry.⁷⁷ By 1970, American firms were so integrated into Chile's economy that 61 of the top 100 of Chile's most dynamic industries contained foreign participation that was largely American.⁷⁸ Two major American companies, Anaconda and Kennecott, also secured a monopoly over Chile's copper industry. By 1969, 79.24 percent of Anaconda's worldwide profit came from Chile alone.⁷⁹ As illustrated in Figure 2 below, US investment in Chile's manufacturing industry rapidly skyrocketed

⁷⁴ Sigmund, *The United States and Democracy in Chile*, op. cit.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ See Silva, "The United States and the Promotion of Democracy in Latin America", op. cit.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ O'Brien, *Allende's Chile*, op. cit.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

from the beginning of Frei's second year of administration.

Figure 2. US Investment in Chile's Manufacturing Industry, 1965-1970

Source: O'Brien, *Allende's Chile*, op. cit., p.221

In addition to large investments in Chile's economy, America provided Chile with development aid. From 1962 to 1969, Chile benefitted from more than US\$1 billion in the form of aid, loans, and grants from the United States. American banks ensured that a total of US\$200 to 300 million short term credits were available to Chile while Frei was in power.⁸⁰

However, America's thriving economic relations with Chile came to a quick end when Frei reached his maximum presidential term of six years, after which Frei was required to resign from his presidential post in 1970. However, when Frei stepped down, he also left behind a Chilean economy suffering from chronic inflation, housing shortages, and unemployment. In the same year that Frei resigned, Chile's GDP growth was at 1.9 percent, inflation reached 35 percent,

⁸⁰ Jonathan Haslam, *The Nixon Administration and the Death of Allende's Chile: A Case of Assisted Suicide*, (London and New York: Verso, 2005)

and the housing deficit was at 20 percent.⁸¹ These economic grievances led the Chilean people to demand for higher living standards and a greater share in political power.⁸² As a candidate running in the 1970 presidential elections, Salvador Allende from the *Unidad Popular* party offered the Chilean people the prospect of a brighter economic future through the “transition to socialism” programme. During the elections, Allende’s campaign promises gained him a narrow win of the electoral votes which led to his inauguration as Chile’s next President on 3 November 1970.

3.2.2. Chile’s Political Crisis

Upon Frei’s resignation as President in 1970, Chile was afflicted with a series of political and economic problems for Allende to resolve. After the economic problems that accumulated under Frei’s administration, the Chilean people invested higher expectations in Allende’s “transition to socialism” programme. However, in 1972, Allende’s economic policies further escalated the domestic political crisis when inflation escalated and Chile’s economy experienced another decline. Under the pressure of economic grievances, the Chilean public grew disenchanted with Chile’s poor economic performance and expressed their lack of trust in the Allende leadership through nationwide protests. In this section, I trace Chile’s political crisis which began with Frei’s resignation in 1970 and ended with the overthrow of Allende in 1973.

⁸¹ S. Ilgu Ozler, “The Concertacion and Homelessness in Chile: Market-Based Housing Policies and Limited Popular Participation”, *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no.4 (July, 2012), pp.53-70; and Rodrigo Caputo and Diego Saravia, “The Fiscal and Monetary History of Chile, 1960-2010”, Becker Friedman Institute, April 2014, <https://bfi.uchicago.edu/research/working-paper/fiscal-and-monetary-history-chile-1960-2010/> (accessed 3 March 2018)

⁸² Edgardo Boeninger, “The Chilean Road to Democracy”, *Foreign Affairs* 64, no.4 (Spring, 1986), pp.812-832

After Frei stepped down, intense political competition emerged between the centre, left, and right political parties in Chile to assume political authority. At the centre was the Christian Democratic Party led by Frei's successor, Radomiro Tomic. The Christian Democratic Party was flanked on the left by Salvador Allende's Unidad Popular (UP) coalition and on the right by Jorge Alessandri's National Party. However, the election campaign was also marked by excessive partisanship as political parties struggled to maintain their economic and political positions along the political spectrum. This political crisis impacted Chile's economy, which was already suffering from the implications of Frei's "Revolution in Liberty" programme that had enforced agrarian reforms, failed to boost high productivity, and opposed landed interests during the Frei administration.⁸³

Due to the absence of clear party positions, none of the political parties secured a clear winning majority during the presidential election on 4 September 1970. Allende gained a narrow margin of 36.3 percent of votes, a figure only slightly higher than his opponents, Alessandri (35 percent) and Tomic (27.8 percent).⁸⁴ As none of the candidates achieved more than 50 percent of valid ballots, the Chilean Constitution required the Chilean Congress to make the final decision on the election winner.⁸⁵ After much inter-party bargaining, Chile's political elites eventually agreed to follow tradition and elected Allende as the next President on 24 October 1970 based on his highest number of votes.⁸⁶ On 3

⁸³ Haslam, *The Nixon Administration and the Death of Allende's Chile*, op. cit. and Boeninger, "The Chilean Road to Democracy", op. cit.

⁸⁴ Nathaniel Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende* (London, England: I.B. Tauris & Co., Ltd., 1985)

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Although partisanship was high, Chile's political parties wanted to ensure that Chile's political institutions and values would continue to survive under Allende. Allende agreed that opposition parties, including the Christian Democrats, would continue to exist and promised to uphold the nonpartisan and autonomous nature of the armed forces. See Peter A. Goldberg,

November 1970, Allende was officially inaugurated as Chile's 30th President.

One of Allende's first tasks as President was to implement the "transition to socialism" programme which was an agenda of 40 measures aimed towards tackling Chile's economic and political crises. These measures spanned from nationalising industries to holding local, regional, and national elections. Through this programme, Allende envisioned the expansion of "the most democratic government in the history of the country" through the transformation of Chile's economic and political institutions.⁸⁷ By 1970, Allende's "pump priming" reforms were relieving some of Chile's economic difficulties. Chileans were enjoying higher wages and employment rates increased. Farm workers were purchasing goods they could not previously afford. As the supply of goods expanded, Chilean industrial plants hired more workers and in 1971, Chile's industrial production increased by 12 percent, the highest increase in many years.⁸⁸

However, Allende's policies soon reached the limit of stimulating Chile's economy. Inflation began to settle in as Chile's economy headed towards another descent. As illustrated in Table 2 below, Chile's annual inflation rate rose from 22.1 percent in 1971 to 260.5 percent in 1972. Chile's industries began to suffer as agricultural production dropped by 22 percent and wheat production by 34 percent in 1973. As the value of money in Chile fell, profits declined too.⁸⁹ The world price of Chile's largest export, copper, also dropped and impacted Chile's

"The Politics of the Allende Overthrow in Chile", *Political Science Quarterly* 90, no.1 (Spring, 1975), pp.93-116

⁸⁷ Clark, *Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

⁸⁸ Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

⁸⁹ Haslam, *The Nixon Administration and the Death of Allende's Chile*, op. cit.

profits. Soon, the Allende government could no longer afford to pay for imported goods. Towards the end of Allende's term, Chile was struggling to pay its debts and was no longer considered creditworthy by international financial institutions.

Table 2. Main Macroeconomic Variables in Chile from 1970 to 1973 (%)

	1970	1971	1972	1973
Economic growth rate (GDP)	3.6	8.0	-0.1	-4.3
Annual inflation rate (CPI)	36.1	22.1	260.5	605.1
National unemployment rate	5.7	3.8	3.1	4.8
Annual increase of real wages	8.5	22.3	-11.3	-38.6

Source: Felipe Larrain and Patricio Meller, "The Socialist-Populist Experience in Chile: 1970 – 1973" in Rudiger Dornbusch and Sebastian Edwards (editors), *The Macroeconomics of Populism in Latin America* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp.175 - 222

Chile's declining economic health cultivated a severe deficit of public trust in Allende's policies. Through his socialist reforms Allende further challenged the economic interests of opposition political parties, Chile's middle and upper classes, and American foreign policymakers.⁹⁰ In December 1971, upper and middle class housewives protested against escalating food shortages in the "March of the Empty Pots".⁹¹ This was followed by two trucker strikes led by the Trucker's Confederation in October 1972 and June 1973 which affected the flow of Chile's crucial supplies. Chile's working class was also mobilised as mine workers participated in a strike at the *El Teniente* mines in April 1973 to demand extra pay and a wage readjustment from the Allende government. Periodic skirmishes by opposition women, youth, middle sectors, and terrorist organisations such as the Patria y Libertad also took place in Chile's capital,

⁹⁰ Allende's reforms gravitated towards a Chilean foreign policy that was independent of the priorities of US foreign policy and multinational companies. See William Blum, *Killing Hope: US Military and CIA Interventions since World War II* (London: Zed Books Ltd., 2003)

⁹¹ Cristobal Kay, "Chile: The Making of a Coup d'Etat", *Science & Society* 39, no.1 (Spring, 1975), pp.3-25

Santiago.⁹²

The democratic crisis in Chile came to an end in 1973 with two attempted military coups, one of which ended Allende's presidency. On 29 June 1973, Chile's 2nd Armoured Regiment attempted the first military coup. Although the coup failed, it had politicised most of Chile's armed forces. Pro-constitutional senior commanding officers were being forced by lower-ranked military officers to resign from their positions. The Commander of the Air Force and Minister of Transport General Cesar Ruiz Danyau was coerced to leave his ministerial position not long after Commander Arturo Araya Peeters, the naval aide to President Allende, was assassinated.⁹³ The Commander-in-Chief of the Chilean Armed Forces and Minister of Interior General Carlos Prats was also forced to resign and was replaced by Augusto Pinochet, General Prats' second-in-command.⁹⁴ On 11 September 1970, Pinochet orchestrated the second military coup when Chilean troops surrounded the La Moneda presidential palace. Cornered in one of La Moneda's rooms, Allende ended his life and his brief presidency.

3.2.3. America's Policy Response

In response to Chile's democratic crisis, the United States adopted a subversive "cold but correct" policy. The aim of this policy was to covertly subvert Allende's political leadership through "maximis[ing] pressures on the Allende government to prevent its consolidation and limit its ability to

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Arturo Alejandro Munoz, "The Assassination of Commander Arturo Araya Peeters", *Memoria Viva*, 27 June 2012, http://www.memoriaviva.com/Ejecutados/Ejecutados_A/araya_peters_arturo.html, (accessed 4 June 2018)

⁹⁴ Clark, *Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

implement policies contrary to US and hemisphere interests".⁹⁵ In this section, I identify the various strategies that constituted the democracy subversion policy. These strategies were: i) to diplomatically isolate Allende, ii) spread propaganda and pursue socialisation strategies, iii) impose punitive economic measures, and iv) exercise coercion against Allende's government.

First, Nixon aimed to diplomatically isolate Allende from the international community by seeking diplomatic assistance from other countries. Nixon stressed to Medici that, "we [America and Brazil] must try and prevent new Allendes and Castros and try where possible to reverse these trends."⁹⁶ After some persuasion, Brazil's President Emilio Garrastazu Medici agreed to cooperate with America to counter the "Allende threat" through an exchange of military officers. In return, Brazil would benefit from discreet American aid. In September 1970, Nixon also approached Italian President Giuseppe Saragat, Pope Paul VI, and British Prime Minister Edward Heath and appealed to them to try "discreetly influence the situation."⁹⁷

Secondly, US officials were requested to spread propaganda that would weaken public support for Allende.⁹⁸ By investing heavily in Chile's mass media outlets and social groups, CIA officials spread information aimed to alter the Chilean public's perspective of Allende.⁹⁹ Most of America's propaganda funds

⁹⁵ Henry A. Kissinger, "Policy Towards Chile", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973* Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 9 November 1970

⁹⁶ Henry A. Kissinger, "Meeting with President Emilio Garrastazin Medici of Brazil on Thursday, December 9, 1971 at 10.00 am, in the President's Office, the White House", *The National Security Archive*, 9 December 1971

⁹⁷ Tanya Harmer, *Allende's Chile & the Inter-American Cold War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011)

⁹⁸ US Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities (US Senate), *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973, Staff Report of the Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities*, 18 December 1975

⁹⁹ Gil Merom, "Democracy, Dependency, and Destabilization: The Shaking of Allende's Regime",

were directed towards the opposition newspaper *El Mercurio*, wire services, conservative magazines, and weekly newspapers.¹⁰⁰ In the period leading to the 1970 presidential election, the United States also invested around US\$125,000 on leaflets and posters that discredited Allende.¹⁰¹ Another US\$1.24 million was used to purchase radio stations and newspapers to support Chilean opposition parties in the 1971 municipal elections. An amount of US\$700,000 was also authorised for the *El Mercurio* newspaper in September 1971 and another US\$965,000 was released in April 1972.¹⁰² This was accompanied by another half a million US dollars from January to July 1971 to boost the Christian Democratic Party's campaign.¹⁰³

The CIA also pursued socialisation strategies that established operational relationships with peasants, slum dwellers, organised labours and students to "train and organise" anti-communist groups amongst them.¹⁰⁴ US funds reached opposition groups such as the *Patria y Libertad* which organised public disturbances to undermine Allende's legitimacy. The Church Committee staff report stated that the CIA provided the *Patria y Libertad* with US\$38,000 to incite tension as a pretext for intervention by the Chilean military. The same report also noted that US\$24,000 were directed towards the Society for Manufacturing Development (SOFOFA) which helped opposition parties to prepare bills against

Political Science Quarterly 105, no.1 (Spring, 1990), pp.75-95

¹⁰⁰ Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

¹⁰¹ These funds were authorised by the Forty Committee, which was formerly known as the 303 Committee. See Paul E. Sigmund, *The Overthrow of Allende and the Politics of Chile 1964-1976* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977) and National Security Council, "Minutes of the Meeting of the 40 Committee 25 March 1970", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 25 March 1970

¹⁰² Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

¹⁰³ James Petras and Morris Morley, "On the US and the Overthrow of Allende: A Reply to Professor Sigmund's Criticism", *Latin American Research Review* 13, no.1 (1978), pp.205-221

¹⁰⁴ Blum, *Killing Hope*, op. cit.

Allende.¹⁰⁵ American funds were also linked to public protests such as the 1971 “March of the Empty Pots” and the 1973 *El Teniente* strike.¹⁰⁶

In addition to spreading propaganda, the United States targeted Chile’s economy by imposing strict economic sanctions. Under President Nixon’s command, the CIA Director Richard Helms was granted US\$10 million to “make...[Chile’s] economy scream.”¹⁰⁷ Helms later recounted that “the President came down very hard...that he wanted something done, and he didn’t much care how and that he was prepared to make money available...If I ever carried the marshal’s baton in my knapsack out of the Oval Office, it was that day.”¹⁰⁸ The United States also reduced financial assistance and loans towards Chile during Allende’s presidency. The 1972 Gonzalez Amendment was implemented to instruct US representatives in multilateral lending institutions to vote against loans to countries such as Chile that expropriated American-owned companies without compensation.¹⁰⁹ In November 1970, the National Security Decision Memorandum (NSDM) 93 was released to call for the termination of economic assistance, financing, and guarantees for US private investments in Chile. The NSDM 93 also pressured international financial institutions to limit credit and other financing assistance to Chile and avoid further bilateral economic aid commitments.¹¹⁰ Additionally, Chilean government accounts in America were

¹⁰⁵ O’Brien, *Allende’s Chile*, op. cit.; and Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

¹⁰⁶ Petras and Morley, “On the U.S. and the Overthrow of Allende”, op. cit.

¹⁰⁷ Richard Helms, “Editorial Note”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973* Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 15 September 1970

¹⁰⁸ Quoted in Robert Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), p.234

¹⁰⁹ The Gonzalez Amendment targeted Allende’s nationalisation of the copper industry which threatened the monopoly that large US business companies had in the Chilean economy. See Paul E. Sigmund, “The “Invisible Blockade” and the Overthrow of Allende”, *Foreign Affairs* 52, no.2 (January, 1974), pp.322-340

¹¹⁰ Kissinger, “Policy Towards Chile”, op. cit.

blocked through court orders.¹¹¹

America's economic sanctions and sharply reduced assistance contributed to a shrinking Chile economy. As indicated in Table 3, the total US economic aid to Chile dropped from US\$29.6 million in 1970 to US\$3.8 million in 1973.¹¹² As the United States controlled 40 percent of the votes on the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) board, US veto power was also used to delay the submission of Chilean projects to the board.¹¹³ The IDB thus refused all of Chile's loan requests except for loans that aided opposition-controlled universities.¹¹⁴ The World Bank did not extend any new loans to Chile either.¹¹⁵ In the Export-Import Bank, in which America also had influence in, Chile was dropped to the lowest credit-rating category.¹¹⁶ Although the United States had directed US\$220 million in credits to the Frei Administration, Chile was only receiving US\$30 million in credits by the middle of 1973 under the Allende government.¹¹⁷

¹¹¹ O'Brien, *Allende's Chile*, op. cit.

¹¹² US Agency for International Development (USAID), "U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants, Obligations and Loan Authorizations, July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1974", *Agency for International Development*, 2013, <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/USOverseasLoansGrantsTheGreenBook2013.pdf>, (accessed 28 September 2017), p. 39, 175

¹¹³ Sigmund, "The 'Invisible Blockade' and the Overthrow of Allende", op. cit.

¹¹⁴ The Inter-American Development Bank rejected all loans from the Allende government but provided US\$7 million in loan to the Catholic University of Santiago and US\$4.6 million to the Austral University, both of which were universities controlled by opposition parties in Chile. See O'Brien, *Allende's Chile*, op. cit.

¹¹⁵ Blum, *Killing Hope*, op. cit.

¹¹⁶ O'Brien, *Allende's Chile*, op. cit.

¹¹⁷ Goldberg, "The Politics of the Allende Overthrow in Chile", op. cit.

Table 3. Foreign Aid to Chile from US Government Agencies and International Institutions from 1970 to 1974 - Total of loans and grants (in millions of US dollars)

Fiscal year	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
<u>Total U.S. economic aid</u>	<u>29.6</u>	8.6	7.4	<u>3.8</u>	9.8
U.S. Aid	18.0	1.5	1.0	.8	5.3
U.S. Food for Peace	7.2	6.3	5.9	2.5	3.2
U.S. Export-Import Bank	3.3	-	1.6	3.1	98.1
Total U.S. Military Aid	.8	5.7	12.3	15.0	15.9
Total U.S. Economic and Military Aid	30.4	14.3	21.3	21.9	123.8
<u>Total Assistance from International Organizations</u>	76.4	15.4	8.2	9.4	111.2
IBRD (World Bank)	19.3	-	-	-	13.5
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)	45.6	12.0	2.1	5.2	97.3

Source: USAID, "U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants, Obligations and Loan Authorizations, July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1974", op. cit.

Lastly, US policymakers employed coercive methods which contributed to a coup climate that ended the Allende administration. US National Security Advisor Kissinger had instructed his staff to "set the limits of diversity...[which] at a minimum will either insure his [Allende's] failure...and at a maximum might lead to situations where his collapse or overthrow later may be more feasible."¹¹⁸ To provide Chile's armed forces with the incentive to challenge Allende's political authority, the United States increased military assistance from US\$800,000 in 1970 to US\$12.3 million by 1972. Additionally, the Chilean military gained an extended arms credit of US\$5 million which was used to purchase C-130 transport aircraft and paratrooper equipment. The US Army also agreed to train more Chilean

¹¹⁸ Henry A. Kissinger, "Memorandum from the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973 Volume xxi*, Chile, 1969-1973, 18 October 1970

military officers and pursued joint US-Chilean naval manoeuvres.¹¹⁹

In addition to military aid, the United States sanctioned two covert operations, Track I and Track II, to undermine the Allende leadership. Under Track I, the United States sought to obstruct Allende's inauguration through covertly bribing Chilean congress members to elect the other candidate, Alessandri, instead. After a meeting with Chile's Senate President Tomas Pablo, the US Ambassador to Chile Edward Korry narrated the Track I strategy:

If Alessandri were elected by Congress, the old man [Alessandri] could keep his electoral pledge to respect the first majority by refusing to accept the Presidency. (Alessandri has always said he would not seek to govern without effective support and such renunciation would also be consistent with this view.) If Alessandri refused the Congressional will, then, according to Pablo, new elections would have to be called with the President of the Senate acting as interim President. Frei would be a candidate in the new election and would surely win an overwhelming majority.¹²⁰

However, despite America's persistence, Frei eventually rejected the Track I proposal to run as a new candidate. Track I was no longer a feasible option.¹²¹

Nixon and Kissinger then pursued Track II, a highly confidential and intricate plan conceived without the knowledge of most US policymakers. The US Ambassador to Chile Edward Korry and the 404 Committee, the group responsible for overseeing US policy towards Chile, were not aware of the implementation of the Track II operation either.¹²²

¹¹⁹ O'Brien, *Allende's Chile*, op. cit., Sigmund, *The United States and Democracy in Chile*, op. cit. and Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

¹²⁰ Edward Korry, "Backchannel Message from the Ambassador to Chile (Korry) to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the Inter-American Affairs (Crimmins)", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 11 August 1970

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² It should be noted that in that time period, Nixon did not violate the US Constitution by sanctioning covert action without the knowledge of other agencies or the authorisation of the US Congress. It was only made a requirement for the US Congress to be informed of covert operations after the implementation of the Hughes-Ryan Amendment in 1974. However, the

Under Track II, the CIA planned to kidnap Chile's Commander-in-Chief General Rene Schneider in the hopes of temporarily destabilising Chile's political atmosphere and foment a coup. However, like Track I, the Schneider plot also failed when Schneider died from gun wounds sustained from the kidnapping attempt. Instead of provoking a coup climate, the death of the pro-constitutionalist General Schneider radically nationalised the Chilean population, encouraging the Chile Congress to abide by its civil and constitutional tradition and ratify Allende as the winner with the majority of electoral votes as the next Chilean President.¹²³

On 3 November 1970, the day Allende was inaugurated as Chile's next President, the United States articulated a vow to continue subverting Allende's leadership through a long-term strategy. Under this approach, America's strategy to undermine Allende would "continue vigorously beyond this date. We are to continue to generate maximum pressure toward this end utilising every appropriate resource."¹²⁴ The CIA Station in Santiago was ordered to continue with its efforts as "it is firm and continuing [US] policy that Allende be overthrown by a coup."¹²⁵ Throughout Allende's next three years as President, most US policymakers remained steadfast to this subversive policy.

Consequently, in response to both Allende's candidacy and his elected

President's order for these covert operations without informing other branches of the executive was still an unprecedented manoeuvre, although not strictly illegal. See Kristian Gustafson, *Hostile Intent: U.S. Covert Operations in Chile 1964-1974* (Dulles, Virginia: Potomac Books, Inc., 2007) and Sigmund, *The Overthrow of Allende and the Politics of Chile 1964-1976*, op. cit.

¹²³ Peter Kornbluh, *The Pinochet File* (New York: The New Press, 2013)

¹²⁴ Central Intelligence Agency, "Telegram from the Central Intelligence Agency to the Station in Chile", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973*, 16 October 1970

¹²⁵ Ibid.

government, the United States adopted a series of strategies to conduct a “cold but correct” policy that aimed to subvert Allende’s leadership. Despite US efforts, Allende was inaugurated as Chile’s President in 1970, after which America continued to employ a long-term strategy of undermining Allende’s leadership until his overthrow in 1973. The US decision to diplomatically isolate Allende, spread propaganda and other socialisation methods, enforce economic pressure, and employ covert coercive action demonstrates that the United States did not aim to promote democracy in Chile. Rather, these policy responses indicate that US officials carried out these strategies with the clear intent to subvert Allende’s leadership and democratically elected government.

The following sections constitute a policy analysis of the influence of five factors on America’s democracy subversion policy towards Chile. The analysis begins with a study of factors that drove President Nixon’s intended policy response towards the Allende government. I then proceed to investigate how other groups of domestic actors such as US senior policymakers, members of the US Congress, business groups, and the American public and media responded to Nixon’s preferred policy and shaped America’s policy response towards Chile.

3.3. Presidential Intent

What was the President’s intended policy response? What factors drove the President to support this policy?

When the end of the Frei presidency signalled the start of a new era of political leadership in Chile, a series of factors triggered Nixon to pursue a democracy subversion policy against Chile. Several ideas such as Allende’s

ideology and the Nixon Doctrine contributed to Nixon's decision to support a policy that undermined Allende's leadership. The role of ideas was also supplemented by other factors such as fears of a domino effect and concern for US economic interests in Chile.

Nixon began his presidential term with a realist worldview of a balance-of-power approach to world politics.¹²⁶ This realist mindset was developed through Nixon's unique exposure to international relations. As a congressman and member of the Herter Committee, Nixon was closely involved in the Marshall Plan which contributed to the division of Europe into two sides: the capitalist, democratic, and western Europe and the communist eastern Europe. As Vice-President, Nixon attained foreign policy experience during the post-war period by representing the United States in diplomatic trips to East Asia, Africa, and South America. These exposures cultivated Nixon's realist understanding of the international system as strictly bipolar and the belief that the communist Soviet Union needed to be balanced against through both diplomatic and military means if necessary.¹²⁷ Therefore, Nixon firmly believed that Soviet expansionism needed to be kept in check through a mixed policy of deterrence and cooperation that included military action, diplomacy, and mutual concessions.¹²⁸

With this worldview, Nixon feared that an Allende government would align Chile with other Communist powers in the region. Therefore, when Allende was elected as Chile's next President in 1970, US policymakers grew anxious with the

¹²⁶ Sigmund, *The United States and Democracy in Chile*, op. cit.

¹²⁷ Fredrik Logevall and Andrew Preston (editors), *Nixon in the World: American Foreign Relations, 1969-1977* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)

¹²⁸ Campbell Craig and Frederik Logevall, *America's Cold War: The Politics of Insecurity* (London, England: The Bellknap Press, 2009)

prospect of a communist Chile. Kissinger described Allende as “probably a Communist himself” that would not support US interests in the alliance.¹²⁹ Similar hardline thinkers such as US Ambassador to Chile Korry supported Kissinger when he argued that “Allende intends...to cooperate fully with Castro to set in motion throughout Latin America a revolutionary tide...that would in the first instance be aimed at eliminating meaningful US public and private presence and influence.”¹³⁰

Another reason for the concern of a potentially communist Chile was the fact that US policymakers had been investing money and effort to prevent a Leftist victory in Chile. Former US President Kennedy worked to establish the Alliance for Progress framework to develop Chile’s economy and nurture Chile into a showcase for democracy for the rest of Latin American countries to follow. During the 1964 elections, the United States directed large sums of funds to Eduardo Frei’s campaign to ensure that Allende’s Socialist Party and Julio Duran’s Radical Party would not win the elections. Therefore, with Allende eventually winning the presidential elections in 1970, US policymakers were wary that Allende would impose policies that would undermine years of investment that America had poured in to try transform Chile into an example for democracy in Latin America.

In addition to this, there was a concern amongst US policymakers, including President Nixon himself, that a domino effect could take place across

¹²⁹ The Harvard Crimson, “Kissinger and the Fall of Allende”, *The Harvard Crimson*, 24 July 1974, <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/1974/9/24/kissinger-and-the-fall-of-allende/> (accessed 12 January 2018)

¹³⁰ Edward Korry, “Telegram from the Embassy in Chile to the Department of State”, *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 6 July 1970

Latin America in which the Allende election would incite the rapid spread of Communism across the region and beyond into the world. Chile was geographically situated in Latin America, a region which the United States views as its sphere of influence that should not be dominated by Communism. Chile was also located near two-all water routes, the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, which would allow Chile to spread ideas and information to other parts of the world.¹³¹ On 5 November 1970, a few days after Allende was inaugurated, Kissinger expressed his concern that Chile could be transformed into an entry point for Soviet subversion in Latin America. "The consolidation of Allende in power in Chile, therefore", according to Kissinger, "would pose some very serious threats to our interests and position in the hemisphere...it would become part of the Soviet/Socialist world, not only philosophically but in terms of power dynamics; and it might constitute a support base and entry point for expansion of Soviet and Cuban presence and activity in the region" which would challenge America's dominance in Latin America.¹³² If Allende invited a stronger Soviet presence, there was a fear that Chile would also adopt Communist practices and trigger a domino effect across other parts of the world.¹³³ Kissinger shared his vision of a world in which Latin American countries could abandon democratic institutions for Communism, to the detriment of US dominance in the region:

Now it is fairly easy for one to predict that if Allende wins, there is a good chance that he will establish over a period of years some sort of Communist Government. In that case, we would have one not on an island off the coast [Cuba] which has not a traditional relationship and impact in Latin America, but in a major Latin-American country you would have a Communist Government, joining, for example, Argentina, which is already deeply divided, along a long frontier, joining Peru, which has already been heading in directions that have been difficult to deal with, and joining Bolivia, which has also gone in a more

¹³¹ Mark Falcoff, "Chile: The Dilemma for U.S. Policy", *Foreign Affairs* 64, no.4 (Spring, 1986), pp.833-848

¹³² Kissinger, "Memorandum from the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon", op. cit.

¹³³ Richard R. Fagen, "The United States and Chile: Roots and Branches", *Foreign Affairs* 53, no.2 (January, 1975), pp.297-313

leftist, anti-US direction, even without any of these developments. So I don't think we should delude ourselves on an Allende take-over would not present massive problems for us, and for the democratic forces and for pro-U.S. Forces in Latin America, and indeed to the whole Western Hemisphere.¹³⁴

Nixon shared Kissinger's fears of a domino effect when he relayed a meeting he had with "an Italian businessmen [that] came to call on me in the Oval Office and said "If Allende should win the election in Chile and then you have Castro in Cuba, what you will in effect have in Latin America is a red sandwich. And eventually it will all be red." And that's what we confronted."¹³⁵

In addition to the potential spread of Communism across Latin America, there was the fear that a democratically elected socialist administration in Chile would incite Italian and French Socialist and Communist parties in Europe to build a stronger popular front. The spread of radical regimes entrenched in Communism threatened to weaken European integration and further challenged America's efforts in resisting Soviet influence in Latin America and Western Europe.¹³⁶

The Nixon Doctrine also fuelled Nixon's anxiety over the future direction of Chile. Also known as the Guam Doctrine, the Nixon Doctrine was announced in 1969 to craft a different but sustained role for the United States in Asia. The overarching idea of the Doctrine was to ensure that future US foreign policy "avoid[ed] that kind of policy that will make countries in Asia so dependent upon us that we are dragged into conflicts such as the one that we have in Vietnam." Although Nixon affirmed that there would be "no more Vietnams",

¹³⁴ US Senate, "Multinational Corporations and United States Foreign Policy", *Hearings before the Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Ninety-Third Congress*, Washington: GPO, 1973, Part 2, pp.542-543

¹³⁵ Quoted in Lubna Z. Qureshi, *Nixon, Kissinger, and Allende: US Involvement in the 1973 Coup in Chile* (Lanham, M.D.: Lexington Books, 2009), p.56

¹³⁶ Fagen, "The United States and Chile: Roots and Branches", op. cit.

there was an acknowledgement that America would continue to help states combat future Communist insurgencies but “would not fight the war for them.”¹³⁷ In the address that introduced the Nixon Doctrine, Nixon stated that the United States had a “preference” for democracy in other nations, although he insisted that “we [the United States] must deal realistically with governments in the inter-American system as they are.”¹³⁸ Nixon later admitted to Kissinger that he “favour[ed] dictatorships.”¹³⁹ In shaping America’s policy response towards the leadership change in Chile, the Nixon Doctrine played a strong role in Nixon’s decision. Cautious about committing US forces abroad, Nixon needed to refrain from an overt US military presence in Chile. Instead, Nixon chose to resist the potential spread of Communism by aiding pro-US actors in Chile to undermine Allende.¹⁴⁰

The prospect of a Communist Chile would also significantly undermine US economic interests in Chile. As US multinational companies (MNCs) such as Anaconda, Kennecott, and the International Telephone & Telegraph (ITT) had heavily invested in Chile’s economy, US policymakers were concerned that Allende’s proposed economic reforms would shift Chile’s economy away from the ambit of the global capitalist system. This would result in large economic losses for US business corporations that had a majority stake in Chilean industries. Official threat assessments such as National Intelligence Estimates also recognised this economic threat and cited America’s economic vulnerability by arguing that Allende would “move quickly to expropriate not only the copper

¹³⁷ Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger*, op. cit.

¹³⁸ Quoted in *Ibid.*, p.274

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ Mark Atwood Lawrence, “History from Below: The United States and Latin America in the Nixon Years” in Frederik Logevall and Andrew Preston (editors), *Nixon in the World: American Foreign Relations, 1969-1977* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp.269-288

mines and other properties with foreign ownership [such as American-owned firms], but also the private banks and other important elements of the private sector with little, if any, compensation.”¹⁴¹ Therefore, US policymakers feared that Allende would cultivate a “socialist, anti capitalist development strategy” that would constrain US businessmen from securing their business investments in Chile and in other Latin American countries.¹⁴²

The role of ideas, anxiety over the spread of Communism and Soviet influence in Latin America, and potential economic losses were strong enough for the Nixon Administration to overestimate the level of threat posed by the Soviet Union. In hindsight, the Soviet Union had cautiously adopted a restrained policy towards Chile. Upon determining that Chile would not be fit to uphold Soviet ideology, the Soviet Union reduced assistance to the Allende government. The Soviet Union was also wary of inciting a reaction from the United States so as not to derail the détente that was taking place between the two countries and thus avoided establishing a close relationship with Chile.

When Allende requested the Soviet leaders for aid during a state trip to Moscow in December 1972, Soviet officials refrained from meeting Allende’s requests. During the visit, Allende attempted to convince Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev to purchase Chilean copper, invest \$220 million in Chile’s steel production, and provide large short-term credits to counteract Chile’s deficits

¹⁴¹ Central Intelligence Agency, “National Intelligence Estimate”, *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 30 July 1970. The National Intelligence Estimate was jointly prepared by the CIA, and the intelligence organisations of the Departments of State and Defence. The National Security Agency also participated in preparing the estimate.

¹⁴² James F. Petras and Morris M. Morley, *How Allende Fell: A Study in US-Chilean Relations* (Nottingham: Spokesman Books, 1974), p.9

and relieve Chile's mounting economic problems.¹⁴³ Allende hoped to replicate the USSR-Cuba relationship by presenting Chile as a "Silent Vietnam" that also required Soviet aid to repel US intervention.¹⁴⁴ However, the Soviet Union could not afford to economically sustain a "new Cuba" as the Soviet Union was undergoing its own set of economic difficulties and had recently increased its financial commitment to Cuba.¹⁴⁵

Soviet leaders were also extremely reluctant to engage the United States in another Cold War battlefield as a detente between the Soviet Union and the United States was being negotiated and the Vietnam War was coming to an end.¹⁴⁶ Instead of meeting Allende's demands, Soviet leaders provided US\$45 million in credit instead of hard currency loans and signed an agreement that previous credits supplied to Chile would be used to receive USSR technical assistance. More importantly, Brezhnev also advised Allende to resolve his bilateral conflicts with the United States.¹⁴⁷ During Allende's next two years as President, the Soviet Union also reduced its economic support for Chile from US\$144 million in 1972 to US\$63 million in 1973.¹⁴⁸

Unlike the CIA's assessment of widespread Communist influence under the Allende government, the Soviet Union had in fact concluded that Chile was not fit to uphold Soviet ideology. A report prepared by Moscow's Academy of Sciences in 1972 revealed that the Soviet government saw the Chilean situation

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Joaquin Fernandois, "Chile and the Great Powers" in Michael A. Morris (editor), *Great Power Relations in Argentina, Chile and Antarctica* (South Carolina: Macmillan, 1990), pp.77-98

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Harmer, *Allende's Chile & the Inter-American Cold War*, op. cit.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

as “uncertain and unstable” and concluded that Chilean parties had no means or potential to launch Chile onto the “peaceful road to socialism”.¹⁴⁹ In June 1972, the East German Ambassador reported that growing divergence between the Communist and Socialist parties in Chile jeopardised Chile’s potential to transform into a complete Socialist state. Therefore, in October 1972, the Soviet Union officially redefined Chile from a country that was “building socialism” to a Third World nation seeking “free and independent development on the path of democracy and progress.”¹⁵⁰ Having concluded that the Allende government could not transform into a full socialist state and that the Soviet Union needed to avoid antagonising the United States so as to protect the ongoing détente, the Soviet Union chose to adopt a cautious policy by refraining from open-ended commitments for aid and avoiding a Soviet military presence in Chile.¹⁵¹

However, US intelligence assessments argued that “Allende’s election spells the end of democracy in Chile.”¹⁵² The National Intelligence Estimate also concluded that “if Allende wins, the problems created for the US would be much greater. These would arise from measures taken against US business interests in Chile which would likely be compounded by statements and actions both abrasive to the US and challenging to US policies in the hemisphere.”¹⁵³ Kissinger himself stressed to President Nixon that Allende’s election “poses for us one of the most serious challenges ever faced in this hemisphere” and that “your decision as to what to do about it may be the most historic and difficult foreign

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ US Senate, *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, op. cit.

¹⁵² Acting Chief of the Western Hemisphere Division (name not declassified), “Memorandum by the Acting Chief of the Western Hemisphere Division, Directorate of Operations, Central Intelligence Agency”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973*, 23 August 1970

¹⁵³ Central Intelligence Estimate, “National Intelligence Estimate”, op. cit.

affairs decision you will have to make this year.”¹⁵⁴ Fuelled by strong ideology, fears of a domino effect that could spread Communism, and anxiety over potential economic losses in Chile, Nixon decided that “an Allende regime in Chile was not acceptable to the United States. The President asked the [Central Intelligence] Agency to prevent Allende from coming to power or to unseat him.”¹⁵⁵

3.4. Influence of Senior Policymakers

Did US policymakers with direct access to the President exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?

Nixon's intent to subvert democracy in Chile was met with resistance from some senior policymakers that preferred a US approach which promoted democracy. Consequently, the US foreign policymaking process towards Chile was characterised by an intense debate between these policy doves and hardline thinkers such as Nixon and Kissinger. As the policy doves exerted pressure on the foreign policymaking process, Nixon and Kissinger responded by centralising decision-making between themselves instead. Soon, agencies such as the State Department found themselves alienated from foreign policy decisions and most US policymakers remained unclear of America's policy response throughout Chile's democratic crisis.

3.4.1. Resistance from Policy Doves

There were two main points of disagreement between the policy doves and

¹⁵⁴ Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger*, op. cit.

¹⁵⁵ William V. Broe, “Memorandum for the Record”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973* Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 16 September 1970

hardline thinkers: i) the extent of threat posed by Allende to US security interests, and ii) the policy that America should adopt in response to the crisis in Chile.¹⁵⁶ While policy doves in the State Department called for the United States to allow political events in Chile to run its own course, the hardline thinkers preferred an immediate and quick intervention. Despite the domestic opposition from policymakers, Nixon and Kissinger continued to alienate the policy doves by pursuing a hardline approach which aligned closely with Nixon's presidential intent.

The National Security Council Staff Viron P. Vaky, Assistant US Secretary of State Charles A. Meyer, and Assistant Secretary for inter-American Affairs Jack Kubisch were amongst the policy doves that called for Nixon to avoid a harsh intervention into Chile's domestic politics. These policymakers insisted that an interventionist policy was unwarranted because the Allende government did not pose a serious threat to US security interests. Vaky acknowledged that while the successful election of Allende might pose some problems to the United States, "whether that means a serious threat to U.S. security and national interest requires a better and more systematic judgment, because how serious we deem the threat to our interests to be will determine the risks we are willing to take to insure his defeat."¹⁵⁷

Other US policymakers were critical of the strategic importance of America's interests in Latin America. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Thomas Moorer, viewed Latin America as a region with the potential for very

¹⁵⁶ Harmer, *Allende's Chile & the inter-American Cold War*, op. cit.

¹⁵⁷ Vaky, "Memorandum from Viron P. Vaky of the National Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)", op. cit.

little major conflict. In comparing Latin America to other regions, Moorer commented “if the U.S. and the USSR are engaging in a technologically explosive arms race, and if the Middle East is witnessing, in the constant effort to upset weapons parity, at least an arms walk, then Latin America is engaged at most in an arms crawl.”¹⁵⁸ Indeed, after Allende won the 1970 presidential elections, an intelligence memorandum released by the National Security Council insisted that the Allende victory did not significantly jeopardise US national security because the “U.S. has no vital national interests within Chile” and “the world military balance of power would not be significantly altered by an Allende government.”¹⁵⁹ Vaky also doubted that the threat posed by the Allende victory to US interests was greater than the risks of US intervention. Additionally, he disagreed that an Allende government would set off a domino effect which would spread Communism across the region, as argued by hardline thinkers. In a memorandum directly addressed to Kissinger, Vaky defended his argument:

Why the need for USG involvement. This is the crux of the issue. Do the dangers and risks of an Allende government coming to power outweigh the dangers and risks of the probable chain of events we would set in motion by our involvement? What we propose is patently a violation of our own principles and policy tenets. Moralism aside, this has practical operational consequences. Are they rhetoric or do they have meaning? If these principles have any meaning, we normally depart from them only to meet the gravest threat to us, e.g., to our survival. Is Allende a mortal threat to the US? It is hard to argue this. Is he a serious problem that would cost us a great deal? Certainly. Is it inevitable that he will consolidate his power? He has a very good chance; but it is far from inevitable or that if he does that he will be a success. Does an Allende government start a South American dominoes? Unlikely; the impact of a Marxist state in the rest of Latin America is containable.¹⁶⁰

The debate over the extent of threat led to another discussion on America’s appropriate policy response that the United States towards Chile. There was

¹⁵⁸ Qureshi, *Nixon, Kissinger, and Allende*, op. cit.

¹⁵⁹ National Security Council, “Intelligence Memorandum”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973, Volume E-16, Documents on Chile, 1969-1973*, 7 September 1970

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

strong resistance from policy doves whom argued that America should not adopt a subversive policy because the level of threat in the external environment was not severe enough to warrant extensive US involvement in Chile's domestic politics. The policy doves also argued that a subversive policy would be a moral contradiction to America's founding democratic values and that the public discovery of US covert involvement could cultivate an anti-US sentiment in Chile which would hamper US credibility in the region and beyond.

The Special Assistant to the National Security Advisor Winston Lord and Deputy Director for Coordination Wymberly Coerr reasoned that if the American public discovered US covert involvement in Chile, it would create a negative backlash that would cripple America's credibility as a global power which would be more damaging than the threat posed by Allende and the Soviet Union. Lord argued that the discovery of US efforts to undermine Chile's democratic presidential elections could also undercut US policy in Vietnam, where the United States was fighting for self-determination.¹⁶¹ Meanwhile, Coerr argued that the US covert operations in Chile ran higher risks than the Bay of Pigs incident in which a CIA-sponsored group of Cuban exiles failed to infiltrate Cuba to spark a revolution:

In attempting to assess the penalties of being caught in our presently proposed operation, I believe it helpful to compare them with our hitherto most costly Latin American failure in covert operations - Pigs' Bay. The American President was able to assume responsibility for that operation. I doubt he could do so for subornation of the Chilean Congress and electoral system. Such action is beyond the pale, and evidence of our involvement would hurt our prestige and effectiveness in Latin America (not to mention the United States Government's reputation with its own citizens) even more than did Pigs' Bay. I assess the potential penalties of subornation as greater than those of an Allende victory.¹⁶²

¹⁶¹ Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger*, op. cit.

¹⁶² Wymberly Coerr, "Memorandum from the Deputy Director for Coordination, Bureau of Intelligence and Research (Coerr) to the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Meyer", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973*, Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 4

Similarly, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Robert Hurwitch and Director of the Policy Planning Staff Arthur Hartman argued that violating the US policy of “respect for the outcome of democratic elections” in Chile would have an adverse impact on US global influence:

Failure on our part to act from the outset in a manner consistent with that policy would reduce our credibility throughout the world. Such failure would probably also: increase nationalism directed against us...be used by the Allende government to consolidate its position with the Chilean people and to gain influence in the rest of the hemisphere, where other governments are also facing threats from leftist nationalist forces; and move the Allende government to seek even closer relations with the USSR than it might have initially contemplated.¹⁶³

Instead of a democracy subversion policy, the policy doves insisted that the Chile government should be allowed to come to its own political end.¹⁶⁴ Hurwitch and Hartman called for the United States to adopt a low-key posture that reflected a “deliberate, restrained attitude and that we refrain from overt actions which could be interpreted by Latin American governments and others as hostile.”¹⁶⁵ Similarly, the Assistant US Secretary of State Meyer recommended that the United States adopt a passive and “restrained, deliberate posture” which “affords an appropriately firm response to any manifestation of hostility by an Allende government.”¹⁶⁶

September 1970

¹⁶³ Robert Hurwitch and Arthur Hartman, “Briefing Memorandum from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Hurwitch) and the Director of the Policy Planning Staff (Hartman) to Secretary of State Rogers”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973*, Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 3 November 1970

¹⁶⁴ Gustafson, *Hostile Intent*, op. cit.; and Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

¹⁶⁵ Hurwitch and Hartman, “Briefing Memorandum from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Hurwitch) and the Director of the Policy Planning Staff (Hartman) to Secretary of State Rogers”, op. cit.

¹⁶⁶ Charles A. Meyer, “Memorandum from the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Meyer) to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs (Johnson)”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973*, Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 18 August 1970

However, as illustrated in several instances, the pressure from policy doves were repelled by hardline thinkers in the CIA, White House, and the US Embassy in Chile. In March 1970, the Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Ural Alexis Johnson, a policy dove, countered the 40 Committee's approval of US\$125,000 to fund a spoiling operation and called for a more positive approach towards Allende.¹⁶⁷ Hardline officials responded by overruling Johnson's suggestion and approving another funding increase of US\$300,000 instead. Kissinger defended the decision to further commit to a spoiling campaign against Allende by arguing, "I don't see why we need to stand by and watch a country go Communist due to the irresponsibility of its own people."¹⁶⁸

In another 40 Committee meeting in September 1970, the CIA Deputy Director for Plans Thomas Karamessines discussed enforcing a series of economic pressures on Chile. Undersecretary of State Johnson protested yet again that economic warfare would indicate a sharp change in US foreign policy. However, the 40 Committee continued to pursue these sanctions against Chile.

Towards the end of Allende's term, another disagreement rose between policy doves and hardline officials when a CIA memorandum suggested providing large-scale support to terrorist elements in Chile such as the *Patria y Libertad* and militant elements of the National Party. The memorandum also proposed that every effort should be made to "promote economic chaos, escalate political tensions and induce a climate of desperation in which the PDC [Christian Democratic Party] and the people generally come to desire military intervention. Ideally, it would succeed in inducing the military to take over the government

¹⁶⁷ See US Senate, *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, op. cit.

¹⁶⁸ Sigmund, *The Overthrow of Allende and the Politics of Chile*, op. cit.

completely.”¹⁶⁹ However, Assistant Secretary Kubisch and the US Ambassador to Chile Nathaniel Davis opposed the suggestion to foment a coup climate and instead called for the United States to wait for Chile’s next presidential elections to reduce Allende’s political authority by aiding the opposition party.¹⁷⁰ However, as with the other instances in which the policy doves tried to exert influence against Nixon’s intended policy, the protests from the policy doves did not impede America’s democracy subversion policy against Chile. This was primarily because Nixon and Kissinger’s close partnership and the centralisation of decision-making had allowed hardline thinkers to consistently overrule any opposition from policy doves.

3.4.2. The Nixon-Kissinger Partnership

After Allende was overthrown in a military coup, an investigation by the Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities concluded that Allende’s election and the Soviet threat were fears that were “often exaggerated, [but] appear to have activated officials in Washington” to conduct obstructive policies.¹⁷¹ The end of Frei’s presidency indeed activated Nixon and Kissinger to engineer a policy response that overruled the policy doves and pursued harsh intervention into Chile. Both Nixon and Kissinger shared realist worldviews which soon evolved into a close partnership that centralised most foreign policy decisions between themselves and alienated other agencies from influencing America’s policy towards Chile.

A refugee from Germany, Kissinger has been described as an “European...

¹⁶⁹ Quoted in Kornbluh, *The Pinochet File*, p.107, op. cit.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ US Senate, *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, op. cit.

[with] a view of the world that born Americans could not have” because of the fresh realist outlook he brought to American foreign policy.¹⁷² Kissinger studied at Harvard University before entering Washington's bureaucracy as an advisor. He was soon appointed as National Security Advisor which led him to build a close working relationship with Nixon that has been described as almost symbiotic; Nixon was described as “the architect, and Kissinger the construction manager” behind the implementation of the realist vision of their world.¹⁷³

Kissinger thus gained direct access to the President as he became one of the few senior policymakers who repeatedly met Nixon every day in addition to numerous telephone conversations. In a log of daily visitors for the first hundred days, Kissinger had 198 individual and group meetings with Nixon as compared to the total of thirty meetings attended by the Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defence Melvin Laird.¹⁷⁴

Throughout his time in the White House, Kissinger closely steered US foreign policy and was soon able to influence most foreign policy decisions through several methods. During the Chilean crisis, Kissinger appointed himself as Chair of the 40 Committee, the special working group tasked with overseeing America's policy towards Chile. The 40 Committee was staffed by representatives from various agencies and included Attorney General John Mitchell, CIA Director Helms, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary of State, and the Defence Secretary.¹⁷⁵ Although the group would normally have

¹⁷² Ralph Blumenfeld, *Henry Kissinger: The Private and Public Story* (Mishawaka, Indiana: New American Library, 1974)

¹⁷³ Gustafson, *Hostile Intent*, op. cit.

¹⁷⁴ Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger*, op. cit.

¹⁷⁵ Qureshi, *Nixon, Kissinger, and Allende*, op. cit.

been directed by Assistant Secretary of State Meyer, Kissinger chose to closely supervise the Committee in order to direct Chilean policy.¹⁷⁶ Therefore, in the case of Chile, “Kissinger, in effect, became a Chilean desk officer... He made sure that the policy was made in the way he and the President wanted it.”¹⁷⁷ In other words, “Kissinger was a willing executor, but the choice of measures was almost always Nixon’s.”¹⁷⁸

Another task that allowed Kissinger to centralise foreign policy decisions was Nixon’s request to restructure the foreign policy bureaucracy. Kissinger streamlined the chain of command and ensured that a majority of the decision-making power remained between Nixon and himself. To restrain the influence of the State Department, Kissinger also supported the appointment of the less-experienced William Rogers to the head the Department.¹⁷⁹ Nixon applauded this decision as he “considered Rogers’s unfamiliarity with the subject [foreign policy] an asset because it guaranteed that policy direction would remain in the White House.”¹⁸⁰ Kissinger also replaced the Senior Interdepartment Group (SIG) created by former President Johnson with a National Security Council (NSC) Review Group, which allowed Kissinger to control the foreign policy agenda. Additionally, Kissinger oversaw the flow of all information to the Oval Office.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁶ Fagen, “The United States and Chile”, op. cit.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 300.

¹⁷⁸ William Bundy, *A Tangled Web: The Making of Foreign Policy in the Nixon Presidency* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998)

¹⁷⁹ Rogers was nominated for the appointment because of his lack in foreign policy skills. Rogers’ main profession was as a New York attorney and a former Attorney General. See Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger*, op. cit.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹⁸¹ In Nixon’s first hundred days, Rogers and the Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird had only thirty meetings with Nixon. Comparatively, Kissinger had 198 individual or group meetings with the President. See Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger*, op. cit.

Although it was widely criticised that Nixon and Kissinger's foreign policy was too detached from reality because of "the realpolitik [that] they brought to the White House and the methods they used to implement their own Manichean view of the world", Nixon and Kissinger applied the same realist approach towards shaping America's policy towards Chile.¹⁸² To Nixon, an Allende government could transform into a Communist regime that would encourage other Latin American countries to move to the extreme left.¹⁸³ Nixon's view was supported by Kissinger, whom also saw that the consolidation of the Allende government could pose serious threats to US interests.¹⁸⁴

Together, Nixon and Kissinger crafted a US policy that was heavily interventionist.¹⁸⁵ "I recommend therefore that you make a decision", Kissinger wrote to Nixon, "that we will oppose Allende as strongly as we can and do all we can to keep him from consolidating power."¹⁸⁶ Kissinger was also supported by other hardline groups such as CIA officials that stated in a memorandum that "it is reasonably clear, in exploring avenues to prevent an Allende government from exercising power, that...the only prospect with any chance of success whatsoever is a military golpe either before or immediately after Allende's assumption of power."¹⁸⁷

Under Kissinger's advice, Nixon adopted the "cold but correct" posture that "maximises pressures on the Allende government to prevent its

¹⁸² Gustafson, *Hostile Intent*, p.86, op. cit.

¹⁸³ Bundy, *A Tangled Web*, op. cit.

¹⁸⁴ Lawrence, "History from Below", op. cit.

¹⁸⁵ Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

¹⁸⁶ Henry A. Kissinger, "NSC Meeting, November 6 - Chile", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973*, 5 November 1970

¹⁸⁷ Central Intelligence Agency, "Telegram from the Central Intelligence Agency to the Station in Chile", op. cit.

consolidation and limit its ability to implement policies contrary to U.S. and hemisphere interests.”¹⁸⁸ The posture required implementing a series of measures such as: “(1) initiating punitive measures, such as terminating aid or economic embargo; (2) making every effort to rally international support of this position; and (3) declaring and publicising our concern and hostility...quietly and covertly; on the surface our posture would be correct, but cold.”¹⁸⁹ When the Allende government eventually fell to Pinochet’s military dictatorship in 1973, Kissinger echoed Nixon’s sentiments when he observed “that however unpleasant they [the Pinochet government] act, the government is better for us [the United States] than Allende was.”¹⁹⁰

3.4.3. The Bureaucratic Divide

Due to the strong resistance from the policy doves and efforts by hardline thinkers such as Kissinger and Nixon to centralise foreign policy decisions, a clear bureaucratic divide existed between US policymakers. This sharp divide facilitated sowed distrust between agencies in the US bureaucracy and isolated US officials from the foreign policymaking process surrounding Chile’s democratic crisis. Aware of this divide, Kissinger summed up these two conflicting positions in one of his memorandums to Nixon:

1. *The Modus Vivendi Strategy*: This school of thought, which is essentially State’s position, argues that *we really do not have the capability of preventing Allende from consolidating himself* or forcing his failure; that the main course of events in Chile will be determined primarily by the Allende government and its reactions to the internal situation; and that the best thing we can do in these circumstances is maintain our relationship and our presence in Chile so that over the long haul we may be able to foster and influencing domestic trends favorable to our interests. In this view actions to exert pressure on Allende or to isolate Chile will not only be ineffective, but will

¹⁸⁸ Henry A. Kissinger, “National Security Decision Memorandum 93”, *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 9 November 1970

¹⁸⁹ Kissinger, “Memorandum from the President’s Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon”, op. cit.

¹⁹⁰ State Department, “Secretary’s Staff Meeting”, *The National Security Archive*, 1 October 1973, <http://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB110/chile03.pdf> (accessed 6 August 2017)

only accelerate adverse developments in Chile and limit our capacity to have any influence on the long-range trend...

2. *The Hostile Approach*: DOD, CIA and some State people, on the other hand, argue that it is patent that Allende is our enemy, that he will move counter to us just as soon and as strongly as he feels he can; and that when his hostility is manifest to us it will be because he has consolidated his power and then it really will be too late to do very much—the process is irreversible. In this view, therefore, we should try to prevent him from consolidating *now* when he is at his weakest.¹⁹¹

However, the State Department's pressure to pursue the *modus vivendi* strategy was not strong enough to convince Kissinger and Nixon to abandon the hostile approach. Both Kissinger and Nixon continued to pursue democracy subversion as declassified tapes indicate that Kissinger planned the overthrow of Allende with Nixon. Eight days after Allende's election, Kissinger stressed to CIA Director Helms that "we will not let Chile go down the drain."¹⁹² Convinced that Allende challenged US interests, Kissinger was determined to prevent Allende's inauguration as the next President of Chile. Consequently, in the first 40 Committee meeting held on 8 September 1970, Kissinger ordered a "cold-blooded assessment" of the outcome of organising a Chilean military coup with US assistance.¹⁹³

When met with resistance from the policy doves, Kissinger and Nixon disregarded the opposing arguments. When the National Security Council staff Vaky cautioned against taking covert action, Kissinger rejected Vaky's advice by endorsing a cable that instructed Ambassador Korry to encourage "the military take over [of] the government" by promising "financial support" to Eduardo Frei

¹⁹¹ Kissinger, "Memorandum from the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon", op. cit.

¹⁹² John Pilger, "Kissinger and Chile: In an Age of Vigilantes, there is cause for Optimism", *Truth Out*, 19 September 2013, <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/18933-in-an-age-of-realists-and-vigilantes-there-is-cause-for-optimism>, (accessed 3 September 2017)

¹⁹³ Frank M. Chapin, "Minutes of the Meeting of the 40 Committee, 8 September 1970", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 8 September 1970

and “a maintenance of our close relationship” with the Chilean military.¹⁹⁴ After Allende’s inauguration on 3 November 1970, Kissinger urged Nixon to reject the State Department’s preference to accommodate the Allende government and directed Nixon towards a “correct but cool” posture instead.¹⁹⁵

This divide in the administration eventually sowed distrust between agencies in Washington.¹⁹⁶ As Nixon and Kissinger excluded other officials from foreign policymaking, many officials were isolated from America’s policy decisions towards Chile. The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, observed that “no one...knew precisely what administration policy towards Chile was [in late 1970 and early 1971] because Henry [Kissinger] had made an elaborate point of not telling them.”¹⁹⁷ During the planning of Track II, the US Ambassador to Chile Davis, the military attaché Colonel Paul J. Wimert, Jr., and members of the 40 Committee were also excluded from the planning operations.¹⁹⁸

Therefore, the foreign policymaking process behind America’s response towards Chile was characterised by a bureaucratic debate between hardline thinkers that supported an interventionist policy and policy doves that favoured a more restrained policy. Despite resistance from the policy doves, Nixon and Kissinger continued to dominate the foreign policymaking process by centralising foreign policy decisions between themselves. This cultivated intense distrust between Nixon and Kissinger, and other policymaking agencies

¹⁹⁴ Viron P. Vaky, “Chile - 40 Committee Meeting, Monday - September 14”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973*, 14 September 1970; and Ural Alexis Johnson, “Concept that Military Takeover the Government of Chile”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973*, 22 September 1970

¹⁹⁵ Kissinger, “National Security Decision Memorandum 93”, op. cit.

¹⁹⁶ Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ Gustafson, *Hostile Intent*, op. cit.

in the United States. Additionally, key senior policymakers such as the US Ambassador to Chile and the US military attaché in Chile were alienated from the foreign policymaking process, which also prevented other domestic actors from shaping the final US policy outcome towards Chile.

3.5. Congressional Pressure

Did members of the US Congress exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?

During the Chilean democratic crisis, members of the US Congress were not included in the foreign policymaking process. Only after the Allende government collapsed did evidence of US covert intervention become public, which drove congressional members to express their dissatisfaction with Nixon's subversive policy. In this section, I observe how congressional members could not exert enough influence to restrain Nixon's democracy subversion policy because of the delayed release of the news of US intervention in Chile. However, upon discovering Nixon's policy reaction towards Chile, some members of Congress reacted by amending a bill, passing a resolution, and launching two congressional investigations.

By centralising policymaking within the White House, Nixon and Kissinger had insulated themselves from domestic actors with opposing views such as members of the US Congress. By limiting congressional activity, Nixon was able to ensure that the US Congress would not restrain Nixon's growing executive power and thus influence the development of US policy towards Chile.

However, after the Allende presidency ended, news of extensive US covert involvement in Chile became public. The US Congress sought to restrain the President from conducting future covert action without congressional knowledge and moved to pass the Hughes-Ryan Amendment. The Hughes-Ryan Amendment was an amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill that demanded all future covert actions to first be approved by Congress.¹⁹⁹ The Amendment granted Congress an oversight role as the Executive now needed to oblige by a reporting requirement to discuss all future covert actions with Congress first.²⁰⁰ Under this amendment, the American President can approve payment or military action as part of covert operations only if the US Congress could “monitor and review the intelligence activities of the United States Government.”²⁰¹ Without congressional oversight, the US government would not be able to release any funds for the purpose of covert operations. The Amendment aimed to keep both the American President and the six committees in the US Congress informed of all covert operations conducted abroad. To prevent the President from sanctioning a covert operation that would subvert another democratic government without congressional knowledge, the Hughes-Ryan Amendment allowed Congress to curb any future covert action proposed by the President.

Additionally, the US Congress launched two investigations to uncover the

¹⁹⁹ James S. Van Wagenen, “A Review of Congressional Oversight: Critics and Defenders”, *Central Intelligence Agency Library*, 2008, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/97unclass/wagenen.html>, (accessed 3 March 2017)

²⁰⁰ The US Senate passed the Hughes-Ryan Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act in 1974. The amendment was later altered in 1980, requiring the President to inform only two intelligence congressional committees and not the former six committees. With the Hughes-Ryan amendment in place, future executive power is now restrained from ordering covert action without oversight from Congress. See Loch K. Johnson, “Covert Action and Accountability: Decision-Making for America’s Secret Foreign Policy”, *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no.1 (March, 1989), pp.81-109

²⁰¹ Michael Rubel, “The Hughes-Ryan Act”, *The Church Committee*, <https://churchcommittee.wordpress.com/2014/12/05/hughes-ryan/>, (accessed 12 January 2018)

extent of CIA covert interference in Chile.²⁰² These investigations were sparked by a leaked transcript by the new CIA Director William Colby in which Colby admitted that he was aware of CIA efforts to mount a military coup against Allende. When this transcript was leaked to the New York Times and The Washington Post, the American public responded with sharp criticism that forced a congressional investigation into US covert actions in Chile. The investigation was conducted by the Church Committee and chaired by Senate member Frank Church.²⁰³ In its final report, the Church Committee uncovered wide evidence of US covert intervention and traced how Nixon and Kissinger circumvented the 40 Committee when shaping US policy towards Chile. The Committee also concluded that America's covert action "deliberately served to negate openly avowed diplomatic policies of the US government."²⁰⁴ However, as the report was only released two years after Allende's overthrow, the findings of the Church Committee were unable to shape US policy towards the Allende government.

The second congressional investigation uncovered ITT involvement in Chile and resulted in passing a resolution to prevent future contributions from private corporations for interventionist purposes in other countries. The ITT investigation followed from the same leak that was released to the Washington Post. During the investigation, it was found that ITT Chairman Harold S. Geneen offered funds to the CIA to support Chilean candidate Alessandri.²⁰⁵ In response to this discovery, the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee concluded that

²⁰² US Senate, *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, op. cit.

²⁰³ Haslam, *The Nixon Administration and the Death of Allende's Chile*, op. cit.

²⁰⁴ US Senate, *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, op. cit.

²⁰⁵ Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations, *The International Telephone and Telegraph Company and Chile, 1970-71*, Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate, 21 June 1973

future offers of such nature should be prohibited by law. Consequently, the S2239 Resolution was passed to “bar U.S. corporations from offering or making contributions to the federal government to influence the outcome of a foreign election.”²⁰⁶

Nixon and Kissinger’s domination of US policy towards Chile had excluded domestic actors such as the US Congress from the foreign policymaking process. Therefore, when covert involvement in Chile was released after the Allende government was removed, congressional action was much too delayed to influence America’s final policy response towards Chile. Nevertheless, members of the US Congress sought to curb future covert action that would threaten to undermine another democratic government by introducing the Hughes-Ryan amendment, passing congressional resolutions, and conducting two congressional investigations on the involvement of the CIA and business groups in Chile.

3.6. Capitalist Influence

Did private business groups or individuals exert influence on the US foreign policymaking process to facilitate or restrain the President’s intended policy?

During Chile’s political crisis, American multinational corporations such as Anaconda, Kennecott, and the ITT shared Nixon’s belief that the Allende government would undermine US interests in Latin America. Under the Frei administration, American investors had established a strong presence in Chile’s economy and acquired major shares in Chile’s natural resource industries.

²⁰⁶ Congressional Quarterly Press, “Foreign Election Campaigns”, *Congressional Quarterly Almanac* 1973, 27th edition., (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1974)

However, when Frei's presidency ended, Allende's economic reforms threatened to remove US ownership in Chilean companies by nationalising Chile's resource industries. To protect their investments, American investors pressured Nixon to enforce strict economic sanctions, which also facilitated the democracy subversion policy against Chile.

Out of the 40 measures that Allende promised to implement once he was elected as President, American companies were largely concerned with the implications of Allende's nationalisation policies. Allende aimed to reform Chile's economy through a process of "democratically decided planning" in which steps would be taken to nationalise copper, nitrates, iodine, iron and coal industries, the banking system, foreign trade, and Chile's largest monopolies.²⁰⁷ However, the nationalisation of industries also threatened to remove major American stakeholders from most of Chile's companies.²⁰⁸ As part of the nationalisation policy, Allende required a calculation of excess profits to be deducted from any compensation paid to nationalised firms in the copper sector. In 1970, the ITT corporation had nearly US\$60 million of investments in Chile in book value, including a 70 percent ownership in the Chilean Telephone Company (Chitelco) company and investments in telephone equipment, assembling and manufacturing, directory printing, and hotels.²⁰⁹ In addition to losing their ownership in these companies, American corporations also risked owing a substantial amount of money to the Chilean government.²¹⁰ Due to the excess

²⁰⁷ Clark, *Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

²⁰⁸ Fagen, "The United States and Chile: Roots and Branches", op. cit.

²⁰⁹ Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations, *The International Telephone and Telegraph Company and Chile, 1970-71*, op. cit.; and Sigmund, "The 'Invisible Blockade' and the Overthrow of Allende", op. cit.

²¹⁰ Excess profits are considered profits that are over and above reinvestments, with a 10-12 percent margin. See US Senate, *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, op. cit.

profits requirement, the ITT would potentially lose most of its investments in Chile while Kennecott and Anaconda were at risk of losing US\$774 million of their investments.²¹¹

These American corporations could not accept such large economic losses to their businesses in Chile. To protect their economic holdings, the corporations pressured Nixon to counter Allende's economic reforms by stifling Chile's economy through an "invisible blockade".²¹² Nixon, who was perceived by most American investors as a "self-declared friend and protector of corporate interests and investments in Latin America", was approached numerous times by MNC representatives.²¹³

Donald Kendall, a close friend to Nixon and the President of PepsiCo, exercised his influence by introducing Nixon to the publisher of Chile's opposition newspaper *El Mercurio*, Agustín Edwards. Together, Kendall and Edwards convinced Nixon of the detrimental impact that Allende's policies would have on US-owned industries in Chile and persuaded Nixon to impose an economic blockade against Chile.

On 15 September 1970, Nixon authorised CIA Director Helms to make Chile's economy "scream."²¹⁴ Nixon also took action against the excess profits issue by declaring that America would "withhold its support from [Chilean] loans under

²¹¹ Fagen, "The United States and Chile: Roots and Branches", op. cit.

²¹² Allende described the series of economic sanctions enforced by the United States against Chile as an "invisible blockade" designed only to "make life difficult in Chile and to lessen the possibility of a successful transition to socialism under Marxist auspices." Therefore, trade and private bank lending were not completely cut off and existing aid and investment programmes continued. See Sigmund, *The United States and Democracy in Chile*, op. cit.

²¹³ Fagen, "The United States and Chile: Roots and Branches", op. cit.

²¹⁴ James R. Schlesinger, "Meeting with President on Chile 9/15/1970", US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives, 15 September 1970

consideration in multilateral development banks” until “it is determined that the country [Chile] is taking reasonable steps to provide adequate compensation.”²¹⁵

America’s economic sanctions policy against Chile was then cemented in the NSDM 93, which called to:

a. exclude, to the extent possible, further financing assistance or guarantees for U.S. private investment in Chile... b. determine the extent to which existing guarantees and financing arrangements can be terminated or reduced; c. Bring maximum feasible influence to bear in international financial institutions to limit credit or other financing assistance to Chile...; and d. assure that U.S. private business interests having investments or operations in Chile are made aware of the concern with which the U.S. Government views the Government of Chile and the restrictive nature of the policies which the U.S. Government intends to follow.²¹⁶

ITT representatives also pressured officials from the CIA and State Department to adopt democracy subversion policies. Like Kendall, the ITT Chief Executive Officer Geneen was a close acquaintance of Nixon.²¹⁷ During the 1970 elections, ITT executives approached the CIA with US\$1 million for the purpose of funding covert strategies that would obstruct Allende from coming to power, such as bribing Chilean Congress members.²¹⁸ The CIA rejected the offer but not without advising the ITT on how best to proceed with their plan independently. Soon, the ITT was channelling US\$350,000 to the Alessandri campaign and another US\$100,000 to the opposition *El Mercurio* newspaper.²¹⁹ Geneen then met with William Broe, the Chief of the CIA's Clandestine Services of the Western Hemisphere, and offered once again to fund CIA covert operations. Broe rejected the offer but continued a close working relationship with the ITT. After Allende’s election, Broe reached out to the ITT Vice President Ned Gerrity with a plan to stall Allende’s inauguration. Included in Broe's plans were proposals for the

²¹⁵ Richard Nixon, “Statement announcing United States policy on Economic Assistance and Investment Security in Developing Nations, January 19, 1972”, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Richard Nixon, 1969* (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1999), pp.31-34

²¹⁶ Kissinger, “National Security Decision Memorandum 93”, op. cit.

²¹⁷ Qureshi, *Nixon, Kissinger, and Allende*, op. cit.

²¹⁸ O'Brien, *Allende's Chile*, op. cit.; and Kornbluh, *The Pinochet File*, op. cit.

²¹⁹ Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende*, op. cit.

United States to impose the non-renewal of bank credits, a delay in the deliveries of spare parts, pressure on Chilean savings and loan companies, and the withdrawal of technical help by private companies.²²⁰

The ITT also approached the State Department to encourage the United States to impose economic sanctions against Allende. Once again, Geneen offered the same US\$1 million to the State Department to be used towards subverting Allende. However, Geneen did not receive a response from the State Department because Kissinger believed that “that any covert action in Chile should be carried out exclusively by our government; this was not a field for private enterprise.”²²¹ The ITT Washington office then forwarded Kissinger a list of policy suggestions of economic sanctions.²²² The list was supplemented with the ITT’s Chile White Paper, an eighteen-point plan of action which included the same set of policies that Broe proposed in his earlier meeting with Gerrity.²²³

Other American corporations soon joined the ITT’s effort to exert economic pressure on Chile. The Chairman of the Anaconda board, Jay Parkinson, met separately with Assistant Secretary Meyer and Ambassador Korry to urge the United States to aid Alessandri’s campaign during the 1970 elections. “Mr. Parkinson, in a very direct and hard fashion, put it to Mr. Meyer that the Government of the United States must make a large financial contribution to the Alessandri presidential campaign” the meeting memorandum notes. During the meeting, Parkinson also “indicated that if either Tomich or Allende [the other

²²⁰ Sigmund, “The “Invisible Blockade” and the Overthrow of Allende”, op. cit.

²²¹ Quoted in Qureshi, *Nixon, Kissinger, and Allende*, op. cit.

²²² Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations, *The International Telephone and Telegraph Company and Chile, 1970-71*, op. cit.

²²³ Ibid. and Qureshi, *Nixon, Kissinger, and Allende*, op. cit.

presidential candidates] win, private enterprise in Chile is finished.”²²⁴ However, Meyer refused to acknowledge Alessandri’s proposal but “commented that he was saddened that situations materialise which bring a U.S. company to suggest that the U.S. Government consider gross intervention in the political affairs of another country.”²²⁵ Parkinson then approached Ambassador Korry with the same request and implied that “it is “widely known” the US helped to elect Frei in 1964...[and] goes on to assert we could become involved in the current campaign without risk of exposure.”

Ambassador Korry was more favourable to Parkinson’s suggestion of corporate contributions to influence Chile’s domestic politics. As Korry informed Anaconda President John G. Hall, “I was not rpt not advising Anaconda to abstain from any contribution it or other US companies wished to make...open allegiance to Alessandri had its inherent risks to their futures and that in their own self-interest, they should be discreet in expression and action.”²²⁶ Anaconda also chaired monthly meetings with other US companies with economic investments in Chile to discuss strategies that could undermine the Allende government. In these meetings, the objective was “to make it clear that a Chilean takeover [of their investments] would not be tolerated without serious repercussions following.”²²⁷ While some companies strongly supported this objective, others refused to endorse the strategy as they feared it may harm their direct negotiations with the Chilean government.

²²⁴ William P. Stedman, Jr., “Memorandum of Conversation”, *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 10 April 1970

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ Korry, “Telegram from the Embassy in Chile to the Department of State”, op. cit.

²²⁷ O’Brien, *Allende’s Chile*, op. cit.

After Allende was overthrown in 1973, reporter Jack Anderson leaked the ITT's covert role to the public which sparked further investigations by the Senate Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations. The findings of the Senate subcommittee concluded that "the highest officials of the ITT sought to engage the CIA in a plan covertly to manipulate the outcome of the Chilean presidential election."²²⁸ The series of meetings and proposed recommendations by PepsiCo, ITT, and Anaconda point to a close collaboration between American MNCs and the CIA, White House, and embassy officials in which US business entities exerted direct influence on Nixon and US policymakers to support provoking an economic decline in Chile, which reflected a democracy subversion policy.

3.7. Public Opinion and the US Media

Did the American public or US media exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?

When Allende first came into power, the US media depicted Allende as a potential threat to the United States. Nevertheless, the US public continued to insist that Allende's election should not warrant a US interventionist policy in Chile's domestic politics.²²⁹ However, despite the widespread US public opinion, the influence of the American public was not strong enough to restrain Nixon's democracy subversion policy.

²²⁸ Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations, *The International Telephone and Telegraph Company and Chile, 1970-71*, op. cit.

²²⁹ The election of Chile's former President, Eduardo Frei, was seen as a sign of "efforts to promote peaceful relations in the Western Hemisphere." However, Allende's election was described by The New York Times as "a heavy blow at liberal democracy. It may mark the demise of the ailing Alliance for Progress, which was undertaken "to improve and strengthen democratic institutions." See Henry Raymond, "Frei, Victor in Chile, Vows Cooperation with the US", *The New York Times*, 6 September 1964 and The New York Times, "Marxist Victory in Chile", *The New York Times*, 6 September 1970

The US media contained a largely negative interpretation of Allende, unlike the media's earlier positive depiction of Chile's former President, Eduardo Frei. During Frei's presidential campaign in 1964, which was supported by American funds, the US media labelled Frei a "bright future for the Americas" by the *Chicago Tribune* in 1964.²³⁰ In comparison, Allende was described as a "Marxist threat in the Americas" by the *Time* magazine.²³¹ The *Christian Science Monitor* also had an unfavourable view of Allende, describing the Allende election as "the first time in world history that a Marxist has come to power through the democratic electoral process."²³² Additionally, the *New York Times* set an alarmist tone by describing the Allende victory as "cataclysmic."²³³

Despite the sharp friend-enemy distinction between Frei and Allende and the media's negative portrayal of Allende, there was still a disapproval against an open US militaristic intervention into Chile. Due to America's protracted engagement in the Vietnam War and US attempts to reach a detente with the Soviet Union, most Americans had become averse to continued foreign entanglements with hostile countries.²³⁴ This public opinion was reflected in the media as the *New York Times* also urged the United States to "keep hands off, behave correctly and hope for the best" in Chile, while the *Washington Post* advised that "respect for Chile's democratically taken decisions is the only mature course for the United States."²³⁵ More boldly, the *Los Angeles Times* insisted that "the American interest at this point, it seems, would be best served

²³⁰ Chicago Tribune Press Service, "Chile Election A Bright Sign, Johnson Says", *Chicago Tribune*, 6 September 1964

²³¹ *Time*, "Marxist Threat in the Americas", *The Time Magazine*, 19 October 1970

²³² The New York Times, "Chile on the Tightrope", *The New York Times*, 27 August 1970

²³³ *Ibid.*

²³⁴ Jaechun Kim and David Hundt, "Popular consent and foreign policy choices: war against the Philippines and covert action in Chile", *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 66, no.1 (February, 2012), pp.52-69

²³⁵ The New York Times, "Marxist Victory in Chile", *op. cit.*

by keeping hands off and letting the Chileans work things out themselves.”²³⁶

Consequently, due to the public's aversion to intervention, Nixon could not gain the public consent he needed to openly interfere in the Allende election.²³⁷ Doing so would risk inciting a public uproar that could incur high domestic costs and jeopardise Nixon's political survival as President. To avoid public disapproval, Nixon chose to continue pursuing an interventionist policy by relying heavily on covert action that would still ensure Nixon would achieve his objective of subverting the Allende government.²³⁸ Consequently, most US actions toward Chile were conducted in secrecy, which led Nixon to proudly confide to Kissinger that “as you know - our hand doesn't show on this one.”²³⁹ Evidence of US covert involvement was eventually leaked to the American media only after the fall of Allende, which incited public anger as the American people discovered the extent of America's intervention in Chile. However, as the Allende government had already collapsed, the public's disapproval could no longer alter America's policy towards Chile.²⁴⁰

²³⁶ Quoted in Sebastian Hurtado Torres, “The U.S. Press and Chile, 1964-1973”, *Revista de Historia Ibero Americana* 5, no.2 (June, 2012), pp.37-61

²³⁷ Jaechun Kim and David Hundt argued that when a leader is faced with an introverted national mood, he will be more inclined to use covert action. See Kim and Hundt, “Popular consent and foreign policy choices: war against the Philippines and covert action in Chile”, op. cit.

²³⁸ Kissinger, “NSC Meeting, November 6 - Chile”, op. cit.; and US Senate, *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, op. cit.

²³⁹ Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon, “Transcript of a Telephone Conversation between the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) and President Nixon”, Telephone Transcript, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973*, 16 September 1973

²⁴⁰ The Church Committee uncovered America's covert actions towards Chile only in 1975, two years after Allende's overthrow. Upon conducting a series of investigations and hearings, the Church Committee concluded that “the United States sought in 1970 to foment a military coup in Chile; after 1970 it adopted a policy both overt and covert, of opposition to Allende; and it remained in intelligence contact with the Chilean military, including officers who were participating in coup plotting.” See US Senate, *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, op. cit.

3.8. Conclusion

This chapter investigates a range of factors that drove the United States to subvert Chile's democratically elected government during a democratic crisis from 1970 to 1973. During the crisis, America responded to the candidacy and political leadership of Salvador Allende through a series of strategies that composed a subversive "cold but correct" policy. Influenced by realist ideas, fears of a domino effect, and the potential loss in US economic interests, Nixon was triggered to adopt an intended policy which undermined the democratically elected Salvador Allende when he came to power as Chile's new President. This policy analysis investigates how Nixon's intended policy and the actions of other domestic actors impacted the development of America's policy towards Chile. This final section analyses the findings and highlights the factors that played a strong role in influencing US foreign policy. As illustrated in Table 4, not all domestic political actors were able to influence America's policy response.

Table 4.
Factors surrounding US Democracy Subversion Policy towards Chile, 1970 – 1973

FACTORS SURROUNDING US DEMOCRACY SUBVERSION POLICY	
1 Presidential Intent What was the President's intended policy response?	Democracy Subversion
2 Influence of Senior Policymakers Did US policymakers with direct access to the President exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	Hardliners ✓ Policy Doves X
3 Congressional Pressure Did members of the US Congress exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	X
4 Capitalist Influence Did private business groups or individuals exert influence on the US foreign policymaking process to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	✓
5 Public Opinion and US media Did the American public or the US media exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	X

Nixon's policy was supported by a number of similar hardline thinkers such as the National Security Advisor Kissinger. Both Kissinger and Nixon had developed a strong partnership built on a shared view of a strictly bipolar world. As National Security Advisor, Kissinger dominated America's foreign policymaking process by setting foreign policy agendas, nominating an under-experienced Secretary of State, alienating other foreign policy agencies and individuals, and centralising foreign policy decisions to largely between himself and Nixon. As a result, Nixon and Kissinger were able to overcome resistance from policy doves in the State Department whom insisted that America must not intervene in Chile's domestic politics and that the threat posed by the Allende government was not as large as it was perceived to be.

Nixon was also receptive to private businessmen that had large investments in Chile such as the Pepsico President Kendall and ITT Chief Executive Officer Geneen that shared Nixon's mindset. Both these MNC heads urged Nixon and CIA officials to enforce economic restrictions on Chile to protect their monopoly in the Chilean industries. Some ITT recommendations were even reflected in the economic actions taken against Chile.

However, domestic actors such as members of the US Congress and the American public were less able to influence the final policy outcome because they did not share Nixon's ideas on democracy subversion. Nixon only exposed the US Congress to America's actions in Chile after the fall of the Allende government. All congressional action was therefore not influential enough to shape America's policy response towards Chile in any way.

Despite the depiction of Allende as a potential threat to US interests, the American public had also called for Nixon to avoid another intervention in Chile as the American people had become weary of long foreign entanglements with other countries. Aware of the risk of losing public support by pursuing an open intervention, Nixon proceeded with a democracy subversion policy through covert methods that excluded the US Congress and the American public from the foreign policymaking process.

This analysis on America's policy response towards Chile's democratic crisis indicates that while domestic actors are critical factors, there are other factors such as ideas, shared concerns of threats, and direct relationships with the President that can also develop a democracy subversion policy. Nixon was more receptive towards domestic actors that had direct connections to him, supported his policy, and shared similar worldviews. Due to the centralised foreign policymaking process, Nixon was also able to overcome resistance from other domestic actors with opposing ideas. Consequently, Nixon could reject opposing policy suggestions and pursue covert strategies that continued to subvert democracy in Chile.

CHAPTER FOUR

PASSIVE DEMOCRACY PROMOTION IN SOUTH KOREA, 1979-1980

4.1. Introduction

On 18 May 1980, residents of the town of Kwangju in South Korea (ROK) protested against the military rule of General Chun Doo Hwan. In what began as a peaceful demonstration calling for a democratic political system and the removal of General Chun, the Kwangju Uprising quickly descended into violence as the South Korean Army moved to harshly suppress the demonstrators. By the end of the Uprising on 27 May 1980, clashes between the civilian protestors and armed forces resulted in an estimated death toll of 600 to 2,000 people.²⁴¹ Throughout this democratic crisis from 1979 to 1980, the United States maintained a passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea. Under this policy, US policymakers cautiously supported democratic change in South Korea. By resorting to methods such as privately persuading South Korean officials to consider democratic reforms, the United States did not urge South Korea to undergo an immediate democratic transition. Rather, a few factors in the US foreign policymaking structure drove US officials to encourage South Korea to adopt a slow and gradual transition to democracy instead.

This chapter seeks to identify domestic factors that drove America to adopt a passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea. The historical background behind the alliance relationship between the United States and South Korea is discussed in the first section, which also describes the events that

²⁴¹ James Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", *Political Science Quarterly* 114, no.2 (Summer, 1999), pp.265-288

characterise South Korea's political crisis. The democratic crisis began with the assassination of the authoritarian leader Park Chung Hee on 26 October 1979, evolved towards the 12/12 military coup on 12 December 1979, and ended with the Kwangju Uprising in May 1980. In response to these domestic upheavals, US policymakers implemented a range of strategies that characterised a passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea.

The remaining sections of this chapter investigate the impact of a range of factors on the foreign policymaking process in the United States. I first identify President Jimmy Carter's intention to implement a policy towards South Korea. I then analyse how other domestic actors such as senior US foreign policymakers, members of the US Congress, private business groups and individuals, and the American public attempted to influence on the US foreign policymaking process. While some groups of domestic actors were able to exert pressure on America's foreign policy towards South Korea, other domestic actors were less influential.

4.2. History

South Korea began its relationship with the United States as a trading partner in 1866 and transformed into an American ally with the signing of the 1953 Mutual Defence Treaty after the end of the Korean War.²⁴² During South Korea's democratic crisis from 1979 to 1980, the United States remained a close security ally to South Korea. In this section, I trace America's historical relationship with South Korea, describe the events that characterised South Korea's democratic

²⁴² Foreign relations between the United States and Korea were first officially formed by the 1882 Treaty of Peace, Amity, Commerce and Navigation, which affirmed common economic goals. See King of Tah-Chosun, *Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United States*, translated by Percival Lowell, 4 December 1883, <http://images.library.wisc.edu/FRUS/EFacs/1883/reference/frus.frus1883.i0011.pdf>, accessed (8 February 2016)

crisis, and discuss America's policy responses towards the crisis.

4.2.1 American Ally

The US-ROK alliance was formally established after the formation of South Korea at the end of the Korean War in 1953. Since then, the alliance treaty has been instrumental to the United States by guaranteeing US access to military bases in South Korea in return for economic and military assistance. However, as soon as South Korea's economic growth soared, South Korea grew to rely less on the United States for development aid. In this section, I trace the historical background of the US-ROK alliance and discuss the relationship between the Carter administration and the Park Chung Hee government.

On 27 November 1943, Korea gained strategic importance to the United States when America joined the United Kingdom and China to sign the Cairo Declaration which "vowed to be mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, [and] are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent [of Japanese control]."²⁴³ It was agreed that after liberating Korea, Japanese occupation would be replaced with a four-power joint trusteeship administration in which Korea would be shared between the United States, Soviet Union, Great Britain, and China.²⁴⁴ Under this trusteeship proposal, Korea was to enter a "long-term apprenticeship" that would eventually lead to independence in "due-course".²⁴⁵ World War II continued until the Allied powers

²⁴³ "Cairo Declaration, United States - Great Britain - China", 1 December 1943, www.ndl.go.jp/constitution/e/shiryo/01/002_46/002_46tx.html (accessed 1 March 2016)

²⁴⁴ This arrangement was later amended into a two-power joint administration between the United States and Soviet Union. See "Report of the Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom", Moscow, 16-26 December 1945, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/decade19.asp (accessed 9 September 2017)

²⁴⁵ Chae-Jin Lee, *A Troubled Peace: U.S. Policy and the Two Koreas* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), p.18.

called for the unconditional surrender of the Imperial Japanese armed forces during the Postdam Declaration in July 1945. However, Japan rejected the ultimatum. Less than two weeks later, the United States detonated two bombs over the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Soviet Union moved to invade Manchuria and Korea to liberate these countries from Japanese rule. However, President Harry Truman also feared that Soviet forces could occupy the entire Korean Peninsula as well.²⁴⁶ In a hasty meeting that lasted only 30 minutes on 10 August 1945, the US State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee agreed to divide the Korean Peninsula along the 38th Parallel.²⁴⁷ Consequently, North Korea was created on the north of the parallel while South Korea was formed in the south. Five days later, the Empire of Japan agreed to surrender, bringing an end to World War II.

Less than two years after South Korea's formal inception as an independent state in 1948, the Korean War began. On 25 June 1950, North Korea invaded South Korea to reunify the two Koreas once again.²⁴⁸ The United States responded by deploying troops to counter North Korea's aggression. On 23 July 1953, an armistice was signed between the United States, China, and North Korea. Although the first President of South Korea, Syngman Rhee, refused to accept the armistice, the Korean War had reached a ceasefire.

After the Korean War, President Rhee upgraded South Korea's relationship with America into a security alliance. In October 1953, the Mutual Defence Treaty

²⁴⁶ John Kie Chiang Oh, *Korean Politics: The Quest for Democratization and Economic Development* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1999)

²⁴⁷ Bruce Cumings, *Korea's Place in the Sun* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2005)

²⁴⁸ Clay Blair, "The Korean War: Background and Overview" in Phil Williams, Donald M. Goldstein and Henry L. Andrews, Jr. (editors), *Security in Korea. War, Stalemate and Negotiation* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, Inc., 1994), pp.39-52.

was signed between the United States and South Korea in which it was recognised that an external attack on either country would be considered as a common threat to them both. This is stated in Article III, where:

Each party recognises that an armed attack in the Pacific area on either of the Parties in territories now under their respective administrative control, or hereafter recognised by one of the Parties as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the other, would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.²⁴⁹

To facilitate joint defence, the ROK-US Combined Forces Command (CFC) was created in 1978 under which American and South Korean troops would coordinate to strengthen South Korea's national defence capability. The South Korean military units that were under the United Nations Command were then transferred to the CFC's operational control. These combined forces were led by a Commander-in-Chief who reported to the national command authorities of the United States and South Korea.

Under the Mutual Defense Treaty, America also gained a strategic benefit. Article IV in the treaty granted America "the right to dispose United States land, air and sea forces in and about the territory of the Republic of Korea as determined by mutual agreement."²⁵⁰ Through this Article, America was able to establish a military presence in South Korea that would allow the United States to project force and strengthen its military dominance across the Asia Pacific. Article IV thus converted South Korea into a cornerstone of America's collective Asia Pacific security system, which had also included Australia, New Zealand,

²⁴⁹ "Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea", 1 October 1953 (ratified on 17 Nov. 1954), http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/kor001.asp, (accessed 12 April 2017), art. 3

²⁵⁰ *Ibid*, art 4.

the Philippines, and Japan. In addition to expanding America's military presence in the region, US forces stationed in South Korea could deter future North Korean aggression and quickly respond to any unanticipated attacks.²⁵¹

The US-ROK alliance thus began as a relationship in which South Korea was heavily dependent on America for military and economic assistance.²⁵² However, South Korea soon transitioned away from this dependency relationship after the Vietnam War, during which South Korea deployed troops to fight alongside US soldiers. During the war, South Korea had gained expertise in post-war rehabilitation, infrastructure building, and military strategy, which allowed South Korea to evolve into a provider of aid rather than an aid-recipient state. The second President of South Korea, Park Chung Hee, also came into power during this period and stressed the need to further reduce South Korea's economic dependency on the United States. President Park pioneered a range of economic development plans and oversaw the rapid transition of South Korea's economy into an export-oriented industry .

However, President Carter's relationship with the Park government began to strain US-ROK relations. Carter had proposed withdrawing troops from South Korea and continued to criticise human rights violations in the country. In 1977, Carter released a presidential review memorandum (PRM) that considered withdrawing US troops and imposing human rights requirements on Park's government. South Korean and Japanese leaders immediately reacted by rejecting Carter's proposals on the grounds that the withdrawal of US troops

²⁵¹ Kim Jung Ik, *The Future of the US-Republic of Korea Military Relationship* (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1996)

²⁵² Ibid.

would undermine regional stability.²⁵³ The South Korean government also reacted by covertly lobbying US congressmen to vote against Carter's troop withdrawal plan. The discovery of this Koreagate scandal further strained the US-ROK alliance.²⁵⁴ Carter's troop withdrawal plan was also resisted by domestic actors in the United States such as members of the US military and the US Congress. After receiving reports that North Korean forces were larger than estimated, Carter eventually agreed to indefinitely postpone the troop withdrawal plan in July 1979.²⁵⁵ Carter's decision eventually paved the way for improved bilateral relations between the United States and South Korea. However, US-ROK relations were soon jeopardised once again when President Park was assassinated on 26 October 1979.

4.2.2. South Korea's Political Crisis

After Park's murder, the people of South Korea strengthened their call for a democratic political system to fill the political vacuum in South Korea. However, on 12 December 1979, their demands were suppressed by a military coup led by General Chun Doo Hwan that swiftly brought South Korea under military leadership. Nevertheless, pro-democracy protests persisted nationwide, including the Kwangju Uprising from 18 to 27 May 1980. In response to the Uprising, General Chun decided to deploy the South Korean army

²⁵³ Tae Hwan Kwak and Wayne Patterson, "The Security Relationship between Korea and the United States, 1960-1982" in Yun-Bok Lee and Wayne Patterson (editors), *Korean-American Relations 1866-1997* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), pp.11-34; and Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Presidential Review Memorandum/ NSC 13", *National Security Council*, 26 January 1977

²⁵⁴ Han Sungjoo, "South Korea and the United States: The Alliance Survives", *Asian Survey* 20, no.11 (November, 1980), pp.1075-1086

²⁵⁵ An intelligence report by the US Army revealed that a revised estimate of the number of North Korean ground troops from about 440,000 to 500,000 soldiers. This figure was solely based on photographs from satellites and intercepted communications on the movement of North Korean units. The actual figure was argued to be much higher. See Bernard Weinraub, "Opposition Growing on Korean Pullout", *The New York Times*, 21 January 1979

to crackdown on demonstrators in Kwangju.²⁵⁶ This harsh suppression ended South Korea's democratic crisis as General Chun further consolidated his control over South Korea. This section traces the events that produced this democratic crisis in South Korea from 1979 to 1980.

In 1972, President Park imposed martial law under the Yushin Constitution for several reasons: to contain the growing divisions between political parties in South Korea, strengthen Park's control over South Korea's economy, and tackle South Korea's security crisis in the aftermath of Carter's announcement of a troop withdrawal.²⁵⁷ Under the Yushin Constitution, Park expanded the powers of the executive branch to appoint and dismiss cabinet members and prime ministers, suspend civil liberties, rule by emergency decree, and even remove presidential term limits. The wider executive power also allowed Park to drive a government-led economic growth which installed structural problems that failed to withstand the shock in oil prices in the 1970s.²⁵⁸ As a consequence of the economic crisis, South Korea's inflation in consumer prices rose sharply from 3.2 percent in 1973 to 25.3. percent in 1975 while the debt to GNP ratio skyrocketed from 28.7 percent in 1970 to 45 percent in 1980.²⁵⁹

Due to Park's authoritarianism and rising economic challenges, labor unrest and public dissatisfaction rose in South Korea in the late 1970s. On 17 October

²⁵⁶ Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", op. cit.

²⁵⁷ Uk Heo and Terence Roehrig, *South Korea Since 1980* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

²⁵⁸ Ibid.

²⁵⁹ Global Economy, "South Korea: Inflation", *Globaleconomy.com*, <https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/South-Korea/Inflation/>, (accessed 3 February 2017) and Susan M. Collins and Won Am Park, "An Overview of Korea's External Debt" in Jeffrey D. Sachs and Susan M. Collins (editors), *Developing Country Debt and Economic Performance, Volume 3, Country Studies - Indonesia, Korea, Philippines, Turkey* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp.170-182

1979, student-citizen demonstrations broke out as 12,000 students and middle-class citizens marched in Pusan city.²⁶⁰ Similar protests took place in other cities such as Seoul and Masan.²⁶¹ President Park responded by clamping down on the opposition New Democratic Party (NDP), arresting key NDP officials, confiscating NDP-produced newspapers, and raiding the NDP headquarters.²⁶²

In the midst of containing these public demonstrations, the Park government abruptly ended. On 26 October 1979, South Korea's crisis entered a new phase when Park Chung Hee was assassinated by the KCIA Director Kim Chae Kyu at a dinner event.²⁶³ Park died from sustained gun wounds, leaving behind a political vacuum for the next South Korean leadership to fill.

The United States responded to Park's assassination with a statement declaring continued support for the South Korean government and by deploying a US carrier battle group to deter North Korea from any rash behaviour.²⁶⁴ Throughout South Korea's democratic crisis, America prioritised maintaining stability on the Peninsula and prevent North Korea from exploiting domestic instability in South Korea.

After Park's assassination, Prime Minister Choi Kyu Hah assumed his new position as Acting President of South Korea. However, Choi's leadership was

²⁶⁰ Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", op. cit.

²⁶¹ Gregg Brazinsky, *Nation Building in South Korea* (USA: The University of Carolina Press, 2007)

²⁶² Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", op. cit.

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ Kwak and Patterson, "The Security Relationship between Korea and the United States, 1960-1982", op. cit.

soon challenged by the Hanahoe faction within the South Korean military.²⁶⁵ The Hanahoe, which was led by General Chun Doo Hwan, was a group of military officers that graduated together from the 11th class of the Korean Military Academy. On 12 December 1979, under the command of General Chun, the Hanahoe forces orchestrated a military coup to overtake Choi's administration. General Chun also deployed the 9th Army Division from its position along the demilitarised zone without the formal approval of the US Commander of the Combined Forces Command Lieutenant General John Wickham.²⁶⁶ The Hanahoe troops seized control of South Korea's Defence Ministry and Army Headquarters, and arrested senior commanders such as the Martial Law Administrator Jeung Seung Hwa for accused involvement in Park's assassination.²⁶⁷ The 12/12 military coup, as this event was termed, marked the beginning of General Chun Doo Hwan's military government over South Korea.

However, Chun's leadership was not well received by the South Korean people. After years of authoritarian rule under President Park, there was a growing public call for an end to martial law in favour of a more democratic political process and the direct election of South Korea's next President.²⁶⁸ After the 12/12 coup, student protests spread across the country as labour strikes followed in the towns of Sabuk and Pusan.²⁶⁹ On 14 April 1980, General Chun

²⁶⁵ Oh, *Korean Politics*, op. cit.

²⁶⁶ Hyug Baeg Im, "The US role in Korean democracy and security since Cold War era", *International Relations of the Asia Pacific* 6, no.2, (August, 2006), pp.157-187

²⁶⁷ Another reason for General Jeung's arrest was his intention to remove or reassign generals, including General Chun Doo Hwan. General Chun was likely to be reassigned to the East Coast Security Command, away from the political centre in Seoul. As General Chun could not have stopped this decision within normal channels, he decided to act first through a military coup. Upon his arrest, General Jeung Seung Hwa was convicted, reduced to the rank of private, stripped of all pay and benefits and forced to serve some prison time. See Heo and Roehrig, *South Korea since 1980*, op. cit.

²⁶⁸ William E. Berry, Jr., *Global Security Watch - Korea: a reference handbook* (Westport: Praeger Security International, 2008)

²⁶⁹ A minor strike took place in Sabuk and another steel mill riot in Pusan ended with one death and several injured. The Federation of Korean Trade Union was also threatening to sue the

appointed himself as Director of the KCIA to extend his authority into the civilian sphere. Angered at Chun's strengthening grip on power, domestic protests escalated. On 16 May 1980, NDP opposition leaders Kim Dae Jung and Kim Young Sam led 50,000 students to protest against Chun's government. The next day, General Chun responded by extending martial law, banning political activity, suspending the National Assembly, and detaining Kim Dae-Jung under house arrest.²⁷⁰

The residents of Kim Dae-Jung's hometown of Kwangju responded strongly against General Chun's manoeuvres.²⁷¹ On 18 May 1980, the Kwangju Uprising sparked when 200 college students from Chosun University marched towards the Provincial Office in Kwangju in defiance of the ban on political activity and protested against General Chun's military rule. The students were joined by Kwangju residents that transformed the movement into a student-worker-citizen uprising.²⁷² Once the demonstrators reached the Provincial Office in Kwangju, they were met by riot police that dispersed the crowd with tear gas. Military troops from the Special War Command airborne troops of the 7th Brigade descended on protestors with bayonets, riot-control clubs, and rifle butts.²⁷³ In retaliation, the protestors armed themselves with weapons raided from local armories and police stations.²⁷⁴ On 21 May 1980, students and citizens filled Kumkang Street in Kwangju with buses and taxis. They were met with

South Korean government if the Special Measures law, which denied labor rights, was not removed. See Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", op. cit.

²⁷⁰ Linda S. Lewis, *Laying Claim to the Memory of May: A Look Back at the 1980 Kwangju Uprising* (Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press, 2002)

²⁷¹ Oh, *Korean Politics*, op. cit.

²⁷² There are competing sources on the actual size of the crowd. Some estimate that the final size was 500, while other authors speculate 100,000 protestors. See Lewis, *Laying Claim to the Memory of May*, op. cit.; and Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", op. cit.

²⁷³ Heo and Roehrig, *South Korea Since 1980*, op. cit.; and Oh, *Korean Politics*, op. cit.

²⁷⁴ Heo and Roehrig, *South Korea Since 1980*, op. cit.

paratroopers from the South Korean army that indiscriminately opened fire on them. The students moved to occupy the provincial government building and declared that Kwangju was liberated from General Chun's government.²⁷⁵

On 27 May 1980, the Kwangju Uprising ended when General Chun firmly suppressed the protestors. Around 20,000 troops from the 20th Division of the joint Combined Forces Command were deployed, without acknowledgment from General Wickham, and ascended on the demonstrators with tanks and armoured personnel carriers.²⁷⁶ On this final day of the Uprising, 1740 civilian were arrested and around 230 Kwangju citizens were killed, according to official estimate. However, unofficial estimates put the actual number of deaths to between 600 to 2,000 people.²⁷⁷

This series of domestic events that took place from October 1979 to May 1980 cultivated intense public distrust in the South Korean government. Incited by the economic crisis, South Koreans first protested against the authoritarian Park leadership in 1979. When the political vacuum left by Park's sudden death was swiftly replaced with another authoritarian government led by General Chun, the South Korean public heightened their call for a more democratic political system. However, General Chun continued to strengthen his military authority and responded to the Kwangju Uprising through harsh and repressive authoritarian actions, which soon demanded a policy response from the United States.

²⁷⁵ Oh, *Korean Politics*, op. cit.

²⁷⁶ Heo and Roehrig, *South Korea Since 1980*, op. cit.; and Oh, *Korean Politics*, op. cit.

²⁷⁷ Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", op. cit.

4.2.3. America's Policy Response

In response to South Korea's democratic crisis, US policymakers adopted a cautious and passive democracy promotion policy towards General Chun's government. The strategies used by US policymakers to implement this policy included avoiding economic pressure, employing quiet diplomacy, refraining from supporting South Korea's civil society, and leveraging US military cooperation with South Korea.

First, US policymakers refrained from imposing any form of economic sanctions against General Chun's government. The US Ambassador to South Korea William Gleysteen rejected proposals from US policymakers that suggested imposing economic sanctions as he argued that sanctions might cripple South Korea's economy and national defence capability. "We must not take sanctions, symbolic or otherwise against the ROK", Gleysteen wrote in a confidential memorandum to the State Department, "which would in any way diminish ROK and US/ROK defence capabilities."²⁷⁸ The priority was to maintain political stability in South Korea and protect US economic interests in South Korea's economy.

Consequently, economic relations between the United States and South Korea continued unhampered during the political crisis. The week after Park's assassination, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance met with South Korean officials on 8 November 1979 to assure them that the US\$1 billion loan from the Export-Import (EXIM) bank would proceed on schedule.²⁷⁹ After the 12/12 military coup,

²⁷⁸ William Gleysteen, "Korea Focus - Relations with ROK Military", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 26 December 1979

²⁷⁹ William Gleysteen, "Korea Focus - Secretary's Discussion with Foreign Minister Park Tong-Jin", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 8 November 1979

the White House continued to discuss proposals with the South Korean government on ways to improve bilateral cooperation in scientific-assistance.²⁸⁰ As popular protests in South Korea peaked in January 1980, a US congressional delegation led by Senator Lester Wolff visited Seoul to conduct talks with President Choi Kyu Hah, Prime Minister Shin Hyon Hwak, Foreign Minister Park Tong Jin, Defense Minister Choo Young Bak, Education Minister Kim Ok Gil, Ruling Party Leader Kim Jong Pil, Opposition Leader Kim Young Sam, Presidential Candidate Kim Dae Jung, and many others. The main agenda of the visit was to discuss a concept for a regional economic community and examine prospects of dropping protectionist measures against South Korean exports.²⁸¹

Additionally, US policymakers relied heavily on quiet diplomacy in their engagements with South Korea. US policymakers would refrain from openly criticising the Chun government while privately encouraging South Korean officials to adopt democratic reforms. US Secretary of State Cyrus Vance encouraged quiet diplomacy which required upholding a low-profile policy that would “avoid taking sides for or against individual contenders and must be circumspect to a fault to avoid being seen by many Koreans as the behind the scenes Kingmaker.”²⁸² Gleysteen outlined the strategies that should entail quiet diplomacy, in which the United States:²⁸³

²⁸⁰ Cyrus Vance, “Weekly Status Report - Korea”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 19 December 1979

²⁸¹ William Gleysteen, “First Meeting of a US Congressional Delegation with Korean President Choi Kyu Hah”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 15 January 1980

²⁸² Warren Christopher, “Text of scope paper re state funeral for Korean President Park”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 1 November 1979

²⁸³ In his memoir, Gleysteen specified guidelines that he personally followed to adopt quiet diplomacy towards South Korea: i) Guard against North Korean efforts to exploit the weakness in South Korea's governing structure; ii) Deter fighting against South Korean military units; iii) Prevent hostile confrontation between US forces and Korean troops or civilians; iv) Communicate with effective authorities but refrain from premature endorsement of self-appointed leaders; v) Support the process of constitutional change, even through a flawed constitution; vi) Stress that long-term stability in Korea requires discernible progress toward political liberalization; vii) Sustain economic stability; viii) Keep in mind that US influence is a

... should deal with the ROK army group through normal military channels, continuing to convey our distress over recent events, but not give the impression that we expect a return to the status quo ante. Mostly in quiet ways, we should encourage unity of the armed forces, maintenance of civilian government, political moderation on the part of law and order force, and patience among opposition/dissident elements - all in hopes of preserving progress toward political liberalisation.²⁸⁴

This quiet diplomacy approach largely characterised the passive democracy promotion strategy adopted by US policymakers after Park's assassination and the 12/12 military coup. After Park's assassination, Secretary of State Vance suggested that Ambassador Gleysteen should advise the South Korean government to move towards a democratic direction which "make[s] a clear break from the past" by releasing a timeline that listed gradual steps to achieve a democratic political structure such as releasing political prisoners, abolishing the martial law (also known as EM-9), and lifting constraints on opposition leaders.²⁸⁵ As Gleysteen personally approached Acting President Choi Kyu Hah, Foreign Minister Park Tong Jin, and Martial Law Administrator Jeung Seung Hwa to relay this message, Gleysteen heeded Vance's advice and also added that America would not publicly discredit South Korea and that strong bilateral trade ties would continue.²⁸⁶

marginal factor in Korean domestic struggles; and ix) Try not to be on the wrong side of an issue from the majority of the Korean people. See William H. Gleysteen, Jr. *Massive Entanglement, Marginal Influence: Carter and Korea in Crisis* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999)

²⁸⁴ William Gleysteen, "Second look at December 12 Incident", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 28 December 1979

²⁸⁵ Christopher, "Text of scope paper re state funeral for Korean President Park", op. cit.

²⁸⁶ Gleysteen, "Korea Focus - Secretary's Discussion with Foreign Minister Park Tong-Jin", op. cit.; William Gleysteen, "Call on Acting President", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 13 November 1979; William Gleysteen, "Korea Focus: Meeting with FONMIN Park November 28", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 28 November 1979; and William Gleysteen, "Korea Focus: Meeting with Martial Law Administration Toh Chong November 30", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 3 December 1979

After the 12/12 coup, US Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke also used quiet diplomacy to assure Korean Ambassador to the United States Kim Young Shik that America “would not publicly contest the ROKG [Republic of Korea Government] version of recent events.”²⁸⁷ Holbrooke added that America “would not wish to see further military changes of command “Korea Style”” and warned that the US-ROK alliance would experience “potentially grave implications” if the coup resulted in the reversal of orderly political change.²⁸⁸ Holbrooke also privately met with President Choi and NDP President Kim Young Sam to relay the same message.²⁸⁹

Meanwhile, Gleysteen reached out to General Chun, Prime Minister Shin Hyon Hawk, Foreign Minister Park Tong Jin, and NDP President Kim Young Sam to relay America’s disappointment with the coup outcome and America’s concern that political instability could threaten to undermine South Korea’s defence capability and democratisation progress.²⁹⁰ The Chairman of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Lester Wolff added to America’s quiet diplomacy efforts by approaching Defence Minister Choo Young Bak in January 1980 to express America’s hope for a democratic South Korea.²⁹¹

²⁸⁷ Richard Holbrooke, “Korea Focus - Amb Kim conveys ROKG assurances on Political Development”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 18 December 1979

²⁸⁸ Ibid.; and Cyrus Vance, “Korea Focus - ROK Ambassador Kim tries to exert influence”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 15 December 1979

²⁸⁹ William Gleysteen, “Holbrooke Meeting with President Choi”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 17 January 1980 and William Gleysteen, “Assistant Secretary Holbrooke’s call on NDP President Kim Young-Sam”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 17 January 1980

²⁹⁰ William Gleysteen, “Korea Focus - Discussion with SG Chon Tu Hwan”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 15 December 1979; William Gleysteen, “Korea Focus - My meeting with Prime Minister December 18”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 18 December 1979 and William Gleysteen, “Korea Focus - My meeting with Foreign Minister December 19”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 19 December 1979

²⁹¹ William Gleysteen, “CODEL Wolff call on Defense Minister Choo”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 11 January 1980

Therefore, throughout South Korea's democratic crisis, US policymakers were in agreement that the United States should only relay America's concern through private avenues and avoid public statements because, as according to Ambassador Gleysteen, "while we need to react strongly, we also need to control ourselves...As angry as we may be, we are still deeply entangled in Korea and do not really have the alternative of walking away."²⁹² By adopting quiet diplomacy to passively encourage gradual democratic change in South Korea, America would be able to achieve its priorities, which according to Senator Wolff was that "the US was interested in ROK economic viability, democratization over time and a strong common defence against those who would rule by force of arms."²⁹³

The third strategy that America employed was a conscious decision to refrain from supporting pro-democracy groups in South Korea. According to Gleysteen, the United States should not intervene in the Korean society and "urged that we resist the temptation to suggest architectural designs to the Koreans."²⁹⁴ Consequently, the US Embassy in Seoul limited its interactions with South Korean opposition parties through infrequent meetings that only focused on gaining information on the opposition movement without extending much democratic assistance to them.

Lastly, US policymakers leveraged US military assistance to pressure General Chun to adopt democratic reforms. After the 12/12 military coup, the Senate

²⁹² William Gleysteen, "Crackdown in Seoul", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 17 May 1980

²⁹³ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁴ William Gleysteen, "Initial Reflections on post-Park Chung Hee Situation in Korea", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 28 October 1979

Foreign Relations Committee tried to exert pressure on the Chun government by postponing a hearing on the co-production of F-5 fighter jets in South Korea.²⁹⁵ The United States also suspended the annual Security Consultative Meeting and foreign military sales credits to South Korea.²⁹⁶ However, the implications of these actions on the US-ROK relationship were minimal and served only to indicate America's dismay with the outcome of events in South Korea.

Additionally, US policymakers refrained from interfering in General Chun's decision to deploy CFC troops to Kwangju.²⁹⁷ During an emergency meeting on 22 May 1980, Assistant Secretary Holbrooke and other policymakers including National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, CIA Director Admiral Stansfield Turner, US Defence Secretary Harold Brown, and the newly-installed Secretary of State Edmund Muskie reached a "general agreement that the first priority is the restoration of order in Kwangju by the Korean authorities with the minimum use of force necessary."²⁹⁸ During the meeting, a consensus was reached that "in none of our discussions [with South Korean officials] will we in any way suggest that the USG (US Government) opposes ROKG contingency plans to maintain law and order, if absolutely necessary, by reinforcing the police with the army."²⁹⁹ Brzezinski neatly summed up America's passive policy, which was "in the short

²⁹⁵ Cyrus Vance, "Korea Focus: Relations with ROK Military", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 20 December 1979

²⁹⁶ Lee, *A Troubled Peace*, op. cit.

²⁹⁷ It is a procedural formality for the South Korean government to notify the United States before moving units under CFC command. However, General Wickham was in Washington when the South Korean military notified their intent to move the 20th Division to Kwangju. As General Wickham was out of the country, the CFC's Deputy Commander accepted the notification in his stead. See Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", op. cit.; and Heo and Roehrig, *South Korea since 1980*, op. cit.

²⁹⁸ Tim Shorrock, "The U.S. Role in Korea in 1979 and 1980", *The May 18 Memorial Foundation*, 17 October 2008, <http://eng.518.org/sub.php?PID=0502&page=19&category=&searchText=&searchType=&action=Read&idx=279&ckattempt=1> (accessed 17 October 2017)

²⁹⁹ Tim Shorrock, "Ex-Leaders Go On Trial", *Journal of Commerce*, 27 February 1996, http://timshorrock.com/?page_id=21, (accessed 30 November 2015)

term support, in the longer term pressure for political evolution."³⁰⁰ By adopting such a limited and restrained response towards South Korea, America hoped to first support the Chun government in securing political stability before actively encouraging democratisation in South Korea.³⁰¹ However, due to the emphasis on maintaining stability, America's passive policy also jeopardised South Korea's democratisation progress as General Chun continued to consolidate his political authority by suppressing pro-democracy demonstrators in Kwangju.

Throughout South Korea's democratic crisis, America adopted a passive democracy promotion policy which refrained from opposing General Chun's authoritarian actions and privately encouraged South Korean officials to adopt democratic reforms. Under the passive policy, America's four strategies were designed to prioritise political stability on the Korean Peninsula, deter aggressive action from North Korea, and maintain South Korea's economic viability. The next sections comprise a policy analysis of various domestic factors surrounding the development of America's passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea's democratic crisis. The policy analysis begins with identifying President Carter's intended policy response and then proceeds to analyse the impact of other groups of domestic actors on America's foreign policymaking process.

³⁰⁰ Policy Review Committee, "Summary of Conclusions", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 30 May 1980

³⁰¹ Tim Shorrock, "The Lasting Significance of Kwangju", *Institute for Policy Studies*, 1 June 2010, <http://www.ips-dc.org/the-lasting-significance-of-kwangju/>, (accessed 17 October 2017)

4.3. Presidential Intent

What was the President's intended policy response? What factors drove the President to support this policy?

Unlike President Nixon's strongly determined foreign policy response towards Chile, President Carter had not developed a clear foreign policy response towards the democratic turmoil in South Korea. The political crisis in South Korea had coincided with a turbulent period in America's foreign policy history. In 1979, the same year that popular protests began in Seoul, the Carter administration was occupied with a series of foreign policy crises. US global power was undermined by an economic recession, the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba and Afghanistan, and a hostage-taking crisis in Iran. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union and North Korea continued to pose a challenge to America's influence in Northeast Asia.

America's economic recession was sparked by rising global oil prices that contributed to the 1979 energy crisis. Due to investor fears fuelled by Iran's decreased oil output in the wake of the Iranian Revolution, the nominal price of imported crude oil escalated from US\$ 14.52 per barrel in January 1978 to US\$ 35.63 per barrel in December 1980, as shown in Figure 3 below.³⁰²

³⁰² Tim McMahon, "Historical Crude Oil Prices (Table)", *InflationData*, 27 August 2017, https://inflationdata.com/Inflation/Inflation_Rate/Historical_Oil_Prices_Table.asp, (accessed 23 June 2017)

Figure 3. Imported Crude Oil Nominal Price (US\$/barrel), 1978 - 1980

Source: US Energy Information Administration, "Short-Term Energy Outlook", *US Energy Information Administration*, <https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/steo/realprices/> (accessed 12 November 2018)

This spike in oil prices contributed to rising unemployment rates in the United States, with the lowest rate at 5.6 percent in May 1979 spiking to 7.8 percent in July 1980.³⁰³ From January 1978 to June 1980, inflation in the United States also increased from 6.84 percent to 14.38 percent.³⁰⁴ These two concerning trends are illustrated in Figure 4 below. By February 1980, an opinion poll indicated that 48 percent of the American people were citing inflation as their greatest concern.³⁰⁵

³⁰³David Coleman, "Unemployment Rates by President, 1948-2016", *History in Pieces*, <https://historyinpieces.com/research/us-unemployment-rates-president>, (accessed 24 June 2017)

³⁰⁴Tim McMahon, "Historical Inflation Rate", *InflationData*, 12 June 2018, https://inflationdata.com/Inflation/Inflation_Rate/HistoricalInflation.aspx, (accessed 25 June 2018)

³⁰⁵Scott Kaufman, *Plans Unraveled: The Foreign Policy of the Carter Administration* (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008)

Figure 4. US Unemployment Rate and Inflation Rate (%), 1978 - 1980

Source: Coleman, "Unemployment Rates by President, 1948-2016", op. cit. and Tim McMahon, "Historical Inflation Rate", *InflationData*, 12 June 2018, https://inflationdata.com/Inflation/Inflation_Rate/HistoricalInflation.aspx, (accessed 25 June 2018)

To add to the challenge of addressing an economic downturn, the Soviet Union presence in Cuba and Afghanistan was undermining America's global presence. In September 1979, President Carter received reports that around 2,000 to 3,000 Soviet troops were building a Soviet combat unit in Cuba.³⁰⁶ To prevent these reports from undermining the ongoing US-Soviet Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) II negotiations which was aimed towards mutually reducing nuclear stockpiles, Carter insisted that the Soviet troops in Cuba "poses no threat to the United States."³⁰⁷ However, in December 1979, another 80,000 Soviet troops were deployed into Afghanistan.³⁰⁸ This time, Carter responded by

³⁰⁶ Don Oberdofer, "Soviets in Cuba called Threat to SALT Approval", *The Washington Post*, 6 September 1979

³⁰⁷ George C. Wilson, "Soviet Troop Unit in Cuba is called 'No Threat' to U.S.", *The Washington Post*, 1 September 1979; and Robert Kaiser, "Selling SALT: A Defense Plan Preview", *The Washington Post*, 5 October 1979

³⁰⁸ Afghanistan was on the brink of civil war as President Nur Muhammad Taraki and Deputy Prime Minister Hafizullah Amin were struggling for power. Meanwhile, Islamic militancy was spreading across the Middle East. Having attacked the Grand Mosque in Saudi Arabia, the militants were on the verge of capturing Afghanistan as well. The Soviet Union also feared that if they did not intervene, the Soviets would lose their Afghanistan ally to the United States. See

imposing a grain embargo and international controls on the export of technology to the Soviet Union, called on the world to boycott the 1980 Summer Olympics, and shelved the final ratification of the SALT II treaty in January 1980.³⁰⁹ The Soviet Union's decision to intervene in Afghanistan had "ended" detente between Washington and the Kremlin, as Carter proclaimed the Soviet invasion was "a clear threat to the peace" which "could mark a long-lasting turning point in our relations."³¹⁰

During this period, Carter was also tackling the Iran hostage situation in which American civilians were being held hostage in Tehran, Iran. In November 1979, radical Islamist students angered with America's decision to allow the exiled Shah of Iran Reza Pahlavi to enter the United States for medical treatment, seized the US Embassy in Tehran and captured 52 American staff. The Americans stayed in captivity for more than a year before Carter hastily approved Operation Eagle Claw in April 1980 to try rescue the hostages. However, the operation failed drastically when eight soldiers died in a helicopter crash due to mechanical problems with the rescue helicopter. The Iran hostage-taking situation has since been described as a foreign policy failure for the Carter administration.³¹¹

The combination of these international and economic crises damaged Carter's presidency so much so that by 1980, America's global standing was described in harrowing terms: "We see peace threatened, our defences weakened, the military

Kaufman, *Plans Unraveled*, op. cit.

³⁰⁹ Robert T. Davis II and Scott Kaufman, "The Armed Forces during the Carter Years" in Scott Kaufman (editor), *A Companion to Gerald R. Ford and Jimmy Carter* (Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2016), pp. 430-449

³¹⁰ Kaufman, *Plans Unraveled*, op. cit.

³¹¹ Lewis L. Gould, *The Modern American Presidency* (Lawrence, Kansas: The University Press of Kansas, 2003)

balance tipped, the Soviet Union and its agents from Cuba and Vietnam expand, exploit, invade, and repress.”³¹²

Meanwhile, US-South Korea relations were also undergoing change. In 1978, a year before South Korea’s democratic crisis, the joint CFC was formed to reassure the South Korea government that the US security guarantee would remain in place despite Carter’s decision to withdraw combat ground troops. The aim of the CFC was to provide coordinated defence against any external aggression to South Korea through ground, air, naval and combined marine forces component commands.³¹³ As North Korea’s refusal to recognise the sovereignty of South Korea remained a threat to stability in Northeast Asia, the CFC vowed to continue providing for South Korea’s national defence. America had also recently pulled out of the Vietnam War in 1975, which made Carter keen to shift the US strategic focus away from Asia. By reducing US military presence from the region, Carter hoped to encourage countries in Asia to uphold their own national security.³¹⁴ Carter also called for a new direction in US policy towards Asia that focused on strategic flexibility by shifting the emphasis away from conventional ground forces and towards developing naval and air capabilities instead.³¹⁵

³¹² This statement was made by Donald Rumsfeld at the Republican National Convention in 1980. See Ibid.

³¹³ United States Forces Korea, “Mission of the ROK/US Combined Forces Command”, *United States Forces Korea*, <http://www.usfk.mil/About/Combined-Forces-Command/>, (accessed 28 February 2017)

³¹⁴ Carter’s decision reflects the Nixon Doctrine, in which the United States is to “avoid the kind of policy that will make countries in Asia so dependent upon us that we are dragged into conflicts such as the one we have in Vietnam.” Therefore, “as far as the problems of military defense, except for the threat of a major power involving nuclear weapons, that the United States is going to encourage and has a right to expect that his problem will be handled by, and responsibility for it taken by, the Asian nations themselves.” See Office of the Historian, “Editorial Note”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume I, Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1969 - 1972*, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v01/d29>, (accessed 23 June 2017)

³¹⁵ Lee, *A Troubled Peace*, op. cit.

Therefore, during South Korea's democratic crisis, Carter was also pressed to address other pressing foreign policy challenges such as the energy crisis that spurred an economic downturn, Soviet troops in Cuba and Afghanistan, the Iran hostage-taking situation, and the constant threat of invasion posed by North Korea. Having taken steps to secure South Korea's national defence by installing the Combined Forces Command in South Korea, Carter was also confident in America's ability to conduct a quick response to any unanticipated belligerence from North Korea. Consequently, with other foreign policy crisis taking a higher priority than South Korea's democratic crisis on Carter's foreign policy agenda, Carter did not articulate a clear intended policy towards South Korea.

4.4. Influence of Senior Policymakers

Did US policymakers with direct access to the President exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?

As the democratic crisis in South Korea unfolded, senior foreign policymakers surrounding Carter were preoccupied with the other foreign policy challenges taking place around the world. The policymakers that did have access to Carter, such as Secretary of State Vance and Assistant Secretary Holbrooke, decided to proceed with a low-profile policy towards South Korea. Through limited US intervention in South Korea, US policymakers hoped to avoid "another Iran" situation and the escalation of a North Korean threat. It became a priority for US policymakers to maintain the regional status-quo especially as America continued to defend its global influence in other parts of the world. America's passive democracy promotion policy was thus an outcome of these shared perspectives and also a product of the clashing foreign policy opinions and

influence of key individuals in the US foreign policy bureaucracy.

4.4.1. Avoiding “another Iran”

The Iranian Revolution which had ended in February 1979 influenced the US policymakers’ response to the South Korean democratic crisis. US policymakers grew concerned that as in Iran, Park’s assassination and the 12/12 military coup might necessitate a US intervention that would produce a hostile South Korean government against the United States. After a meeting with US Congressmen and Senators, Assistant Secretary Holbrooke described how the Congress members “attitudes, like everyone else’s, are dominated by the Iranian crisis and, needless to say nobody wants “another Iran” - by which they mean American action which would in any way appear to unravel a situation and lead to chaos or instability in a key American ally.”³¹⁶ Due to this concern, Holbrooke also encouraged a passive democracy promotion policy, “a delicate operation designed to use American influence to reduce the chances of confrontation.”³¹⁷

4.4.2. Deterring North Korea

After Park’s assassination, US policymakers were also concerned that the North Korean government could exploit South Korea’s political instability through aggressive actions, which would require a military response from South Korean and US forces based in South Korea. As expressed by the Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher, “the new situation [in South Korea] clearly is an opportunity. But it also begins a period of great danger. Koreans in the North as well as in the South will be watching, and in some cases trying to exploit, what

³¹⁶ Richard Holbrooke, “Korea Focus - Nudging ROK Political Leaders”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 3 December 1979

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*

we do and what we say. Any mishandling would have direct and serious consequences for the United States.”³¹⁸ The same concern arose amongst US policymakers during the 12/12 military coup, after which Ambassador Gleysteen condemned the coup as “irresponsible military actions” and stressed America’s “concern over the danger of insubordination, particularly in light of the North Korean threat.”³¹⁹

4.4.3. Clashing Foreign Policy Opinions

America’s passive democracy promotion policy was also an outcome of competing foreign policy opinions and direct disagreements between policymakers and agencies. The main debate was on whether to adopt a low-profile policy, which required cooperating with General Chun’s authoritarian government, or cooperate with the Chun government that would also imply accepting General Chun as South Korea’s legitimate leader. However, US policymakers were not clearly divided along these opinions due to inter-agency disagreements.

Assistant Secretary of State Holbrooke was amongst the policymakers that supported a “carefully calibrated posture of disapproval, public and private” which comprised “avoiding statements which imply that we [the United States] are encouraging opposition to the government”, cooperating with the Chun military government, and exercising restraint.³²⁰ Holbrooke was also backed by

³¹⁸ Christopher, “Text of Scope Paper re State Funeral for Korean President Park”, op. cit.

³¹⁹ William Gleysteen, “Younger ROK Officers Grab Power”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 13 December 1979

³²⁰ Won Gon Park, “The US Carter Administration and Korea in the 12/12 Incident: Concession of Moral Diplomacy”, *Korean Social Sciences Review* 2, no.2 (2012), pp.253-281; and Richard Holbrooke, “Memo: Action Memorandum from Richard Holbrooke and Anthony Lake to the US Secretary of State, ‘PRC Meeting on Korea’”, *History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive*, 22 May 1980, <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/122094>, (accessed 20 October 2017)

other policymakers such as the Director of Korean Affairs Robert Rich and Secretary of State Vance, who all agreed that although there could an opportunity for democratisation in South Korea, “we had to shut our mouths a bit” to prioritise stability on the Korean Peninsula.³²¹

On the other hand, policymakers such as the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights Patricia Derian criticised the US policymakers’ emphasis on US national security concerns. Derian argued that State Department officials, including Holbrooke, were driven by “national security hysterics” that drove US foreign policy away from actively encouraging democratisation in South Korea.³²² The CFC Commander Admiral John Wickham also called for a US policy that restrained Chun’s authoritarian decision to unilaterally deploy troops against protestors. Wickham argued that Chun would impede democratic political change and could potentially expose South Korea to North Korean invasion.³²³

The development of US policy towards South Korea was also influenced by disagreements between individual policymakers. Although Assistant Secretary Holbrooke and Ambassador Gleysteen agreed that America’s optimal policy should be “low-profile”, they could not concur on how best to implement this strategy. Gleysteen rejected most of Holbrooke’s policy suggestions which he considered too destabilising for the Korean Peninsula. When Holbrooke pushed for economic sanctions, Gleysteen countered that “we must not take sanctions, symbolic or otherwise, against the ROK...[because it could]...diminish ROK and US/ROK defence capabilities, and we must also be careful not to do anything

³²¹ Fowler, “The United States and South Korean Democratisation”, op. cit.

³²² Shorrock, “Ex-Leaders Go On Trial”, op. cit.

³²³ Park, “The US Carter Administration and Korea in the 12/12 Incident”, op. cit.

which would appear to the Korean public as anti-Korean..."³²⁴ Holbrooke then suggested warning the protestors that "demonstrations in the street are a throwback to an earlier era and threaten to provoke retrogressive actions on the part of the Korean government...the US government views them as unhelpful while martial law is still in effect."³²⁵ However, Gleysteen once again disagreed, explaining that "if we were to go beyond it with an explicit message and clear warning to the dissidents, I think we would get ourselves in a lot of trouble without accomplishing much more than we are now."³²⁶

In Seoul, officials from the US Embassy, United States Forces Korea (USFK), and the CIA station competed to influence Korean policy, sowing further mutual distrust between the departments. The State Department was intent on driving US foreign policy, as it was observed that "the State Department was likely concerned that it would lose control of what it viewed as an essentially political matter."³²⁷ This is reflected in the actions by the Political Section in the US Embassy and Ambassador Gleysteen which rejected several proposals by USFK military officers such as setting up a direct channel with Martial Law Commander General Jeung Seung Hwa to encourage democratic reform.³²⁸ Ambassador Gleysteen from the US Embassy also rejected a suggestion by the CIA Station Chief Robert Brewster to push for a more "realistic and conciliatory position" by holding personal meetings with General Chun.³²⁹

³²⁴ Richard Holbrooke, "Korea Focus - Nudging ROK Political Leaders", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 4 December 1979

³²⁵ *Ibid.*

³²⁶ William H. Gleysteen, "Korea Focus - Nudging ROK Political Leaders", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 7 December 1979

³²⁷ James V. Young, *Eye on Korea: An Insider Account of Korean-American Relations* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2003)

³²⁸ *Ibid.*

³²⁹ Ambassador Gleysteen eventually agreed to meet with General Chun but only after it was first suggested by General Chun himself. See *Ibid.*, op. cit., p.82; and Lee, *A Troubled Peace*, op. cit.

4.4.4. Influential Individuals

As other foreign policy challenges took precedence over South Korea's democratic crisis in the Carter administration, US foreign policymakers that were directly involved in South Korea gained a wider latitude of authority in determining US foreign policy.³³⁰ Ambassador Gleysteen, Assistant Secretary Holbrooke, and Secretary of State Vance were amongst some of the policymakers that played an important role in shaping US policy towards South Korea.

Assistant Secretary of State Holbrooke exerted influence on the US foreign policymaking process to form a passive "low-profile" policy towards South Korea. In a meeting with South Korea's Ambassador Kim Young Shik, Holbrooke informed Ambassador Kim that Carter's priority was to maintain stability in South Korea. "Despite the pressures of the Iranian crisis," Holbrooke stated to Ambassador Kim, "the President has been following the Korean situation very closely. The President is anxious that the combined forces command arrangements remain inviolate."³³¹

Secretary Vance also pressured Ambassador Gleysteen to implement a cautious policy towards South Korea because "nobody wants another Iran". Ambassador Gleysteen then followed Vance's advice by pursuing a passive low-profile policy through various strategies.³³² Meanwhile, President Carter, who was following the democratic crisis in South Korea from a distance, did not

³³⁰ Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", op. cit.

³³¹ Cyrus Vance, "Korea Focus: Amb Kim", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 19 December 1979

³³² Cyrus Vance, "Korea Focus - Nudging ROK Political Leaders", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 4 December 1979

demonstrate any objections to the policymakers' decision to adopt a passive democracy promotion approach.

The intense disagreement between Secretary of State Vance and National Security Advisor Brzezinski, which eventually led to Vance's resignation, also impacted US foreign policy towards South Korea. Vance and Brzezinski had represented two disparate ends of the political spectrum. While Vance preferred diplomacy and detente, Brzezinski favoured a more assertive posture that included military build-ups. These competing viewpoints became a regular point of friction in foreign policy debates between Vance and Brzezinski on Soviet Union, Nicaragua, Iran and China.³³³ According to Vance, the lack of clear guidance from President Carter and the developing tension with Brzezinski "became a political liability...[which left] the Congress and foreign governments with the impression that the administration did not know its mind."³³⁴ Vance eventually handed in his resignation in anger over Operation Eagle Claw which failed to rescue American hostages in Iran in April 1980. Vance was soon replaced by Edmund Muskie as Secretary of State on 8 May 1980, which was also at the height of the South Korean democratic crisis.

This change in the holders of the Secretary of State position, which took place only ten days before the Kwangju Uprising, contributed to a shift in US policy towards South Korea. While Vance had counselled a passive policy that required exercising moderation to South Korean opposition parties and was "careful not to engage in public criticism" of the Chun government, Secretary of State Muskie

³³³ Kaufman, *Plans Unraveled*, op. cit.

³³⁴ Ibid.

was expressing a willingness to actively encourage democracy.³³⁵ Under Muskie's direction, America's policy towards South Korea turned towards active democracy promotion after the Kwangju Uprising. On 4 June 1980, upon Muskie's instructions, Ambassador Gleysteen met with General Chun to relay America's serious concern with the deployment of ROK Special Forces to Kwangju. On 26 June 1980 and 8 July 1980, Gleysteen emphasised once again to General Chun "the need for overall progress toward political liberalization" in South Korea. Gleysteen also warned General Chun of America's difficulty to sustain a basic security and economic relationship with South Korea without any signs of democratic progress and emphasised that Chun had "abused" the US-ROK security relations.³³⁶

Throughout South Korea's democratic crisis, the development of US foreign policy was marked by clashing foreign policy opinions and the competing influence of departmental agencies and influential individuals. There were frequent disagreements between Secretary of State Vance and National Security Advisor Brzezinski and debates between policymakers that preferred a "low-profile" approach and those that advocated a more active posture. There were also disputes between policymakers on the implementation of US strategy and the lack of coordination between the US Embassy in Seoul, United States Forces Korea (USFK) officials, and the CIA station. Without a firm intended policy response expressed by President Carter, US policymakers could not achieve a firm consensus on whether to adopt a passive low-profile policy or to actively encourage an immediate democratic transition in South Korea. This resulted in

³³⁵ Shorrock, "The Lasting Significance of Kwangju", op. cit.

³³⁶ John A. Wickham, *Korea on the Brink: From the "12/12 Incident" to the Kwangju Uprising, 1979-1980* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1999)

America settling on the lowest common denominator option which was to prioritise regional stability through a passive democracy promotion policy that allowed for the United States to remain detached from political developments in South Korea.

4.5. Congressional Pressure

Did members of the US Congress exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?

When public protests first broke out in South Korea in October 1979, a majority of members in the US Congress practised restraint and discouraged US involvement in South Korea's domestic politics. Congress' experiences with the recent Koreagate scandal and the troop withdrawal debate had restrained members of the US Congress from supporting a stronger US involvement in South Korea's democratic crisis. However, this did not stop a few congressional members from taking the initiative to directly persuade some South Korean officials to adopt democratic reforms. Only after the brutal end of the Kwangju Uprising incited international media attention, the US Congress was incited to exercise more influence in driving US policy towards South Korea.

The experiences of the Koreagate scandal and the troop withdrawal debate had restrained most congressional members from taking a strong stand towards any South Korean issue. When the 1976 Koreagate scandal uncovered South Korean officials that were bribing US congressional members to influence US policy in Asia, this exacerbated tensions in the US-ROK. South Korean President Park Chung Hee had also initially refused to comply with President Carter's

request to extradite the prime suspect Park Tong Sun to the United States.³³⁷

US-ROK bilateral relations were also strained by Carter's decision to withdraw US troops from South Korea and to criticise President Park's human rights violations.³³⁸ Carter's troop withdrawal proposal was rejected by members of the US Congress such as the Chairman of the Senate Government Affairs Committee and a member of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee, Senator John Glenn, who stressed that it was important to prevent giving the impression to US allies in Asia that the United States would unilaterally withdraw its military power from the region as this could upset the delicate strategic balance on the Korean Peninsula.³³⁹ Only after coming under strong domestic pressure and receiving a reassessment that North Korean troops were larger than originally estimated, Carter announced in July 1979 that plans to withdraw troops "will remain in abeyance".³⁴⁰ However, the negative experiences of the Koreagate scandal and troop withdrawal debate had already formed a strong anti-Korean lobbying group in the US Congress that was reluctant to engage any further with South Korea.³⁴¹

Therefore, when the democratic crisis began in South Korea in 1979, most Congress members were still resistant to the idea of developing US policy

³³⁷ A. David Adesnik and Sunhyuk Kim, "If at first you don't succeed: the puzzle of South Korea's democratic transition", *CDDRL Working Paper*, July 2008, http://cddrl.fsi.stanford.edu/publications/if_at_first_you_dont_succeed_the_puzzle_of_south_koreas_democratic_transition (accessed 28 July 2014)

³³⁸ Lee, *A Troubled Peace*, op. cit.

³³⁹ United States Congress (House), *Committee on Foreign Affairs: Congress and Foreign Policy - 1979* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980)

³⁴⁰ Jimmy Carter, "United States Troop Withdrawals from the Republic of Korea Statement by the President", *The American Presidency Project*, 20 July 1979, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=32622>, (accessed 29 February 2017)

³⁴¹ Chung-in Moon, "Complex Interdependence and Transnational Lobbying: South Korea in the United States", *International Studies Quarterly* 32, no.1 (March, 1988), pp.67-89

towards South Korea. In a meeting with the Congress members, Secretary of State Vance found that most congressional members had “high interest but no inclination to interfere with the present ripening of events” in South Korea.³⁴² In another cable that described Congress’ position in late 1979, Assistant Secretary Holbrooke wrote that high-ranking Democrats such as Senator Nunn and Senator Glenn kept making references to the ongoing Iran hostage situation when discussing US responses to the Korean developments.³⁴³ Nunn and Glenn emphasised that America should avoid any action which could result in confusion or instability in American allies such as Iran.³⁴⁴ Congress also proposed that pro-democracy Koreans should not expect any long-term support from the United States.³⁴⁵

However, a few Congressional members had taken the initiative to pressure the Chun government to adopt democratic reforms. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee's East Asia subcommittee agreed to indefinitely set aside its plan to hold hearings on the proposed co-production of F-5E aircraft in South Korea in an effort to pressure General Chun to allow democratic elections.³⁴⁶ The Chairman of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Senator Wolff also led a congressional delegation to South Korea in January 1980 to discuss trade issues while expressing his concern with South Korea’s deteriorating domestic situation.³⁴⁷ During the meetings, Wolff made sure to assert

³⁴² Cyrus Vance, “Status Report - Korea”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 29 November 1979

³⁴³ Tim Shorrock, “The Cherokee Files: New Documents Reveal U.S. Policy Making During Kwangju”, *Sisa Journal*, 28 February 1996

³⁴⁴ Park, “The U.S. Carter Administration and Korea in the 12/12 Incident”, *op. cit.*

³⁴⁵ Shorrock, “The Cherokee Files”, *op. cit.*; and Adesnik and Kim, “If at first you don’t succeed: the puzzle of South Korea’s democratic transition”, *op. cit.*

³⁴⁶ Robert G. Rich, Jr., “Weekly Status Report - Korea”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 6 December 1979

³⁴⁷ Gleysteen, “First Meeting of a US Congressional Delegation with Korean President Choi Kyu Hah”, *op. cit.*

that “the United States will not interfere in Korea's internal affairs, but will express its support for the continuation of civil leadership.”³⁴⁸

However, after the Kwangju Uprising ended in May 1980 with a brutal outcome that gained the attention of the United States and the international community, the anti-Korea lobbying group in Congress began to dissolve as more congressional members moved to support a more active US democracy promotion policy towards South Korea. In a meeting with Congress members a month after the Uprising, the Secretary of State Muskie found that “virtually all those present who chose to speak up share our disappointment over recent developments and frustration at the hiatus in the process of political liberalization.”³⁴⁹ After the meeting, more congressional members began to actively push for an active democracy promotion policy. Congressman Lee Hamilton suggested releasing a Sense of Congress resolution “that would affirm our [US] security commitment to South Korea, but at the same time express deep concern over recent political developments and the interruption of political liberalisation.”³⁵⁰ Additionally, US Senators introduced a congressional resolution in September 1980 to call against the death sentence on opposition leader Kim Dae Jung and the harsh sentences that General Chun imposed against other defendants. The resolution also appealed to President Carter, asking him to urge the South Korea government to “fulfil its stated commitments to the democratization and the political life in South Korea.”³⁵¹

³⁴⁸ Ibid.

³⁴⁹ Edmund Muskie, “Korea Focus: Consultations with Congress”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 12 June 1980

³⁵⁰ Ibid.

³⁵¹ Lee, *A Troubled Peace*, op. cit.

Therefore, the strong anti-Korea lobbying group that transpired from Congress' recent experiences with the Koreagate scandal and the troop withdrawal debate restrained congressional members from influencing US policy towards South Korea. Although a few Congressional members encouraged South Korean officials to adopt democratic reforms during South Korea's political crisis, the majority of Congress members continued to refrain from intervening in the US policy. Lone congressional efforts to drive a change in US policy towards South Korea were not effective enough to overcome the wider resistance developed by the anti-Korean lobby. Only after the outcome of the Kwangju Uprising drove a public reaction that pressured America to adopt a more active democracy promotion policy, members of the US Congress began to support an immediate transition to a democratic political system in South Korea. However, prior to the Kwangju Uprising, members of the US Congress did not exert enough pressure to persuade President Carter to adopt an active democracy promotion policy. Consequently, the United States settled on a passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea's democratic crisis in the lead up to the Kwangju Uprising.

4.6. Capitalist Influence

Did private business groups or individuals exert influence on the US foreign policymaking process to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?

Before the Kwangju Uprising, private US businesses did not exert much influence on the development of US policy towards South Korea. This was because South Korea's economy had remained stable throughout the democratic crisis and had not threatened US economic investments in South Korea.

However, after the Kwangju Uprising, more US business representatives grew concerned that continued domestic instability in South Korea could destabilise the country's economy and weaken US business investments. This section traces how US business groups refrained from influencing US policy during the democratic crisis and only began to influence US policy after the Kwangju Uprising ended.

During South Korea's democratic crisis, the United States had a strong economic interest to protect the stable trade relationship that America shared with South Korea. From 1979 to 1980, South Korea was America's 13th largest trading partner as it absorbed US\$4.2 billion in American exports and US\$4.1 billion in American imports. Direct US equity investment in Seoul also amounted to over US\$300 million during the crisis period.³⁵²

However, after the Chun government harshly suppressed the Kwangju Uprising, American businessmen grew concerned with the potential impact of economic instability in South Korea on their economic investments. Ambassador Gleysteen noted that "U.S. businessmen are cautious over the long-term stability of the ROK but less concerned over democratic development. If the military leadership can develop an apparently stable structure and reinvigorate the economy, then U.S. business and banking circles will be prepared to go back to business as usual."³⁵³ Consequently, after the Uprising, American banks such as the Bank of America, Chase Manhattan Bankers Trust, Chemical Bank, Hanover, and Citibank moved to protect their investments through measures such as

³⁵² William Gleysteen, "Ambassador Gleysteen's Message in June issue on Nation's Business", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 30 May 1980

³⁵³ William Gleysteen, "An Initial Assessment of the Public Mood", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 6 June 1980

refusing to grant commercial loans to the Korea Electrical Company that would have funded the development of nuclear power plants.³⁵⁴

Additionally, American corporate companies began pressuring General Chun to restore political and economic stability in South Korea. The US Embassy in South Korea made “every effort to protect the interests of U.S. investors, emphasizing the need for the ROKG...to deal carefully with foreign businessmen on the basing of equity in order to protect Korea’s reputation as a favourable business climate.”³⁵⁵ In response to the pressure from American investors, General Chun held a dinner meeting with business leaders of American companies such as 3-M and Dow Chemical on 13 June 1980 to assure them that US investment would continue to be protected in South Korea.³⁵⁶ The Governor of the Bank of Korea, Byonghyung Shin, was also by warned by “one of the large New York Banks” on 11 July 1980 that “if Korea did not get its political house in order swiftly then it would be exceedingly difficult to get necessary financing.”³⁵⁷

Eventually, the pressure exerted by US capitalist groups achieved some effect. On 20 July 1980, the Chun government conducted a “nationwide purge” that included arresting 17 politicians and dismissing 431 bankers, brokers, and insurance officials from their jobs.³⁵⁸ A few months later in September 1980, Chun agreed to relax foreign investments and made changes to his cabinet appointees. After South Korea’s cabinet reshuffle, Gleysteen noted that “the [South Korean

³⁵⁴ George Katsifas, *Asia’s Unknown Uprisings: South Korean Social Movements in the 20th Century* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012)

³⁵⁵ Warren Christopher, “Weekly Status Report - Korea”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 20 September 1980

³⁵⁶ The other business leaders that attended the dinner meeting were representatives from the American Chamber of Commerce in Korea, Bank of America and Gulf Oil.

³⁵⁷ Rich, “Weekly Status Report - Korea”, *op. cit.*

³⁵⁸ Don Oberdofer, “Hundreds more held or fired in S. Korean purge”, *The Washington Post*, 20 July 1980

cabinet] economic team in particular seems competent...the new line-up should tend to reassure international business interests.”³⁵⁹

Therefore, US business companies did not seek to influence US policy during South Korea’s democratic crisis in the period prior to the Kwangju Uprising as US economic investments in South Korea were not significantly threatened. Only after the Kwangju Uprising ended did American investors begin to fear the implications of potential economic instability on their economic investments in South Korea. Consequently, American businesses reacted by supporting a more active democracy promotion policy that would encourage economic stability in South Korea.

4.7. Public Opinion and the US Media

Did the American public or the US media exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President’s intended policy?

Due to the America people’s wide disinterest in South Korea’s democratic crisis, the US public opinion did not exert much influence on US foreign policy towards South Korea. The US media had also influenced this public opinion by framing the South Korean crisis as a public disturbance rather than as a genuine struggle for democracy by the people. Consequently, due to the low level of public interest, the American public did not exert enough pressure on the foreign policymaking process to influence US foreign policy towards South Korea.

The US media’s depiction of the South Korean crisis produced an impartial

³⁵⁹ William Gleysteen, “New ROK Cabinet Named”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 2 September 1980

reaction from the American public. America's news coverage did not interpret the South Korean political crisis as a pro-democracy movement but as a public disturbance. The Daily News described the Kwangju demonstrations as "scarred Kwangju gun battles between anti-government protestors and army troops" while the New York Times used terms such as "rebel" and "dissidents" to describe the protestors.³⁶⁰ According to a study on the media's coverage of the Uprising, 51.2 percent of the American media depicted the Kwangju Uprising unfavourably by using terms such as "turmoil" and "riot" while only 7.1 percent saw the demonstration as pro-democratic.³⁶¹ The media's interpretation therefore developed the public's understanding of the Kwangju Uprising as a violent event and not as a genuine pro-democracy struggle by the South Korean people. The American public was therefore largely apathetic towards the crisis in South Korea, as they could not perceive any need for a higher level of US involvement.

Due to the wide public disinterest in the South Korean crisis, public opinion on US policy towards South Korea was not very well formed. Surveys conducted on US public opinion during the South Korean crisis indicated a range of conflicting opinions. In a 1979 Gallup/Potomac survey, around 49 percent of the respondents were highly supportive of continued US military presence in South Korea. Additionally, 48 percent agreed with Carter's decision to abort any troop withdrawals until a military balance of power between North Korea and South Korea has been achieved or border tensions have reduced.³⁶² However, in the same

³⁶⁰ The Daily News, "5 Hanged for Park Slaying", *The Daily News*, 24 May 1980; and Henry Kamm, "South Korea troops recapture Kwangju in Predawn Strikes", *New York Times*, 27 May 1980

³⁶¹ Sung Tae Kim, "Making a Difference: US Press Coverage of the Kwangju and Tiananmen Pro-Democracy Movements", *Journalism & Mass Communications Quarterly* 77, no.1 (Spring, 2000), pp.30-32

³⁶² Wayne W. Shannon, "American Public Opinion on South Korea: Continuity and Change, 1968 - 1988" in I.J. Kim (ed.), *Korean Challenges and American Policy* (New York: Paragon House Publishers, Inc., 1991), pp.399-426

survey, 49 percent of the respondents also indicated that any US security commitment to South Korea should be conditional on improvements in the human rights situation.³⁶³ These survey results demonstrate that the percentage of the American people that supported a consistent US military presence in South Korea was similar to the percentage that prioritised democratic and human rights values in South Korea. This contradiction demonstrates a conflict in the US public opinion. The American people had not achieved a clear consensus on whether to prioritise security interests or democratic values in America's alliance relationship with South Korea.

Therefore, due to the media's narrow interpretation of the Kwangju Uprising, the American public registered conflicting opinions and a low level of interest in influencing America's foreign policy response towards South Korea's democratic crisis. Consequently, President Carter did not come under strong pressure from the American public to implement any specific policy towards South Korea.

4.8. Conclusion

America's policy response towards the democratic crisis in South Korea demonstrates America's capability to adopt a passive democracy promotion policy towards an allied state undergoing democratic turmoil. This policy prioritises domestic stability in the allied state and only seeks a slow and gradual democratic transition in the ally as a secondary goal. In response to the series of events that characterised South Korea's democratic crisis from 1979 to 1980, US policymakers responded by avoiding economic pressure, employing quiet diplomacy, refraining from supporting South Korea's civil society, and leveraging

³⁶³ Ibid.

US military cooperation with South Korea.

In this policy analysis, I investigated a range of domestic factors that may have contributed to the development of America's passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea. As President Carter was engaged in tackling a series of foreign policy challenges that took place around the world at the time of South Korea's democratic crisis, Carter did not have the opportunity to articulate a clear foreign policy towards South Korea's crisis. Consequently, other domestic actors such as US policymakers, private business groups and individuals, members of the US Congress, and the American public could have adopted a stronger role in directing US foreign policy towards South Korea. However, as illustrated in the findings presented in Table 5 below, only some domestic actors exerted enough influence to shape America's policy response.

Unlike Nixon's clearly articulated preference for democracy subversion towards Chile, Carter did not express a policy response towards South Korea. Consequently, senior policymakers in the United States assumed a stronger role in shaping America's policy response towards South Korea. However, the vacuum left by Carter's reduced policy guidance also resulted in the foreign policymaking process plagued by a number of challenges. There was a wide range of clashing foreign policy opinions on issues such as whether or not to adopt a low-profile passive policy or how best to implement America's policy response in South Korea. Intense disagreements also took place between agencies such as the USFK and the CIA, and between key individuals such as Ambassador Gleysteen and Assistant Secretary of State Holbrooke. Meanwhile, the sudden change in the holder of the Secretary of State position from Cyrus Vance to

Edmund Muskie contributed to a shift in US policy after the Kwangju Uprising. Due to the conflicted foreign policymaking process that was not guided by an executive power, America's foreign policy response settled on the lowest common denominator option which was to remain detached from political developments in South Korea while preserving political stability on the Korean Peninsula through adopting a passive democracy promotion policy.

Table 5.
Factors surrounding US Passive Democracy Promotion Policy towards
South Korea, 1979 – 1980

FACTORS SURROUNDING US PASSIVE DEMOCRACY PROMOTION POLICY	
1 Presidential Intent What was the President's intended policy response?	No clear policy response
2 Influence of Senior Policymakers Did US policymakers with direct access to the President exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	✓
3 Congressional Pressure Did members of the US Congress exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	✗
4 Capitalist Influence Did private business groups or individuals exert influence on the US foreign policymaking process to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	✗
5 Public Opinion and US Media Did the American public or the US media exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	✗

On the other hand, other domestic actors such as the US Congress, business groups, and the American public had refrained from pressuring US foreign policy until after the Kwangju Uprising. The anti-Korea lobbying group within the US Congress restrained most congressional members from impacting US policy. Congress members could not reach an agreement on whether to

actively promote democratic reforms or “not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs”.³⁶⁴ Similarly, as US economic investments were protected during the democratic crisis, US business groups and individuals refrained from intervening in the development of US foreign policy towards South Korea. The narrow framing of the crisis in South Korea by the US media also contributed to wide public disinterest, which did not result in a clear public opinion on US policy towards South Korea.

However, after the brutal outcome of the Kwangju Uprising triggered outrage across the international community and in the United States, these groups of domestic actors began to push for a more active democracy promotion policy. The anti-Korea lobbying group in Congress weakened as congressional members pushed for more US involvement in South Korea through an active democracy promotion policy. Investors also began to fear that domestic instability could jeopardise US economic interests in South Korea, which led US business representatives to pressure General Chun to install free market economic measures. Similarly, the American public were shocked at the extent of Chun’s repressive measures and began to call for US policymakers to encourage more democratic reforms in South Korea. The Kwangju Uprising was a key trigger moment that generated a reactive response from other domestic actors in the United States, which eventually pressured US foreign policy to gravitate towards a more active democracy promotion response to South Korea.

This policy analysis of the final US policy outcome towards the political crisis in South Korea points to several findings. First, the United States is capable of

³⁶⁴ Gleysteen, “First meeting of a US congressional delegation with Korean President Choi Kyu Hah”, *op. cit.*

adopting a passive democracy promotion policy towards an ally in crisis. Secondly, the lack of a clearly articulated intended policy response towards South Korea allowed various policymakers to compete in shaping US policy. This case study also demonstrates that ideas are important in driving foreign policy, but without political will or guidance from the President, these ideas could also impede efficient foreign policymaking by resulting in clashing foreign policy opinions. Lastly, the Kwangju Uprising posed a trigger event that incited interest from other domestic actors such as members of Congress, US business groups, and the American public. The devastating outcome of Chun's suppression of South Korean citizens in the Kwangju Uprising demonstrated the potential political and economic implications if South Korea continued as an authoritarian state. The prospect of growing domestic instability, economic disruption, and violation of human rights eventually drove domestic actors in the United States to advocate a more active democracy promotion policy. Consequently, after the Kwangju Uprising, more domestic actors began to express support for increased US involvement in South Korea's domestic politics which eventually translated into a more active US democracy promotion policy.

CHAPTER FIVE

ACTIVE DEMOCRACY PROMOTION IN THE PHILIPPINES, 1983-1986

5.1. Introduction

In February 1986, nearly 2 million Filipino people filled the long stretch of the Epifanio de los Santos (EDSA) highway in Manila to urge the authoritarian President Ferdinand Marcos to step down.³⁶⁵ On 25 February 1986, Marcos eventually agreed to resign, ending a three-year long democratic crisis which began with the assassination of opposition leader Benigno Aquino on 21 August 1983. In response to the Philippines democratic crisis, the United States first responded by demonstrating support for Marcos but then adopted an active democracy promotion policy towards the end of the crisis. Under this active democracy promotion policy, the United States began to support the democratic election of Corazon Aquino as the legitimate leader of the Philippines.

This chapter studies the impact of domestic factors on US foreign policy and highlights factors that have contributed to this policy shift. The chapter begins with the history behind the US-Philippines alliance before describing the Philippines democratic crisis which began with Aquino's murder and led to a spiral of events that spanned across three years. These events included the 1984 parliamentary election, Marcos' snap election announcement in November 1985, the 1986 presidential elections, the EDSA Revolution, and finally, Marcos' resignation at the end of February 1986. I then identify how America's policy

³⁶⁵ News sources indicate that hundreds of thousands, peaking at 2 million people, gathered along the EDSA highway. See Jose Maria Sison, "Significance and Consequences of the 'People Power' Uprising in the Philippines", *Telesur*, 25 February 2016; and Trisha Macas, "Filipino People the real heroes of EDSA, say RAM Boys", *GMA News Online*, 25 February 2016

responses towards the Philippines evolved from a strong support of the Marcos government towards an active democracy promotion policy.

In the remaining sections, I conduct a structured policy analysis. I first identify President Ronald Reagan's intended policy response towards the Philippines. As Reagan firmly believed that Marcos' strong authoritarian state presence was needed to deter the threat of communist expansion posed by the New People's Army (NPA) in the Philippines, Reagan intended to continue supporting the Marcos government. However, over the course of the Philippines democratic crisis, from 1983 to 1986, groups of domestic actors in the United States attempted to guide US foreign policy towards supporting the pro-democratic movement in the Philippines instead. By investigating the efforts of US policymakers, members of the US Congress, US business groups and individuals, the American public and the US media, I analyse the mechanisms that these domestic actors have used to try influence a change in US foreign policy towards the Philippines democratic crisis.

The Philippines case study illustrates America's active democracy promotion policy, as propagated by liberal ideas such as American Exceptionalism. However, unlike US foreign policy towards Chile and South Korea, this case study also demonstrates how groups of domestic actors in the United States are able to cooperate with one another to collectively generate change in America's foreign policy towards allies in crisis.

5.2. History

From 1965 to 1986, US policymakers were confident that Marcos' strong grip on power could defeat Communist insurgents and protect US access to key military bases in the Philippines such as the Clark Air Base and Subic Bay Naval Base. For this reason, the United States consistently supported the authoritarian Marcos regime in the Philippines. However, when the Filipino opposition leader Benigno Aquino was assassinated in 1983, his murder incited a democratic crisis that induced US policymakers to reconsider US policy towards the Philippines. In this section, I provide an overview of America's alliance relationship with the Marcos government. I then trace the series of events that characterised the Philippines democratic crisis and discuss the policy responses that US policymakers adopted towards the Philippines.

5.2.1. An American Ally

Although the United States and the Philippines entered into a security alliance in 1951, they shared a bilateral history that spanned far longer. In 1898, America liberated the Philippines from Spanish rule as part of America's westward Pacific expansion strategy.³⁶⁶ However, after winning the Spanish War, the United States also annexed the Philippines as an American colony until the Philippines gained full independence from the United States in 1946. Since then, America became an important part of Filipino history just as much as the Philippines evolved into a crucial element in America's defence system in the Asia Pacific. In this section, I outline the progress of the US-Philippines security alliance before studying America's close relationship with the Marcos government.

³⁶⁶ James Bradley, *The Imperial Cruise: A Secret History of Empire and War* (New York: Little Brown and Company, 2009)

After the Philippines achieved independence from the United States, the US-Philippines bilateral relationship began by centering on military cooperation. In 1950, the Philippines contributed troops to the US-led United Nations coalition team during the Korean War.³⁶⁷ A year later, the United States and the Philippines upgraded their relationship into a security alliance by signing the 1951 Mutual Defence Treaty. Under this treaty, both countries declared that they would defend each other against external attacks “so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that either of them stands alone in the Pacific Area.”³⁶⁸ With the Treaty came an influx of large-scale US military and economic assistance into the Philippines. In return for development assistance, the Philippines signed the 1947 Military Base Agreement (MBA) which granted the United States access to 23 military bases in the Philippines for 99 years.³⁶⁹ These bases were critical in enhancing US regional presence in the Asia Pacific during the Cold War as they enabled the United States to rapidly deploy forces across the region to deter the expansion of Communist influence.³⁷⁰ The Military Base Agreement was later reaffirmed between Marcos and the United States government in 1979. In return, the United States promised to contribute US\$50 million in military assistance, US\$250 million in foreign military sales credit, and US\$200 million in security-supporting assistance every year for the next five years until 1984.

³⁶⁷ Richard D. Fisher, Jr., “Rebuilding the US-Philippine Alliance”, *The Heritage Foundation Backgrounder*, 22 February 1999

³⁶⁸ The Avalon Project, “Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines”, 30 August 1951, *The Avalon Project*, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/phil001.asp, (accessed 12 March 2017)

³⁶⁹ “Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines concerning Military Bases”, 17 March 1947, <https://www.loc.gov/law/help/us-treaties/bevans/b-ph-ust000011-0055.pdf>, (accessed 29 December 2017); and Gary Hawes, “United States Support for the Marcos Administration and the Pressures that made for Change”, *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 8, no.1 (June, 1986), pp.18-36

³⁷⁰ Executive Secretary to the National Security Council, “Report to the National Security Council by the Department of State”, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950, East Asia and the Pacific, Volume VI*, 27 February 1950

When Ferdinand Marcos came into power as President of the Philippines in 1965, America continued to provide military, economic, and political assistance to the Philippines. Marcos' presidency spanned across the term of five American Presidents, all of whom prioritised US access to military bases in the bilateral relationship with the Philippines.³⁷¹ With the exception of President Reagan, all five American presidents consistently furnished the Philippines with military aid to uphold America's security alliance. Consequently, Marcos received a total of US\$2.7 billion in military aid and US\$5.5 billion in economic assistance from the United States during his entire presidency which spanned nearly 20 years.³⁷²

America also extended strong political support to the Marcos government. When President Marcos declared martial law in 1972, President Nixon refrained from criticising Marcos' decision.³⁷³ Similarly, when Reagan was elected as the US President in 1981, Reagan continued to support Marcos' authoritarian rule. In believing that Marcos' strong grip on power was needed to resist the Communist threat posed by the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and its armed wing the New People's Army (NPA), Reagan reassured Marcos that "the Reagan administration regards him as a friend and continues to attach importance to a close relationship with the Philippines."³⁷⁴

However, the sudden assassination of the Filipino opposition leader Benigno

³⁷¹ Marcos' presidency spanned across five American administrations: Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan. See Richard J. Kessler, "Marcos and the Americans", *Foreign Policy* 63 (Summer, 1986), pp.40-57

³⁷² Inside Gov, "US Overseas Loans and Grants to the Philippines", *US Foreign Aid*, <http://us-foreign-aid.insidegov.com/1/139/Philippines>, accessed 10 January 2017

³⁷³ H.W. Brands, *Bound to Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992)

³⁷⁴ Ibid.

Aquino in August 1983 impacted America's close security alliance with the Philippines. US policymakers began to debate on whether to continue backing President Marcos or to uphold the democratic desires of the Filipinos instead.

5.2.2. The Philippines' Political Crisis

The Philippines' crisis played out across a series of critical events that began with the assassination of Benigno Aquino in August 1983 and ended with Marcos' resignation in February 1986. During this period, Marcos announced a snap election in November 1985 and conducted an election that was claimed to be rigged in February 1986. This was quickly followed with a four-day long revolution in the Philippines capital city, Manila, which eventually led to Marcos' resignation.

During the 20-year Marcos administration, the Philippines was plagued by a series of governmental problems. The country suffered from graft and corruption, a widening gap between the rich and poor, government inefficiency, and inadequacies in the top leadership. President Marcos had contributed to the corruption by allocating large parts of the Filipino economy to crony businessmen. Consequently, the Philippines' political institutions such as the Supreme Court, legislature, financial institutions, and media were constrained from functioning normally under the influence of corruption. Additionally, Marcos had semi-politicised the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) by using the military as a tool to suppress political opponents.

In the 1980s, the Filipino economy was burdened with a steady fall in global

sugar prices, which was a major export of the Philippines.³⁷⁵ The world price of sugar had collapsed across the years, from US\$0.65 per pound in 1974 to only US\$0.04 in 1985. Consequently, the unemployment rate rose from an average of 3.9 percent in 1975 to 6.7 percent in 1986, and inflation in consumer prices skyrocketed from 2.56 percent in 1965 to 50.34 percent in 1984.³⁷⁶ Meanwhile, due to Marcos' poor economic policies, foreign debt accumulated from US\$360 million in 1962 to US\$26.2 billion in 1985, which also made up four-fifths of the Philippines' gross national product (GNP) by 1984.³⁷⁷

These economic difficulties fuelled intense public dissatisfaction as the Filipinos began to lose trust in the Marcos administration. The opposition was strongest amongst the middle class and the Roman Catholic clergy, who looked to Benigno Aquino as the leader of the opposition Liberal Party for a new political direction. In 1983, Aquino was beginning a life in exile in the United States when he heard news of Marcos' kidney failure. Fearing that Marcos' wife, Imelda Marcos, would seize the opportunity to extend the authoritarian regime under her leadership, Aquino decided to return to Manila. Despite warnings that he could risk an assassination, Aquino arrived in Manila on 21 August 1983 but was fatally shot as he descended from the plane.³⁷⁸

³⁷⁵ Ibid.

³⁷⁶ Philippines Statistics Authority, *Yearbook of Labor Statistics 2015* (Manila: Philippines Statistics Authority, 2015) and Indexmundi, "Philippines - Inflation", *indexmundi*, <https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/philippines/inflation> (accessed 20 June 2018)

³⁷⁷ Robert S. Dohner and Ponciano Intal, Jr., "The Marcos Legacy: Economic Policy and Foreign Debt in the Philippines" in Jeffrey D. Sachs and Susan M. Collins (editors), *Developing Country Debt and Economic Performance, Volume 3: Country Studies - Indonesia, Korea, Philippines, Turkey* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp.373-400 and Theodore Friend, "Timely Daring: The United States and Ferdinand Marcos" in Daniel Pipes and Adam Garfinkel (editors) *Friendly Tyrants* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), pp.201-219

³⁷⁸ Robert Dayley and Clark D. Neher, *Southeast Asia: In the New International Era* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2013)

Aquino's assassination sparked a democratic crisis in the Philippines that eventually led to Marcos' resignation in 1986. Incensed by Aquino's assassination, a coalition of the opposition party, moderates, and revolutionaries rallied behind Benigno's widow, Corazon Aquino.³⁷⁹ As Corazon had no political history or experience, she was initially reluctant to follow her husband's steps as an opposition leader. However, most Filipinos had already built their support for Corazon, as they perceived that "a vote for Cory [Corazon Aquino] would be a vote for Ninoy [Benigno Aquino]."³⁸⁰ Exactly a month after Aquino's assassination, 200,000 protestors marched in memory of Aquino, calling for an "end [to] the Marcos regime and in its place establish a truly democratic, representative government, to halt the militarisation of our country, and to assert the full sovereignty of our people and resist all forms of alien control or domination."³⁸¹ The growing strength of the opposition movement was also displayed during the parliamentary elections in May 1984, in which the opposition party unprecedentedly won a third of the seats in the Philippines National Assembly.³⁸²

With the growing strength of the opposition party challenging the legitimacy of his leadership, Marcos moved to strengthen his grip on power. In a bid to reassert his presidency, Marcos held a televised interview on 3 November 1985 to announce his decision to hold a "snap" presidential election in early 1986.³⁸³ By

³⁷⁹ Hawes, "United States Support for the Marcos Administration and the Pressures that made for Change", op. cit. and William H. Overholt, "The Rise and Fall of Ferdinand Marcos", *Asian Survey* 26, no.11 (November, 1986), pp.1137 - 1163

³⁸⁰ Brands, *Bound to Empire*, op. cit., p.330

³⁸¹ Quoted in Sandra Burton, *Impossible Dream: The Marcoses, the Aquinos and the Unfinished Revolution* (New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1989), p.155

³⁸² Amy Blitz, *The Contested State: American Foreign Policy and Regime Change in the Philippines* (Maryland, USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000)

³⁸³ Marcos appeared in David Brinkley's Sunday morning talk show in America. The talk show was clearly catered to the American audience because the timing of the live talk show coincided with the middle of the night in the Philippines. See Ibid.

announcing an election just a few months before the election date, Marcos anticipated that the divided opposition would not have enough time to prepare for the election campaign. Although Corazon Aquino was caught by surprise with the sudden announcement, she soon agreed to represent a coalition of the Philippine Democratic Party and the Power of the People. Corazon's fierce campaigning also attracted support from high-ranking officials in the Malacanang presidential palace such as the Leader of the Reform the Armed Forces Movement (RAM) and Defence Minister General Juan Ponce Enrile and the Acting Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces Lieutenant General Fidel Ramos.³⁸⁴

On 7 February 1986, the Filipinos voted for the next President of the Philippines. However, to the dismay of the opposition coalition party and US policymakers, there was also news that the election results were also marred with fraud. An electronic quick count by the Committee on Elections (COMELEC) estimated that President Marcos had won the election with 53.62 percent of the vote. However, as the COMELEC computer technicians realised the wide scale of fraud committed by Marcos, the technicians refused to complete the vote counts. Another vote-counting organisation, the National Citizens' Movement for Free Elections (NAMFREL), attempted a non-partisan count and concluded that Corazon Aquino had won the election with 800,000 more votes than Marcos.³⁸⁵ Nevertheless, the Marcos-controlled Philippines National Assembly refused to accept the election outcome and declared Ferdinand Marcos as the official election winner instead on 15 February 1986.³⁸⁶

³⁸⁴ Dayley and Neher, "The Philippines", op. cit.

³⁸⁵ Renato Perdon, "The Chaotic Presidential Election of 1986", *Bayanihan*, 13 April 2016, <http://bayanihannews.com.au/2016/04/13/the-chaotic-presidential-election-of-1986/> (accessed 11 January 2016)

³⁸⁶ Fernando del Mundo, "President Ferdinand Marcos was declared the winner of the...", *United Press International*, 15 February 1986

Marcos' widespread fraud triggered widespread dissatisfaction from the Filipino people. Angered by Marcos' decision to commit fraud, RAM officers planned to revolt against Marcos. When Marcos discovered the RAM's coup plans, General Ramos and RAM Leader Enrile sought refuge in the AFP's headquarters at Camp Aguinaldo on 22 February 1986. In response, Marcos deployed tanks and helicopters along the EDSA highway leading to the Camp to arrest Ramos and Enrile. Fearing his arrest, Enrile made a televised appearance in which he recognised Corazon Aquino as the legitimate winner of the 1986 presidential election and appealed to the Filipino people to join the protest.³⁸⁷ Nearly 2 million Filipinos responded by congregating in front of Camp Aguinaldo and called for Marcos to resign. The overwhelming standoff on the EDSA highway continued for four days straight. On 25 February 1986, the last day of the EDSA Revolution, Marcos received a message from President Reagan that appealed for Marcos to step down. After US Senator Paul Laxalt confirmed that Reagan would no longer support him, Marcos reluctantly agreed to resign from his presidential post. A few hours later, Marcos and his family boarded a plane for a life in exile in Hawaii and Corazon Aquino was inaugurated as the 11th President of the Philippines.³⁸⁸

The assassination of the opposition leader Benigno Aquino had sparked a democratic crisis in the Philippines in which the Filipino people demonstrated their intense distrust in the Philippines political institutions under the Marcos leadership. This crisis of trust stemmed from the economic difficulties caused by

³⁸⁷ Stanley Karnow, *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines* (New York & Toronto: Random House, Inc., 1989)

³⁸⁸ Blitz, *The Contested State*, op. cit.

the fall in global prices and Marcos' mismanagement of the economy. When the public's demands for a more democratic and representative government were not met, the Filipino people rallied behind the opposition coalition party against the Marcos government. As his political authority eroded, Marcos eventually agreed to step down as President. The accumulation of these political events demanded a policy response from the United States, which was also a close security and political ally of the Philippines.

5.2.3. America's Policy Response

At the start of the Philippines' democratic crisis, the US policy was still supportive of the Marcos regime. However, as the crisis unfolded, the United States shifted towards an active democracy promotion policy. In this section, I investigate how US policymakers utilised economic assistance, diplomacy, socialisation strategies, and military cooperation to coordinate this policy shift.

First, US economic assistance to the Philippines shifted from unconditional economic assistance to conditional aid over the course of the democratic crisis. America had initially extended unconditional economic assistance to the Philippines and leveraged its role in the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) to ensure that the Philippines received aid preference in order to protect the debt-ridden Filipino economy.³⁸⁹ In 1984, the Marcos government was benefitting from US\$50 million in Economic Support Funds and US\$225 million in credit from the Department of Agriculture. Separately, the Export-Import Bank was offering US\$200 million in insurance guarantees for agricultural sales and another US\$500 million as a bank-to-bank guarantee programme to provide the

³⁸⁹ Paul Wolfowitz, "Philippine Financial Situation", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 10 January 1984

Philippines with credit for trade in industrial commodities.³⁹⁰

However, by 1985, the United States began to utilise economic aid as an incentive to encourage democratic change in the Philippines. This shift was initiated by the 1985 National Security Decision Directive titled “US Policy towards the Philippines” which suggested that non-bases bilateral measures should be conditional on political and economic reforms in Manila.³⁹¹ Under the Directive, the United States also announced that America would provide US\$35-40 million in annual development assistance and increase economic support funds to the Philippines only if political and economic reforms were carried out.³⁹² Another conditional promise was that US support for Filipino loan requests to the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) would be increased only if the Philippines adopted more democratic reforms.³⁹³

Secondly, US policymakers began to rely on both private and public avenues of diplomacy to urge Filipino officials to adopt more democratic reforms.³⁹⁴ Under the same 1985 Directive, US diplomats were instructed to exert quiet influence by “actively, albeit discreetly, supporting the efforts of diverse Filipino leaders to promote revitalized institutions. These include the responsible members of Marcos’ party, the businessmen and professionals, the Catholic hierarchy, the

³⁹⁰ Hawes, “United States Support for the Marcos Administration and the Pressures that made for Change”, op. cit.

³⁹¹ The directive explicitly stated that grant-aid support would only be provided upon the Philippines’ successful implementation of, and compliance with, the IMF programme and a comprehensive programme of structural economic reform. See Ronald Reagan, “United States Policy Toward the Philippines”, National Security Decision Directive, no. 163, 20 February 1985

³⁹² Amongst the reforms requested by Washington were to restructure COMELEC, reform the legislation of NAMFREL, amend the reform of presidential decree-making powers, create a new election law, and make changes in the media to allow opposition views. See *ibid.*

³⁹³ Under this conditional promise, Philippines was expected to gain an increase in loans from US\$650 million to about US\$1 billion every year.

³⁹⁴ Tamar Jacoby, “The Reagan Turnaround on Human Rights”, *Foreign Affairs* 64, no.5 (Summer, 1986), pp.1066-1086

military professionals, and responsible members of the democratic opposition.”³⁹⁵ The directive pushed for “active diplomacy; to include Presidential and other letters and visits by [US] Administration officials as needed.”³⁹⁶

As a result, more American policymakers began to encourage democratic reform in the Philippines through personal letters, close US Embassy contact with Filipino policymakers, and regular personal meetings with President Marcos.³⁹⁷ Towards the end of Marcos’ presidency, Marcos had received several private letters from high-level policymakers such as the US Secretary of State George Shultz and US Senator Sam Nunn.³⁹⁸ President Reagan also penned a personal letter to Marcos which was delivered by Senator Laxalt, whom Reagan introduced as “one of my closest friends”. In the letter, Reagan expressed America's concern with the Communist insurgency and other “trends and problems” of the political situation in the Philippines. In the meeting with Marcos, Laxalt reviewed the same problems before urging Marcos to take action.³⁹⁹ In the months leading to the 1986 presidential elections, CIA Director William Casey, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Michael Armacost, Special Envoy Philip Habib, and an observer delegation led by the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Senator Richard Lugar and Congressman John Murtha also visited Marcos in the Philippines.⁴⁰⁰ In each of these visits, the

³⁹⁵ Reagan, “United States Policy Toward the Philippines”, op. cit.

³⁹⁶ Ibid.

³⁹⁷ Ibid.; and US State Department, “National Security Study Directive: US Policy towards the Philippines - Executive Summary”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 12 March 1985

³⁹⁸ George Shultz, “Message from the Secretary to President Marcos”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 26 February 1986; and Sam Nunn, “Letter to the President”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 13 February 1986

³⁹⁹ George P. Shultz, *Turmoil and Triumph: My Years as Secretary of State* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1993)

⁴⁰⁰ Walden Bello, “Edging toward the Quagmire: The United States and the Philippine Crisis”, *World Policy Journal* 3, no.1 (Winter, 1985), pp.29-58

US policymakers consistently stressed the importance of conducting free and fair elections to Marcos.

In addition to quiet diplomacy, US policymakers used public diplomacy to openly encourage the Marcos government to adopt a more democratic political system. This method was also outlined in the 1985 Directive, which defined public diplomacy as “spell[ing] out our Philippine policy through a high level Administration speech, followed by regular policy statements in Washington and Manila.”⁴⁰¹

Consequently, US policymakers exhorted Marcos through public speeches and regular policy statements, urging Marcos to uphold democratic values. In response to Aquino’s assassination, the State Department released a public statement expressing outrage and describing the murder as “a cowardly and despicable act which the US Government condemns in these strongest possible terms...”⁴⁰² State Department spokesman Charles E. Redman also publicly warned Marcos that “a fair election law, a truly impartial commission on elections, and an accredited independent citizens’ election monitoring organisation are essential” after Marcos announced in November 1985 that he would hold a snap election in 1986.⁴⁰³ When the United States received news of Marcos’ complicity in fraud during the 1986 elections, the White House announced that “it has already become evident, sadly, that the elections were marred by widespread fraud and violence perpetrated largely by the ruling party... Both sides must work together

⁴⁰¹ US State Department, “National Security Study Directive: US Policy towards the Philippines - Executive Summary”, op. cit.

⁴⁰² Max Vanzi, “Opposition leader Benigno Aquino, defying President Ferdinand Marcos by...”, *United Press International Archives*, 21 August 1983

⁴⁰³ John Whitehead, “Charge’s meeting with President Marcos”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 5 November 1985

to make those reforms which are needed to ensure a stable democracy, a truly professional military and a healthy economy.”⁴⁰⁴

US policymakers also engaged in socialisation strategies to encourage democratic habits and values in the Filipino society. Amongst the strategies were US officials voicing strong support for the Filipino civil society, improving the climate for multiparty political opposition, and persuading the Philippines government to adopt frameworks for collective action. A 1985 congressional testimony clearly set out the aims of America’s socialisation approach in the Philippines:

We are prepared to do all that is appropriate for US as a concerned ally to support those institutional components such as COMELEC and NAMFREL which are key to the credibility of the electoral process. We also will be prepared to work with any government which is formed as the result of an electoral process that is credible to the majority of Filipinos, and undertakes genuine economic, political and military reform Philippines.⁴⁰⁵

In the months leading up to the 1986 presidential elections in the Philippines, more socialisation strategies were being actively implemented. In November 1985, the State Department's Philippine Desk Officer John Maisto and Assistant Secretary of State Paul Wolfowitz discussed providing election assistance resources and financial assistance sponsored by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to NAMFREL.⁴⁰⁶ With support from the US Senate, the Centre for Democracy also undertook a fact-finding mission to the Philippines in December 1985. During their visit to Manila, the Centre studied

⁴⁰⁴ Michael Armacost, “White House Statement Concerning Philippine Presidential Election”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 15 February 1986

⁴⁰⁵ George Shultz, “DAS Monjo's Testimony on the Philippines before House Armed Services Committee. December 5”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 6 December 1985

⁴⁰⁶ John Maisto, “A U.S. Strategy for Philippine Snap Elections (discussion paper for 5:00 p.m. meeting, November 3)”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 5 November 1985

the Filipino electoral code, analysed the election preparations, met election participants, and reported their findings back to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.⁴⁰⁷ As the election date grew closer, US policymakers articulated a set of democracy habits and values and emphasised them as a guideline for the Filipino civil society to follow. These values included non-partisan behaviour by COMELEC, accreditation of NAMFREL, a fair electoral code, enough time to campaign and organise, fair opposition access to media and non-partisan military behaviour.⁴⁰⁸

Lastly, US policymakers supported the pro-democracy movement in the Philippines by using America's leverage in military assistance. In August 1984, the US Congress pushed to restrict US military assistance to the Philippines by transferring military sales credit into economic assistance.⁴⁰⁹ By limiting military sales, Congress hoped to deliver a message to President Marcos that America expected justice to be served in the special commission investigating Aquino's assassination in Manila and that Marcos should adopt democratic reforms. The 1985 National Security Study Directive also echoed Congress' suggestions by articulating that military credit sales would be transferred into outright grants.⁴¹⁰ During the EDSA Revolution, US policymakers made the firm decision to shift military assistance away from Marcos. Upon receiving reports of attempted attacks by pro-Marcos force, the United States agreed to provide assistance to Filipino opposition forces by allowing rebel helicopters to refuel and rearm at the

⁴⁰⁷ Richard G. Lugar and Claiborne Pell, "Letter to Dr. Allen Weinstein, President of the Center for Democracy", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 21 November 1985

⁴⁰⁸ Morton I. Abramowitz, "Criteria for Honest Elections in the Philippines", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 9 November 1985

⁴⁰⁹ John Maisto, "Secret memorandum to Paul Wolfowitz including Press Statement", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 29 August 1984

⁴¹⁰ Reagan, "United States Policy Toward the Philippines", op. cit.

Clark base airfield.⁴¹¹

Therefore, as the democratic crisis in the Philippines unfolded, US policymakers slowly reduced US support for the Marcos government and gravitated towards a more active democracy promotion policy. Under the active democracy promotion policy, US policymakers stressed the need for electoral mechanisms in the Philippines and for election results to be widely respected by both Marcos and the opposition parties. To conduct this foreign policy shift, US policymakers utilised economic assistance, diplomatic efforts, socialisation strategies, and military assistance to push for an immediate democratic transition in the Philippines. By the end of the Philippines democratic crisis, the United States had abandoned all economic, military, and political support for Marcos and adopted a firm active democracy promotion policy. The next sections comprise a policy analysis that investigates various domestic factors that may have driven this shift in US foreign policy .

5.3. Presidential Intent

What was the President's intended policy response? What factors drove the President to support this policy?

Like Nixon, President Reagan's preferred policy response towards the Philippines democratic crisis was heavily influenced by anti-communist ideology. Reagan's ideas were driven by the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, which argued that America should cooperate with anti-Communist "traditional governments" to repel Communism.⁴¹² Additionally, Reagan's policy response was influenced

⁴¹¹ Karnow, *In Our Image*, op. cit.

⁴¹² Kirkpatrick, "Dictatorships and Double Standards", op. cit.

by foreign policy challenges that were taking place elsewhere in Europe and in the Middle East. Although occupied by these foreign policy crises, Reagan remained confident in Marcos' strong and authoritarian state presence in the Philippines, which Reagan believed was necessary to deter the threat of communist expansion posed by the New People's Army. Consequently, Reagan advocated a policy that maintained the political status-quo in the Philippines by supporting the Marcos government.

During the Philippines democratic crisis, the United States was faced with a series of foreign policy challenges in Europe and the Middle East. As America tried to secure a detente with the Soviet Union, the US-Soviet relationship became volatile and tense. Additionally, after the Iran-Iraq War, terrorist activities in the Middle East escalated and soon threatened the lives of US civilians and military officials posted in the Middle East region.

In 1983, the year Aquino was assassinated, US-Soviet relations had taken a turn for the worse. Reagan had adopted a hard-line stand against the Soviet Union by publicly labelling the Soviet Union an "evil empire". In the same speech, Reagan justified the US decision to deploy nuclear-armed missiles to North American Treaty Organisation (NATO) countries and develop a space-based defence capability to strike against incoming strategic missiles.⁴¹³ Later that year, in September 1983, Korean Airlines 007 which contained 61 citizens was shot by Soviet fighter jets and further escalated US-Soviet tensions.⁴¹⁴ A month later, in October 1983, US forces launched an invasion against pro-Soviet Cuban

⁴¹³ William Bundy, "The Conduct of American Policy: A Portentous Year", *Foreign Affairs* 62, no.3 (Fall, 1983), pp.485-520

⁴¹⁴ Trevor McCrisken, *American Exceptionalism and the Legacy of Vietnam: US Foreign Policy since 1974* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p.190

and Grenadian forces that were deployed to Grenada. In the same month, the United States and NATO staged Operation Able Archer, a joint military exercise designed to test NATO's command, control, and communications procedures in the advent of a nuclear war. However, the Soviet Union interpreted the military exercise as an indication of a future NATO attack. NATO nuclear-armed missiles also continued to accumulate in West Germany in response to the Soviet deployment of nuclear-armed missiles in East Germany. The Soviet Union reacted to NATO's deployment of missiles by suspending negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) in November 1983.

The next year, in 1984, a change in Soviet leadership shifted US-Soviet relations towards reconciliation. The former General Secretary of the Soviet Union's Communist Party Yuri Andropov had passed away from kidney failure and was replaced by Konstantin Chernenko. However, Chernenko's leadership was also short-lived as he passed away a year later and was succeeded by the more progressive leader Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985. Under Gorbachev's leadership, US-Soviet relations began a new era of reconciliation as Gorbachev and Reagan worked jointly to achieve an arms control agreement to end the permanent enmity between both countries.⁴¹⁵

In addition to managing a volatile relationship with the Soviet Union, the United States was occupied with escalating terrorist attacks in the Middle East. In 1983, US marines were deployed to Beirut, Lebanon, as part of a joint task force with French and Italian forces to ensure the smooth evacuation of Syrian and

⁴¹⁵ This agreement was called the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty was signed in 1987 between Reagan and Gorbachev. The INF Treaty eliminated all nuclear and conventional missiles with short to intermediate range. James Mann, *The Rebellion of Ronald Reagan: A History of the End of the Cold War* (London: Penguin Books, 2014)

Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO) troops. However, America's strong military presence in the Middle East also transformed the US forces into a target for terrorist groups. In April 1983, the US Embassy in Beirut was attacked in a suicide bombing led by the terrorist organisation Hezbollah. A few months later, a truck ploughed into the buildings that were housing the First Battalion of the Eighth Maritime group that was part of a multinational peacekeeping force in Beirut. Eventually, under pressure from the frequent attacks on US forces, Reagan agreed to the complete withdrawal of US forces from Lebanon in February 1984.

Nevertheless, individual US marines and armed forces continued to be targeted. In late 1983, an American pilot was killed in an attack on two Syrian anti-aircraft emplacements. A series of kidnappings also took place as seven Americans, including CIA Station Chief William Buckley, were kidnapped in March 1984. This kidnapping sparked the Iran-Contra scandal, in which Reagan sanctioned a covert operation to supply weapons to a group of "moderate" Iranians for their help in releasing the US hostages.⁴¹⁶ However, by providing arms to Iran, America was also contradicting its efforts to convince other nations to stop selling spare parts for weapons to Iran. Additionally, the US policy to meet the kidnappers' demands encouraged terrorist groups to kidnap more American hostages as currency to achieve their aims. In late 1984, even more Americans were kidnapped and released only after the United States delivered 500 anti-tank weapons to Iran. In mid-1985, the TWA Flight 847 which contained 134 Americans was also seized. The American hostages were slowly released as the US government met the hijackers' demands.

⁴¹⁶ It was later found that the "moderate Iranians" were part of an operation orchestrated by the Iranian government to secure weapons from the United States.

Although Reagan did not face a revisionist threat in the Asia Pacific that was considered as pressing as the threats posed to US influence and the lives of US officials in Europe and in the Middle East, US influence in the Asia Pacific was still being challenged by home-grown communist insurgent groups in the region. Reagan's policy response to the Philippines crisis was therefore driven by a continued concern of communist influence in the Asia Pacific and the strong anti-communist ideology that was prominent in the Reagan administration at that time.

Reagan's strong anti-Communist ideology contributed to a policy response that prioritised sustaining Marcos' authoritarian government over encouraging a democratic opening in the Philippines. Reagan's strong ideology of anti-Communism was influenced by the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, which was discussed in a 1979 article by the scholar Jeane Kirkpatrick. In the article titled "Dictatorships and Double Standards", Kirkpatrick argued that undemocratic allies such as the Shah of Iran should not be considered as tyrants because they are "less repressive than revolutionary autocracies, that they are more susceptible of liberalisation, and that they are more compatible with U.S. interest."⁴¹⁷ According to Kirkpatrick, leaders that are anti-Communist, pro-American and right-wing authoritarian allies are different from the more threatening totalitarian regimes such as Soviet Union. Therefore, America should cooperate with anti-Communist "traditional governments" to repel Communism as the alternative to "victorious, violent insurgency headed by Marxist revolutionaries is unlikely to lead to anything but totalitarian tyranny."⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁷ Kirkpatrick, "Dictatorships and Double Standards", op. cit.

⁴¹⁸ Ibid.

Driven by the Kirkpatrick thought, Reagan believed that America required a strong and centralised government to help repel the Communist threat in the Philippines and hence protect US influence in Asia Pacific. During the 1984 election debate, Reagan echoed these beliefs when he was asked if the overthrow of President Marcos would constitute a threat to vital American interests. "Well, as I say," Reagan replies, "we have to look at what an overthrow there would mean and what the government would be that would follow. And there is every evidence, every indication, that that government would be hostile to the United States. And that would be a severe blow to...our abilities there in the Pacific."⁴¹⁹ In the same debate, Reagan also stressed that it was critical to prevent the removal of Marcos because:

I know there are things there in the Philippines that do not look good to us from the standpoint right now of democratic rights, but what is the alternative: It is a large communist movement to take over the Philippines. They [the Philippines] have been our friend for, since their inception of the nation, and I think that we've had enough of a record of letting, under the guise of revolution, someone that we thought was a little more right than we could be, letting that person go and then winding up with totalitarianism pure and simple in the alternative. And I think that we are better off, for example with the Philippines of trying to retain our friendship and help them right the wrongs we see, rather than throwing them to the wolves and then facing a Communist power in the Pacific.⁴²⁰

Reagan thus believed that continued support to the Marcos government, although to the detriment of democratic rights, was critical to repel the CPP and its military wing, the NPA. US policymakers were concerned that the communist CPP and the NPA armed forces could undermine US influence in the Asia Pacific. A report written by Frederick Brown and Carl Ford for the US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations also pointed to the growing communist insurgency in the Philippines. The

⁴¹⁹ United Press International, "The transcript of the second debate between President Reagan...", *United Press International*, 22 October 1984

⁴²⁰ *Ibid.*

report also stressed that public and congressional awareness towards this problem needed to be heightened.⁴²¹ Brown and Ford's opinions were supported by Ross H Munro, who conducted a detailed study on NPA activities in a twenty-page long article titled "The New Khmer Rouge". Munro's article heightened the threat perception of the Communist influence when he described the CPP's objective to undermine US military and economic interests in the Philippines:

The heart of the [Communist] program is a call for the establishment of a People's Democratic Republic of the Philippines (PDRP)...The United States is, of courses, the enemy. The program promises that the PDRP's "revolutionary army as well as the people shall be constantly in a state of readiness to repel any act of intervention and aggression from foreign forces, including the United States." Furthermore, "the United States must leave its military bases in the Philippines. . . ." and "as a rule, direct investments and profit-making assets of the U.S. and other big foreign capitalists, especially those in the vital and strategic industries, shall be nationalized."⁴²²

In view of the Communist threat present in the Asia Pacific, America's strategic priorities in the region were twofold: to maintain US access to key military bases in the Philippines and protect US regional influence. During the Vietnam War, America relied on military bases in the Philippines such as the Clark Air Base and Subic Bay Naval Base, and smaller facilities such as the Wallace Air Station, San Miguel Naval Communication Station, and John Hay Air Station to forward project US military power into the Asia Pacific and deter Soviet expansionism in the region. After the war, the US armed forces continued to rely on these bases, especially Clark and Subic Bay, for defensive capabilities such as maintaining "high state of readiness of US operational forces in the Pacific", the "comprehensive support for all operating forces...including communications, logistics, maintenance, training, and personnel requirements",

⁴²¹ Frederick Brown and Carl Ford, *The Situation Report in the Philippines, A Staff Report prepared for the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate* (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1984)

⁴²² Ross H. Munro, "The New Khmer Rouge", *Commentary Magazine*, 1 December 1985

and “major war reserve material storage for a variety of contingencies.”⁴²³ US policymakers such as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defence and National Security Affairs (East Asia and Pacific) Jim Kelly insisted on “the crucial role these facilities play in supporting our forward deployment in both the Pacific and Indian Ocean Basins and offsetting the expanded Soviet military presence in Asia.”⁴²⁴ The importance of these bases were also required to sustain US regional presence as stressed by President Reagan in the 1985 National Security Decision Directive, in which he asserted that “strategically, continued and unhampered access to our military facilities [in the Philippines] is of prime importance in helping to offset the expanded Soviet threat.”⁴²⁵

Therefore, when the assassination of opposition leader Aquino in 1983 sparked the beginning of a democratic crisis in the Philippines, President Reagan feared that a domestic instability fallout in the Philippines would restrict America’s access to these strategic bases and undermine US key interests in the region. Consequently, in the 1985 National Security Directive, Reagan announced that “the U.S. does not want to remove Marcos from power to destabilise the GOP [Government of the Philippines].”⁴²⁶ Reagan also believed that “a strong ASEAN... includes a healthy Philippines allied to the United States as a buffer to Communist pressure in Southeast Asia.”⁴²⁷

Influenced by an anti-Communist ideology and the continued presence of a

⁴²³ “United States - Philippine Relations and the New Base and Aid Agreement”, *Hearings, Subcommittee on Asia and Pacific Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 98th Congress, 1st session, June 1983, pp.7-12

⁴²⁴ Shultz, “DAS Monjo’s Testimony on the Philippines before House Armed Services Committee”, *op. cit.*

⁴²⁵ Reagan, “United States Policy Toward the Philippines”, *op. cit.*

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*

Communist threat in the Asia Pacific, Reagan believed that removing the Marcos government would threaten to undermine domestic stability in the Philippines, with wider unstable consequences for the region. Therefore, to retain US access to the strategic bases in the Philippines which Reagan believed was critical to sustain America's influence in the Asia Pacific, Reagan encouraged a policy response that supported the Marcos government.

5.4. Influence of Senior Policymakers

Did US policymakers with direct access to the President exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?

Unlike the lack of policy interest surrounding America's foreign policy towards the South Korean democratic crisis, America's policy towards the Philippines was a hotly debated and highly contentious issue within the US foreign policy bureaucracy. Numerous policymakers from agencies such as the State Department, Defence Department, and the CIA, voiced their divergent views on Reagan's intended policy to support the Marcos government.

These views can roughly be categorised into two competing groups of policymakers: the Reaganites and the Pragmatists. While the Reaganites supported Reagan's policy and echoed his concern that the removal of Marcos might invite a Communist takeover in the Philippines, the Pragmatists denounced continued US support for the Marcos government. Eventually, a key event took place in the Philippines which demanded a US policy response. Triggered by the February 1986 EDSA Revolution, US policymakers successfully exerted strong pressure on President Reagan to adopt their recommended policy

responses. Under the direct influence of the Pragmatist policymakers, Reagan conceded to a US policy that supported immediate democratic transition in the Philippines under Corazon Aquino.

5.4.1. Competing Ideologies

America's foreign policymaking process was shaped by intense debate between two groups of policymakers that competed to shape US foreign policy towards the Philippines crisis. Reaganite policymakers insisted that America needed to help sustain the survival of the Marcos government in the Philippines, while the Pragmatist policymakers did not agree with the US policy of fully supporting Marcos.⁴²⁸

Reaganite policymakers such as President Reagan, Vice President George H.W. Bush, Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger, and CIA Director Casey believed that America needed to support the Marcos government to deter Communism and prevent the collapse of a US ally. This Reaganite thought echoed the Kirkpatrick Doctrine that was heavily based on the idea that pro-American right-wing authoritarian political systems needed to be supported to repel Communism.⁴²⁹ There was a concern amongst the Reaganites that removing Marcos as the Philippines President could open a political vacuum that would allow the Communist CPP to seize as an opportunity to take over the Filipino government and undermine US interests in the Asia Pacific. Having also experienced foreign policy debacles in South Vietnam, Nicaragua, and Iran, Reaganite policymakers argued that America needed to maintain support for

⁴²⁸ Walden Bello was one of the first few theorists to label this camp of policymakers as "pragmatists" in the literature. See Bello, "Edging toward the Quagmire", op. cit.

⁴²⁹ Kirkpatrick, "Dictatorships and Double Standards", op. cit.

Marcos to avoid the collapse of the Filipino government and the spread of Communism.⁴³⁰

To pursue their pro-Marcos agenda, Reaganite policymakers demonstrated support for Marcos during the Philippines democratic crisis. After Aquino's assassination in 1983, members of the US Congress pressured Reagan to express America's dissatisfaction by cancelling his pre-planned trip to Manila.⁴³¹ However, Vice President Bush rejected this suggestion by arguing that the United States "would not cut away from a person who imperfect though he may be on human rights, has worked with us." Eventually, Reagan reluctantly agreed to cancel his trip to the Philippines but not before assuring Marcos that "I've always had confidence in your ability to handle things...our friendship for you remains as warm and firm as does our feeling for the people of the Philippines."⁴³² Reagan also adopted a pro-Marcos policy when he first refused to acknowledge Marcos' complicity in fraud during the 1986 presidential election. Reagan expressed this position in a televised news conference when Reagan expressed his concern with "the violence...and the possibility of fraud" in the Philippines election but went beyond the statement prepared by the State Department to add that "it could have been...occurring on both sides" to imply that Corazon's party could have also been responsible for manipulating the votes.⁴³³

On the other hand, Pragmatist policymakers disagreed with the policy of

⁴³⁰ Stanley Karnow, "Reagan and the Philippines: Setting Marcos Adrift", *New York Times*, 19 March 1989

⁴³¹ Barrie Dunsmore, "Television Coverage of September 21 events in Manila", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 22 September 1983

⁴³² Sara Steinmetz, *Democratic Transition and Human Rights: Perspectives on US Foreign Policy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994)

⁴³³ Michael Putzel, "Reagan sending envoy to Manila", *Morning Call*, 12 February 1986 and Bernard Gwertzman, "US tries to limit Manila confusion on Reagan stance", *The New York Times*, 13 February 1986

heavy American support for Marcos. The Pragmatist effort was led primarily by Assistant Secretary Armacost who was aided by US Ambassador to the Philippines Stephen Bosworth, Assistant Secretary of State Wolfowitz, Secretary of State George Shultz, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral William Crowe Jr., the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Lugar, and Chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs Stephen Solarz. These Pragmatist policymakers pushed for democratic change in the Philippines by first calling for Marcos to adopt democratic reforms as “there is a fear that pulling the rug out from under him [Marcos] would create greater instability, less democracy and fewer human rights.”⁴³⁴ However, after Marcos proposed in November 1985 to hold the snap presidential election, the Pragmatists were concerned that any evidence of fraud committed during the election could spark political instability in the Philippines. After Marcos’ announcement, Pragmatist policymakers began to shift towards a stronger anti-Marcos policy that called for Marcos to immediately step down. To pursue the Pragmatist agenda, policymakers lobbied support from other policymakers, engaged Filipino officials to adopt democratic reforms, secured compromises with Reaganite policymakers, and directly persuaded President Reagan to consider shifting America’s policy response towards the Philippines democratic crisis.

When Michael Armacost returned to Washington in 1984 after serving as the US Ambassador to the Philippines for two years, he began to pursue the Pragmatist agenda to reduce US support for the Marcos government. During his term in the Philippines, Armacost had developed a close relationship with Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos. However, as the scale of Marcos’ corruption

⁴³⁴ Dunsmore, “Television Coverage of September 21 events in Manila”, op. cit.

heightened, Armacost began to support the Filipino opposition parties instead.⁴³⁵ After Aquino's murder in 1983, Armacost distanced himself from the Marcos government by pushing for Marcos to conduct a credible investigation into Aquino's murder.⁴³⁶ Once Armacost was recalled to Washington in 1984, he began his new position as Assistant Secretary of State which also granted Armacost closer access to other Pragmatists in Washington such as Assistant Secretary Wolfowitz and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State John Monjo.⁴³⁷

Another policymaker that supported the pro-democracy movement in the Philippines was Stephen Bosworth, who replaced Armacost as the US Ambassador to the Philippines. During his tenure as Ambassador, Bosworth continued to shift US policy away from the Marcos government. As Bosworth began his new position sceptical of the Marcos government, he cultivated new ties with the opposition parties in Philippines instead.⁴³⁸ Bosworth was also instrumental in relaying messages from the State Department to pressure Marcos to install democratic reforms. When Reagan announced in February 1986 that fraud could have been committed by both political parties, Bosworth played a critical role in acting upon the instructions of the State Department to assure Corazon Aquino that Reagan's firm position on supporting Marcos would soon shift. Bosworth also carried a message that promised to offer Marcos asylum to the United States if Marcos agreed to step down as President.⁴³⁹

⁴³⁵ Armacost lent his support to Benigno Aquino by praising Aquino's beliefs "in a free press, in free elections, in due process of law" and held frequent meetings with opposition leader Cardinal Sin. See Raymond Bonner, *Waltzing with a Dictator: The Marcoses and the Making of American Policy* (New York: Random House, 1987)

⁴³⁶ Friend, "Timely Daring", op. cit.

⁴³⁷ Walden Bello and Edward S. Herman, "US-sponsored Elections in El Salvador and the Philippines", *World Policy Journal* 1, no.4 (Summer, 1984), pp.851-869

⁴³⁸ Bonner, *Waltzing with a Dictator*, op. cit.

⁴³⁹ Ibid.

The Assistant Secretary of State Paul Wolfowitz was also another prominent Pragmatist that was critical in coordinating the other Pragmatist policymakers. In 1983, Wolfowitz gathered similar-minded Pragmatists such as Assistant Secretary of State for International Security Affairs Richard Armitage, Special Assistant to the President for Asian Affairs Gaston Sigur, and National Security Council Director for Asian Affairs Richard Childress to develop an inter-agency task force which discussed US policy towards the Philippines on a weekly basis.⁴⁴⁰ Wolfowitz also shuttled between human rights monitors and opposition leaders to collect critical information for Secretary of State Shultz. With Wolfowitz's input, Shultz managed to secure a "rough consensus" from other Reaganite policymakers such as CIA Director Casey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr., and National Security Advisor Robert McFarlane to agree to a "quiet diplomacy" approach that could urge Marcos to adopt democratic reforms and develop strategies to prepare for a Marcos succession and a restructuring of the Philippines' foreign debt.⁴⁴¹ Wolfowitz also accompanied Assistant Secretary Armitage to make congressional appearances in which they encouraged economic, political, and military reforms in the Philippines.⁴⁴²

Secretary of State George Shultz exerted the most direct pressure on President Reagan. Shultz maintained a consistently close relationship with Reagan by conducting direct telephone conversations and frequent meetings throughout the Philippines democratic crisis. When Reagan first refused to recognise Marcos' use of widespread fraud in the 1986 elections, Shultz was quick to correct Reagan's

⁴⁴⁰ Blitz, *The Contested State*, op. cit.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴⁴² Bonner, *Waltzing with a Dictator*, op. cit.

perception by personally telephoning Reagan's Santa Barbara ranch home to furnish Reagan with examples of Marcos' vote manipulation.⁴⁴³ Under Shultz's pressure and the combined resistance from other Pragmatist policymakers and Congress members, Reagan eventually announced that "widespread fraud and violence" was "perpetrated largely" by Marcos during the elections.⁴⁴⁴ Shultz also actively coordinated meetings with President Reagan and policy officials from the State Department and National Security Planning Group to discuss proposals designed to undermine Marcos and encourage a pro-democracy foreign policy towards the Philippines.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral William Crowe Jr. also used his direct access to President Reagan to convince Reagan of the unstable political situation in the Philippines that stemmed from Marcos' poor governance. After Admiral Crowe Jr.'s visit to the Philippines in 1984, Crowe met with Reagan to stress that the NPA communist forces posed a serious threat to US security interests in the Philippines and that Marcos needed to step down for America to continue tackling communism effectively. Reagan was also briefed on the rapid growth of the NPA guerrilla force to over 15,000 soldiers, the widespread corruption in the Marcos government, politicisation of the Philippines armed forces, and the potentially disastrous consequences on American bases in Subic Bay and Clark Field.⁴⁴⁵ In a report that Admiral Crowe Jr. later delivered directly to Reagan, Admiral Crowe Jr. also emphasised that Reagan needed "to develop a policy to persuade Marcos to leave office."⁴⁴⁶ As Admiral Crowe Jr. later

⁴⁴³ Karnow, "Reagan and the Philippines", op. cit.

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁵ Leslie H. Galb, "Marcos reported to lose support in Administration", *New York Times*, 26 January 1986

⁴⁴⁶ Karnow, "Reagan and the Philippines", op. cit.

informed journalist Stanley Karnow, “Things had to change. Marcos was not making the decisions that had to be made and the country was sliding downhill. So, I felt he had to go.”⁴⁴⁷

Members of the US Congress such as Senator Lugar and Congressman Solarz were also active Pragmatist policymakers. During the 1986 presidential elections, Lugar led a US observer delegation to Manila during which he observed that some poll stations had delayed vote-counting, which was an indication of fraud. Lugar publicly expressed his concern of “frankly a very disturbing pattern” of fraud and violence before ensuring that the delegation’s final report reflected the widespread use of fraud.⁴⁴⁸ “Sadly, however,” the report stated, “we have witnessed and heard disturbing reports to undermine the integrity of [the electoral] process...serious charges have been made in regard to the tabulation system.”⁴⁴⁹ Upon his return to Washington, Lugar continued to assert that “if the vote had been held honestly that [Corazon] Aquino would clearly be far ahead.”⁴⁵⁰ Lugar also directly pressured President Reagan to use America’s influence to uphold an election result based on a fair vote-count and not on Marcos’ interpretation of the results. During the meeting, Lugar continued to insist that “if the vote had been held honestly that [Corazon] Aquino would clearly be far ahead.”⁴⁵¹

Meanwhile, Congressman Solarz conducted visits, hearings, and released

⁴⁴⁷ Quoted in Blitz, *The Contested State*, op. cit., p.163

⁴⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁹ Robert Pear, “US Observers disagree on extent of Philippine Fraud”, *The New York Times*, 12 February 1986

⁴⁵⁰ John Whitehead, “February 13 EAP Press Summary”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 14 February 1986

⁴⁵¹ Ibid.

critical statements to try persuade the Reagan administration to explain its pro-Marcos policy to the American public.⁴⁵² Solarz also approached Marcos to try encourage Marcos to share political power with the elite opposition. Between 1983 and 1986, Solarz persuaded the US Congress to reduce US military aid to the Philippines, restrict military assistance to “nonlethal” items, and call for “genuine, free, and fair elections” in a sense-of-the-house resolution.⁴⁵³ After the 1986 presidential elections, Solarz also supported Lugar’s claims of fraud. Solarz insisted that there was clear evidence that Marcos deprived Corazon of as many as 5 million votes, which if she had used, would have gotten her very far ahead in the election race.⁴⁵⁴

5.4.2. The Trigger Event

The EDSA Revolution from 22 to 25 February 1986 posed a trigger event that was key in pressuring US policymakers to formulate a clear policy response towards the Philippines democratic crisis. For four days, over 2 million Filipinos congregated along the Epifanio de los Santos (EDSA) highway leading to Camp Aguinaldo. The overwhelming standoff on the highway against the Marcos government served as a tipping point; there were concerns that Marcos could either respond with a harsh crackdown or allow the democratically elected leader Corazon Aquino to be recognised as the Philippines’ legitimate President. Consequently, US policymakers needed to respond to the democratic crisis quickly to prevent a violent spill over that could produce domestic instability. Over the course of the EDSA revolution, Reaganite and Pragmatist policymakers held several meetings in the United States. The outcome of these meetings, of

⁴⁵² Friend, “Timely Daring”, op. cit.

⁴⁵³ Walden Bello, “US-Philippine Relations in the Aquino Era”, *World Policy Journal* 5, no.4 (Fall, 1988), pp.677-702

⁴⁵⁴ Whitehead, “February 13 EAP Press Summary”, op. cit.

which some were attended by President Reagan himself, also demonstrate the importance of gaining direct access to the US President when developing US foreign policy.

The bureaucratic division between the Pragmatist and Reaganite policymakers intensified when the United States was pressured to release an official policy towards the EDSA Revolution. On the day before the Revolution, Secretary of State Shultz gathered Assistant Secretary Armacost, Assistant Secretary of State Wolfowitz and Charles Hill, Shultz's aide, to discuss America's security stakes in the Philippine crisis. The four policymakers agreed that while America needed to caution Marcos against using force, the United States also needed to adopt an official policy towards the Philippines crisis. However, no consensus was reached on the policy response that America should adopt.

On 22 February 1986, the first day of the Revolution, Shultz chaired a meeting of the National Security Planning Group during which Reaganite and Pragmatist policymakers hotly debated the US policy towards the Philippines democratic crisis. Defence Secretary Weinberger used the Iran analogy to argue that the Philippines would fall to instability if Marcos resigned. However, Special Envoy Habib countered that the situation in Manila could not be compared to Iran.⁴⁵⁵ "It's not Iran," Habib insisted, "There is a democratic opposition backed by the Catholic Church...We have a great store of good will."⁴⁵⁶ Shultz also proposed to hold another election in the Philippines but was immediately dismissed by CIA Deputy Director Robert Gates who argued that a new election was not realistic

⁴⁵⁵ Karnow, *In Our Image*, op. cit.

⁴⁵⁶ Karnow, "Reagan and the Philippines", op. cit.

nor legalistic enough.⁴⁵⁷

Another meeting was held in the White House Situation Room, where President Reagan, Vice President Bush, Treasury Secretary James Baker, and CIA Director Casey joined the discussion. By gaining direct access to Reagan, the Pragmatist and Reaganite policymakers were able to directly convince Reagan to adopt their respective policies. The White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan echoed the same Iran analogy to argue that abandoning Marcos would equate to “opening the door to Communism.” Shultz and Habib retorted that “the Marcos era has ended” and that “nobody believes that Marcos can remain in power.” Eventually, President Reagan conceded to the State Department’s proposal to shift US support away from Marcos and towards a government led by the democratically elected Corazon Aquino. Although Reagan refused to publicly announce this policy decision, Reagan agreed to release a public statement that warned Marcos against using force on the protestors. In the public statement,

“the President appealed...to President Marcos to avoid an attack against other elements of the Philippine armed forces...An attempt to resolve this situation by force will surely...cause untold damage to the relationship between our governments...We cannot continue our existing military assistance if the [Philippine] government uses that aid against other elements of the Philippine military which enjoy substantial backing.”⁴⁵⁸

After the public release of this statement, the Pragmatist policymakers continued to closely monitor America’s policy response. Back in the Philippines, Marcos correctly interpreted Reagan’s statement as an indication that the United States would no longer support his government. In a last bid to save his presidency, Marcos telephoned Senator Laxalt and attempted to broker a power-

⁴⁵⁷ Karnow, *In Our Image*, op. cit.

⁴⁵⁸ Bob Sector and Don Shannon, “Reagan warns Marcos of Military Aid cut off: Philippine Chief cautioned against attacking rebel troops; U.S. might offer him asylum”, *Los Angeles Times*, 24 February 1986

sharing arrangement with Corazon. However, Secretary of State Shultz rejected the power-sharing option as “impractical”. The only available option was for Marcos to step down as President and allow Corazon Aquino to take his place. “I think you should cut and cut cleanly, I think the time has come”, Laxalt advised Marcos.⁴⁵⁹

With Marcos’ resignation, the Pragmatist policymakers finally achieved their goal of pursuing an active democracy promotion policy towards the Philippines. In April 1986, Reagan telephoned Corazon to deliver America’s congratulations for her electoral win and officially recognise the new Corazon government.⁴⁶⁰ Critical factors that facilitated the Pragmatists’ efforts in redirecting US policy were the EDSA Revolution which acted as a trigger event and the policymakers’ direct access to President Reagan. Through personal meetings, direct telephone conversations, and confidential reports delivered directly to Reagan, Pragmatist policymakers such as Secretary of State Shultz, Senator Laxalt, and Admiral Crowe were able to persuade Reagan to abandon support for the Marcos government and to adopt an active democracy promotion policy instead.

5.5. Congressional Pressure

Did members of the US Congress exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President’s intended policy?

During the Philippines’ democratic crisis, members of the US Congress exerted consistent pressure on President Reagan to try redirect US policy away from Reagan’s preference to support the Marcos government. To drive this policy

⁴⁵⁹ Burton, *Impossible Dream*, op. cit.

⁴⁶⁰ Karnow, “Reagan and the Philippines”, op. cit.

change, congressional members passed at least three resolutions that called for free and fair elections, directly appealed to Reagan to reduce US support for Marcos, and made public appearances and announcements against Reagan's pro-Marcos policy. This section outlines how this heightened congressional activity contributed to a domestic resistance against the pro-Marcos policy.

In the months leading to the Philippines' parliamentary election in May 1984, a majority of congressional members were concerned that the election would be marred with fraud and hence undermine democratic progress in the Philippines. This concern led the Chairman of the House Asian and Pacific Affairs Committee Solarz to push for a "Sense of the House" resolution. Also known as the House Concurrent Resolution 187, this resolution deplored the assassination of Benigno Aquino and urged the United States to "support genuine, free and fair elections to the National Assembly in May 1984." Concurrent Resolution 187 was passed with an overwhelming 413 to 3 votes, reflecting the strong congressional support for democratic reforms in the Philippines.⁴⁶¹

In November 1985, the US Congress passed another resolution after Marcos announced his intention to hold snap presidential elections. In response to Marcos' announcement, the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Dante Fascell and the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Lugar sponsored House Resolution 232. Under this resolution, the US Congress suggested five steps that Marcos should follow to demonstrate his genuine intention to uphold the pledge of free and fair elections. Resolution 232 also included a threat to restrain US economic and military assistance to the

⁴⁶¹ Ronald Kokinda and Susan Kokinda, "Congressional Closeup - House Slaps Philippine Government", *Executive Intelligence Review* 10, no.43 (8 November 1983), p.53

Philippines if Marcos did not observe these democratic reforms.⁴⁶² Senator Lugar asserted that Congress would deny aid to the Philippines if the election was shown to be “fatally flawed.”⁴⁶³ To demonstrate Congress’ real intent to use aid as leverage, Congress reduced Reagan’s request for US\$275.25 million in military and economic assistance to the Philippines for FY1986. Around US\$25 million was removed from the budget that was allocated to military assistance and another US\$60 million was added to the budget for economic assistance instead.⁴⁶⁴ As with the House Concurrent Resolution 187, House Resolution 232 was also overwhelmingly approved by both House and Senate members, which further pressured Reagan to support democratic reform in the Philippines.⁴⁶⁵

After the 1986 presidential election, the US Senate passed another resolution on 19 February 1986 which declared that the Philippines elections was “marked by such widespread fraud that they cannot be considered a fair reflection of the will of the people of the Philippines.” The resolution was also passed with an overwhelming vote of 85 to 9. In the House of Representatives, Congressman Solarz led a similar resolution.⁴⁶⁶

In addition to passing legislation, members of Congress exerted direct pressure on President Reagan. A letter to the President by Congressman Fascell described Marcos’ use of fraud as a “blatant, manipulation and gross disregard for democratic principles” and urged Reagan “to consider immediate suspension

⁴⁶² Hawes, “United States Support for the Marcos Administration and the Pressures that made for Change”, op. cit.; and George Shultz, “10 EAP Press Summary”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 11 February 1986

⁴⁶³ Whitehead, “February 13 EAP Press Summary”, op. cit.

⁴⁶⁴ Hawes, “United States Support for the Marcos Administration and the Pressures that made for Change”, op. cit.

⁴⁶⁵ Shultz, “DAS Monjo’s Testimony on the Philippines before House Armed Services Committee, December 5”, op. cit.

⁴⁶⁶ Shultz, *Turmoil and Triumph*, op. cit.

of all military and economic assistance to the Philippines".⁴⁶⁷ Senator Nunn also wrote to President Reagan to "urge that the U.S. take a strong stand against election fraud, refuse to recognise the fraudulent result as valid, and notify the GOP that we will terminate aid if the will of the Philippine voters is not followed" and asserted that US policymakers need to be "caught trying" being "unalterably opposed to this election fraud" as "the Philippine people want President Marcos out and they have elected Corazon Aquino as President".⁴⁶⁸ After receiving news of fraud in the 1986 Philippines elections, Senator Mark Hatfield, Congressman Jim Leach, and Congressman Dick Gephardt also exerted influence on Reagan by directly telephoning to urge the President to call for Marcos' resignation and end all US support for Marcos.⁴⁶⁹

Members of Congress also took to public channels to express their dissatisfaction with the Marcos regime. According to Secretary of State Shultz, congressional members were using newspapers and TV outlets to "turn on the public pressure faucets for [democratic] reform" in the Philippines.⁴⁷⁰ Congressman Fascell publicly criticised America for lacking a coherent policy towards the Philippines and suggested for the FY1986 assistance to be postponed until "the Administration can better articulate its policy toward the Philippines."⁴⁷¹ Senator Bradley contributed an article to the New York Times which he called for a timetable for electoral reform in the Philippines.⁴⁷² Senator

⁴⁶⁷ Dante Fascell, "Letter to Mr. President", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 14 February 1986

⁴⁶⁸ Sam Nunn, "Letter to the President", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 13 February 1986

⁴⁶⁹ James W. Dyer, "Congressional Reaction to Philippine Elections", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 15 February 1986

⁴⁷⁰ Shultz, "10 EAP Press Summary", op. cit.

⁴⁷¹ John Whitehead, "Fascell urges President to suspend Philippines aid immediately", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 15 February 1986

⁴⁷² Bello, "Edging toward the Quagmire", op. cit

Lugar also made public statements and television appearances to ensure that his “point of view was heard.”⁴⁷³ Lugar provided a statement to The Sun newspaper, which quoted him as observing that the Filipino election was “teetering on the brink of disaster” because of the allegations of fraud, and that American policymakers will need to prove their commitment to the democratic tradition in the Philippines.⁴⁷⁴ Senator Lugar also delivered a high school convocation speech in which he asserted that Reagan’s policy towards the Philippines was flawed as “the President was not well informed.”⁴⁷⁵

Through congressional resolutions, directly approaching the US President, and making public announcements and appearances, members of the US Congress were able to actively voice their dissatisfaction with Reagan’s support of the Marcos regime. This level of pressure exerted by congressional members strengthened the resistance within the United States which was increasingly against Reagan’s pro-Marcos policy.

5.6. Capitalist Influence

Did private business groups or individuals exert influence on the US foreign policymaking process to facilitate or constrain the President’s intended policy?

After Marcos announced the snap presidential elections in 1986, the Filipino and American business community in Manila feared for the security of their economic investments in the Philippines. This concern drove most business individuals to approach and urge US policymakers to reduce support for the

⁴⁷³ Blitz, *The Contested State*, op. cit.

⁴⁷⁴ Shultz, “10 EAP Press Summary”, op. cit.

⁴⁷⁵ Mike Privitera, “Dole/Lugar/Nunn action on Philippines”, *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 13 February 1986

Marcos government and to encourage a more democratic political system in the Philippines instead. Consequently, representatives from both the Filipino and American business community supported a US foreign policy that shifted towards active democracy promotion. Although the direct impact of capitalist pressure on America's policy response towards the Philippines democratic crisis cannot be firmly determined, it can be affirmed that the efforts of these business representatives contributed to a growing domestic resistance against the pro-Marcos policy.

Marcos' decision to implement martial law in the Philippines in 1972 was initially supported by US businessmen in Manila. Edgar Molina, the Vice-President of Ford Motor Co, welcomed the stability of Marcos' martial law while Robert Wales, the President of Mobil Oil Philippines, believed that "if martial law will instil some discipline and solve the law and order problem, the temporary loss of freedom of speech is not important."⁴⁷⁶ Under martial law, Marcos was able to finance a new clique of elite individuals that remained loyal to him as long as wealth continued to be redirected towards them.

The increased state intervention also boosted the Philippines economy, which grew in the early 1970s from an annual gross domestic product (GDP) of 5.4 percent in 1972 to 8.8 percent in 1976.⁴⁷⁷ As indicated by the rise in gross fixed capital formation, which reflects spending on public and private construction, infrastructure spending in the Philippines also rose from 17 percent in 1972 to

⁴⁷⁶ Cedric J. Robinson, "The American press and the repairing of the Philippines", *Race & Class* 28, no.2 (October, 1986), pp.31-44

⁴⁷⁷ The World Bank, "GDP annual growth (annual %)", *The World Bank Data*, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG?locations=PH>, (accessed 12 January 2018)

nearly 30 percent in 1983.⁴⁷⁸ More funds were being directed towards hotel, tourist-related, and major industrial projects such as the Philippine Film Centre.⁴⁷⁹ Filipino officials with close ties to Marcos such as Defence Minister Enrile were also awarded major interests in the coconut and telecommunications industries.⁴⁸⁰

However, these economic benefits did not last long. The Philippines economy became strained under the excessive spending. By the time Marcos left office in 1986, the Philippines foreign debt had reached US\$26 million.⁴⁸¹ The Philippines inflation rate had also escalated from 4.8 percent in 1972 to 62.8 percent by September 1984.⁴⁸²

The decline of the Filipino economy placed the economic interests of the Filipino business community increasingly at stake. Soon, the business community publicly declared no confidence in the Marcos regime under the umbrella of the Makati Business Club. The Club expressed concern in the fragility of the Filipino economy, the growing size of the foreign debt, and the government support of sagging industrial empires. The businessmen also proposed a series of economic reforms to help stave off economic collapse in the Philippines.⁴⁸³ Amongst the reforms suggested were to reduce government interference in private industry, end over-regulation, return the sugar and coconut industries to private control, and terminate controlled product pricing. As observed by US Ambassador Armacost, most of these reforms reflected a strong anti-Marcos

⁴⁷⁸ Pauline Macareg, "How did the declaration of martial law in 1972 affect the economy?", *Entrepreneur Philippines*, 21 September 2017

⁴⁷⁹ Friend, "Timely Daring", op. cit.

⁴⁸⁰ Robinson, "The American press and the repairing of the Philippines", op. cit.

⁴⁸¹ Friend, "Timely Daring", op. cit.

⁴⁸² Macareg, "How did the declaration of martial law in 1972 affect the economy?", op. cit.

⁴⁸³ Michael Armacost, "Economic Policy Recommendations of the Makati Business Club", *National Security Archive - The Philippines: US Policy during the Marcos Years, 1965 - 1986*, 3 September 1982

position as the business community “obliquely criticized the Palace, the cronies, the technocrats and the national government bureaucracy.”⁴⁸⁴

Aquino’s assassination in 1983 also drew further concern amongst the Filipino business community, who began to fear for their livelihood. The murder of Aquino, who also came from a politically prominent and landowning family, incited fears from American and Filipino businessmen whom had invested in the Filipino economy. “If they can kill Aquino,” a senior businessman reasoned, “they will kill anybody. None of us is safe.”⁴⁸⁵

The resistance demonstrated by the business community in the Philippines translated into some effect as international financial institutions became reluctant to extend loans to Marcos. The World Bank considered imposing stricter loan conditions, including the “dismantling of agricultural monopolies”, which was also one of the reforms suggested by the Makati Business Club.

To protect their business interests and personal safety, several representatives from the Filipino business community appealed to the United States to pressure Marcos to resign. In a meeting with the Special Envoy Ambassador Habib, representatives of the Filipino business community pleaded to the United States for assistance. Habib noted that there was a consensus amongst Filipino businessmen that “only the US can unseat Marcos...neither we nor other important countries should recognize the Marcos government...The US has more power than it ever recognizes.”⁴⁸⁶ The American Chamber of Commerce

⁴⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁵ Paul Quinn-Judge, “Businessmen in Philippines protest Marcos rule - and a mounting financial crisis”, *The Christian Science Monitor*, 22 December 1983

⁴⁸⁶ Stephen Bosworth, “Summary: Ambassador Habib met with a group of moderate

(Amcham) also met with a group of Senators from the US Congress to stress that it would be in the interests of the United States if Marcos stepped down.⁴⁸⁷ The Amcham also urged Ambassador Habib to advise President Reagan to release a statement that condemned the irregularities observed during the 1986 election and to urge Marcos to resign. Upon Habib's return to Washington, Habib reacted accordingly and advised Reagan to retract US support from Marcos.

Individual American businessmen also played significant roles in the resistance against Marcos. William H. Overholt, who was a Vice-President of the Bankers Trust Co., met with several senior officials from the Defense Department, State Department, CIA, and the National Security Council. With the support from some senior officials in the State Department, Overholt asserted that more pressure should be exerted on Marcos to revive the democratic process in the Philippines.⁴⁸⁸ Overholt also invested generous amounts into Corazon's political campaign and provided for her security by hiring former operatives from British and Australian intelligence.⁴⁸⁹

Another businessman that lobbied US policymakers was Robert Trent Jones, Jr, a golf course designer and family friend to the Aquino family. After the assassination of Aquino, Jones approached Secretary of State Shultz to request assistance in supporting Corazon's campaign. Jones was then introduced to the New York-based public relations firm DH Sawyer & Associates which

businessmen", *National Security Archive - The Philippines: US Policy during the Marcos Years, 1985 - 1986*, 21 February 1986

⁴⁸⁷ Stephen Bosworth, "Codel Boren calls on NAMFREL, American Chamber of Commerce, and Presidential Envoy Habib", *National Security Archive - The Philippines: US Policy during the Marcos Years, 1985 - 1986*, 17 February 1986

⁴⁸⁸ Blitz, *The Contested State*, op. cit.

⁴⁸⁹ Karnow, "Reagan and the Philippines", op. cit.

successfully boosted Corazon's public image and campaign.⁴⁹⁰ Jones was also instrumental in raising money and political support for the pro-democracy People Power movement in the Philippines. Additionally, Jones pressured policymakers such as Senator Nunn, State Secretary Shultz, and other senior officials in the United States to support democratic change in the Philippines.⁴⁹¹

Filipino and American businessmen with economic investments in the Philippines were initially supportive of Marcos' authoritarian policies. However, as their economic investments dwindled under the sagging Filipino economy, the business community began to reject Marcos' policies and lobbied for US assistance to replace Marcos with Corazon Aquino. Through methods such as publicly declaring a loss of confidence in the Marcos government and directly approaching senior US policymakers in the State Department, these businessmen attempted to influence the US foreign policymaking process. Although the direct influence of their efforts on the shift in US foreign policy cannot be definitively traced, the resistance from the business community nevertheless demonstrated the growing lack of support that Reagan's pro-Marcos policy was facing within the United States and the Philippines.

⁴⁹⁰ Bonner, *Waltzing with a Dictator*, op. cit.

⁴⁹¹ A. Craig Copetas, "An Architect of Diplomacy on the Greens", *The New York Times*, 15 January 2005

5.7. Public Opinion and the US Media

Did the American public or the US media exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?

Some members of the American public were also resistant to Reagan's policy of supporting the Marcos government. The American people expressed their preference to support a democratic opening in the Philippines by directing letters to the US government and establishing advocacy groups such as the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights and Friends of Aquino. National outlets such as American newspapers also played an important role in shaping this pro-democratic public opinion through producing articles that were heavily pro-democratic and not in favour of the Marcos regime. This section traces the development of the US public opinion towards the Philippines democratic crisis and identifies the role of the US media in encouraging this opinion.

After Aquino's assassination, several members of the American public expressed their preference for the United States to reduce support for the Marcos regime. In 1983, the State Department, White House, and Capitol Hill received a flurry of letters from the public. The letters criticised Marcos' human rights record and urged Reagan to cancel his pre-planned trip to Manila.⁴⁹² Fourteen out of sixteen American newspapers also expressed their opposition to Reagan's planned Philippines trip, with only the conservative Washington Times and San Diego Union newspapers continuing to support Reagan's visit.⁴⁹³

⁴⁹² Ulrich A. Straus, "Status Report", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 11 September 1983

⁴⁹³ Bonner, *Waltzing with a Dictator*, op. cit.

The US public support for a democratic opening in the Philippines intensified over the course of the Philippines' democratic crisis. As the 1986 Philippines presidential election neared, a Chicago Council on Foreign Relations Survey demonstrated that the year 1986 marked the highest percentage of respondents (30%) that ranked "helping to bring a democratic form of government to other nations" as a very important foreign policy priority.⁴⁹⁴ Anti-Marcos sentiments amongst Americans had heightened throughout the Philippines democratic crisis as another public opinion poll in 1986 indicated that 40 percent of Americans agreed that the United States should push a reluctant dictator to reform through elections and not by force, even if Communist groups were likely to win.⁴⁹⁵

To generate domestic resistance against the pro-Marcos policy, several advocacy groups such as the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights and Friends of Aquino were established.⁴⁹⁶ After Aquino's assassination in 1983, the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights released a report that denounced US policymakers for prioritising security interests in the Philippines and undermining human rights. The Lawyers Committee also condemned the United States for being "increasingly seen as an apologist for the Philippine Government's deteriorating human rights record, [and] the United States is now included in the sweeping wave of condemnation that threatens the

⁴⁹⁴ Holsti, "Promotion of Democracy as a Popular Demand?", op. cit.

⁴⁹⁵ Robert A. Pastor, "Preempting Revolutions: The Boundaries of US Influence", *International Security* 15, no.4 (Spring, 1991), pp.54-86

⁴⁹⁶ The "human rights" community included a range of interest groups. The largest and most influential group was the Fund for Free Expression, which sponsors the activities of Americas Watch, Helsinki Watch, Asia Watch and the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights. Professional organisations such as the American Bar Association were also doing advocacy for human rights. These groups also relied on Congress members such as Stephen Solarz and Tony Hall and Senators Tom Harkin, Dave Durenburger and Daniel Patrick Moynihan to push their cause. See Tamar Jacoby, "The Reagan Turnaround on Human Rights", *Foreign Affairs* 64, no.5 (Summer, 1986), pp.1066-1086

stability of the government.” Furthermore, the Lawyers Committee called for the US Congress to deny President Reagan’s request for additional military aid to the Philippines and urged the Reagan Administration to support free and fair elections and protest against human rights violations in the Philippines.⁴⁹⁷

The Friends of Aquino group was another advocacy group formed by US policymakers and exiled Filipino politicians that were living in the United States. This group aimed to lobby members of the US Congress to support Corazon Aquino’s candidacy in the 1986 presidential election and encourage a shift in US foreign policy towards active democracy promotion. Friends of Aquino was founded by the Chairman of the House Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee Solarz, former Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs Richard Holbrooke, businessman Robert Trent Jones, and Marcos’ former Executive Secretary Rafael Salas. As a result of their lobbying efforts, Friends of Aquino gained the support of Democratic Senators Bill Bradley and Sam Nunn, and Senate Minority Assistant Leader Alan Cranston. As early as October 1983, 86 US congressional allies had pledged support for the advocacy group’s cause.⁴⁹⁸ Friends of Aquino also provided information to American journalists that discredited Marcos’ reputation in a series of controversial articles on Marcos’ wartime allegations and hidden wealth.⁴⁹⁹ Other Filipino interest groups were The Movement for a Free Philippines society, Ninoy Aquino Movement, Campaign

⁴⁹⁷ The Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights, *The Philippines: A Country in Crisis* (Washington, D.C., 1983)

⁴⁹⁸ Yossi Shain and Mark Thompson, “The Role of Political Exiles in Democratic Transitions: The Case of the Philippines”, *Journal of Developing Societies* 6 (January-April, 1990), pp.71-86

⁴⁹⁹ A series of articles that documented massive transfers of wealth abroad by the Marcos family was compiled by Lewis M. Simons, Pete Carey and Katherine Ellison of San Jose Mercury News in June 1985. Other articles were published by the New York Times. See Jeff Gerth and Joel Brinkley, “Marcos Wartime Role Discredited in US Files”, *The New York Times*, 23 January 1986

against the Marcos Dictatorship, and the Church Coalition for Human Rights.⁵⁰⁰

The US media also played a role in enforcing anti-Marcos sentiments within the American public. There was a consensus across most American newspapers that the Reagan Administration needed to recognise the democratic opposition in the Philippines as a legitimate alternative and retract US support from the Marcos government.⁵⁰¹ In response to Reagan's statement that the only alternative to Marcos was a Communist takeover, the US media reacted by condemning the President's assessment. The liberal New York Times criticised Reagan for "completely misreading the situation in the Philippines" while the Atlanta Constitution chided Reagan's "placid inattention to the real world. There is a danger that Marcos may continue to think that he can lean for uncritical support on a distant US President."⁵⁰² Conservative newspapers such as the Chicago Tribune also echoed the same sentiment when it recognised that "Ferdinand Marcos' corruption and incompetence is Washington's business like it or not...By squashing democracy and freedom, he [Marcos] has fed a growing leftist movement. As a result, his nation is in peril - and so is US defense policy in the Pacific."

Therefore, Aquino's assassination in 1983 triggered the American public to call for a more active democracy promotion policy towards the Philippines. As the democratic crisis in the Philippines evolved across the years, the US public opinion was increasingly being expressed through personal letters, public advocacy groups, and American newspapers. These efforts demonstrate the

⁵⁰⁰ Jacoby, "The Reagan Turnaround on Human Rights", op. cit.

⁵⁰¹ Alan D. Romberg, "Editorial Comment on Philippines - Commission Reports on Aquino Slaying", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 2 November 1984

⁵⁰² Steve Lohr, "Reagan Remark on Philippines Assailed", *The New York Times*, 23 October 1984

public's growing resistance against Marcos and the American people's preference for a Philippines government led by Corazon Aquino. As with the efforts of the American businessmen, it is difficult to ascertain the direct impact of the US public opinion on Reagan's decision to eventually support democratic transition in the Philippines. However, the pressure generated by the US public does indicate the lack of public support that Reagan would receive if he continued to pursue a pro-Marcos policy towards the Philippines.

5.8. Conclusion

The shift in America's foreign policy response towards the Philippines democratic crisis from 1983 to 1986 demonstrates the ability of domestic actors to collectively drive change in the US foreign policymaking process. At the beginning of the crisis in 1983, President Reagan expressed a preference to fully support Marcos' authoritarian regime. However, as the crisis evolved across the years, the United States moved towards supporting the pro-democracy movement in the Philippines instead. This final case study investigates the dynamics behind this shift in US foreign policy by first tracing the history of the US-Philippines alliance, the events that sparked the democratic crisis in the Philippines, and America's policy response to the crisis. In the policy analysis, this chapter studied the efforts of various domestic actors to influence the development of America's foreign policy towards the Philippines, as summarised in Table 6 below. This concluding section discusses the roles of domestic actors in the United States and highlights other factors that emerged to play an important role in initiating America's shift towards active democracy promotion.

Table 6.
Factors surrounding US Active Democracy Promotion Policy towards
the Philippines, 1983-1986

FACTORS SURROUNDING US ACTIVE DEMOCRACY PROMOTION POLICY	
1 Presidential Intent What was the President's intended policy response?	Support the authoritarian Marcos government
2 Influence of Senior Policymakers Did US policymakers with direct access to the President exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	Reaganites ✓ Pragmatists ✓
3 Congressional Pressure Did members of the US Congress exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	✓ , contributed to domestic resistance
4 Capitalist Influence Did private business groups or individuals exert influence on the US foreign policymaking process to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	✓ , contributed to domestic resistance
5 Public Opinion and US Media Did the American public or the US media exert influence to facilitate or constrain the President's intended policy?	✓ , contributed to domestic resistance

The Philippines democratic crisis is an ideal example of Jurgen Habermas' idea of a political crisis, in which a crisis of trust in the governing political system is initiated by external factors. The economic collapse that the Philippines experienced in the 1980s, which was a result of steadily declining global sugar prices, sparked domestic grievances of the growing economic difficulties and widespread corruption in the Philippines. The Philippines population exhibited an inclination to support the opposition party, which was first led by Benigno Aquino and later by his wife Corazon, as an alternative to the Philippines leadership. Faced with a weakening legitimacy, Marcos attempted to buffer his political strength by proposing a snap election. However, Marcos also underestimated the strength of the opposition movement, despite his tactics to

commit electoral fraud during the 1986 presidential election. The Philippines democratic crisis reached a trigger point when the Philippines people publicly declared their complete loss of trust in the Marcos leadership during the four-day EDSA revolution. Under pressure from events on the ground and America's declining support, Marcos eventually agreed to resign as President. Marcos' resignation demonstrates the strength of people power in the Philippines and also the influence of actors in the United States.

President Reagan's intended policy response to the Philippines democratic crisis was to continue supporting the Marcos government. However, Reagan's intended policy response was met with varying responses from other domestic actors such as senior US policymakers, members of the US Congress, business individuals, and the American public. Although senior US policymakers were the most successful in directly influencing Reagan to alter US foreign policy, the efforts of the other groups of domestic actors were also critical in creating a climate of domestic resistance against Reagan's pro-Marcos policy.

The role of ideas was prominent in the policymakers' debates surrounding the development of US foreign policy towards the Philippines democratic crisis. The tension between groups with competing ideologies such as the Reaganites and the Pragmatists helped to shape the direction of US foreign policy. The Reaganites, who supported Reagan's pro-Marcos policy to tackle the Communist threat, was initially able to ensure continued support for Marcos. However, as the Philippines democratic crisis escalated, the group of Pragmatists soon gained strength in influencing Reagan. Driven by the course of events in the Philippines and the growing strength of Corazon's party, the

Pragmatists were soon convinced that Marcos needed to be immediately replaced with a democratically elected leadership.

Another critical component that drove the shift in US policy was the trigger event, which was key in allowing the Pragmatists to exert more influence on Reagan's foreign policy decision. The EDSA Revolution forced the United States to generate a firm policy response towards the Philippines crisis, placing Reagan under severe pressure. This allowed senior Pragmatists with direct connections to Reagan, such as Secretary of State Shultz, to utilise this personal relationship and convince Reagan of the need to adopt a more active democracy promotion policy. The Pragmatists' efforts eventually succeeded when Reagan relented to a US policy that retracted support from Marcos and supported the new Philippines government under Corazon Aquino.

Other groups of domestic actors such as members of the US Congress, American and Filipino business individuals, and the American public contributed to the growing domestic resistance against Reagan's pro-Marcos policy. During the Philippines democratic crisis, heightened congressional activity took place in the form of multiple congressional resolutions, stricter controls on budget allocations to the Philippines, direct letters to the President, and congressional efforts to gather domestic support through public announcements and appearances. Through these efforts, the US Congress had developed bureaucratic resistance by obstructing the implementation of a pro-Marcos US policy towards the Philippines. Similarly, the US media and advocacy groups such as the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights and Friends of Aquino encouraged a public opinion that called for reduced US

support for the Marcos government. Eventually, by 1986, 40 percent of the American public believed that the United States should push a reluctant dictator to reform through elections and not by force.⁵⁰³

Unlike the business groups and individuals involved in the development of US foreign policy towards Chile, business individuals were the least influential in shaping America's policy response towards the Philippines crisis. As business groups and individuals such as the Makati Business Club, William H. Overholt, and Robert Trent Jones did not share a direct relationship with President Reagan, they were unable to exert direct influence on Reagan's foreign policy decision. Consequently, pressure from business entities came largely in the form of supporting the opposition party and by communicating with senior officials in the State Department and Ambassador Habib.

The development of America's foreign policy towards the Philippines illustrates the varying influence of domestic factors in shaping US foreign policy. Ideas, direct access to the US President, and the presence of a trigger event are all critical in initiating a shift in US foreign policy towards the Philippines. Additionally, the resistance that was collectively generated by several groups of domestic actors helped to create an unsuitable domestic environment for Reagan's anti-Marcos policy to succeed. Without enough support from domestic actors, Reagan was restrained from implementing his intended policy response towards the Philippines democratic crisis.

⁵⁰³ Pastor, "Preempting Revolutions", *op. cit.*

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION:

ANALYSING US POLICY TOWARDS ALLIES IN CRISIS

6.1. Introduction

This policy analysis has paved the way for future studies on America's policy response towards democratic progress in US allies. In comparing America's different policy responses towards three allies in crisis, this policy analysis moves beyond the constraints of international relations theory to highlight the close interconnectivity between domestic actors and the strong influence of other factors in the complex US foreign policymaking process. In doing so, this research aims to produce policy-relevant knowledge that can build more common ground between the two worlds of policy and academia.⁵⁰⁴

In each case study, all three American allies were struggling with a severe crisis of trust in which the population in the allied states withdrew their support from the ruling government due to the leadership's failure to meet public demands.⁵⁰⁵ In response to the democratic crises, the United States adopted three different policy responses. These responses can be arranged along a policy spectrum that ranges from heavily subverting a democratic political system to actively supporting immediate democratic transition in the allied state, with a passive democracy promotion policy in the middle. During the Chilean crisis from 1970 to 1973, President Richard Nixon subverted Salvador Allende's democratically-elected government, which also paved the way for a long-term

⁵⁰⁴ George, *Bridging the Gap*, op. cit.

⁵⁰⁵ Habermas, *Theory and Practice*, op. cit.

authoritarian government led by General Augusto Pinochet. This is in contrast to America's passive democracy promotion response towards South Korea's political crisis from 1979 to 1980, where US officials cautiously encouraged a slow and gradual democratic transition. With minimal intervention from the United States, General Chun Doo Hwan was able to consolidate his authoritarian leadership in South Korea by launching a military coup and suppressing the pro-democracy movement in the Kwangju Uprising. On the other hand, President Ronald Reagan's decision to abandon support for Marcos' authoritarian government in the Philippines and to lend legitimacy to the democratically elected Corazon Aquino instead is a clear case of active democracy promotion.

Alexander George's structured and focused comparison research method provides a useful tool to analyse these three different policy responses.⁵⁰⁶ By selecting case studies with different outcomes, I am able to determine that the presence of an allied state with a democratic crisis is not sufficient enough to demand a particular response from the United States. Rather, this policy analysis has demonstrated that America's different policy responses are an outcome of the influence of various domestic actors and other factors present within the US political system and in the allied state. The analysis' inductive approach also allows me to highlight the impact of these critical factors. By not confining the research findings to any specific theory or school of thought, I was able to open the black boxes of decision-making and study the interaction between US domestic actors and their influence on the US foreign policymaking process in detail.⁵⁰⁷ I could also study a range of other factors that emerged to drive domestic actors, including the US President, to change the direction of US foreign policy

⁵⁰⁶ George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, op. cit.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid.

towards its allies in crisis.

In each case study chapter, I conducted a policy analysis structured around five questions, each of which investigated the influence of various groups of actors in the United States. The first question identified the President's intended policy response towards the democratic crisis. This set the scene for other domestic actors to respond accordingly to the President's intended policy. Consequently, the remaining sections addressed the responses of senior US policymakers, members of the US Congress, business groups and individuals, and the role of the US public opinion and US media respectively. At the end of each case study, these findings were compiled in a table that compared the relative influence of each domestic actor on America's policy response.

This concluding chapter offers the final piece to the policy analysis by conducting a detailed comparative analysis of how various factors impacted the influence of domestic actors to produce different policy outcomes. The chapter begins with a brief assessment of the various roles of domestic actors in each case, which will be complemented with a comprehensive table of the research findings. The subsequent sections then lend more insight into other factors that also impacted America's reaction towards allies in crisis. The chapter will proceed to analyse how ideas, US economic interests, the centralisation of decision-making in the US bureaucracy, direct access to the US President, trigger events in the allied state, and the nexus between the US media and the US public opinion were able to influence America's policy responses in the three case studies. This will be followed by another section dedicated to passive democracy promotion, under which I discuss the factors that led America to pursue this policy. While

these factors will not necessarily be the same drivers for America's policy responses towards other allies, these factors nevertheless remain a good indication of when to expect a particular US policy outcome. The chapter will then end with a discussion of future avenues of research.

6.2. Domestic Actors

The structured analysis in the three previous chapters highlight two major findings on the influence of domestic actors on US policy towards allies in crisis: i) no domestic actor is consistently more influential than other domestic actors, and ii) although a domestic actor may try impact policy, other factors may obstruct the actor from influencing US foreign policy. This section studies these two findings in greater detail while conducting a comparison of the roles of domestic actors on US foreign policy. Table 7 below includes a compilation of the varying levels of influence exerted by US senior policymakers, members of the US Congress, business groups and individuals, and the role of US public opinion and the US media.

Table 7.
Comparison of Factors Influencing US Policy Responses towards Allies in Crisis

	Presidential Intent	Influence of Senior Policymakers	Influence of Members of US Congress	Influence of Business Groups and Individuals	Influence of Public Opinion and the US Media
Democracy Subversion <i>Chile, 1970 – 1973</i>	Democracy Subversion	Hardliners ✓ Doves ✗	✗	✓	✗
Passive Democracy Promotion <i>South Korea, 1979-1980</i>	No clear policy response	✓	✗	✗	✗
Active Democracy Promotion, The Philippines, 1983-1986	Support the authoritarian Marcos government	Reaganites ✓ Pragmatists ✓	✓ <i>contributed to domestic resistance</i>	✓ <i>contributed to domestic resistance</i>	✓ <i>contributed to domestic resistance</i>

The table above illustrates that the presidential intent will not always correlate with the final policy response adopted by the United States. With the exception of the Chile case, America's response towards the democratic crises in South Korea and the Philippines differed from the presidential intent. While Carter did not articulate a clear intent to adopt a specific policy, the United States settled on a passive democracy promotion approach towards South Korea. Meanwhile, Reagan's preference to support the authoritarian Marcos government was not reflected in America's final decision to actively promote democracy in the Philippines. This demonstrates that due to the competing influence of other domestic actors and other factors, the President's preferred policy will not always be reflected in the final policy response.

Unlike other groups of domestic actors in the United States, Table 7 indicates that senior US policymakers appear to relatively have more influence in shaping US foreign policy. However, certain groups of senior policymakers were still prevented from influencing America's foreign policymaking process despite their efforts to shape policy. The policy doves that rejected US-led intervention into Chile's domestic politics were side-lined by hardline thinkers such as Kissinger and Nixon, whom preferred to pursue the "hostile approach" by covertly undermining Allende's leadership.⁵⁰⁸

Across these three cases, business groups and individuals were also able to exert some influence on US policy. When US economic interests were at stake, business groups such as Anaconda in Chile and entrepreneurs in the Philippines' Makati Business Club were incited to protect their investments in these countries.

⁵⁰⁸ Kissinger, "Memorandum from the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon", op. cit.

Business representatives attempted to influence US policymakers through direct meetings and policy forums such as PepsiCo President Kendall's meeting with President Nixon and the American Chambers of Commerce meeting with Special Ambassador Habib. However, capitalist pressure appeared to be more effective in the Chilean case study because of the direct access that these business representatives had gained to the President. Although Habib did relay the concern of businessmen to the President, Reagan was not immediately persuaded to abandon US support for Marcos. On the other hand, when US economic interests are not at stake, business groups were not driven to influence US foreign policy. This was the case in South Korea, where companies such as the Bank of America and Dow Chemical only encouraged economic reforms in South Korea after the Kwangju Uprising incited fears of a destabilising economy.

In Table 7, members of the US Congress appeared less influential in driving US foreign policy in the Chilean and South Korean cases, but more effective in the Philippines case. However, in all these cases, there were members of Congress that responded to the democratic crises in the US allies. Their efforts to influence the US foreign policymaking process had been restrained by other factors such as the lack of information and a wider overriding consensus in Congress. During the Chilean democratic crisis, President Nixon's decision to exclude most members of Congress in the foreign policymaking process restricted the flow of information to Congress, which prevented members of Congress from restraining Nixon's intervention in Chile. Additionally, the strong anti-Korean lobby in Congress during the South Korean crisis deterred Congress from taking a stronger stand against General Chun's authoritarian actions. However, in the Reagan administration, congressional members were more

exposed to developments in the Philippines and were also included in the foreign policymaking process. Members of Congress were therefore able to express their disagreement with Reagan's intended policy, which contributed to the resistance shared with other domestic actors in the United States.

As with the congressional members, the American public was not influential in all three cases. The US media had portrayed Allende as a "Marxist threat" unlike his predecessor Frei, who brought a "bright future for the Americas."⁵⁰⁹ However, because of America's long engagement in the Vietnam War, the American public continued to urge for a non-interventionist approach towards Chile although the American people also considered Allende as a security concern. However, Nixon continued to implement an interventionist policy towards Chile but under covert circumstances so as to avoid inciting public dissatisfaction. On the other hand, in the South Korean case, the American people were more apathetic towards the democratic crisis, which was partly due to the US media's portrayal of the pro-democracy movements as a riot and not a civil liberty movement. However, the US public opinion was significantly more vocal in support of an active democracy promotion policy towards the Philippines, which generated domestic resistance against Reagan's policy to support Marcos.

The structured policy analysis demonstrates that although there are several domestic actors involved in the development of US foreign policy, not all domestic actors are necessarily influential. This is due to a number of factors such as the centralisation of decision-making, economic interests, the lack of

⁵⁰⁹ Chicago Tribune Press Service, "Chile Election A Bright Sign, Johnson Says", op. cit. and Time, "Marxist Threat in the Americas", op. cit.

information, or an overriding consensus that can restrict the influence of these actors. Consequently, there is no domestic actor that can be considered more influential than the rest in driving US foreign policy. The next sections study the impact of other factors that exist in the US political system and in the allied state. In doing so, these sections analyse how these factors can obstruct or facilitate the influence of domestic actors on America's policy response towards these three allies in crisis.

6.3. Role of Ideas

The role of ideas was prominent across all three case studies, particularly in driving the President's intended policy and impacting the influence of US senior policymakers in these three case studies. This section outlines the different forms of ideas and analyses how these ideas interacted with other factors and domestic actors to impact the US foreign policymaking process.

Ideas such as American Exceptionalism can drive a democracy promotion agenda in US foreign policy. This is because US senior policymakers that subscribe to these ideas believe they have a moral obligation to promote democracy abroad as a "sacred mission".⁵¹⁰ This was illustrated in the actions of policy doves in the Nixon administration and Pragmatists in the Reagan administration whom rejected the President's preference to support authoritarian leadership in the allied state. Policy doves such as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Hurwitch and Director of the Policy Planning Staff Hartman called for the United States to step back and adopt a restrained posture to allow Chile to come to its own political end. Meanwhile, Pragmatists such as Secretary of State Shultz

⁵¹⁰ Smith, *America's Mission*, op. cit; Monten, "The Roots of the Bush Doctrine", op. cit.; and Kammen, "The Problem of American Exceptionalism", op. cit.

and Ambassador Habib insisted that “the Marcos era has ended” in the Philippines.⁵¹¹

On the other hand, ideas driven by anti-Communism can hamper democracy promotion. Ideologies such as the Nixon Doctrine and the Kirkpatrick Doctrine prioritised supporting authoritarian pro-American regimes, which was instrumental in tackling Communist influence but also undermined democratic progress.⁵¹² Given Nixon’s anxiety over the spread of Communism and Soviet influence in Latin America, these anti-Communist ideas further reaffirmed Nixon’s belief that the Allende government needed to be replaced to protect US influence in the region. Similarly, Reagan’s presidential intent to continue backing the Marcos regime was influenced by his strong anti-Communist ideology. By continuing to extend US support to the Marcos government, Reagan was confident that Marcos’ state presence would repel the growing Communist insurgency and retain US access to strategic bases in the Philippines. Anti-Communist ideas also impacted the actions of policymakers within the US administration. During the debate on which US policy response to adopt towards its allies in crisis, hardline thinkers in the Nixon administration and Reaganites in the Reagan administration believed that democratic progress should be made secondary and that national security interests are better protected by authoritarian and anti-Communist leaderships in Chile and the Philippines respectively .

The impact of ideas on policymakers can also come in the form of analogies. In response to South Korea’s democratic crisis, numerous

⁵¹¹ Karnow, *In Our Image*, op. cit.

⁵¹² Kirkpatrick, “Dictatorships and Double Standards”, op. cit.

policymakers viewed the developments through the lens of past foreign policy analogies. There was a concern amongst policymakers that South Korea could transform into “another Iran” and become a hostile government against the United States.⁵¹³ These analogies also convinced Assistant Secretary Holbrooke, Senator Nunn, and Senator Glenn that the United States needed to adopt a cautious policy response to avoid instability in South Korea.⁵¹⁴ During the Reagan administration, past foreign policy debacles in South Vietnam, Nicaragua, and Iran convinced policymakers that the United States needed to continue supporting the Marcos government so as to prevent the collapse of the Filipino government and a possible takeover by a Communist leadership.

However, the role of ideas does not always directly impact US foreign policy. The above case studies indicate that ideas need to interact with other factors before being able to impact the US foreign policymaking process. Theorist McClelland argued that the influence of ideas can be moderated by national security priorities, in which the United States is more likely to encourage democracy only when America has an unrivalled global power status.⁵¹⁵ Additionally, Carothers argues that US policymakers will likely be driven to promote democracy only when it coincides with US security or economic interests.⁵¹⁶

Although national security interests can influence the extent to which ideas of democracy promotion or anti-Communism can drive US foreign policy, there are also other factors which can moderate the impact of ideas. A particular

⁵¹³ Holbrooke, “Korea Focus - Nudging ROK Political Leaders”, op. cit.

⁵¹⁴ Park, “The U.S. Carter Administration and Korea in the 12/12 Incident”, op. cit.

⁵¹⁵ McClelland, “Exporting virtue”, op. cit.

⁵¹⁶ Carothers, *Critical Mission*, op. cit.

idea is likely to thrive when decision-making is heavily centralised between the President and his close advisors. In the case of Chile, anti-Communism strongly influenced the direction of America's policy response because Nixon strongly upheld these ideas and alienated other policymakers with opposing ideas. On the other hand, US foreign policy towards the South Korean crisis was not characterised by a strong guiding executive power. As President Carter had not articulated a clear intended policy response towards the South Korean crisis, other policymakers were unable to subscribe to firm ideologies that supported or challenged Carter's preferred policy. Consequently, this led to a myriad of ideas and competing foreign policy opinions that resulted in settling on the lowest common denominator option which was to adopt a passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea.

Therefore, the role of ideas is prominent in shaping US foreign policy response towards allies in crisis. Ideas can come in the form of ideologies such as American Exceptionalism or anti-Communism, each of which can be used to promote or suppress democratic transitions respectively. Analogies have also been used by policymakers to frame their understanding of democratic crises. Together, these forms of ideas can determine the President's intended policy response and drive policymakers to support different kinds of policies. However, the impact of these ideas on America's final policy response were also moderated by other factors such as national security interests and the centralisation of decision-making within the US foreign policy bureaucracy.

6.4. Economic Interests

It has been shown that business groups and individuals can influence the direction of US foreign policy towards allies in crisis when their economic investments in the allied state are threatened by rising domestic instability. The reactions of business groups towards the democratic crises support William Robinson's argument that transnational financial elites can drive democracy promotion in other countries to protect their economic interests.⁵¹⁷ However, business representatives in Chile deviated from this behaviour by persuading President Nixon to undermine Allende's democratically-elected leadership instead. This section analyses how economic interests can drive business groups and individuals to exert pressure and influence the US foreign policymaking process in different ways.

According to Robinson, business firms can be highly influential in driving US foreign policy because of the structure of America's economy which encourages other countries to participate in the global capitalist system through implementing free market economic reforms. When an authoritarian leadership exerts increased state intervention in an allied state's economy, the investments of business groups in the country can become threatened. Consequently, to protect their economic investments, business entities would seek to remove the authoritarian leadership by persuading US policymakers to adopt a democracy promotion policy. This was the case after the Kwangju Uprising, in which American investors were concerned that rising domestic instability could portend an economic collapse in South Korea. With the price of goods and services skyrocketing in the increasingly shrinking economy, business investors

⁵¹⁷ Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy*, op. cit.

engaged US policymakers such as Ambassador Gleysteen to try convince him to encourage a shift in South Korea's economy from "central control" to "market forces."⁵¹⁸ Similarly, business groups and individuals in the Makati Business Club in the Philippines shifted their allegiance to the opposition party after Marcos' martial law measures strained the Philippines economy with excessive spending and rising foreign debt.⁵¹⁹ Marcos soon lost support from the Philippines business community, who also reached out to US policymakers such as Ambassador Habib to relay their concerns of the impact of Marcos' authoritarian policies on their business interests.

On the other hand, despite Robinson's argument, business groups have also demonstrated the ability to encourage a democracy subversion policy. In the case of the Chilean democratic crisis, the investments of multinational companies such as Anaconda and Kennecott were threatened by Allende's proposal to nationalise major industries which would remove most American companies from Chile's economy. Additionally, Allende suggested deducting excess profits from any compensation paid to nationalised firms, which would heavily impact the profits of these large American companies.⁵²⁰ Consequently, business representatives such as President of Pepsico Kendall held a direct meeting with President Nixon. The ITT Chief Executive Officer Geneen, who was also a close

⁵¹⁸ The price of oil-based products had increased by over 59 percent while electricity rates rose by 39 percent during the democratic crisis. Additionally, the gross national product of South Korea had slowed from an annual average of 9.5 percent to 7.1 percent in 1979, and experienced a negative growth rate of 1.7 percent in the first quarter of 1980. See George Katsifias, "Neoliberalism and the Gwangju Uprising," *Democracy and Human Rights* 6, no.2 (Fall, 2006), pp.191-229

⁵¹⁹ In 1986, the Philippines foreign debt had reached US\$26 million. The inflation rate had also reached 62.8 percent by September 1984. See Macareg, "How did the declaration of martial law in 1972 affect the economy?", op. cit.

⁵²⁰ Anaconda and Kennecott were now facing a potential loss of US\$774 million. See Fagen, "The United States and Chile: Roots and Branches", op. cit.

acquaintance of Nixon's, approached the CIA and State Department to try support the United States' agenda to undermine Allende's legitimacy. Therefore, like the South Korean and the Philippines cases, business groups in the Chile case were also driven by the threat posed to their economic interests.

Unlike the business groups' attempts to influence US foreign policy towards the Philippines democratic crisis, the efforts of business representatives during the Chilean democratic crisis was the most successful form of direct influence on US foreign policy. After his meeting with Kendall, President Nixon had authorised the CIA Director to impose an economic blockade that would make Chile's economy "scream."⁵²¹ Similarly, most of the suggestions offered by the ITT were reflected in US action against Chile. This demonstrates that gaining direct access to the US President, either through a personal meeting or by being an acquaintance of the President, is critical in influencing US foreign policy. In the Philippines case, the business representatives did not acquire a direct channel to the US President and were thus unable to effectively persuade the President of their preferred policies.

6.5. Centralising Decision-Making

As indicated in the previous sections, the centralisation of decision-making in the US bureaucracy can impact the way policymakers can influence America's final policy response. This section provides a more detailed discussion on how the structure of decision-making can interact with other factors to produce different policy outcomes towards allies in crisis.

⁵²¹ Schlesinger, "Meeting with President on Chile 9/15/1970", op. cit.

In the Chilean case study, President Nixon centralised most foreign policy decision-making powers between himself and Kissinger after making some bureaucratic changes. Under Nixon's orders to restructure the foreign policy bureaucracy, Kissinger supported the selection of an under-experienced State of Secretary and appointed himself as Chair of the 40 Committee. This granted both Nixon and Kissinger greater control in determining America's policy towards Chile's democratic crisis. By dominating the foreign policymaking process, Nixon and Kissinger ensured that America would adopt a foreign policy response that closely aligned with their shared ideas of anti-Communism.

However, the centralisation of decision-making also carved a clear bureaucratic divide between hardline thinkers and the policy doves. This cultivated distrust between the Nixon-Kissinger partnership and other agencies in the US bureaucracy. Kissinger's determination to "monopolise all contact with the new President" had caused troubles as Kissinger reduced Nixon's direct communication with the CIA and the State Department.⁵²² Both Kissinger and Nixon also felt that the CIA and State Department officers were consistently opposed to their political aims. As observed by CIA Director Helms,

Nixon never trusted anyone in the Executive Branch. Here he had become President of the United States and therefore the Chief of the Executive Branch, and yet he was constantly telling people that the State Department was just a bunch of pin-striped, cocktail-drinking diplomats, and the Agency couldn't come up with a winning action in Vietnam, and the Interior Department was a bunch of 'pinkos'. It just went on and on.⁵²³

Consequently, domestic actors with competing ideas were alienated from the foreign policymaking process. Suggestions by policy doves that opposed Nixon's subversive policy were not included in US policy. Similarly,

⁵²² Gustafson, *Hostile Intent*, op. cit., p.87

⁵²³ Quoted in Ibid, p.87

congressional members were only made aware of Nixon's subversive policy after the fall of the Allende government. Due to the bureaucratic divide in opinion that was magnified by the centralisation of decision-making, these domestic actors were restrained from directly influencing the direction of US foreign policy. America's final policy outcome towards Chile therefore closely mirrored Nixon's intended policy.

On the other hand, decision-making in the administrations of Reagan and Carter were not as centralised. The opinions of domestic actors such as policymakers, members of the US Congress, and the American public were actively part of the foreign policymaking processes. The main distinction between the Philippines and South Korea cases was that Reagan advocated for the continued support of Marcos while Carter did not clearly articulate an intended policy. This difference translated into serious implications for America's policy response.

With Reagan's clearly articulated preference for a pro-Marcos policy, other policymakers in the Reagan administration were able to either support or counter Reagan's ideas. These competing ideas drove a sharp bureaucratic divide between the US policymakers into two camps: the Reaganites and the Pragmatists. Due to the decentralised structure of decision-making, domestic actors such as the Pragmatists were also granted the opportunity to influence US foreign policy. In an effort to develop institutional resistance against Reagan's pro-Marcos policy, Pragmatist policymakers used coalition-building, directly persuaded other policymakers, and lobbied support from congressional members and the American public. With President Reagan guiding policy

development, a productive policy debate was able to take place between the two camps. The institutional resistance created by the Pragmatists and other domestic actors soon impacted the President's decision-making.⁵²⁴ Combined with the pressure of the EDSA Revolution which demanded a policy response from the United States, Reagan eventually agreed to deviate from his preferred policy stance and decided to actively promote democracy in the Philippines instead. The Philippines case demonstrates that under a less centralised structure, the US foreign policymaking process can be influenced by other domestic actors. This combination of factors, in addition to a trigger event in the allied state, can produce a final policy outcome that differs from the President's intended policy.

On the contrary, competing ideas are less able to influence US foreign policy without a clear presidential intent. As in the South Korea case, policymakers in the Carter administration were unable to align their policy preferences with different ideological camps. Without a guiding executive, policymakers and agencies such as the US Embassy and USFK were left to engage in direct disagreements with one another in a competition to influence US foreign policy. Without a clear consensus or agreement on America's final policy response, America produced a mid-range policy outcome that passively promoted democracy towards the South Korean crisis.

Therefore, the decision-making structure in the US administration moderated the influence of domestic actors and ideas on America's final policy response in the three case studies. Only ideas supported by the US President would thrive under a centralised decision-making structure, which can alienate

⁵²⁴ Fabbrini and Yossef have also observed how institutional resistance was able to influence US policy under the Obama administration. See Fabbrini and Yossef, "Obama's wavering", *op. cit.*

other domestic actors with competing ideas. On the other hand, a decentralised decision-making structure would offer a more conducive bureaucratic environment for a productive policy debate. However, such a debate can only take place when there is a clear presidential intent and an executive power guiding the debate. Without either of these factors, America's final policy response could likely settle on the lowest common denominator option as illustrated in the South Korean case.

6.6. Direct Access to the President

Another factor that is understudied in the US democracy promotion literature is the importance of gaining direct access to the President to influence US foreign policy. The three case studies illustrate how policymakers have various levels of access to the US President, which then impacts the President's receptiveness to their policy suggestions. This section investigates how direct access to the US President can influence the development of US foreign policy towards allies struggling with democratic crises.

The most effective way for policymakers to influence the direction of US foreign policy is by gaining direct access to the US President, as demonstrated in the foreign policymaking processes surrounding the democratic crises in Chile and the Philippines. In the Chile case, Kissinger's direct and frequent interactions with Nixon during which they discussed their shared ideas allowed Kissinger to drive most of America's foreign policy.⁵²⁵ The centralisation of decision-making in the US administration also allowed Kissinger to closely control US foreign policy.

⁵²⁵ Within Nixon's first 100 days in office as US President, Kissinger had clocked in 198 individual and group meetings as compared to the total of 30 meetings attended by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defence. See Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger*, op. cit.

Other domestic actors such as Pepsico President Kendall were also able to impact US foreign policy by directly approaching Nixon to discuss economic sanctions. As mentioned above, Nixon immediately instructed the CIA Director Helms to make Chile's economy "scream" after the meeting with Kendall.⁵²⁶

America's policy towards the Philippines democratic crisis also showcases the effectiveness of direct discussions with the US President. To counter the influence of the Reaganites, senior Pragmatist policymakers in the Reagan administration utilised their direct connection to the President to persuade Reagan to support the pro-democracy movement in the Philippines. When news of Marcos' involvement in electoral fraud emerged, Secretary of State Shultz personally telephoned Reagan at his Santa Barbara ranch home to try convince Reagan of the credibility of this news. After the conversation with Shultz, Reagan was persuaded to release a public statement acknowledging Marcos' involvement in vote rigging. Other Pragmatist policymakers such as Ambassador Habib and Senator Lugar also relied on their direct connections to the President to convince Reagan to abandon support for Marcos. This direct communication with the President was critical in shifting US foreign policy towards active democracy promotion in the Philippines.

On the other hand, without access to the President, domestic actors can be restrained from influencing US foreign policy. Unlike Nixon's decision to enforce economic pressure on Chile after meeting Kendall, the businessmen of the American Chamber of Commerce were unable to achieve a similar impact during the Philippines democratic crisis. This was because the American Chamber of

⁵²⁶ Schlesinger, "Meeting with President on Chile 9/15/1970", op. cit.

Commerce expressed their grievances through Ambassador Habib, who then relayed their concerns to President Reagan. Upon receiving Habib's feedback, Reagan did not take an action similar to Nixon's by reacting immediately upon the news. Therefore, although the pressure exerted by business groups did contribute to the wider domestic resistance against Reagan's pro-Marcos policy, their direct influence on US foreign policy is more difficult to trace.

To effectively influence America's foreign policy, it is important for domestic actors to gain direct access to the US President. The above analysis demonstrates that the US President would be more receptive to policy suggestions that are being directly discussed with him. Additionally, factors such as the centralised structure of decision-making can facilitate the extent to which policymakers are able to directly access the President.

6.7. Trigger Events in the Allied State

The development of America's policy response towards allies in crisis are not only moderated by factors present within the US political system. Events that take place in the allied state can also influence the direction of US foreign policy. This section highlights how events on the ground influenced US public opinion and also triggered policymakers to drive a shift in America's policy responses.

A trigger event can be described as a defining moment that is pivotal in determining the ally's future political direction during the democratic crisis. The allied state could either progress along a democratic direction or regress towards authoritarianism. At this critical juncture, US policymakers can be coerced to redefine US foreign policy towards these allies for several reasons. Events in the

allied state may have reached a point that US policymakers can no longer influence and will therefore need to frame US policy to support the series of events that have already taken hold of the state. Additionally, the democratic crisis may have ignited international attention and a mass media effect which now require US policymakers to pursue a different policy response to influence the political direction of the allied state. The US media can also play a role by subjecting trigger events to major press scrutiny, which can spread awareness across the American public and influence the US public opinion. The public's support for a particular policy response can then contribute to domestic resistance that impacts the President's decision making. As the President prioritises political survival by seeking to remain in office, it would be in the President's best interest to implement a policy response that is largely supported by the American public.⁵²⁷

America's policy response towards the Philippines crisis is an example of how extensive media coverage can drive US policy to support the direction of events in the allied state. The four-day standoff along the EDSA highway was a trigger event that garnered widespread media attention and cultivated a strong anti-Marcos sentiment within the American people. Prior to the trigger event, President Reagan intended to continue supporting the Marcos government because of the strong personal ties shared with Marcos. Another reason for Reagan's intended policy was Marcos' guarantee to retain US access to military bases in the Philippines which was critical in repelling the Communist insurgency that the United States feared could spread to other regional countries and undermine America's wider influence in the Asia Pacific if not contained.

⁵²⁷ Morrow, "Arms versus Allies", op. cit.

However, under the media's attention, America's response towards the Philippines democratic crisis in the few days before and after Marcos' decision to resign was closely scrutinised. The major press scrutiny cultivated a strong domestic resistance against America's continued support for Marcos. Combined with the pressure exerted by the Pragmatist policymakers, President Reagan eventually conceded to an active democracy promotion approach towards the Philippines.

However, this was not the case in South Korea's democratic crisis, which began with minimal media attention. Only the tragic outcome of the Kwangju Uprising was heavily showcased in the international media and across the United States. An article in the Independent Record newspaper that was headlined "Army won but at what price?" argued that "the cause of the mutually destructive uprising at Kwangju, almost everyone agrees, was the brutality of paratroopers in dealing with a student demonstration..."⁵²⁸ Meanwhile, the Longview Morning Journal newspaper indicated that the United States should develop a response to the Kwangju Uprising in its article titled "Student protestors look to United States for help."⁵²⁹ The article also detailed how protestors were expressing hopes that "President Carter must order U.S. forces in Korea to kidnap (Gen.) Chun Doo Hwan, army, security chief, and assassinate him" and for the United States to deliver food and medicine aid to Kwangju.⁵³⁰ The newspaper also noted that "Student leaders Monday called on the United States to mediate but the State Department did not respond."⁵³¹ The San Francisco

⁵²⁸ Henry Scott Stokes, "Army Won but at what Price?", *The Independent Record*, 28 May 1980

⁵²⁹ UPI, "Student protestors look to United States for help", *Longview Mountain Journal*, 28 May 1980

⁵³⁰ Ibid.

⁵³¹ AP, "Paratroopers enforce martial law after end to nine-day rebellion", *Longview Mountain Journal*, 28 May 1980

Examiner was more critical of America's response towards the Kwangju Uprising by criticising the lack of consensus emerging between US policymakers in this "dark period of history" and observing that "dissidents have accused the United States of collaborating with the South Korea martial law command in smashing insurgents seeking democracy."⁵³² Consequently, in addition to other factors such as capitalist pressure, the mass media effect surrounding America's complacency towards South Korea's democratic crisis eventually cultivated a policy interest amongst US policymakers which drove America to adopt a more active democracy promotion policy.

Therefore, the trigger events in these case studies facilitated a shift in US policy response especially when it was surrounded by major press scrutiny. As will be further elaborated in the next section, the US media can play an important role by informing the US public opinion. Once a consensus amongst the American people is developed to actively address the democratic crisis in the allied state, the US President can come under domestic pressure to initiate a change in America's policy response.

6.8. Media-Public Opinion Nexus

The close relationship between the US media and the US public opinion has an indirect ability to impact US foreign policy. This section looks at how domestic actors in the United States can influence the US media, and conversely, how the US media can drive public opinion to impact the President's decision-making process.

⁵³² Donald Kirk, "U.S. 'approval' angers Korean Dissidents", *San Francisco Examiner*, 28 May 1980

During the Philippines democratic crisis, domestic actors in the United States utilised mass media to generate public support for a more pro-democratic US policy. Members of the US Congress published articles in the national newspapers and made public appearances to express their disagreement with Reagan's pro-Marcos policy. While Senator Lugar was quoted by *The Sun* newspaper, Senator Bradley contributed an article to the *New York Times*.⁵³³ Additionally, both Senator Lugar and Congressman Fawell publicly criticised America's policy towards the Philippines.⁵³⁴ Advocacy groups in the United States such as Friends of Aquino also cultivated anti-Marcos sentiments within the American public by submitting discrediting information against the Marcos government to *San Jose Mercury News* and *The New York Times*. Their efforts contributed to a domestic resistance that developed anti-Marcos sentiments within the American public and gathered congressional support for an anti-Marcos policy.

This indicates that the American media's portrayal of democratic crises can impact the US public opinion. The South Korean case study demonstrates how American newspapers framed the Kwangju Uprising in a specific way; as a riot and not as a struggle for democracy. Without enough information, the American people did not perceive the Kwangju Uprising as a genuine pro-democracy movement. This generated an apathetic public sentiment towards South Korea's democratic crisis, as reflected in the contradicting public opinions on America's foreign policy towards South Korea. Consequently, the US public did not generate enough domestic pressure for the US President to execute a

⁵³³ Shultz, "10 EAP Press Summary", op. cit. and Bello, "Edging toward the Quagmire", op. cit.

⁵³⁴ Privitera, "Dole/Lugar/Nunn action on Philippines", op. cit. and Whitehead, "Fawell urges President to suspend Philippines aid immediately", op. cit.

specific policy response.

However, as illustrated in the Chile case, the US media can only direct US public opinion to a certain extent. Although the media portrayed the Chile democratic crisis in a “friend versus enemy” structure, there was a strong public sentiment to avoid a US-led intervention into Chile and to maintain a “low-profile” policy instead.⁵³⁵ America’s long-term engagement in the ongoing Vietnam War had created an aversion within the American public against any future entanglements with another country. Consequently, despite the media’s portrayal of Allende as an “enemy”, the American people continued to appeal for the United States to allow the political situation in Chile to come to its own end.

Therefore, domestic actors with a particular policy preference can utilise the US media to try generate public support for their preferred policies as in the Philippines case study. However, as in the Chile case, the media’s influence on the American people will not always override resilient public sentiments.

6.9 The Passive Democracy Promotion Policy

America’s passive democracy promotion policy can be characterised by the reluctance of US policymakers to encourage an immediate democratic transition in an allied state afflicted with a democratic crisis. The aim of this passive policy is to encourage a slow and gradual democratic transition in the allied state while maintaining minimal interference in the ally’s domestic politics, which can create a distance between the United States and the allied state. In this

⁵³⁵ Kissinger, “NSC Meeting, November 6 - Chile”, op. cit.

section, I review the factors that led the United States to adopt a passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea's democratic crisis. I begin with describing the strategies used to execute this policy and then investigate the factors that surrounded the development of America's policy response towards South Korea. While these strategies and factors are not necessarily the main determinants of passive democracy promotion, these factors are nevertheless indicative of when America would implement this policy.

America's passive democracy promotion policy can impact the democratic progress of an allied state. In the case of America's policy response towards South Korea, theorist James Fowler faulted Carter for having "abandoned an important human rights tool" and not engaging earlier to restrain General Chun's authoritarian actions.⁵³⁶ Another scholar, Won Gon Park, concluded that "if the U.S.. had actively promoted the democratization of Korea, they would have suppressed and acted forcefully against the new army, which had attempted to overturn the Korean political power dynamics."⁵³⁷ Therefore, it is necessary to understand that a passive democracy promotion policy would be able to constrain democratic progress in other countries.

US policymakers implemented a passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea through quiet diplomacy, continuing US economic trade, restraining from offering democratic support to the civil society, and subtly leveraging US military assistance. These strategies allowed US policymakers to establish distance from South Korea's domestic politics while continuing to passively encourage democratic change in

⁵³⁶ Fowler, "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", op. cit., p.288

⁵³⁷ Park, "The US Carter Administration and Korea in the 12/12 Incident", op. cit., p.278

South Korea's political system. Through quiet diplomacy, US policymakers avoided public channels to express America's dissatisfaction with events in South Korea. US policymakers preferred to resort to private exchanges with South Korean officials to encourage democratic reforms without offering any incentives or conditions. Meanwhile, America maintained close bilateral economic relations by refraining from economic sanctions and continuing to offer loans. This way, the United States could maintain economic viability in South Korea and retain stability on the Korean Peninsula. Lastly, some US policymakers leveraged America's military cooperative relationship with South Korea to subtly exert pressure on the South Korean government. US policymakers considered delaying the hearing on the co-production of the F-16 fighter jets and postponed the Security Consultative Meeting to subtly express America's dissatisfaction with Chun's actions.⁵³⁸ Additionally, the United States refrained from intervening when Combined Forces Command units were deployed to suppress the Kwangju Uprising. US policymakers had agreed not to "oppose ROKG contingency plans to maintain law and order, if absolutely necessary, by reinforcing the police with the army."⁵³⁹ Neither of these strategies incited an immediate democratic transition in South Korea, which was in line with the aims of America's passive democracy promotion policy.

As expressed by US policymakers, the goal of US policy was to maintain the regional status quo in Northeast Asia. According to Senator Wolff, "the US was interested in ROK economic viability, democratization over time, and a strong common defense against those who would rule by force of arms."⁵⁴⁰ Driven by

⁵³⁸ Gleysteen, *Massive Entanglement, Marginal Influence*, op. cit.

⁵³⁹ Shorrock, "Ex-Leaders Go On Trial", op. cit.

⁵⁴⁰ Gleysteen, "CODEL Wolff call on Defense Minister Choo", op. cit.

analogies, US policymakers hoped to avoid “another Iran” and prevent the escalation of a North Korean threat.

There were several factors that surrounded the development of this passive democracy promotion policy. First, President Carter had not articulated a clear intended policy response towards South Korea. A reason for Carter’s lacklustre was the timing of the crisis, which coincided with pressing strategic concerns such as the energy crisis that spurred an economic recession in the United States, the Soviet presence in Cuba and Afghanistan, the Iran hostage crisis, and the SALT talks. Additionally, the United States had just pulled out of the Vietnam War and Carter was hesitant to become entangled in the domestic politics of another country in the Asia Pacific. Secondly, as explained in the previous sections, the lack of a firm presidential intent contributed to disorganised and competing foreign policy opinions. While policymakers such as Assistant Secretary Holbrooke and Ambassador Gleysteen could not agree on the best policy approach, US agencies in South Korea were also competing to influence policy. This prevented a productive policy debate on the most effective policy response towards South Korea’s crisis. Thirdly, there was a reluctance by members of the US Congress to become involved in the foreign policymaking process because of their experiences with the Koreagate scandal and the troop withdrawal debate. Although some members of Congress attempted to encourage South Korean officials to pursue democratic reforms, their efforts were not strong enough to overcome the anti-Korea lobby in Congress. Lastly, the US media’s construct of the democratic crisis in South Korea was not effective enough to develop a strong public opinion. Due to the wide disinterest, the American people were conflicted over America’s foreign policy towards South Korea.

As mentioned above, America's policy response towards South Korea's democratic crisis is only one example of a passive democracy promotion policy. To better understand the factors that consistently drive passive democracy promotion towards other allies in crisis, future research is required. Nevertheless, this discussion has demonstrated that passive democracy promotion should be characterised as having its own set of aims and strategies. Like the democracy subversion and active democracy promotion policies, passive democracy promotion is also an independent foreign policy that can be implemented as a policy response towards allied states faced with a democratic crisis. By considering passive democracy promotion as a policy option, academics and policy specialists will be better able to understand the range of America's foreign policy behaviour towards allies in crises.

6.10. Future Research Avenues

This inductive policy analysis is only a preliminary step towards better understanding the different policy responses that America can adopt towards allies afflicted with democratic crises. In this section, I highlight future avenues for research that should be pursued by academics and policy specialists to further develop this understanding. I include suggestions to adopt different research methods, extend parameters for the time period, and analyse the practice of democracy promotion by other countries and regional institutions.

America's policy towards allies in crisis remains an understudied topic in the literature on US democracy promotion and US foreign policy. It is for this reason that future research should continue to adopt an inductive approach in

analysing the impact of various factors on the US foreign policymaking process. Confining research to specific theories through a deductive approach might exclude other elements that could emerge as an important factor. Additionally, this research agenda could benefit from using varied research approaches. In this thesis, I utilised the structured and focused comparison research method to study America's policy response in three case studies with different policy outcomes. Future research approaches could focus on case studies that have the same policy outcomes instead. By posing the same set of questions to a series of cases in which America adopted the same policy responses, researchers will be able to identify factors that are necessary to consistently produce that specific policy response. For example, future studies could investigate the impact of factors surrounding the development of America's passive democracy promotion policy towards the democratic crises in South Korea, Egypt, and Myanmar.

Another approach that can be taken is to extend the parameters of the time period under study in two ways. First, researchers could extend the time periods surrounding the Chile, South Korea, and the Philippines case studies to better understand the impact of factors that drove a series of changes in America's policy responses. For example, researchers could expand the time range for the Chile case from 1964 to 1990. This would allow for an in-depth study into the factors that drove America's support for the Frei government and how these factors evolved to drive a democracy subversion policy that undermined the Allende leadership and later supported the incoming Pinochet's government until the end of his term in which he was forced to step down.

Secondly, a focus on case studies beyond the time frame of the 1980s might

be helpful in determining whether these range of policy responses are confined to a particular time period. The time period selected in this research is important because the 1980s was an era during which US foreign policy was subtly shifting from supporting pro-American authoritarian regimes towards a more pragmatic approach that better reflected America's identity concerns as a defender of global democratic values. Identifying various policy responses towards democratic crises during this time period demonstrates that other factors aside from ideologies are also responsible for this shift in US foreign policy. Similarly, investigating case studies in other time periods such as the post-9/11 period could be useful in assessing if the same factors identified in this research drove America's policy responses towards the democratic crises that took place during that time period.

Lastly, researchers could expand the research focus into questioning if these three different policy responses are typical great power behaviours or if they are also adopted by other countries and regional institutions. Studies could be conducted into the behaviour of other powers such as the United Kingdom or China and international institutions such as the European Union and the United Nations towards democratic crises in other countries. This way, researchers will be better able to understand if democracy subversion, passive democracy promotion, and active democracy promotion are widely implemented responses or are just exclusive to major powers such as the United States. This paves the way for another discussion into how the structure of the international order can impact democratic progress across the world.

Therefore, this policy analysis has paved the way for future in-depth

research into factors driving America's different policy responses towards allies faced with democratic crises. In moving this research agenda forward, several research avenues should be pursued. While it is encouraged to retain the inductive approach, future research could compare case studies with similar policy outcomes. Additionally, the parameters of the time period could be expanded for each case study or for other time periods beyond the 1980s. Lastly, the research focus should be expanded to study the policy responses of other powers and international institutions too. Through these future research avenues, the research topic of policy responses towards democratic crises can develop into a strong research agenda with policy-relevant knowledge and implications.

6.11. Conclusion

This policy analysis demonstrates that America's policy response towards allies in crisis is not a simple trade-off between security interests and democratic values as conventional wisdom would suggest. Rather, various domestic actors and factors can also guide the direction of US foreign policy. By developing a comprehensive understanding of how domestic actors and other factors interact with one another, this thesis contributes to the body of knowledge on US foreign policy towards allies in crisis.

This thesis adopts a structured and focused comparison research method that poses five questions to three case studies with different policy outcomes. These cases are America's democracy subversion policy towards Chile, passive democracy promotion policy towards South Korea, and active democracy promotion in the Philippines. The five questions are organised around the

influence of various actors on US foreign policy. These actors are the US President and his intended policy response, senior US policymakers, members of the US Congress, pressure from business groups and individuals, and the impact of the US media and US public opinion. Through this inductive approach, I was able to conduct a policy analysis that not only assessed the influence of domestic actors but also highlighted other factors that emerged to mediate their influence on US foreign policy.

The research findings indicate that across the three case studies, there was not one group of domestic actor that was consistently more influential than the others. This was because the influence of domestic actors was mediated by other factors that existed in the US political system and in the allied state. These factors, as analysed in this chapter, were the role of ideas, economic interests, centralisation of decision-making, direct access to the US President, trigger events in the allied state, and the nexus between the US media and US public opinion. Across these three case studies, these factors interacted with one another to either facilitate or restrain the influence of domestic actors on the US foreign policymaking process. Consequently, as argued in the previous section, future research on US foreign policy towards allies in crisis should recognise the interrelated nature of these factors and domestic actors.

This research also aims to shed light on the passive democracy promotion policy. America's decision to refrain from intervening in an ally's domestic politics has been labelled as "amateurish", "inconsistent" and "confused" by foreign policy analysts.⁵⁴¹ However, by studying America's behaviour as an

⁵⁴¹ Schwarz, "Gingrich says Obama administration 'amateurish' on Egypt",

independent foreign policy that sits along a policy spectrum, this research was able to highlight factors that drove America's passive democracy promotion response towards South Korea. As this research only offers one case study on passive democracy promotion, the factors and strategies behind this policy are not necessarily reflective of America's passive democracy promotion response towards other cases. Future comparative research could consider studying cases that share this passive democracy promotion outcome to bolster this preliminary study.

When an allied state is afflicted with a democratic crisis, the United States may be faced with a strict choice between prioritising national security interests or democratic values. However, this thesis demonstrates that America's choice is not always that simple. A variety of factors within America's political system and in the allied state can interact to impact the influence of domestic actors on US foreign policy. Consequently, America's final policy response could reflect one of the three policy choices that sit along a policy spectrum which includes democracy subversion, passive democracy promotion, and active democracy promotion. Through these findings, this thesis illuminated an under-studied research topic in the literature of US democracy promotion and US foreign policy. By better understanding the factors driving US foreign policy responses towards allies in crisis, this thesis also contributes to policy-relevant knowledge that would benefit academics and policy specialists alike.

APPENDIX I : ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFP	Armed Forces of the Philippines
Amcham	American Chamber of Commerce
CDP	Christian Democratic Party
CFC	Combined Forces Command
Chitelco	Chilean Telephone Company
CIA	United States Central Intelligence Agency
COMELEC	Committee on Elections
CPP	Communist Party of the Philippines
EDSA	Epifanio de los Santos
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GOP	Government of the Philippines
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INF	Intermediate-range Forces
ITT	International Telephone and Telegraph
KCIA	Korean Central Intelligence Agency
MBA	Military Base Agreement
MNC	Multinational Corporations
NAMFREL	National Citizens' Movement for Free Elections
NDP	New Democratic Party
NPA	New People's Army
NSC	National Security Council
NSDM	National Security Decision Memorandum
PLO	Palestinian Liberation Organisation
PRM	Presidential Review Memorandum
RAM	Reform the Armed Forces Movement
ROK	South Korea / Republic of Korea
ROKG	South Korea / Republic of Korea Government
SIG	Senior Interdepartment Group
SOFOFA	Society for Manufacturing Development
UP	Unidad Popular Party
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International
USFK	Development United States Forces Korea
USG	United States Government
USSR	Soviet Union

APPENDIX II: GLOSSARY OF PERSONS

- Acheson, Dean.** 51st US Secretary of State (1949 - 1953)
Alessandri, Jorge. Chile's National Party Presidential Candidate (1970, 1973)
Ali, Zine el Abidine bin. 2nd President of Tunisia (1987 - 2011)
Allende, Salvador. 30th President of Chile (1970 - 1973)
Anderson, Jack. Reporter, The New York Times
Andropov, Yuri. 4th General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1982 - 1984)
Armocost, Michael. US Ambassador to the Philippines (1982 - 1984) and Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs
Armitage, Richard. Assistant Secretary of State for International Security Affairs (1983 - 1989)
Aquino, Benigno. Opposition leader, President of the Philippines' *Lakas ng Bayan* political party (1978 - 1983)
Aquino, Corazon. Leader of the Philippines' United Opposition party
- Baker, James.** 67th US Secretary of the Treasury (1985 - 1988)
Bosworth, Stephen. US Ambassador to the Philippines (1984 - 1987)
Bradley, Bill. US Senator (1979 - 1997)
Brezhnev, Leonid. General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1964 - 1982)
Broe, William. Chief of the CIA's Clandestine Services of the Western Hemisphere
Brown, Harold. 14th US Secretary of Defence (1977 - 1981)
Brzezinski, Zbigniew. 10th US National Security Advisor (1977 - 1981)
Buckley, William. CIA Station Chief, Lebanon
Bush, George H.W. Vice-President of the United States (1981 - 1989)
- Carter, Jimmy.** 39th President of the United States (1977 - 1981)
Casey, William. Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (1981 - 1987)
Castro, Fidel. 16th Prime Minister of Cuba (1959 - 1976)
Chernenko, Konstantin. 5th General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1984 - 1985)
Childress, Richard. National Security Council Director for Asian Affairs
Choi Kyu Hah. Acting President of South Korea (1979 - 1980)
Choo Young Bak. South Korea's Defence Minister
Christopher, Warren. 5th US Deputy Secretary of State (1977 - 1981)
Chun Doo Hwan. 5th President of South Korea (1980 - 1988)
Clinton, Bill. 42nd President of the United States (1993 - 2001)
Coerr, Wymberly. Deputy Director for Coordination
Colby, William. Director of Central Intelligence Agency (1973 - 1976)
Cranston, Alan. Senate Minority Assistant Leader (1981 - 1983)
Crowe, Jr., William J. Admiral, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (1985 - 1989)
- Danyau, Cesar Ruiz.** Commander in Chief of the Chilean Air Force (1970 - 1973)
Davis, Nathaniel. US Ambassador to Chile (1971 - 1973)
Derian, Patricia. US Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights
Duran, Julio. Leader of Chile's Radical Democracy Party

Edwards, Agustin. Founder, *El Mercurio* newspaper
Enrile, Juan Ponce. Defence Minister, Republic of the Philippines (1972 - 1986)

Fascell, Dante. Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee (1982 - 1993)

Frei, Eduardo. 29th President of Chile (1964 - 1970)

Gates, Robert. 6th Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (1986 - 1989)

Geneen, Harold. Chief Executive Officer of the International Telephone and Telegraph Company

Gephardt, Dick. Member of the US House of Representatives (1977 - 2005)

Gerrity, Ned. Vice President of the International Telephone and Telegraph Company

Glenn, John. US Senator, Chairman of the Senate Government Affairs Committee, Member of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee

Gleysteen, William. US Ambassador to South Korea (1978 - 1981)

Gorbachev, Mikhail. 6th General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1985 - 1991)

Habib, Philip. US Special Envoy for the President

Hall, John G. President of Anaconda

Hamilton, Lee. Member of the US House of Representatives (1965 - 1999)

Hartman, Arthur. Policy Planning Staff

Hatfield, Mark. US Senator (1967 - 1997)

Heath, Edward. Prime Minister of the United Kingdom (1970 - 1974)

Helms, Richard. Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) (1966 - 1973)

Hill, Charles. Senior Advisor to Ronald Reagan

Holbrooke, Richard. US Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs (1977 - 1981)

Hurwitch, Robert. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for inter-American Affairs (1969 - 1973)

Jeung Seung Hwa. South Korea Martial Law Administrator (1979)

Johnson, Lyndon. 36th President of the United States (1963 - 1969)

Johnson, Ural Alexis. Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs (1979 - 1973)

Jones, Jr., Robert Trent. Golf course architect

Karamessines, Thomas. CIA Deputy Director for Plans

Kelly, Jim. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defence and National Security Affairs (East Asia and Pacific)

Kendall, Donald. Chief Executive Officer of Pepsi Cola (1963 - 1971)

Kennedy, John F. 35th President of the United States (1961 - 1963)

Khrushchev, Nikita. First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1953 - 1964)

Kim Chae Kyu. Director of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency

Kim Dae Jung. Founder of the National Coalition for Democracy and Unification

Kim Il Sung. 1st President of North Korea (1972 - 1994)

Kim Young Sam. Leader of the National Democratic Party

Kim Young Shik. South Korea's Ambassador to the United States

Kissinger, Henry. 8th US National Security Advisor (1969 - 1975)

Korry, Edward. US Ambassador to Chile (1967 - 1971)

Kubisch, Jack. Assistant Secretary for inter-American Affairs (1973 - 1974)

Laxalt, Paul. US Senator (1974 - 1987)

Leach, Jim. Member of the US House of Representatives (1977 - 2007)

Lord, Winston. Special Assistant to the National Security Advisor (1970 - 1973)

Lugar, Richard. Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (1985 - 1987)

Marcos, Ferdinand. 10th President of the Philippines (1965 - 1986)

Marcos, Imelda. 10th First Lady of the Philippines (1965 - 1986)

McFarlane, Robert. 13th US National Security Advisor (1983 - 1985)

Medici, Emilio Garrastazu. 28th President of Brazil (1969 - 1974)

Meyer, Charles A. Assistant US Secretary of State (1969 - 1973)

Mitchell, John M. Attorney General (1969 - 1972)

Molina, Edgar. Vice-President of Ford Motor Company

Monjo, John. Deputy Assistant Secretary (East Asian and Pacific Affairs) (1983 - 1985), Senior Deputy Assistant Secretary (East Asian and Pacific Affairs) (1987 - 1989)

Moorer, Thomas. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (1970 - 1974)

Mubarak, Hosni. 4th President of Egypt (1981 - 2011)

Murtha, John. Member of the US House of Representatives (1974 - 2010)

Muskie Edward. 58th Secretary of State (1980 - 1981)

Nixon, Richard. 37th President of the United States of America (1969- 1974)

Nunn, Sam. US Senator (1972 - 1997), Armed Services Committee

Obama, Barack. 44th President of the United States (2009 - 2017)

Overholt, William H. Vice-President of the Bankers Trust Co.

Park Chung Hee. 3rd President of South Korea (1963 - 1979)

Park Tong Jin. Foreign Minister of South Korea (1975 - 1980)

Park Tong Sun. South Korea businessman

Parkinson, Jay. Chief Executive Officer of Anaconda

Peeters, Arturo Araya. Naval aide to President Allende (1970 - 1973)

Pinochet, Augusto. 31st President of Chile (1974 - 1990)

Prats, Carlos. Commander-in-Chief of the Chilean Army (1970 1973)

Ramos, Fidel. Acting Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, Philippines Armed Forces (1983 - 1985)

Regan, Donald. 11th White House Chief of Staff (1985 - 1987)

Reagan, Ronald. 40th President of the United States (1981 - 1989)

Rich, Robert. Director for Korean Affairs, US State Department

Romero, Radomiro Tomic. Chile's Christian Democratic Party Presidential Candidate (1970)

Salas, Rafael. Executive Secretary in the Philippines administration (1966 - 1969)

Saragat, Giuseppe. 5th President of Italy (1964 - 1971)

Schneider, Rene. Commander-in-Chief of the Chilean Army (1969-1970)

Shin, Byonghyung. 12th Governor of the Bank of Korea (1978 - 1980)

Shin Hyon Hwak. Prime Minister of South Korea (1979 - 1980)

Shultz, George. 60th US Secretary of State (1982 - 1989)

Sigur, Gaston. Special Assistant to the President for Asian Affairs (1983 - 1986)

Solarz, Stephen. Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs

Syngman Rhee. 1st President of South Korea (1948 - 1960)

Truman, Harry. 33rd President of the United States (1945 - 1953)

Turner, Stanfield. 12th Director of Central Intelligence Agency (1977 - 1981)

Vaky, Viron P. National Security Council Operations Staff, Latin America (1969 – 1972)

Vance, Cyrus. 57th US Secretary of State (1977 - 1980)

Wales, Robert. President, Mobil Oil Philippines

Weinberger, Caspar. 15th United States Secretary of Defence (1981 - 1987)

Wickham, John. Commander-in-Chief of the US Combined Forces Command (1979 - 1982)

Wolff, Lester. Chairman of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee

Wolfowitz, Paul. Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs

Zumwalt, Elmo. Admiral, Chief of Naval Operations (1970 - 1974)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramowitz, M.I., "Criteria for Honest Elections in the Philippines", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 9 November 1985

Acting Chief of the Western Hemisphere Division (name not declassified), "Memorandum by the Acting Chief of the Western Hemisphere Division, Directorate of Operations, Central Intelligence Agency", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 23 August 1970

Adesnik, A.D. and S. Kim, "If at first you don't succeed: the puzzle of South Korea's democratic transition", *CDDRL Working Paper*, July 2008, [http://cddrl.fsi.stanford.edu/publications/if at first you dont succeeded the puzzle of south koreas democratic transition](http://cddrl.fsi.stanford.edu/publications/if_at_first_you_dont_succeeded_the_puzzle_of_south_koreas_democratic_transition) (accessed 28 July 2014)

Adesnik, D. and M. McFaul, "Engaging Autocratic Allies to Promote Democracy", *The Washington Quarterly* 29, no.2 (Spring, 2006), pp.7-26

"Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines concerning Military Bases", 17 March 1947, <https://www.loc.gov/law/help/us-treaties/bevans/b-ph-ust000011-0055.pdf>, (accessed 29 December 2017)

Alqama, K. and R. Nawaz, "US Role in Bending Democracy during Cold War: A Case Study of Pakistan", *South Asian Studies* 25, no.1 (2010), pp.7-20

AP, "Paratroopers enforce martial law after end to nine-day rebellion", *Longview Mountain Journal*, 28 May 1980

Armacost, M., "Economic Policy Recommendations of the Makati Business Club", *National Security Archive - The Philippines: US Policy during the Marcos Years, 1985 - 1986*, 3 September 1982

Armacost, M., "White House Statement Concerning Philippine Presidential Election", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 15 February 1986

Beichelt, T., "The Research Field of Democracy Promotion", *Living Reviews in Democracy* 3 (January, 2012), pp.1-13

Bell, P.D., "Democracy and Double Standards: The View from Chile", *World Policy Journal* 2, no.4 (Fall, 1985), pp.711-730

Bello, W. and E.S. Herman, "US-sponsored Elections in El Salvador and the Philippines", *World Policy Journal* 1, no.4 (Summer, 1984), pp.851-869

Bello, W., "Edging toward the Quagmire: The United States and the Philippine Crisis", *World Policy Journal* 3, no.1 (Winter, 1985), pp.29-58

Bello, W., "US-Philippine Relations in the Aquino Era", *World Policy Journal* 5, no.4 (Fall, 1988), pp.677-702

Berry, Jr., W.E., *Global Security Watch - Korea: a reference handbook* (Westport: Praeger Security International, 2008)

Blair, C., "The Korean War: Background and Overview" in P. Williams, D.M. Goldstein and H.L. Andrews, Jr. (Eds.), *Security in Korea. War, Stalemate and Negotiation* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, Inc., 1994), pp.39-52

Blitz A., *The Contested State: American Foreign Policy and Regime Change in the Philippines* (Maryland, USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000)

Blum, W., *Killing Hope: US Military and CIA Interventions since World War II* (London: Zed Books Ltd., 2003)

Blumenfeld, R., *Henry Kissinger: The Private and Public Story* (Mishawaka, Indiana: New American Library, 1974)

Boeninger, E., "The Chilean Road to Democracy", *Foreign Affairs* 64, no.4 (Spring, 1986), pp.812-832

Bonner, R., *Waltzing with a Dictator: The Marcoses and the Making of American Policy* (New York: Random House, 1987)

Bosworth, S., "Codel Boren calls on NAMFREL, American Chamber of Commerce, and Presidential Envoy Habib", *National Security Archive - The Philippines: US Policy during the Marcos Years, 1985 - 1986*, 17 February 1986

Bosworth, S., "Summary: Ambassador Habib met with a group of moderate businessmen", *National Security Archive - The Philippines: US Policy during the Marcos Years, 1985 - 1986*, 21 February 1986

Bouchet, N., "The democracy tradition in US foreign policy and the Obama presidency", *International Affairs* 89, no.1 (2013), pp.31-51

Boyd, G.M., "U.S. urging a "Credible" Philippine Vote", *The New York Times*, 5 November 1985

Bradley, J., *The Imperial Cruise: A Secret History of Empire and War* (New York: Little Brown and Company, 2009)

Brands, H.W., *Bound to Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992)

Brazinsky, G., *Nation Building in South Korea* (USA: The University of Carolina Press, 2007)

Brzezinski, Z., "Presidential Review Memorandum/ NSC 13", *National Security Council*, 26 January 1977

Broe, W.V., "Memorandum for the Record", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973*, 16 September 1970

Brown, F. and C. Ford, *The Situation in the Philippines*, A Staff Report prepared

for the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1984)

Bundy, W., "The Conduct of American Policy: A Portentous Year", *Foreign Affairs* 62, no.3 (Fall, 1983), pp.485-520

Bundy, W., *A Tangled Web: The Making of Foreign Policy in the Nixon Presidency* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998)

Burnell, P., "Democracy Promotion: The Elusive Quest for Grand Strategies", *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft* 204, no.3 (2004), pp.1001-1011

Burnell, P., *Promoting Democracy Abroad: Policy and Performance* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2011)

Burton, S., *Impossible Dream: The Marcoses, the Aquinos and the Unfinished Revolution* (New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1989)

Caputo, R. and D. Saravia, "The Fiscal and Monetary History of Chile, 1960-2010", Becker Friedman Institute, April 2014, <https://bfi.uchicago.edu/research/working-paper/fiscal-and-monetary-history-chile-1960-2010>, (accessed 3 March 2018)

"Cairo Declaration, United States - Great Britain - China", 1 December 1943, www.ndl.go.jp/constitution/e/shiryo/01/002_46/002_46tx.html (accessed 1 March 2016)

Carothers, T., *Critical Mission: Essays on Democracy Promotion* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2004)

Carter, J., "United States Troop Withdrawals from the Republic of Korea Statement by the President", *The American Presidency Project*, 20 July 1979, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=32622>, (accessed 29 February 2017)

Central Intelligence Agency, "National Intelligence Estimate", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 30 July 1970

Central Intelligence Agency, "Telegram from the Central Intelligence Agency to the Station in Chile", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 16 October 1970

Lee, C., *A Troubled Peace: U.S. Policy and the Two Koreas* (Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006)

Chapin, F.M., "Minutes of the Meeting of the 40 Committee, 8 September 1970", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 8 September 1970

Chicago Tribune Press Service, "Chile Election A Bright Sign, Johnson Says", *Chicago Tribune*, 6 September 1964

Christopher, W., "Text of scope paper re state funeral for Korean President Park", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 1 November 1979

Christopher, W., "Weekly Status Report - Korea", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 20 September 1980

Clark, V.F., *Salvador Allende: Revolutionary Democrat* (London: Pluto Press, 2013)

Coerr, W., "Memorandum from the Deputy Director for Coordination, Bureau of Intelligence and Research (Coerr) to the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Meyer", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973, Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973*, 4 September 1970

Cohen, R., "Threat Perception in International Crises", *Political Science Quarterly* 93, no.1 (Spring, 1978), pp.93-107

Coleman, D., "Unemployment Rates by President, 1948-2016", *History in Pieces*, <https://historyinpieces.com/research/us-unemployment-rates-president>, (accessed 24 June 2017)

Collins, S.D., "Can America Finance Freedom? Assessing US Democracy Promotion via Economic Statecraft", *Foreign Policy Analysis* 5, no.4 (2009), pp.367-389

Collins, S.M. and W.A. Park, "An Overview of Korea's External Debt" in J.D. Sachs and S.M. Collins (eds.), *Developing Country Debt and Economic Performance, Volume 3, Country Studies - Indonesia, Korea, Philippines, Turkey* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp.170-182

Congressional Quarterly Press, "Foreign Election Campaigns", *Congressional Quarterly Almanac 1971*, 27th edition, (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1972)

Copetas, A.C., "An Architect of Diplomacy on the Greens", *The New York Times*, 15 January 2005

Craig, C. and F. Logevall, *America's Cold War: The Politics of Insecurity* (London, England: The Bellknap Press, 2009)

Crozier, M.J., S. Huntington and J. Watanuki, *The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*, (New York: New York University Press, 1975)

Cumings, B., *Korea's Place in the Sun* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2005)

Dallek, R., *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007)

Davis, N., *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende* (London, England: I.B. Tauris & Co., Ltd., 1985)

Davis II, R.T. and S. Kaufman, "The Armed Forces during the Carter Years" in S. Kaufman (ed.), *A Companion to Gerald R. Ford and Jimmy Carter* (Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2016), pp. 430-449

Dayley, R., and C.D. Neher, *Southeast Asia: In the New International Era* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2013)

de Mesquita, B.B., and G.W. Downs, "Intervention and Democracy", *International Organization* 60, no.3 (Summer, 2006), pp.627-649

de Tocqueville, A., *Democracy in America and Two Essays on America*, trans. G.E. Bevan, (London: Penguin Books, 2003)

del Mundo, F., "President Ferdinand Marcos was declared the winner of the...", *United Press International*, 15 February 1986

Diamond, L., "Promoting Democracy", *Foreign Policy*, no. 87 (Summer, 1992), pp.25-46

Dohner, R.S. And Intal, Jr., P., "The Marcos Legacy: Economic Policy and Foreign Debt in the Philippines" in J.D. Sachs and S.M. Collins (eds.), *Developing Country Debt and Economic Performance, Volume 3: Country Studies - Indonesia, Korea, Philippines, Turkey* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp.373-400

Dunsmore, B., "Television Coverage of September 21 events in Manila", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 22 September 1983

Dyer, J.W., "Congressional Reaction to Philippine Elections", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 15 February 1986

Executive Secretary to the National Security Council, "Report to the National Security Council by the Department of State", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950, East Asia and the Pacific, Volume VI*, 27 February 1950

Fabbrini, S. and A. Yossef, "Obama's wavering: US foreign policy on the Egyptian crisis, 2011-13", *Contemporary Arab Affairs* 8, no.1 (2015), pp.65-80

Fagen, R.R., "The United States and Chile: Roots and Branches", *Foreign Affairs* 53, no.2 (January, 1975), pp.297-313

Falcoff, M., "Chile: The Dilemma for U.S. Policy", *Foreign Affairs* 64, no.4 (Spring, 1986), pp.833-848

Fascell, D., "Letter to Mr. President", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 14 February 1986

Fernandois, J., "Chile and the Great Powers" in M.A. Morris (ed.), *Great Power Relations in Argentina, Chile and Antarctica* (South Carolina: Macmillan, 1990), pp.77-98

- Fink, C.K., *Cold War: An International History* (Boulder: Westview Press, 2014)
- Finkel, S.E., A. Perez-Linan and M. A. Seligson, "The Effects of U.S. Foreign Assistance on Democracy Building, 1990-2003", *World Politics* 59, no. 3 (2007), pp. 404-440
- Fisher, Jr., R.D., "Rebuilding the US-Philippine Alliance", *The Heritage Foundation Backgrounder*, 22 February 1999
- Fowler, J., "The United States and South Korean Democratisation", *Political Science Quarterly* 114, no.2 (Summer, 1999), pp.265-288
- Friedman, U., "'American Exceptionalism': A Short History", *Foreign Policy*, 18 June 2012, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2012/06/18/american-exceptionalism-a-short-history/>, (accessed 24 June 2017)
- Friend, T., "Timely Daring: The United States and Ferdinand Marcos" in D. Pipes and A. Garfinkel (eds.) *Friendly Tyrants* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), pp.201-219
- Fukuyama, F., *The End of History and The Last Man* (New York: Avon Books, Inc., 1992)
- Fukuyama, F. and M. McFaul, "Should democracy promotion be promoted or demoted?", *The Washington Quarterly* 31, no.1 (Winter, 2008), pp.23-45
- Galb, L.H., "Marcos reported to lose support in Administration", *New York Times*, 26 January 1986
- George, A.L., *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1993)
- George, A.L. and A. Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2005)
- Gerth, J. and J. Brinkley, "Marcos Wartime Role Discredited in US Files", *The New York Times*, 23 January 1986
- Gills, B. and J. Rocamora, "Low Intensity Democracy", *Third World Quarterly* 13, no.3 (1992), pp.501-523
- Gleysteen, W., "Initial Reflections on post-Park Chung Hee Situation in Korea", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 28 October 1979
- Gleysteen, W., "Korea Focus - Secretary's Discussion with Foreign Minister Park Tong-Jin", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 8 November 1979
- Gleysteen, W., "Call on Acting President", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 13 November 1979
- Gleysteen, W., "Korea Focus: Meeting with FONMIN Park November 28", *US*

Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives, 28 November 1979

Gleysteen, W., "Korea Focus: Meeting with Martial Law Administration Toh Chong November 30", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 3 December 1979

Gleysteen, W.H., "Korea Focus - Nudging ROK Political Leaders", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 7 December 1979

Gleysteen, W., "Younger ROK Officers Grab Power", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 13 December 1979

Gleysteen, W., "Korea Focus - Discussion with SG Chon Tu Hwan", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 15 December 1979

Gleysteen, W., "Korea Focus - My meeting with Prime Minister December 18", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 18 December 1979

Gleysteen, W., "Korea Focus - My meeting with Foreign Minister December 19", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 19 December 1979

Gleysteen, W., "Korea Focus - Relations with ROK Military", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 26 December 1979

Gleysteen, W., "Second look at December 12 Incident", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 28 December 1979

Gleysteen, W., "CODEL Wolff call on Defense Minister Choo", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 11 January 1980

Gleysteen, W., "First Meeting of a US Congressional Delegation with Korean President Choi Kyu Hah", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 15 January 1980

Gleysteen, W., "Holbrooke Meeting with President Choi", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 17 January 1980

Gleysteen, W., "Assistant Secretary Holbrooke's call on NDP President Kim Young-Sam", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 17 January 1980

Gleysteen, W., "Crackdown in Seoul", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 17 May 1980

Gleysteen, W., "Ambassador Gleysteen's Message in June issue on Nation's Business", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 30 May 1980

Gleysteen, W., "An Initial Assessment of the Public Mood", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 6 June 1980

Gleysteen, W., "New ROK Cabinet Named", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 2 September 1980

Gleysteen, Jr., W.H., *Massive Entanglement, Marginal Influence: Carter and Korea in Crisis* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999)

Global Economy, "South Korea: Inflation", *Globaleconomy.com*, <https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/South-Korea/Inflation/>, (accessed 3 February 2017)

Goldberg, P.A., "The Politics of the Allende Overthrow in Chile", *Political Science Quarterly* 90, no.1 (Spring, 1975), pp.93-116

Gould, L.L., *The Modern American Presidency* (Lawrence, Kansas: The University Press of Kansas, 2003)

Gustafson, K., *Hostile Intent: U.S. Covert Operations in Chile 1964-1974* (Dulles, Virginia: Potomac Books, Inc., 2007)

Gwertzman, B., "US tries to limit Manila confusion on Reagan stance", *The New York Times*, 13 February 1986

Habermas, J., *Theory and Practice* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973)

Harmer, T., *Allende's Chile & the Inter-American Cold War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011)

Haslam, J., *The Nixon Administration and the Death of Allende's Chile: A Case of Assisted Suicide*, (London and New York: Verso, 2005)

Hawes, G., "United States Support for the Marcos Administration and the Pressures that made for Change", *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 8, no.1 (June, 1986), pp.18-36

Helms, R., "Editorial Note", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973* Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 15 September 1970

Heo, U. and T. Roehrig, *South Korea Since 1980* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Holbrooke, R., "Korea Focus - Nudging ROK Political Leaders", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 3 December 1979

Holbrooke, R., "Korea Focus - Nudging ROK Political Leaders", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 4 December 1979

Holbrooke, R., "Korea Focus - Amb Kim conveys ROKG assurances on Political Development", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 18 December 1979

Holbrooke, R., "PRC Meeting on Korea", *Wilson Centre Digital Archive*, 22 May 1980

Holbrooke, R., "Memo: Action Memorandum from Richard Holbrooke and Anthony Lake to the US Secretary of State, 'PRC Meeting on Korea'", *History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive*, 22 May 1980, <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/122094>, (accessed 20 October 2017)

Holsti, O.R., "Promotion of Democracy as a Popular Demand?" in Michael Cox, G. John Ikenberry and Takashi Inoguchi (editors), *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies and Impacts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp.308-325

Hook, S.W., "Inconsistent U.S. Efforts to Promote Democracy Abroad" in P.J. Schraeder (ed.) *Exporting Democracy: Rhetoric vs. Reality* (Boulder, Colorado and Covent Garden, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002), pp.109-128

Huntington, S.P., *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991)

Hurwitch, R. and A. Hartman, "Briefing Memorandum from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Hurwitch) and the Director of the Policy Planning Staff (Hartman) to Secretary of State Rogers", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973*, Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 3 November 1970

Im, H.B. "The US role in Korean democracy and security since Cold War era", *International Relations of the Asia Pacific* 6, no.2, (August, 2006), pp.157-187

Indexmundi, "Philippines - Inflation", *indexmundi*, <https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/philippines/inflation> (accessed 20 June 2018)

Inside Gov, "US Overseas Loans and Grants to the Philippines", *US Foreign Aid*, <http://us-foreign-aid.insidegov.com/1/139/Philippines>, (accessed 10 January 2017)

Jacoby, T., "The Reagan Turnaround on Human Rights", *Foreign Affairs* 64, no.5 (Summer, 1986), pp.1066-1086

Johnson, L.K., "Covert Action and Accountability: Decision-Making for America's Secret Foreign Policy", *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no.1 (March, 1989), pp.81-109

Johnson, U.A., "Concept that Military Takeover the Government of Chile", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973* Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 22 September 1970

Karnow, S., *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines* (New York & Toronto: Random House, Inc., 1989)

Karnow, S., "Reagan and the Philippines: Setting Marcos Adrift", *New York Times*, 19 March 1989

Kamm, H., "South Korea troops recapture Kwangju in Predawn Strikes", *New York Times*, 27 May 1980

Kammen, M., "The Problem of American Exceptionalism: A Reconsideration", *American Quarterly* 45, no.1 (March 1993), pp.1-43

Katsifas, G. "Neoliberalism and the Gwangju Uprising," *Democracy and Human Rights* 6, no.2 (Fall, 2006), pp.191-229

Katsifas, G., *Asia's Unknown Uprisings: South Korean Social Movements in the 20th Century* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012)

Kaufman, S., *Plans Unraveled: The Foreign Policy of the Carter Administration* (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008)

Kaiser, R., "Selling SALT: A Defense Plan Preview", *The Washington Post*, 5 October 1979

Kay, C., "Chile: The Making of a Coup d'Etat", *Science & Society* 39, no.1 (Spring, 1975), pp.3-25

Kessler, R.J., "Marcos and the Americans", *Foreign Policy* 63 (Summer, 1986), pp.40-57

Kim, I., *Korean Challenges and American Policy* (New York: Paragon House, 1991)

Kim, J. and D. Hundt, "Popular consent and foreign policy choices: war against the Philippines and covert action in Chile", *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 66, no.1 (February, 2012), pp.52-69

Kim, J.I., *The Future of the US-Republic of Korea Military Relationship* (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1996)

Kim, S.T., "Making a Difference: US Press Coverage of the Kwangju and Tiananmen Pro-Democracy Movements", *Journalism & Mass Communications Quarterly* 77, no.1 (Spring, 2000), pp.30-32

King of Tah-Chosun, *Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United States*, trans. P. Lowell, 4 December 1883, <http://images.library.wisc.edu/FRUS/EFacs/1883/reference/frus.frus1883.i0011.pdf>, (accessed 8 February 2016)

Donald Kirk, "U.S. 'approval' angers Korean Dissidents", *San Francisco Examiner*, 28 May 1980

Kirkpatrick, J., "Dictatorships and Double Standards", *Commentary Magazine* 68, no.5 (November, 1979), pp.34-45

Kissinger, H. and R. Nixon, "Transcript of a Telephone Conversation between the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) and President Nixon", Telephone Transcript, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973*

Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 16 September 1973

Kissinger, H.A., "Memorandum from the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 5 November 1970

Kissinger, H.A., "NSC Meeting, November 6 - Chile", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 5 November 1970

Kissinger, H.A., "Policy Towards Chile", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 9 November 1970

Kissinger, H.A., "National Security Decision Memorandum 93", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 9 November 1970

Kissinger, H.A., "Meeting with President Emilio Garrastazin Medici of Brazil on Thursday, December 9, 1971 at 10.00 am, in the President's Office, the White House", *The National Security Archive*, 9 December 1971

Kokinda, R. and S. Kokinda, "Congressional Closeup - House Slaps Philippine Government", *Executive Intelligence Review* 10, no.43 (8 November 1983)

Kornbluh, P., *The Pinochet File* (New York: The New Press, 2013)

Korry, E., "Telegram from the Embassy in Chile to the Department of State", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 6 July 1970

Korry, E., "Backchannel Message from the Ambassador to Chile (Korry) to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the Inter-American Affairs (Crimmins)", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 11 August 1970

Kwak, T.H. and W. Patterson, "The Security Relationship between Korea and the United States, 1960-1982" in Y.B. Lee and W. Patterson (eds.), *Korean-American Relations 1866-1997* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), pp.11-34

Lawrence, M.A., "History from Below: The United States and Latin America in the Nixon Years" in F. Logevall and A. Preston (eds.), *Nixon in the World: American Foreign Relations, 1969 - 1977* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp.268-288

Lewis, L.S., *Laying Claim to the Memory of May: A Look Back at the 1980 Kwangju Uprising* (Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press, 2002)

Logevall, F. and A. Preston, "The Adventurous Journeys of Nixon in the World" in F. Logevall and A. Preston (eds.), *Nixon in the World: American Foreign Relations, 1969-1977* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp.3-24

Lohr, S., "Reagan Remark on Philippines Assailed", *The New York Times*, 23

October 1984

Lugar, R.G. and C. Pell, "Letter to Dr. Allen Weinstein, President of the Center for Democracy", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 21 November 1985

Macareg, P., "How did the declaration of martial law in 1972 affect the economy?", *Entrepreneur Philippines*, 21 September 2017

Macas, T., "Filipino People the real heroes of EDSA, say RAM Boys", *GMA News Online*, 25 February 2016

Magen, A., T. Risse and M.A. McFaul (eds.), *Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law: American and European Strategies* (Basingstoke, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Maisto, J., "Secret memorandum to Paul Wolfowitz including Press Statement", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 29 August 1984

Maisto, J., "A U.S. Strategy for Philippine Snap Elections (discussion paper for 5:00 p.m. meeting, November 3)", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 5 November 1985

Mann, J., *The Rebellion of Ronald Reagan: A History of the End of the Cold War* (London: Penguin Books, 2014)

McClelland, M.J., "Exporting virtue: neoconservatism, democracy promotion and the end of history", *The International Journal of Human Rights* 15, no.4 (2011), pp.520-532

McCrisken, T., *American Exceptionalism and the Legacy of Vietnam: US Foreign Policy since 1974* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

McMahon, T., "Historical Crude Oil Prices (Table)", *InflationData*, 27 August 2017,
https://inflationdata.com/Inflation/Inflation_Rate/Historical_Oil_Prices_Table.asp, (accessed 23 June 2017)

McMahon, T., "Historical Inflation Rate", *InflationData*, 12 June 2018,
https://inflationdata.com/Inflation/Inflation_Rate/HistoricalInflation.aspx, (accessed 25 June 2018)

Merom, G., "Democracy, Dependency, and Destabilization: The Shaking of Allende's Regime", *Political Science Quarterly* 105, no.1 (Spring, 1990), pp.75-95

Meyer, C.A., "Memorandum from the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Meyer) to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs (Johnson)", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973*, Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 18 August 1970

"Monroe Doctrine; December 2, 1823",
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/monroe.asp, (accessed 8 August 2017)

Monten, J., "The Roots of the Bush Doctrine: Power, Nationalism, and Democracy Promotion in U.S. Strategy", *International Security* 29, no.4 (Spring, 2005), pp.112-156

Montopoli, B., "John Bolton: Egyptian Democracy may be Bad News", *CBS News*, 14 February 2011

Moon, C., "Complex Interdependence and Transnational Lobbying: South Korea in the United States", *International Studies Quarterly* 32, no.1 (March, 1988), pp.67-89

Morrow, J.D., "Arms versus Allies: Trade-offs in the Search for Security", *International Organization* 47, no.2 (Spring 1993), pp.207-233

Munoz, A.A., "The Assassination of Commander Arturo Araya Peeters", *Memoria Viva*, 27 June 2012, http://www.memoriaviva.com/Ejecutados/Ejecutados_A/araya_peters_arturo.html, (accessed 4 June 2018)

Munro, R.H., "The New Khmer Rouge", *Commentary Magazine*, 1 December 1985

Muskie, E., "Korea Focus: Consultations with Congress", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 12 June 1980

The "Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea", 1 October 1953 (ratified on 17 Nov. 1954), http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/kor001.asp, (accessed 12 April 2017)

National Security Council, "Minutes of the Meeting of the 40 Committee 25 March 1970", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973*, 25 March 1970

National Security Council, "Intelligence Memorandum", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973, Volume E-16, Documents on Chile, 1969-1973*, 7 September 1970

Nixon, R., "Statement announcing United States policy on Economic Assistance and Investment Security in Developing Nations, January 19, 1972", *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Richard Nixon, 1969* (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1999), pp.31-34

Nunn, S., "Letter to the President", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 13 February 1986

O'Brien, P., *Allende's Chile* (London: Praeger Publishers, 1976)

Oberdofer, D., "Soviets in Cuba called Threat to SALT Approval", *The Washington Post*, 6 September 1979

Oberdofer, D., "Hundreds more held or fired in S. Korean purge", *The Washington Post*, 20 July 1980

Office of the Historian, "Editorial Note", *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume I, Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1969 - 1972*, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v01/d29>, (accessed 23 June 2017)

Oh, J.K., *Korean Politics. The Quest for Democratisation and Economic Development* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999)

Overholt, W.H., "The Rise and Fall of Ferdinand Marcos", *Asian Survey* 26, no.11 (November, 1986), pp.1137 – 1163

Owen IV, J.M., "The Foreign Imposition of Domestic Institutions", *International Organization* 56, no.2 (Spring, 2002), pp.375-409

Ozler, S.I., "The Concertacion and Homelessness in Chile: Market-Based Housing Policies and Limited Popular Participation", *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no.4 (July, 2012), pp.53-70

Palmer, M. *Breaking the Real Axis of Evil: How to Oust the World's Last Dictators by 2025* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003)

Park, W.G., "The US Carter Administration and Korea in the 12/12 Incident: Concession of Moral Diplomacy", *Korean Social Sciences Review* 2, no.2 (2012), pp.253-281

Pastor, R.A., "Preempting Revolutions: The Boundaries of US Influence", *International Security* 15, no.4 (Spring, 1991), pp.54-86

Patterson E., "Obama and Sustainable Democracy Promotion", *International Studies Perspective* 13, no.1 (February, 2012), pp.26-42

Pear, R., "US Observers disagree on extent of Philippine Fraud", *The New York Times*, 12 February 1986

Perdon, R., "The Chaotic Presidential Election of 1986", *Bayanihan*, 13 April 2016, <http://bayanihannews.com.au/2016/04/13/the-chaotic-presidential-election-of-1986/>, (accessed 11 January 2016)

Petras, J.F. and M.M. Morley, *How Allende Fell: A Study in US-Chilean Relations* (Nottingham: Spokesman Books, 1974)

Petras, J. and M. Morley, "On the US and the Overthrow of Allende: A Reply to Professor Sigmund's Criticism", *Latin American Research Review* 13, no.1 (1978), pp.205-221

Philippines Statistics Authority, *Yearbook of Labor Statistics 2015* (Manila: Philippines Statistics Authority, 2015)

Pilger, J., "Kissinger and Chile: In an Age of Vigilantes, there is cause for

Optimism", *Truth Out*, 19 September 2013, <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/18933-in-an-age-of-realists-and-vigilantes-there-is-cause-for-optimism>, (accessed 3 September 2017)

de Pinho Ferreira Pinto, M.d.C. "Mapping the Obama administration's response to the Arab Spring", *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 50, no.2 (December 2012), pp.109-130

Policy Review Committee, "Summary of Conclusions", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 30 May 1980

Powel, B.T., "The Stability Syndrome: US and EU democracy promotion in Tunisia", *The Journal of North African Studies* 14, no.1 (March, 2009), pp.57-73

Privitera, M., "Dole/Lugar/Nunn action on Philippines", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 13 February 1986

Putzel, M., "Reagan sending envoy to Manila", *Morning Call*, 12 February 1986

Quinn-Judge, P., "Businessmen in Philippines protest Marcos rule - and a mounting financial crisis", *The Christian Science Monitor*, 22 December 1983

Qureshi, L.Z., *Nixon, Kissinger, and Allende: US Involvement in the 1973 Coup in Chile* (Lanham, M.D.: Lexington Books, 2009)

Raymont, H., "Frei, Victor in Chile, Vows Cooperation with the US", *The New York Times*, 6 September 1964

Reagan, R., "United States Policy Toward the Philippines", *National Security Decision Directive*, no. 163, 20 February 1985

"Report of the Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom", Moscow, 16-26 December 1945, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/decade19.asp (accessed 9 September 2017)

Rich, Jr., R.G., "Weekly Status Report - Korea", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 6 December 1979

Rieffer, B.A.J., and K. Mercer, "US Democracy Promotion: The Clinton and Bush administrations", *Global Society* 19, no.4 (October, 2005), pp.385-408

Robinson, C.J., "The American press and the repairing of the Philippines", *Race & Class* 28, no.2 (October, 1986), pp.31-44

Robinson, W.I., *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalisation, US Intervention, and Hegemony* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Robinson, W.I., "Promoting Capitalist Polyarchy: The Case of Latin America" in M. Cox, G.J. Ikenberry, and T. Inoguchi (eds.), *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies and Impacts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp.308-325

Romberg, A.D., "Editorial Comment on Philippines - Commission Reports on Aquino Slaying", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 2 November 1984

Rubel, M., "The Hughes-Ryan Act", *The Church Committee*, <https://churchcommittee.wordpress.com/2014/12/05/hughes-ryan/>, (accessed 12 January 2018)

Schlesinger, J.R., "Meeting with President on Chile 9/15/1970", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 15 September 1970

Schmitter, P.C. and T.L. Karl, "What Democracy Is...And Is Not", *Journal of Democracy* 2, no.3 (Summer, 1991), pp.75-88

Schraeder, P.J., "The State of the Art in International Democracy Promotion: Results of a Joint European-North American Research Network", *Democratization* 10, no.2 (2003), pp. 21-44

Schumpeter, J., *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1943)

Sciolino, E., "Reagan and Democrats split on using Pressure on Haiti", *The New York Times*, 20 November 1987

Schwarz, G., "Gingrich says Obama administration 'amateurish' on Egypt", *CNN Politics*, 7 February 2011

Sector, B. and D. Shannon, "Reagan warns Marcos of Military Aid cutoff: Philippine Chief cautioned against attacking rebel troops; U.S. might offer him asylum", *Los Angeles Times*, 24 February 1986

Sedaca, N.B. and N. Bouchet, *Holding Steady? US Democracy Promotion in a Changing World* (London: Chatham House, February 2014)

Shain, Y., and M. Thompson, "The Role of Political Exiles in Democratic Transitions: The Case of the Philippines", *Journal of Developing Societies* 6 (January-April, 1990), pp.71-86

Shannon, W.W., "American Public Opinion on South Korea: Continuity and Change, 1968 - 1988" in I.J. Kim (ed.), *Korean Challenges and American Policy* (New York: Paragon House Publishers, Inc., 1991), pp.399-426

Shorrock, T., "Ex-Leaders Go On Trial", *Journal of Commerce*, 27 February 1996, http://timshorrock.com/?page_id=21, (accessed 30 November 2015)

Shorrock, T., "The U.S. Role in Korea in 1979 and 1980", *The May 18 Memorial Foundation*, 17 October 2008, <http://eng.518.org/sub.php?PID=0502&page=19&category=&searchText=&searchType=&action=Read&idx=279&ckattempt=1>, (accessed 17 October 2017)

Shorrock, T., "The Lasting Significance of Kwangju", *Institute for Policy Studies*,

1 June 2010, http://www.ips-dc.org/the_lasting_significance_of_kwangju/, (accessed 17 October 2017)

Shorrock, T., "The Cherokee Files: New Documents Reveal U.S. Policy Making During Kwangju", *Sisa Journal*, 28 February 1996

Shultz, G., "DAS Monjo's Testimony on the Philippines before House Armed Services Committee. December 5", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 6 December 1985

Shultz, G., "10 EAP Press Summary", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 11 February 1986

Shultz, G., "Message from the Secretary to President Marcos", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 26 February 1986

Shultz, G.P., *Turmoil and Triumph: My Years as Secretary of State* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1993)

Sigmund, P.E., "The "Invisible Blockade" and the Overthrow of Allende", *Foreign Affairs* 52, no.2 (January, 1974), pp.322-340

Sigmund, P.E., *The Overthrow of Allende and the Politics of Chile 1964-1976* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977)

Sigmund, P.E., *The United States and Democracy in Chile* (London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993)

Silva, M.G., "The United States and the Promotion of Democracy in Latin America", *International Journal of Political Economy* 21, no.2 (Summer, 1991), pp.7-25

Sison, J.M., "Significance and Consequences of the 'People Power' Uprising in the Philippines", *Telesur*, 25 February 2016

Smith, S., "US Democracy Promotion: Critical Questions" in M. Cox, G.J. Ikenberry and T. Inoguchi (eds.) *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies and Impacts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 63-82

Smith, T., *America's Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012)

State Department, "Secretary's Staff Meeting", *The National Security Archive*, 1 October 1973, <http://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB110/chile03.pdf>, (accessed 6 August 2017)

Stedman, Jr., W.P., "Memorandum of Conversation", *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969-1973 Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 10 April 1970

Steinmetz, S., *Democratic Transition and Human Rights: Perspectives on US Foreign*

Policy (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994)

Straus, U.A., "Status Report", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 11 September 1983

Stokes, H.S., "Army Won but at what Price?", *The Independent Record*, 28 May 1980

Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations, *The International Telephone and Telegraph Company and Chile, 1970-71*, Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate, 21 June 1973

Sungjoo, H., "South Korea and the United States: The Alliance Survives", *Asian Survey* 20, no.11 (November, 1980), pp.1075-1086

The Avalon Project, "Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines", 30 August 1951, *The Avalon Project*, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/phil001.asp, (accessed 12 March 2017)

The Daily News, "5 Hanged for Park Slaying", *The Daily News*, 24 May 1980

The Harvard Crimson, "Kissinger and the Fall of Allende", *The Harvard Crimson*, 24 July 1974, <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/1974/9/24/kissinger-and-the-fall-of-allende/> (accessed 12 January 2018)

The Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights, *The Philippines: A Country in Crisis* (Washington, D.C., 1983)

The New York Times, "Chile on the Tightrope", *The New York Times*, 27 August 1970

The New York Times, "Marxist Victory in Chile", *The New York Times*, 6 September 1970

The Organization of American States, "Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance", *The Organization of American States*, <http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/treaties/b-29.html>, (accessed 11 March 2017)

The World Bank, "GDP annual growth (annual %)", *The World Bank Data*, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG?locations=PH>, (accessed 12 January 2018)

Time, "Marxist Threat in the Americas", *The Time Magazine*, 19 October 1970

Torres, S.H., "The U.S. Press and Chile, 1964-1973: Ideology and US Foreign Policy", *Revista de Historia Ibero Americana* 5, no.2 (June, 2012), pp.37-61

Traub, J., *The Freedom Agenda: Why America must Spread Democracy (Just not the way George Bush did)*, (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2008)

United Press International, "The transcript of the second debate between President Reagan...", *United Press International*, 22 October 1984

United States Congress (House), *Committee on Foreign Affairs: Congress and Foreign Policy - 1979* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980)

United States Forces Korea, "Mission of the ROK/US Combined Forces Command", *United State Forces Korea*, <http://www.usfk.mil/About/Combined-Forces-Command/>, (accessed 28 February 2017)

"United States - Philippine Relations and the New Base and Aid Agreement", *Hearings, Subcommittee on Asia and Pacific Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 98th Congress, 1st session, June 1983, pp.7-12

UPI, "Student protestors look to United States for help", *Longview Mountain Journal*, 28 May 1980

US Agency for International Development (USAID), "U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants, Obligations and Loan Authorizations, July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1974", *Agency for International Development*, 2013, <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/USOverseasLoansGrantsTheGreenBook2013.pdf>, (accessed 28 September 2017)

US Energy Information Administration, "Short-Term Energy Outlook", *US Energy Information Administration*, <https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/steo/realprices/> (accessed 12 November 2018)

US Senate, "Multinational Corporations and United States Foreign Policy", *Hearings before the Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate*, Ninety-Third Congress, Washington: GPO, 1973, Part 2, pp.542-543

US Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities (US Senate), *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973, Staff Report of the Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities*, 18 December 1975

US State Department, "National Security Study Directive: US Policy towards the Philippines - Executive Summary", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 12 March 1985

Vaky, V.P., "Memorandum from Viron P. Vaky of the National Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973*, Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 23 June 1970

Vaky, V.P., "Chile - 40 Committee Meeting, Monday - September, 14", *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1973* Volume xxi, Chile, 1969-1973, 14 September 1970

Vance, C., "Status Report - Korea", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 29 November 1979

Vance, C., "Korea Focus - Nudging ROK Political Leaders", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 4 December 1979

Vance, C., "Korea Focus - ROK Ambassador Kim tries to exert influence", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 15 December 1979

Vance, C., "Weekly Status Report - Korea", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 19 December 1979

Vance, C., "Korea Focus: Amb Kim", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 19 December 1979

Vance, C., "Korea Focus: Relations with ROK Military", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 20 December 1979

Vanzi, M., "Opposition leader Benigno Aquino, defying President Ferdinand Marcos by...", *United Press International*, 21 August 1983

Wagenen, J.S.V., "A Review of Congressional Oversight: Critics and Defenders", *Central Intelligence Agency Library* (2008) <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/97unclass/wagenen.html>, (accessed 3 March 2017)

Warrick, J. and P. Bacon Jr., "Obama urges Egypt to heed protests, pursue reforms", *Washington Post*, 29 January 2011

Weinraub, B., "US says staying on is 'futile' and offers to 'be of assistance'", *The New York Times*, 25 February 1986

Whitehead, J., "Charge's meeting with President Marcos", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 5 November 1985

Whitehead, J., "February 13 EAP Press Summary", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 14 February 1986

Whitehead, J., "Fascell urges President to suspend Philippines aid immediately", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act*, 15 February 1986

Whitehead, L., "Losing 'the Force'? The 'Dark Side' of democratisation after Iraq", *Democratization* 16, no.2 (2009), pp.215-242

Wickham, J.A., *Korea on the Brink: From the "12/12 Incident" to the Kwangju Uprising, 1979-1980* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1999)

Wilson, G.C., "Soviet Troop Unit in Cuba is called 'No Threat' to U.S.", *The*

Washington Post, 1 September 1979

Wilson, W., *Address at the Luncheon Tendered to the President by the Mayor's Committee in New York City*, 17 May 1915, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=117709>, (accessed 12 August 2017)

Wolff, J., "What Role for Democracy Promotion? US Reactions to Contemporary Political Developments in South America", prepared for the *47th Annual ISA Convention: The North-South Divide and International Studies*, San Diego, California, 22-25 March 2006

Wolfowitz, P., "Philippine Financial Situation", *US Department of State Freedom of Information Act Archives*, 10 January 1984

Young, J.V., *Eye on Korea: An Insider Account of Korean-American Relations* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2003)

Zakaria, F., "The Rise of Illiberal Democracy", *Foreign Affairs* 76, no.6 (November - December, 1997), pp.22-43

Zunes, S., "Obama's Shift on Egypt", *Huffington Post*, 31 January 2011