



Human Rights in US Foreign Policy

Jila Ahmadi¹, Afshin Zargar^{2*}

^{1,2} Department of International Relations, Faculty of Law & Political Science, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

Received: 13 June 2019 ; Accepted: 22 Nov 2019

Abstract:

In US foreign policy, Human rights are always a combination of humanitarian concerns and strategic interests. In other words, the United States is pursuing a combination of normative goals (promotion of human rights) and material strategic goals (preserving national security, strengthening economic relations). US has initially tried to include issues such as morality, protection of individual rights, and democracy promotion in its foreign policy calculations. These efforts became more prominent after World War II, and in the post-Cold War, foreign aid and humanitarian concerns emerged as an important tool in preventing terrorist attacks in US foreign policy. September 11 attacks changed the policy of the George W. Bush's Administration and the American Congress towards the US position in the world and respecting, promoting, and protecting human rights in the foreign policy. The paper seeks to address the following questions: what role do human rights generally have in US foreign policy and what changes have been witnessed during George W. Bush's presidency? The paper summarizes the history and status of human rights in US foreign policy, reviews the status of human rights in US foreign policy in the George W. Bush's administration and pursuing those policies towards the Middle East region, and finally examines the main actors and the challenges facing implementation of human rights in US foreign policy.

Keywords: Human rights, Foreign policy, United States of America, George W. Bush

Introduction

Regarding the status of human rights in foreign policy, there is a view that human rights concerns should not be easily followed by ordinary citizens or non-governmental organizations such as the United Nations Associa-

tion¹ and Amnesty International, rather they should be followed by governments' foreign policy. In other words, foreign policy should not only seek to meet the national interest, but also to eliminate injustices that occurs in

*Corresponding Author's Email: a.zargar@kia.ac.ir

1. UNA

many non-democratic countries and human rights violators.

This view points out that if the policy of governments reflects the profound human rights concerns of citizens, this will equip governments with necessary tools, allow them to be somehow involved in such an issue. Furthermore, it will not only make these issues the most important ones in foreign policy, but will also make governments to adopt such policies in relation to other governments, especially with countries concerned with human rights violations. Eventually, these policies may lead to a reduction or termination of human rights violations in other countries. Over the past few decades, a number of Western governments, e.g., the United States, have made active efforts to implement such policies (Luard, 1980, pp. 579-580). Human rights have always played a strong role in the history of US foreign policy, as it was founded on the basis of the constitution and bill of rights that respects freedom and individual liberties.

In general, the human rights situation in US foreign policy was not one of the fundamental goals until it became a major power (the end of World War II). Nevertheless, in the late 1970s, human rights became an important part of the U.S. foreign policy, and American politicians pursued them in their policies and speeches. In his inaugural ceremony, President John F. Kennedy spoke about human rights. Jimmy Carter declared human rights as “the central concern” in the U.S. foreign policy. Additionally, all the U.S. presidents utilized human rights issues selectively and in line with the national interest of the United States, regardless of whether the countries facing them are democratic or non-democratic, enemies or allies (friends or foes). As a means of pursuing their goals in their foreign policy, American politicians

have used foreign aid to resolve security problems and humanitarian issues. They have used foreign aid in an effort to counter communism, support its allies economically and militarily, promote and increase economic development, protect strategic and economic interests, strengthen democratic governments, promote human rights, and ultimately fight terrorism.

According to the long U.S. history of pursuing human rights objectives in foreign policy, the paper tries to point to a theoretical framework to address the paradox in the strategic (materialistic) and human rights (Normative) goals of the U.S. foreign policy. Then, it will review the history and status of human rights and the pursuit of human rights in US foreign policy during the George W. Bush’s presidency in general and the Middle East region in particular. Finally, it will address the main actors and the challenges of implementing human rights in US foreign policy.

Theoretical Framework

Regarding the tension between different international policies, the United States has adopted a combination of normative goals (promotion of human rights) and the strategic objectives (preserving national security, strengthening economic relations) (Rosenblum and Salehyan, 2004). The distinction between the two goals can basically be viewed as the difference between the views of realism and liberalism in US foreign policy. The development of human rights is often not accompanied by increasing the material welfare of a country, maintaining national security, and strengthening economic ties.

However, it can be said that the promotion of human rights can provide long - term benefits for liberal-democracies like the United States (Schultz, 2002). In foreign policy,

promoting human rights is often regarded as the promotion of ethical issues, though, national interest seeks to achieve strategic and material goals (Baehr, 2009). The link between the two has always created many issues and challenged its implementation. Considering that the basis of foreign policy of countries is based on national interest (materialistic), the pursuit of two conflicting objectives in foreign policy of countries, especially great powers (e.g., the US), is associated with many problems.

Foreign policy realists believe that morality should be in favor of and in line with promoting national interest in a country's foreign policy; moreover, morality and national interest should be connected as well (Waltz, 1979). This view is best seen in Henry Kissinger's work (1994), who arguing that the US foreign policy must promote stability and the logic of power balance makes countries seek materialistic interests and prefer them to morality. On the other hand, liberalism (liberal perspective) considers the promotion of human rights norms as an important part of foreign policy that would ensure national security and promote economic prosperity at the domestic level. Looking at the US foreign policy, it is clear that the country has two types of foreign policy in pursuing human rights policies.

In the first form, a stable position in which the US (and all other countries) should pursue unconditional support to promote human rights outside their borders and should behave under international human rights standards. This global view was best seen in the early years of Jimmy Carter's presidency, during which human rights were the cornerstone of the US foreign policy (Forsythe, 2011) & (Vinha, 2014).

Another view is the "exceptionalism" of the United States, which sees US as a particu-

lar one engaged in an experiment in personal liberty. This belief comes from a time when the United States regarded itself as an "exceptional" country following its extension of the norms of personal liberty abroad. Furthermore, the exceptional view brings about another opposition view within the U.S. based on which the United States has to completely focus on cultivating personal liberties only at home. This view creates tension between the adopted policies of the country overseas and brings along internal opposition.

Finally, these tensions in global US foreign policy orientation lead to a conflict in advancing human rights objectives by the United States. Therefore, the United States is trying to pursue human rights objectives as well as strategic goals. Notwithstanding, considering the conflict between the two, human rights objectives have been diminished or abandoned in favor of material goals in certain periods of time. (Braaten, 2012, pp. 33-36)

History of human rights in United States foreign policy

The historical base of the current concern for human rights in the United States dates back to the late 18th century. In the United States, two fundamental principles rooted in the national experience of this country are mentioned repeatedly: 1. the right of self-government, 2. the right to freedom of religion. (Brodt, 1976, pp. 233-240) & (Apodaca, 2005, p. 1).

The idea is reflected in the US Constitution and primary documents, including the Declaration of Independence. The United States Constitution refers to the freedom of religion, speech, the press and communication as well as the right to life, freedom, and protection of property. Therefore, it is possi-

ble to say that dealing with human rights issues in the United States has historical roots. (Mahon, 2009).

During the Cold War, the U.S. attention to human rights was selective and occasional. The United States strongly criticized the violation of human rights in communist governments ruling in Eastern Europe, North Korea, Cuba, and Tibet. Although, it remained silent in the case of genocide and other violations of human rights during the same period in Algeria (1958), South Africa (1960), Indonesia (1971), East Pakistan (1971), Burundi (1971), and Sudan (1971). Following a detente policy at the end of the Cold War, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, i.e., Kissinger even prohibited any discussion of human rights issues in communist countries.

The Congress, however, announced that the US State Department would not be willing to pursue human rights objectives in foreign policy. Nonetheless, Congress was seeking an opportunity to create a big role for human rights in US foreign policy, followed by a committee to pursue these issues.

In 1973, the U.S. was concerned about “the widespread violation of human rights and the need for a more effective response from the United States and the international community”, that the committee called on representatives of international organizations to start a series of meetings. The meetings under the auspices of “Donald Fraser” and policies adopted by the Committee, began a new era in US foreign policy on the issue of human rights.

At the end of the first round of hearings, the subcommittee issued a brief report of 54 pages entitled “Human Rights and the World Society, an invitation for US leadership”. The preliminary result of the subcommittee was that the human rights factor does not have a

high priority in the U.S. foreign policy, which the United States deserves. The committee's report offered suggestions for the US actions, followed by the Congress and the State Department, which significantly changed the direction of the US foreign policy on human rights.

Moreover, the United States has played a key role in developing international human rights instruments. Roosevelt, thereprehen- sive of the United States, was one of the most important contributors to the Administrative Court of Justice. In addition, the United States has played an important role in drafting human rights treaties, such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).

President Roosevelt's speech in 1941 indicated that people around the world should enjoy freedom of speech and expression, freedom from want, freedom of religion, and freedom from fear. Jimmy Carter called on the United States to respect human rights and serve as a model and leader for other countries. Furthermore, George W. Bush talked about the relationship between democracy and human rights in the United States.

He pointed out that “with the approval of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the government can underscore the strengthening of democratic values through international law” and is better to “influence the development of the principles of human rights in the international community”. (Bringing Human Rights Home, 2012, pp. 2-3) & (Derian, 1979, pp. 265-271)

While the United States describes itself as a human rights leader and urges other countries to take human rights measures, it tends to be less inclined towards other countries to accept international human rights treaties.

(Bradley, 2010) With a failure to implement international human rights standards and establishing a specific situation for itself, as well as providing foreign aid even to non-democratic countries, military intervention, imposing sanctions, and even multilateral negotiations, the United States has had an adverse performance. (Moravcsik, 2012, p. 14) & (Braaten, 2012, pp. 61-63) & (Luard, 1980, pp. 591-593) & (Johnson and Symonides, 1998)

The Place of Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy

Human rights in US foreign policy have a "paradoxical" (Apodaca, 2005), Bait and switch policy (Mertus, 2004) and "permanent but temporary" (Forsythe, 2002). According to these concepts, human rights in US foreign policy have a conflicting content. On the one hand, the United States has worked on expanding human rights overseas as an exceptional country and has developed this practice among democratic governments to determine human rights as an important part of its foreign policy.

The pursuit of this policy began in the mid-1970s with a decisive action by the Congress, putting many laws on human rights as a factor of some external decisions, including foreign aid allocation (Blanton and Cingranelli, 2010). Among them, we can refer to the distribution of bilateral and multilateral economic aid (Cingranelli and Pasquarello, 1995), (Poe and Meernik, 1985), Military aid distribution (selling weapons) (Blanton, 2005), economic sanctions (Drury and Li, 2006), trade agreements (Burton, 2009), and refugee policies (Rosenblum and Salehyan, 2004) among other regions. "Until now, the U.S. is the only big power capable of building, maintaining, and managing an international system committed to international law,

democracy, and human rights," claimed Harold Cohen.

On the other hand, the United States considers a double standard on human rights, not only for itself but for the rest of the world, and the United States prefers its allies with any kind of human rights laws (including even in conflict with human rights) to its enemies. In other words, the United States often seeks to present international standards in human rights, but in practice it often does not conform to these standards. This way, the country's human rights policies have been called to question; besides, it has been criticized by other countries, especially those accused by the US of violating human rights. (Loescher and Scanlan, 1984) & (Vita, 1982) & (Baehr, 2009)

(Dietrich, 2012, p. 269)

Human Rights in George W. Bush's Foreign Policy

The Events of September 11 changed the George W. Bush's view about the world and the place of the United States in the world. Bush had suddenly taken both the motive and the opportunity to change and improve the U.S. position. Foreign policy was not only a priority, but as a mission to his government. In his speech, Bush stated clearly that "the United States will confront its potential enemies before taking action against them.

"The terrorists will turn to justice, and autocratic regimes will be overthrown and governments and groups that may cause threat and harm to the United States will no longer have access to the weapons of mass destruction." The Bush's foreign-policy revolution had very profound implications on security and international affairs. In his view, "If the United States can act on this view, it can make a better world." But from the perspective of other countries, it is possible that the

United States will be recognized as an arrogant and rebellious country rather than a regulated one. Friends and allies of the United States can either follow or disagree with the United States, or even some countries may counter the country's adopted methods. This will result in the weakening of the U.S. power as a global power in providing national interest." (Daalder and Lindsay, 2003, p. 2)

Thus, George W. Bush formally proposed the "Bush's Doctrine" following the 9/11 attacks. The events of September 11 were a milestone during his presidency. Bush had to focus on international concerns rather than internal issues. Afterwards, he shifted from being an internal president who was involved in education and social security at the beginning of his presidency to a warlike president with a big strategy. Bush's great strategy changed all aspects of his foreign policy and his vision of the United States and what he had to do.

The two principles of preemptive war and preventive war are the main objectives and criteria of the Bush doctrine. The first priority of the U.S. considered the political world together and regarded America as a "rightful" and "responsible" hegemonic power to serve the world. The second tenet is the preemptive war to strike enemies who are trying to strike the United States. (Birkenthal, 2013, p. 46)

The Bush's administration clearly retained its commitment to human rights and declared it a priority, unilateral and multilateral instructions and measures were announced and implemented.

In line with the new human rights policies, Bush sent U.S. Military forces to expel the Taliban from Afghanistan and Saddam Hussein from Iraq. There have been a variety of comments about how much he managed to implement these goals. On December 9, President George W. Bush issued a declaration in

which "December 10, 2002 was declared as Human Rights Day, December 15, 2002 as "Bill of Rights Day", and "December 2002 as the Human Rights Week." "Since the establishment of our country, the constitution is adopted to guide people and government and to respect human rights and freedoms," he said, arguing that the war against terrorism is "a commitment to a future full of hope and an increase in understanding for all people." This declaration and other documents may have different implications.

On the one hand, they can create a clear link between American values and human rights in order to protect the multilateral goals of human rights. On the other hand, the American values can be replaced by different and multilateral norms. In his speeches, Bush said there is a mutual connection between the democracy in the U.S. and human rights. He pointed out that with the approval of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the United States confirms its commitment to strengthening democratic values through international law, "and it is better that the US should influence the development of appropriate human rights bases in the international community."

In the context of the US foreign policy after 9/11 attacks, he decided to take a different approach to the field of human rights diplomacy, which served political purposes, particularly the war on terror. To do this, bilateral and multilateral alliances should have been formed, which should have often been made up with powers with fewer human rights cases. In this period, human rights objectives retreated from the economic and military targets, but tactics and rhetoric were more similar to those of September 11, as isolation and unilateralism. Bush's new plan was similar to Clinton's "internal and external" interaction, i.e. there existed external criticism, the

threats and imposition of economic sanctions, and support for internal reforms.

However, the formula changed over time. Since the war on terror became a priority of the US foreign policy concerns, human rights policies are often seen behind these objectives. It seems that wherever and whenever they would begin to crack down on political freedoms, the Bush's Administration and the Congress immediately would have linked it to terrorist threats resulting from countries that violate human rights.

During this period, the military objectives in the war on terrorism weakened the objectives of human rights in several cases. The primary attempts to achieve human rights objectives through multilateral mechanisms did not succeed. The United States withdrew from the UN Human Rights Commission in 2001. This isolationism was against the United States' human rights objectives at the World Conference Against Racism (WCAR) in Durban.

Moreover, the organization withdrew from the General Assembly and the Security Council on human rights issues. After a while, the U.S. retook its seats in the Human Rights Commission. The United States was also vehemently opposed to the Libyan issue on 20 January 2003, calling for a vote to be held by the Libyan representative to head the commission. According to the Libyan Human Rights case, this happened for the first time since 1947, when the American president made such a decision and put it to the vote. (Roberts, 2003, pp. 659-661)

Julie Marseilles stated in her notes that, George W. Bush's Administration generally refused to use human rights terminology, ignored the institutions and obligations related to human rights treaties, lessened the promotion of values that had shaped the existence of the United States. The second stage tho-

roughly described human rights norms and used concepts like "dignity", which is very narrow and serves the American purposes. In the third stage, the claim and the use of the term "exceptional" caused him not to meet the same human rights standards that others expect. Additionally, He points out that after 9/11 attacks, the concerns about the U.S. strategic interests were greater than the concerns about human rights and democratization.

That is why the United States allied itself with non-democratic alliances such as Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Russia, and Uzbekistan to fight terrorism. It is possible to say that the United States recognizes the human rights which are linked to strengthening economic and social rights and in accordance with the values of the United States, which reflects its contradictory and dualistic human rights approach. (Indurthy, 2006)

Comparison of George W. Bush and Clintons' Human Rights Policies

To better understand human rights in the foreign policy of George W. Bush's administration, his policies can be compared to the Democratic president before him (i.e., Clinton). For example, in the adoption of its human rights policies, Clinton administration paid attention to the ethnic and religious minorities who needed support, as opposed to Bush's administration that saw the terrorist threats as the cause of its human rights activities. Where the Clinton administration sees regional co-operation as a means of establishing stability, the Bush's Administration enjoys stability through concentrating power.

While Clinton could have been involved in Kosovo, he replaced the involvement with the goal of keeping the country away from a major human rights disaster and did not take any action, while humanitarian concerns appear to be no solid reason for Bush's long -

term invasion of Iraq. Where the Clinton administration supported people against invasion of foreign aggression and urged support policies or responsive policies, the Bush Foreign Ministry combined all priorities of foreign policy including trade, security, oil and human rights. (Derian, 1979) & (Peck, 2011) & (Forsythe, 2011, pp. 450-454)

Human Rights in the Foreign Policy of George W. Bush (Middle East)

George W. Bush, at the beginning of the presidency, was opposed to the "nation-building" process and the promotion of democracy in other countries, especially the Middle East, but after the September 11 events and the U.S. war with Afghanistan and Iraq, he changed his position to promote democracy and "nation-building", particularly in the Middle East region, and linked these issues to the national interest of the United States. For example, on June 2003 in an address at the gathering of the twentieth anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy, President George W. Bush noticed that the United States would pursue a new policy, a forward strategy of freedom in the Middle East.

The strategy, he pointed out, "requires the same strength and energy as we have already had and will have similar results in Europe, Asia, and any region of the world, and the spread of freedom will lead to peace," He has called for democratic reforms in Saudi Arabia and Egypt, which are allies of the United States. Bush's administration pledged to protect Israeli security, especially the Arab - Israeli conflict.

When Sharon took over the prime minister and President George W. Bush, the violation of human rights was continued by Israel in the occupied territories, even further because of the tight security measures to deal

with the suicide bombing in Palestine. In this period, the United States rarely criticized the violation of human rights to Israel. Therefore, the administration of George W. Bush followed a more aggressive stance towards Israeli policies during his presidency. (Rathnam Indurthy, 2006)

The United States also called on "the axis of evil" in its annual report on human rights status that it alleges that North Korea, Iran and Iraq violate human rights, calling them "the axis of evil", accusing them of not freedom of expression, gathering as well as allowing or committing violence against religious, ethnic and other minority groups. Bush expressed the cause of this nomenclature by the countries' support of terrorism and their efforts to achieve the weapons of mass destruction. In the United States, countries that undermine people's human dignity "deserve blame" and damage the American interests. It was stated that the country's human rights policies were accompanied by sharp criticisms of the advocates of human rights even in the USA. Stephen Boyle is a very serious critic of George W. Bush's policies.

He criticized the Bush World War against terrorism and considers Bush's war on terrorism as the rule of the Jungle. He considers Bush's policies against international law, human rights, civil rights, civil liberties, and the United States Constitution. He also questioned Bush's actions including Guantanamo detention, kangaroo courts, torture scandal, and attacks on Iraq, spying on the American people, and threatening war against Iran. He sees the attack on Afghanistan as a proof of American armed aggression and considers humanitarian intervention a pretext for rape and theft of natural resources of these countries. (Boyle, 2009)

Major Actors of Human Rights in US Foreign Policy

The main actors of human rights in US foreign policy are the President, the Vice President and the State Department. U.S. President and government members in the White House are monitoring the US foreign affairs. Every administration is able to leave a certain footprint with regard to external action in general and human rights more specifically, in addition, the vice - president will contribute to the policy and serves as a diplomatic representative of the president and the United States overseas. In this regard, the vice president can help advance the policies of human rights and democracy until the matter is on the agenda.

The pursuit of human rights in foreign relations is part of the mission of the U.S. State Department, at the State Department, the foreign minister can play an important role, if he is loyal to the president and has a strong influence on the president or personally, his influence can be far greater. Other institutions, including Democracy, Human Rights and Labor” (DRL) oversees the US human rights country reports and Human Rights & Democracy Fund (HRDF ”, are very influential in the adoption and pursuit of these decisions. (Jan, 2004, pp. 21-26) The two legislative bodies (the Senate and the House of Representatives), which make up the United States Congress, play an important role in the US foreign relations according to the constitution.

The ability of Congress through budgetary allocations and its ability to pass laws based on human rights can provide greater ability to implement human rights in US foreign policy. Congress's action on human rights has a long history and pressure from Congress can even lead to a modification of foreign policy in the field of human rights. Congress can

typically provide research and search groups such as the “Human Rights Vetting” to provide security assistance to allied governments.

Congress can also activate parliamentary diplomacy fully and provide the necessary information of human rights abuses in third countries. In addition, in order to raise information from other countries human rights policies, special representatives can be represented by the president or Congress as representatives of the United States in order to pursue “specific concerns”, including concerns for specific areas and political issues, including human rights. (Henkin, 1995, pp. 341-342)

Means of Promotion of Human Rights in US foreign policy

According to the U.S. human rights policies, the country has always used a variety of tools to implement human rights objectives.

1. Diplomatic instruments

Diplomatic instruments from the US would make governments accountable to their obligations based on international human rights and human rights standards, to help improve the rule of law, accountability of countries and change the culture of punishment law, to help reform and strengthen the institutional capacity of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and Human Rights Commission, and “ cooperation in the direction of human rights activities with important allies, including the European Union and regional organizations.”

According to the bilateral relations of the United States, the United States is very important to its important partners, such as the European Union and the great powers like China. Through this and maintaining the superiority of its position, the United States can

increase pressures from third - party countries. Diplomatic assurances along with other foreign policy instruments, such as the establishment of pro - or opposition alliances, threaten the use of sanctions or a reduction of foreign aid for practical implementation of U.S. Goals (Jan, 2004, p. 33)

2. Sanctions

The United States uses smart and comprehensive sanctions on human rights abuses and operates under the decree of the Treasury Department and presidential and presidential policies. The goal of sanctions is the people "s business. The Office for Foreign Assets Control¹ publishes a list of individuals, countries and businesses that have been targeted. In the case of the American war against terrorism, imposed since President George W. Bush's presidency, sanctions have become an important tool to counter suspected terrorists, not just as a threat to democratic efforts, but to promote human rights.

For example, after the death of the Russian lawyer Magnitsky, the U.S. Congress passed the law on the black list of several Russian nationals involved in the killing. Shortly after that, Russia adopted the ban on child supervision by American parents. The law, referred to as they "Dima Yakovlevlaw", followed the death of a two – years old Russian boy who was adopted by the American adoptive father. Later, Russia responded by publishing its black list of US officials. It is still difficult to judge the efficacy of U.S. Sanctions, but especially Russia, as the Washington Post stated: "The reactions of Russian lawmakers indicate that they are hurt by the sanctions" (Janp, 2004, p. 34)

3. US. Military interventions

The United States is one of the world's largest military powers. It can use its military

power in different ways, unilaterally, bilateral and multilateral. The United States is often accused of using military power to achieve political and economic goals and will seek military action under the name of "human security" in cases where human rights are at risk. After the Cold War and before September 11, the United States carried out its military intervention as "small-scale missions to large exercises." Some of the military operations, such as Operation Return of Hope (1992 - 1994), carried out NATO's mission in Bosnia (1993 - 2001) or NATO campaign in Kosovo in 1999 as a contribution to the international human rights reconstruction.

There was a significant increase in military expenditure after September 11, 2001. The U.S. policies on intervention focused on fighting terrorism once again. Following the doctrine of George W. Bush, terrorist operations are no longer considered as a "crime", but as a "war act" that could be responded by precautionary blows. The war in Afghanistan and Iraq was examples of a new American military policy in the course of George W. Bush. (Janp, 2004, p. 34) & (Valenzuela, 2004)

Challenges for the Implementation of Human Rights in US Foreign Policy

To implement its human rights objectives, the United States has always faced many internal and external obstacles, the most important challenge for policy makers, that each passing policy varies with regard to time, opportunities, and threats to adopt different policies, have effects on accelerating or slowing down or even stopping human rights policies. This is characterized by a variety of statements made by U.S. presidents and their different executive procedures.

The second challenge was posed by the introduction of human rights issues, especial

1. OFAC

ly in US foreign policy, communist countries that had a negative reaction to the Imperialism, or the Majority World countries, which had often nightmares against colonialism, to deal with the Western concept. The vision of these countries created a negative attitude and saw human rights policy as a "moral neo-imperialism". This led to human rights defenders long in defense of the human rights issue to remove the accusations from the entirely Western concept.

The third challenge is how the United States can apply concepts such as human rights and democracy and that the American relations with the target countries may undermine its foreign policy. Reagan, for example, supported the Pinochet regime in Chile and the Marcos's regime in the Philippines because they believed that they united the United States against communism, but they did not seem to be consistent with the American interests, and even if they were anti-communist they could not keep up with American politics. This led to Reagan's ultimate power transfer of both leaders to a democratic state in these countries, and then entered into friendly relations with the United States.

The Bush's Administration also faced a similar dilemma in Pakistan and the government of Musharraf. Cooperation and solidarity with undemocratic and even violating human rights, including Saudi Arabia and Israel, are also another. (Stohl and Others, 1980)

The fourth challenge; another challenge for implementing human rights policies is the existence of competition among priorities of foreign policy goals, namely political, military and economic interests that contradict human rights efforts. For example, in the case of South Africa under the apartheid regime, economic and commercial interests were of-

ten paramount to fighting the white minority white minority policies. Today, huge industrial - industrial complexes in the United States act as leverage to prioritize such objectives. Many critics consider the fundamental reason for George W. Bush's attack on Afghanistan and Iraq as economic - political and non-human.

(Cohen, 2008, pp. 6-7) & (Brodt, 1985, pp.283-287)

The fifth challenge is that within the U.S., human rights policy makers remain poor performers in the policy process. In the United States, the decision-makers of human rights issues are considered to be feebler than decision-makers of the economic, military and other actors.

In the past, they believed that an effective and unified human rights policy arises when some of the underlying variables are replaced. Although the existence of key constraints in the post-Cold War era and September 11 indicates that in fact restrictions are never short-term, limited to specific time and issues, but they are deeply rooted in global and domestic reality and change with different administrations. (Dietrich, 2012, pp. 291-294) & (Farer, 1991)

Conclusion

Human rights in US foreign policy has been a case of "two steps forward, one step back.", or in general, has a dual, contradictory situation. American presidents from Reagan to George W. Bush have elected human rights issues selectively and in terms of the national interest of the United States, regardless of whether they are democratic or non-democratic or whether they are allies of the United States and their friends or foes. The United States has struggled to promote human rights by linking the American values and human rights as well as the link between

human rights, democracy on one side in order to promote human rights, and on the other side undermining its political and economic priorities and considering the status of “Exceptional” for the United States and the Confederacy with human rights violations.

In general, the United States has attempted, at least to some degree, to include morality, the protection of individual rights, and the spread of democracy in foreign policy calculations. These efforts became more prominent after World War II, and in the late 1980s, human rights concerns were heavily influenced by U.S. foreign policy, policy institutions and global action. In spite of this long - term trend, the full implementation of the U.S. policy of human rights policy over time with U.S. power shortages or constraints on all points, the US threat to political, economic priorities, the pursuit of human rights policies in the countries of undemocratic, changing policies in every presidential period and restricting the power of human rights policy institutions, has created many obstacles to implement human rights policies by the United States.

With the international developments some of these restrictions have been partially or eliminated. However, there are considerable limits on the previous limits, and the role of human rights in US foreign policy continues to be less noticeable with regard to developments happening. The fact is that no country can declare human rights the priority of its foreign policy, such as protecting national security, reinforcing economic ties and supporting development, goals that may be incompatible with the protection of human rights in certain situations, and it is a fact that not only the US but other countries face it.

References

- Andrew, Moravcsik (2012). Why Is U.S. Human Rights Policy So Unilateralist? **Policy in Practice**.
- Arturo, Valenzuela (2004). Democracy and Trade: US Foreign Policy Towards Latin America, **Real Instituto Elcano**.
- Baehr, Peter (2009). **Foreign Policy, Encyclopedia of Human Rights**, edited by David P. Forsythe. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bite, Vita (1982). Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy, **Foreign Affairs and National Affairs Division**.
- Blanton, Shannon L. (2005) Foreign Policy in Transition? U.S. Arms Transfers, Democracy and Human Rights. **International Studies Quarterly** 49(4)
- Blanton, Shannon L., and David L. Cingranelli (2010). "**Human Rights and Foreign Policy Analysis**." The International Studies Encyclopedia. Edited by Robert A. Denemark, Blackwell Publishing, Blackwell Reference, Online. <http://www.isacompendium.com/subscriber/tocnode?>
- Bringing Human Rights Home: **How State and Local Governments Can Use Human Rights to Advance Local Policy** (2012). Columbia Law School, Human Rights Institute under the auspices of The Human Rights at Home Campaign December
- Cingranelli, David, and Thomas E. Pasquarello. (1985). Human Rights, Human Rights Practices and the Distribution of U.S. Foreign Aid to Latin American Countries, **American Journal of Political Science**.
- Clair, Apodaca (2005). “U.S. Human Rights Policy and Foreign Assistance”, **Institute of International Relations**

- and Area Studies, Ritsumeikan University.
- Curtis, A. Bradley, (2010). **The United States and Human Rights Treaties: Race Relations, the Cold War, and Constitutionalism**, Oxford University
- Daniel, Braaten (2012). **Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy in the Multilateral Development Banks**, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
- David, Forsythe (2011). The United States and the Organization of American States, Human Rights Quarterly, Vol. 13, No. 1 **The Johns Hopkins University Press.**
- David, P. Forsythe (2002). Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy: Retrospect and Prospect Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 105, No. 3, **the Academy of Political Science.**
- David, W. Brodt (1976). **Human Rights Legislation and U.S. Foreign Policy**, university of Columbia.
- David, W. Brodt (1985). **United States Foreign Policy and Human Rights: An Overview**, University of Minnesota Law School.
- Drury, A. Cooper, and Yitan Li. (2006). U.S. Economic Sanction Threats against China: Failing to Leverage Better Human Rights, **Foreign Policy Analysis** 2(4)
- Evan, Luard (1980). Human Rights and Foreign Policy, International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), Vol. 56, No.4, Oxford **University Press on behalf of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.**
- Francis, A. Boyle (2009). Tackling America's Toughest Questions: Alternative Media Interviews, **Clarity press, Inc.**
- Gilburt, Loescher and John, Scanlan (1984). "Human Rights, U.S. Foreign Policy, and Haitian Refugees, Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs", **Cambridge University Press** Vol. 26, No. 3
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., and James Ron (2009). Seeing Double: Human Rights Impact Through Qualitative and Quantitative Eyes. **World Politics** 61(2)
- Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay (2003). **The Bush Revolution: The Remaking of America's Foreign Policy**, the Brookings Institution.
- James. Peck (2011). Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy Alex Kingsbury (https://www.usnews.com/topics/author/alex_kingsbury)
- Jan. Wouters and others (2004). Directorate - General for External Policies of the Union Directorate, **Policy Department Study a Comparative Study of EU and US Approaches to Human Rights in External Relations.**
- John, W. Dietrich (2012). U.S. Human Rights Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: Continued Structural Constraints across Time and Administrations, **Bryant University.**
- L. Kathleen Roberts (2003). The United States and the World: Changing Approaches to Human Rights Diplomacy under the Bush Administration, **Berkeley Journal of International Law.**
- Louis, Henkin (1995). U.S. Ratification of Human Rights Conventions: The Ghost of Senator Bricker, **the American Journal of International Law**, Vol. 89, No. 2, Cambridge University Press.
- Luis, da Vinha (2014). **Revisiting the Carter Administration's Human Rights Policy: Understanding Traditional Challenges for Contemporary For-**

- ign Policy**, University of Coimbra, Portugal.
- M. Glen Johnson and Janusz, Symonides (1998). *Of Human Rights: A History of its Creation and Implementation 1948 – 1998* Preface by Federico Mayor, Director -General of UNESCO, Published on The Occasion of the, Fiftieth **Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights**.
- Mertus, Julie. (2004) **Bait and Switch: Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy**. New York: Routledge.
- Michael Stohl, David Carleton & Steven. E Johnson (1980). Human rights and U.S. foreign Assistance from Nixon to Carter, **Journal of Peace Research**
- Patricia M. Derian (1979). Human Rights in American Foreign Policy, 55 *Notre Dame L. Rev.* 264
- Poe, Steven C. and James, Meernik (1995). US Military Aid in the 1980s: A Global Analysis. **Journal of Peace Research** 32
- Rathnam, Indurthy (2006). Human Rights in U.S. Policy toward Israel: Explanation 1987-PRESENT, **International Journal on World Peace**, Vol. 23, No. 3 Professors World Peace Academy
- Robert, McMahon (2009). **Human Rights Reporting and U.S. Foreign Policy**, Council on Foreign Relation.
- Roberta, Cohen (2008). **Integrating Human Rights in US Foreign Policy: The History, The Challenges, And The Criteria FORAN, the Brookings Institution** –University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement.
- Rosenblum, Marc R. and Idean, Salehyan (2004). "Norms and Interests in US Asylum Enforcement". **Journal of Peace Research** 41(6)
- Sara M, Birkenthal (2013). "Grand Strategy in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Carter, Bush, and Obama Doctrines" **Claremont McKenna College**.
- Schultz, William F. (2002). **In Our Own Best Interest**. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Tom J. Farer (1991). "Human Rights Investment in Hispanic South America: Retrospect and Prospect", **Human Rights Quarterly**, Vol. 13, No. 1
- Waltz, Kenneth (1979). **Theory of International Politics**. New York: Random House.