America:

A Liberal Imperial Power

Lana Perić

Lana Perić, 20, is an undergraduate student going into her fourth year at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. She is expecting to graduate in 2015 with an Honour's Bachelor of Arts degree majoring in Political Science, with a concentration in International Relations and a minor in European and Russian Studies. She spent her third year abroad studying at Università Luiss Guido Carli in Rome, Italy, taking classes through their Masters in International Relations program. Her interests include foreign, defense and security policy, international relations and affairs, EU foreign policy, and gender and development studies within international relations.

Abstract

The topic over whether or not the U.S. can be considered an imperial power has been largely debated over since the aggressive foreign policy tactics observed by former President George W. Bush. Since then, an anti-American attitude has had many accusing the U.S. of attempting to build an empire. The problem with many arguments is that they often inaccurately portray the idea of imperialism or the arguments are made with little understanding of the American institutions and how foreign policy is made. This research paper hopes to present the idea that there are various branches of imperialism to consider and that the United States have exhibited a liberal imperialist behaviour. To prove this thesis, this paper will show how the foreign policy system of the United States is altered to the external events in the world and that has assisted the United States in acting as a liberal imperial power.

Keywords: American Institutions; Foreign Policy; Imperialism; Liberalism; United States

Introduction

Historically speaking, the idea of imperialism was a clear-cut concept with little to debate on its meaning. In recent decades, there has been a shift that has split the notion of imperialism into various subtitles and definitions, which depend on the scholar in question. Despite the confusion it may cause to those outside the political academic community, it is with good reason to branch out from a single definition. With the change in times, impacts of globalization, along with the memories left from political history, "imperialism" no longer holds the same meaning it did before the creation of the Westphalian system. The debate on what can be considered a modern day imperial power has been sparked since the United States (hereafter referred to as the U.S.) dismantled the international bipolar system at the end of the Cold War, and entered into a new realm of international problems. What followed was a decade of "schizophrenic power" within the U.S.'s institutions, which led to misconceptions of what kind of actor the U.S. will play on the word stage (Fabbrini 2008:154).

The purpose of this paper will be to demonstrate that the U.S., as a hegemonic superpower, has used its foreign policy structure to exhibit imperialistic behaviour despite not being an "empire" in the classical sense. The U.S. can be considered a liberal imperial power in an asymmetric multipolar world, as it exerts military, cultural and economic influence onto other countries. I will be using several case studies throughout my research to demonstrate how U.S. foreign policy has been played out during various points in history, and to which extent that has affected their exhibition of liberal imperialistic behaviour. In order to make my case, first it will be necessary to provide the definitions of the concepts used to make this argument. As the focus for this research is the role of the U.S.'s foreign policy structure, I will follow up with a description of the relationship between the decision-making institution for foreign and domestic policies, and the debate between multilateral and unilateral foreign policy approaches. Afterwards, I will go on to present the counterargument to my thesis and I will then apply my research to show that it is in the internal structure of the U.S. to act as a liberal imperial power and that they do have the mentality that allows for it, and what that mentality entails. I will then present how external events after the Cold War affected American foreign policy and how in the end, multilateralism has played in their favour of acting as a liberal imperial power.

Defining Concepts: Branches of Imperialism

Imperialism derives from the concept of "empires" and it is often seen as the behaviour exhibited by empires in order to benefit from their gains. The definition given by the Merriam-Webster dictionary tells us that imperialism is "the policy, practice, or advocacy of extending the

power and dominion of a nation especially by direct territorial acquisitions or by gaining indirect control over the political or economic life of other areas; the extension or imposition of power, authority, or influence". It also defines imperialism as "the effect a powerful country or group of countries has in changing or influencing the way people live in other poorer countries". The former definition has an emphasis on territorial acquisition, which makes it more on par with both old imperialism and neo-imperialism. Today, due to the age of globalization and an increase in multilateral cooperation, it no longer makes sense to limit the idea of imperialism as something that necessitates force. Imperialism has become such an imbued concept that it feels as if the meaning as been lost from it all together, making it necessary to mention subcategories for a more accurate portrayal (Grondin 2006:8)

There are three branches of imperialism that I would like to clarify for this paper: old imperialism, new imperialism (which is sometimes referred to as "neo-imperialism"), and liberal imperialism. Old imperialism refers to the period of rapid expansion of European states in the early eighteenth century, where the focus was on indirect control of countries being dominated for the purpose of benefitting economically and spreading their religious influence (Scammell 2004:15). New imperialism took place during the mid to late nineteenth century, and the U.S. played more of a role during this era of colonization. Imperial powers were driven to expand because of the industrial revolution, and this brought upon more political control and the establishment of colonial governments (Scammell 2004:145). Political control is the main difference between old and new imperialism. Finally, liberal imperialism is the theoretical idea that a hegemonic power (the U.S. in this case) will continue to impose the ideas of democratization and the market economy onto other countries, albeit with less direct interference (Walberg 2011: 157). The concept of liberal imperialism is a result of the U.S.'s foreign conduct and their attempts to democratize states and spread the idea of the free market economy. Liberal states can exist without necessarily enforcing their ideologies upon other states. There are plenty of democratic free market countries that do not attempt to spread those liberal ideas forcibly. Countries that were part of the old and new imperialist traditions did not have ideological goals in mind - it was all about territorial control in order to spread their influence. The U.S.'s liberal imperialistic behaviour is all about ideology. The most comparable "empire" would have been the Soviet Union spreading their communist ideologies in the East.

Throughout my research I also discuss the concepts of "mentality" and "structure" and I would like to present clarifications on them. I will illustrate "mentality" as a collective mindset that dictates actions and discourse, and is affected by experiences, subjective opinion, and the values

that the state (in this case, the U.S.) would hold. When discussing "mentality", I will be referring to an imperial mentality. When discussing "structure" (especially "foreign policy structures"), I am referring to the institutional mechanisms that form the U.S.'s foreign policy.

From the definitions of the various forms of imperialism, we can already see how liberal imperialism is the only one that can accurately describe the present day American hegemony, as it does not entail direct political control over another territory. The liberal imperial approach is easily applicable to the American case because we can see (in both the historical and contemporary context) how the U.S. foreign policy approach has led to them imposing their ideas of liberalized trade and democracy onto other territories.

Background of the U.S.'s Foreign Policy Structure

It is impossible to be able to claim that the U.S. is any kind of imperial power without first looking at the foreign policy structure and the close relationship it has with domestic politics. There is the misconception that the U.S. has a presidential system like France, where the President holds all of the power and decisions in foreign and domestic policy. This has led to many anti-American theories from people who do not understand the system. The Constitution established a system of separation of powers based on checks and balances in order to prevent a tyranny rising up in the country. In regards to foreign policy, this means that the executive (presidential administration), legislative (Congress) and the judiciary (Supreme Court of the Unite States) each have a veto vote, and all have a role in deciding on foreign policy, not just the President. Although this system has good intentions to maintain a democratic system, shared powers end up creating a system where the Congress and President are often teamed up against each other when it comes to policy making.

Between the Civil War and the Second World War, the U.S. began to internationalize their foreign policy slightly, but still preferred isolationism. When they finally came to the centre of international affairs during WWII, it was decided that the President's role needed to be increased. The Congress delegated powers to the President for foreign policy, while still maintaining their own as advisors to the executive. The threats presented by Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin made it necessary to centralize powers for foreign policy, it would make no sense to send hundreds of members of Congress to negotiate on behalf of the state. Thanks to this new role, the president has utilized this radical change for promoting the institutional interests of the presidency. As the strength of the presidency increased, so did the growth of the U.S. as a global power (Fabbrini: May 6, 2014).

Since then, the President has acted as the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy and has the power to make war, but it is the Congress' power to declare war. This is where domestic politics come into play and can affect the decisions being made in foreign policy. Americans are more likely to vote based on domestic policies, therefore, if the party ideology of the Congress is opposite of the President's, it becomes difficult for the President to pass any decisions when the Congress continuously vetoes them. The President may be in charge and is the central figure in foreign policy, but even they can be constrained by the system of separation of powers. No other democratic system has such close connections between their domestic and foreign policy institutions, which is why it is often difficult for other countries to understand the structure for foreign policy in the U.S.

The struggle for power between the Congress and the Presidency has also brought up a continuous foreign policy issue regarding interventionism: whether the United States is using a multilateral or unilateral approach. The multilateral approach was developed after WWII when the U.S. established a highly institutionalized order to promote cooperation between the European states and to become allies with the states as the Soviet threat began. This approached was justified by the theory of multilateral cooperation with industrial democracies (Fabbrini 2008: 144). The unilateral approach, which was preferred by the neoconservatives (especially those who worked under Reagan), is based on the idea that "international stability can only happen as an outcome of an appropriate military strategy by the military strategy by the big powers, and by America first of all" (Fabbrini 2008: 154).

With a better understanding of the various imperialist approaches and the structure of foreign policy in the U.S., I can now continue to discuss why the U.S. can be considered a liberal imperial power in an asymmetric world.

America unable to become an imperial power?

Counter-Argument

Sergio Fabbrini makes a plausible counter-argument to my thesis in "America and its Critics", stating, "America has neither the necessary mentality nor the internal structures to become an imperial power" (Fabbrini 2008:169). By internal structure, Fabbrini refers to the U.S.'s domestic policies coinciding with their foreign policy and applying isolationism to their foreign policy (which will be discussed further below). He does not deny the foreign interventions that Americans have participated in, but he argues that isolationism has prioritized internal

development in the U.S. This then ties in with their mentality, which tends to be focused within themselves. The U.S. cannot be viewed as an imperial power because their concerns were domestic. They wanted to expand their sphere of economic influence only, and they had no desire for the territorial acquisition goals of the old and new imperialism (Fabbrini 2008:138).

This is understandable because in order to be an imperial power in the tradition sense, there needs to be a strong and visible central leader. The shared powers in the U.S. have made it difficult for the President to exercise their power in foreign policy if the Congress disagrees. In academic literature, it is often considered that unilateralism and exhibition of an imperialistic attitude was at its strongest during the George W. Bush presidency when he also had a large number of neoconservatives supporting him in Congress. This short-term imperial attitude has been argued to fail because it was incompatible with the multilateral institutions that organize the international system (Fabbrini 2008:168). It is important to keep in mind that two characteristics of liberal imperialism involve imposed trade liberalization in states, and imposed democratization. The next section will cover trade liberalizations and how that depicted the U.S. as a liberal imperial power. Further below during my discussion of post-Cold War events, I will discuss how the U.S.'s imposed democratization had also continued to brand them as a liberal imperial power.

Throughout the rest of my research, I would like to argue that, despite the difficulties made by the decision-making procedure, the U.S. has historically always intended on becoming a liberal imperial power, and that the institutions set up by them has actually assisted them with attaining this goal. Following that, I will also make my case as to why the mentality of the U.S. does prove them a liberal imperial power.

Internal Structure - Historical Perspective: Trade liberalization

Traditionally, you can say that the U.S. has been an "empire" so to speak, since Thomas Jefferson purchased the state of Louisiana in 1803. On more than one occasion in the nineteenth century, Jefferson has referred to the U.S. as an "empire of liberty". He has made references about adding the former British Province of Canada to their "empire of liberty" in 1780 and in 1809, right before the U.S. tried to take Canada by means of warfare in 1812 (Boot 2003). The U.S. interest in expansion also went south: American foreign policy, particularly isolationism, come into play here because their interest in Latin and South America stemmed from the establishment of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823. This essentially declared that the U.S. would not tolerate any more intervention from European colonizing powers (other than the Spanish colony

of Cuba at the time) and allowed them to have more control of the America's and keep themselves distanced from the European empires. Through this desire for the expansion and protection of the market interests, it shows that at the time the U.S.'s foreign policy approach adapted to what they wanted to accomplish through their imperialistic actions.

Despite the isolationist foreign policy that was practiced in the nineteenth century, when the U.S. began to internationalize slowly towards the end of the century, they participated in wars that would gain them new colonies during this period of new imperialism. Although the expansion of U.S. territory was not on par with the size and numbers of the British and French colonies, it still served an important purpose for the country. While the European colonizers were focused on expansion in terms of gaining political control of territory, for the U.S., imperialism was driven by economic necessity. This period of new imperialism actually allowed them to begin to act as a liberal imperial power as they were able to impose their market into new territories. After the Spanish American War and the Philippine-American War, the U.S. gained control of Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippine Islands, which allowed them to begin to extend their market into Latin America and Eastern Asia, respectively.

The U.S.'s market relations with East Asia are prevalent in both a historical and modern context. In 1898, the same year that the U.S. obtained the Philippine Islands as a colony, Indiana's Senator Albert Beveridge stated, "America's commerce must be with Asia. The Pacific is our ocean. Where shall we turn for consumers of our surplus? Geography answers our question. China is our natural customer." Gaining a colony in Eastern Asia was beneficial to the U.S. for them to be able to continue to spread their market, which shows that from the beginning, despite expanding their territory, it has always been about trade and continuously searching for a larger market. The argument that can be made against this is that the U.S. did not attempt to impose their ideas of a democratic system upon Eastern Asia - but they were spreading the idea of trade liberalization. Simply wanting to expand their market through new colonies acquired by war so soon after the Second Industrial Revolution is enough to demonstrate that the U.S. had ambitions for building a liberal empire based on their idea of a liberalized market economy. Brooks Adams (American Historian 1848-1927) supports this idea in his book The New Empire where he declares that the U.S. would soon outweigh any single empire, if not all Empires combined, and that "within twenty years, the U.S. will be the world's leading economic empire" (Adams 1902:209). With the U.S. trying to establish this "economic empire" in cheaper markets such as Latin America and Eastern Asia, they were tapping into the application of comparative advantages, which underlies the entire liberal theory of free trade (Shaffaeddin 1998:23).

In sum, the U.S. exhibited liberal imperial power when they gained these smaller colonies as it allowed for them to tap into larger areas. This then spurred industrial revolutions in these non-European sectors in which their industrialization and newfound trade liberalization would benefit the U.S. "economic empire". The American foreign policy of isolationism at this time actually assisted them in promoting trade liberalization theory, showing that even in the historical context, it is in the U.S.'s foreign policy structure to act as an imperial power.

Mentality - Modern Perspective

After analyzing the U.S.'s historical cases for imperialism, we can see a justification that there was obviously an imperialistic mentality behind the expansion for territory in order to promote their economy. While there may have been some altercations to that mentality, it still persists in the modern day context. The idea of spreading trade liberalization persisted, which would continue benefitting the U.S. economy, but imposing this theory was now based on a different approach attaining peace. Since WWII, the U.S.'s role in international affairs surged dramatically and they took on a new role that would spread their ideologies. First, it was the idea of developing a multilateral world. In recent decades, it has been about spreading democracy through various means.

The emergence of a bipolar world after the Second World War brought upon an institutionalized international system, which allowed the U.S. to practice two different types of foreign policy in this new international order: a highly militarized order (focused on the bilateral relations of the U.S. and Soviet Union) and a highly institutionalized order (focused on the western multilateral relations). The U.S.'s foreign policy approach of multilateralism was fitting for the circumstances followed WWII and the Berlin Split. Their strategy was to instill a highly institutionalized order in which the European states involved in the war could cooperate to prevent future conflicts (Fabbrini 2008:142). By instilling a multilateral approach and these behaviours upon the Western European countries, it would spread American ideas that liberalized market democracies do not get into conflicts with one another. Stabilizing this region was important for the U.S. as the Soviet threat was increasing, because it allowed the U.S. to build allies and bridge a geographically closer connection. This established a reciprocal recognition that was institutionalized into the multilateral system, and in which the U.S.'s European partners recognized its leadership and strategic interests (Fabbrini 2008:143). Argumentatively, during this time the U.S. was only displaying their hegemonic powers and not imperial power. With the negative connotation attached to the colonial past, it's no wonder that some academics and politicians steer clear of labeling the U.S. as an imperialist power. If we look back at what constitutes imperial behaviour, it involves imposing and embedding the imperial powers' values onto another country in any means necessary. There is no denying that the multilateral approach the U.S. took in order to impose their ideologies was a negative act - without the U.S. "assisting" Europe in this case, cooperation between the Allies and the Axis countries may have been impossible. In that sense, the U.S. had the mentality for become a liberal imperial power in particular, because they believed they had the right methods for fixing Europe's problems.

Some scholars attribute the U.S.'s imperial attitude to their unilateral foreign policy approaches that the neoconservatives advocated for - especially those who worked under former President Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush. The foreign policy that the neoconservatives fought for was definitely an aggressive imperialistic mentality. Under the Reagan presidency, he adopted a modern stance to a "Jacksonian" foreign policy. This meant that the U.S. would not "limit itself to containing the adversary" and that instead, they would actively seek to pursue a strategy of confrontation (Fabbrini 2008:148). The neoconservatives left over by the Reagan presidency tried to shred up the idea of multilateralism throughout the 1990s. This unilateralist attitude did not bode well in an international system that has already been set up to accommodate the multilateral institutions; neoconservatives believed that as "winners" of the Cold War, the U.S. needed to pursue their new international role as a global police force. The new threat that the U.S. would need to face were "rogue" states that would challenge the U.S.'s new superiority. These "rogue" states were also often non-democratic states that the U.S. believed needed to be democratized. This view that that the U.S. was a victor in history and were now the Chosen One to propagate democracy everywhere demonstrates their exhibition of neocolonialist attitude (more precisely, a liberal imperialist attitude) in which they wanted to impose a certain system onto countries thinking it's the only correct system.

Harvard's Professor Stephen Walt describes liberal imperialists as "kinder, gentler neoconservatives" and that in general, they both believe it is the U.S.'s "responsibility to right political and humanitarian wrongs around the world" (Walt 2013). From that statement we can gather that despite the position of the political spectrum, the mentality is same and it's the preference of strategy that differs (this is where the multilateral vs. unilateral foreign policy applies). Therefore, although the constitution may make decision-making difficult because of the shared powers, we can see through historical cases that the internal structure still allowed the U.S. to behave as a liberal imperial power in order build their "economic empire". Furthermore,

it was shown that the mentalities of those who support either multilateralism or unilateralism are conjoined by similar goal of expanding the American liberal ideologies.

Post-Cold War Events: Balkan Crisis, Foreign Policy after 9/11

Major external events that occurred both internationally and domestically shaped the foreign policy of the U.S. in the post-Cold War world. As we have seen from the historical cases, the U.S. decision-making process remains constitutionally consistent - it is the international affairs combined with the political majorities in government and Congress that dictate what is the U.S.'s foreign policy. Whether they have been unilateral or multilateral approaches, the foreign policy presented during the 1990s and early 2000s have displayed the U.S.'s liberal imperial power. The following events also went on to show that the U.S. had a "mission", so to speak, to "spread democracy". Imposing democracies on other states is another prime characteristic of liberal imperialism, as mentioned earlier in my research.

The Balkan Crisis of the 1990s

The Clinton administration in the 1990s faced many policy-making problems as the Congress had a neoconservative majority. This domestic struggle between the majorities made it extremely difficult for cooperation, because Clinton wanted to apply multilateral approaches to foreign policy, but the Congress would shoot it down in favour of unilateral approaches. While Clinton was willing to reduce the U.S. role as a "global policeman" and entrust the institutions of international cooperation, Congress wanted to maintain a big role on the international stage without cooperating with these institutions (Fabbrini 2008:156). Congress was willing to display the U.S.'s hyperpower to handle any international crisis because they believed that the role of multilateral institutions would only get in the way of the U.S. getting things done.

There were three major decisions that the Congress agreed on with Clinton - the establishment of NAFTA, the Dayton Peace Accords of 1995 after the Balkan Civil Wars, and the NATO airstrikes in Serbia in 1999. Despite Clinton's desire to maintain a multilateral approach, which is evident through his negotiations for NAFTA and the Dayton Peace Accords, this no longer seemed to apply in 1999. The U.S.'s approval of airstrikes on Serbia did not receive UN approval and caused debates because it was against international law. Although Clinton was considered to an advocate for multilateral approaches despite the rift between Congress, the external events of 1999 proved that the U.S. would act unilaterally if they deemed it necessary. For this period of time, this disproves the argument made in "America and its Critics", which stated, "American unilateralism has proven to be incompatible with the structure of multilateral institutions". The

U.S. regarded these airstrikes as a humanitarian intervention, which can be considered an action that is displayed by a liberal imperial power (Davidson 2012: 130). Acting as a liberal imperial power, they believed it was their duty to intervene "to protect Kosovo" as they claimed. The paradox that is evident in humanitarian intervention is that liberal democracies (e.g. the U.S. in this case) are willing to wage war against human life in order to protect human lives. The act of a humanitarian intervention by the U.S. demonstrates their actions as liberal imperial power, as they uphold the idea that societies that do not conform to Western liberalized standards are a threat to society as a whole (Davidson 2012:141). This does not only apply to the Serbian intervention but also sets a theme for the U.S. throughout the new century as they begin to increase their missions to spreading peace and democracy.

Notwithstanding Clinton's unilateral actions in 1999, throughout his presidency, he sought multilateral strategies that would increase and spread democracies, based on theory that the "international promotion of democracy through institutions" would prevent democracies from waging wars and conflicts with one another (Fabbrini 2008:157). This is another neocolonial thought presented by a liberal imperial power that assumes that countries need to become market democracies in order to function. The idea eventually paves a path for the Bush administration, albeit, his approach was aggressively unilateral for a majority of his presidency.

Foreign Policy After 9/11

Under George W. Bush and the neoconservatives in Congress, the foreign policy approach of the U.S. became explicitly aggressive and unilateral, which established the idea internationally that the U.S. wanted to become an empire. The internal structure of the U.S. allowed for decisions in domestic and foreign policy to be made with ease. After the 9/11 attacks, the neoconservatives saw unilateralism as the "only feasible solution" to the new global threat. It allowed for the U.S. to continue acting as a liberal imperial power, claiming their intentions were to protect American security and the only way to do that was to instill democratic values into "rogue" states.

Reintroducing fundamental threads of Jacksonian foreign policy showed actions that proved the U.S. to act as a liberal imperial power. Assertive nationalism mixed in with the idea of democratic imperialism (imposing democracy throughout the world even through military means - this is on par with liberal imperialism) was part of the aggressive unilateral foreign policy that Bush promoted (Fabbrini 2008: 160). The rhetoric Bush used ended up merging the ideas to promote democracy and peace with military strength and power. He believed that the U.S. was above

multilateralism and the only way to protect American security and continue the "democratic project" was to establish a unipolar world in an emerging multipolar world. This meant to challenging the international status quo and justifying that the U.S.'s military power cannot be constrained by the multilateral institutions if they wanted to promote democracy in order to protect peace.

"America and its Critics" argues that the unilateral actions that constituted as imperialistic behaviour were shown to have failed after the Iraq invasion in 2003, as the U.S. had no chance but to "work within the constraints of the multilateral system" and the president had to work within the constraints set by those of separated government (Fabbrini 2008:169). This failure of unilateralism demonstrated to the people of the U.S. that they needed to revise their domestic politics in order to target foreign policy. After the midterm congressional elections in 2006, with the Democrats winning back Congress, the U.S. began making strides towards multilateralism. Multilateralism as a foreign policy approaches proves to be more effective for the U.S. as it allows for them to act as a liberal imperial power. The international institutions that the U.S. had set up since the beginning of the Cold War has allowed for them to act as a liberal imperial power in an asymmetric multipolar world that they set up for their benefits. Asymmetrical power has allowed for many countries to have a role in multilateral relations, but above all, the U.S. has demonstrated that they are the necessary component for multilateralism to work. When the U.S. does not comply with international law set out by these institutions, evidently, cooperation fails or other democracies establish anti-American attitudes within them that makes cooperation difficult to adhere. These institutions that were set out by the U.S. allowed for them to legitimize and conceal imperialistic ambitions during the Cold War, and were useful again when they dropped unilateralism as foreign policy. As Negri and Hardt put it, by establishing these U.S. centric institutions, it was possible for presidential administrations to open up areas of the world that were previously closed to corporate and economic penetration (Negri & Hardt 2000). It allowed for the U.S. to impose liberalized ideologies onto these new countries that decided to cooperate with them, which fundamentally allowed the U.S. to maintain a level of control over these economic regions. Therefore, although the unilateral approach after 9/11 failed, reverting back to multilateralism works more in favour for the institutions and constraints that the U.S. have set up for themselves in the new international system.

Conclusion

Since President Obama has entered into office, he has made it a priority to deploy troops from the Middle East and ease up on the aggressive foreign policies that were set up by his predecessor. Recent literature, by scholars such as Stephen Walt and David Rieff, has pointed towards an increase in theories that under the Obama administration, the U.S. is indeed displaying a liberal imperialist mentality. With the negative history surrounding imperialism and colonialism, it is no wonder that some actively avoid labeling the U.S. as an imperial power. However, whether or not the imperialist behaviour that the U.S. exhibits can be deemed "good" or "bad" only sets out a more philosophical question. In terms of political science and through analyzing how foreign policy has been steered in terms of external events, we can see that the U.S. has acted as a liberal imperial power in an asymmetric multipolar world that they have established. Their internal structure, which has been consistent by the constitution, may make decision-making difficult, but it has allowed foreign policy to be malleable according to how the international system is set up and the events taking place in it. From historical cases to modern day foreign policy approaches, we can see that the mentality for imperialism exists in all sides of the political spectrum and it's the strategy to obtain that power that differs above all else.

Bibliography

Adams, Brooks. 1902. The New Empire. New York: MacMillan Company.

Boot, Max. 2003. "American Imperialism? No Need to Run Away From the Label." *USA Today*, May 6, 2003. Accessed May 18, 2014.

http://attacberlin.de/fileadmin/Sommerakademie/Boot_Imperialim_fine.pdf

David, C.P. and Grondin, D., ed. 2006. Hegemony or Empire? The Redefinition of US Power under George W. Bush. Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company,

Davidson, Joanna. 2012. "Humanitarian Intervention as Liberal Imperialism: A Force for Good?" *POLIS Journal*, vol.7 (2012): 128-164.

http://www.polis.leeds.ac.uk/assets/files/students/student-journal/ug-summer-12/joannadavidson.pdf

Fabbrini, Sergio. 2008. America and its Critics: Virtues and Vices of the Democratic Hyperpower. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fabbrini, Sergio. 2014. "Foreign Policy-Making Structures in the US." LUISS University. Rome. May 6, 2014.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A.2000. Empire. Boston, USA: Harvard University Press.

Merriam-Webster Online. Accessed 16 May, 2014.

http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/imperialism?show=0&t=1400368640

Rieff, David. 2014. "Obama's Liberal Imperialism." *The National Interest*, February 11, 2014. Accessed on May 18, 2014.

http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/obamas-liberal-imperialism-9861

Scammell, Geoffrey Vaughn. 2004. The First Imperial Age: European Overseas Expansion c.1400-1715. London: Routledge.

Shaffaeddin, Mehdi. 1998. "How Did Developed Countries Industrialize? The History of Trade and Industrial Policy: The Cases of Great Britain and the USA." *UNCTAD Review*, no.139. www.iatp.org/files/HOW_DID_DEVELOPED_COUNTRIES_INDUSTRIALIZEThe_H.pd f

Walbery, Eric. 2011. Postmodern Imperialism: Geopolitics and the Great Games. Atlanta, USA: Clarity Press, Inc.

Walt, Stephen. 2013. "Top Ten Warnings Signs of 'Liberal Imperialism'." Foreign Policy, May 20 2013. Accessed on May 18, 2014.

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/05/20/top_ten_warning_signs_of_liberal_imperialism