

Realism Guided by Idealism — Foreign Strategy From the Perspective of American Official Discourse

Zeng Chunsen, Jin Yilang, He Haoqin, Huang Yujia

Researcher of Centre Communication and Public Diplomacy, Jinan University, Guangzhou, China

Since the founding of the United States, American diplomacy has reflected a complex interweaving of ideological considerations, moral overtones, realistic interests, and power politics, that is, a complex interweaving of “idealism” and “realism”. Formulating U.S. diplomatic strategy has always sought a balance between “idealism” and “realism”. With the development of the world today, the development of science and technology has become increasingly important. In the Internet era, the U.S. information technology strategy has been continuously increased and followed up with the continuous development of the world's science and technology, striving to always maintain the leading position of information technology in the world. The U.S. informatization strategy is advanced, and its advancement comes from the support and protection of information technology and industry by the government and various parties in society. Innovation can be promoted only with support and protection, thus bringing strong impetus to the economic and social development of the whole country. Starting from the literature, this paper clarifies the historical origin and theoretical development of U.S. foreign policy and outlines the “idealism” and “realism” in U.S. diplomacy based on the current hot “metaverse”. This paper also discusses the evolution and contrast of “idealism” and “realism” in U.S. history in chronological order, and how they have influenced current developments.

Keywords: idealism and realism, Wilsonianism, metaverse

Introduction

The idealism and realism in international relations are the two important genres of the theory of international relations. The two are different in terms of theoretical origin and main point of view. The idealism of idealism pursues the noble principles and goals (James Germany, Dai Yuan, 2003). Its core idea is based on the principles of moral standards and legal norms as the principles of international relations, and advocate international morality and treaties to standardize order, open diplomatic and collective security systems. Realism is based on the power and politics of the world's anarchic state as the theoretical core and believes that all countries tend to maximize power or security.

Zeng Chunsen, Researcher, Centre Communication and Public Diplomacy, Jinan University, Guangzhou. E-mail: zcs0516@qq.com.

This paper has been sponsored by National Social Science Fund Project: Research on the Construction of Institutional Discourse Right in Global Governance — Realism Guided by Idealism: Foreign Strategy from the Perspective of American Official Discourse.

Idealism

The idealism of modern international relations can also be called progressive theory or jurisprudence. Its origin can be traced back to the 13th century. The typical representative is French diplomat and lawyer Pierre Dubois and Italian thinker and poet Algeli Dante. Based on inheritance and development of these ideas, the more systematic rationalism was born after the First World War. This is also the first wave of international relations theory activities, that is, to observe and handle international relations and deal with international relations and processing international relations and processing international relations (James Doliti, 2003). The trend of foreign policy. In fact, the term “idealism” is not that these authors have always used their title to describe their title, but the title of their critics using them" The most famous representative of the United States President Wilson.

The idealism is based on the assumptions of human nature. Insufficient or defects but can also be improved and improved. It is believed that the occurrence of wars and conflicts between the country is just caused by the morality and conscience of some people. The power to save the world is morality. Misunderstanding, the human world can return to a state of harmony and peace. The idealist scholar believes that the environment can determine behavior. By changing the international community environment, establishing international behavior norms and international organizations, national behavior is constrained, thereby avoiding conflicts and war.

It can be seen that the core idea of idealism pursuing the noble principles and goals is based on the principles of moral standards and legal norms as the principle of international relations. Essence Proposal disclosure of diplomatic, collective security, freedom and peace, righteousness and justice, trade equality, etc. (Wang Yizhou, 1998). It is believed that “peace and justice, international laws and international organizations should also be a goal and architecture pursued by the international community’s family”. It is believed that the “moral principles” and “loyalty principles” have the function of reviving the world order. Emphasizing the moral power of the maintenance of the world must be maintained by the people of the people. Based on explaining the history and reality of international relations, the idealist actively researches and demonstrates what the future international community should be like and how to run, and try to propose to seek to avoid war, maintain peace, and solve international contradictions and conflicts (Ulrvioiti, Markv Kauppi I., 1999).

Realism

Realist thoughts can be traced back to Kuoshid and later political philosophers such as Machiavili, Hegel, and they are regarded as the founders of realism (James Dalti, 2003). However, the theory of international relations realism became a theoretical wave, and appeared before and after the Second World War, and became the mainstream view of international politics in the 20th century international relations theory and practice. Those who have been tested in the theory of realism and the core assumptions of the long-tested basic ideas and core assumptions are reserved, while the heirs of realism continue to make new interpretations and amendments under the new situation and international background (E. H. Carl, 2005).

Realism is in development and changes from beginning to end, and briefly summarizes the most basic views in this theoretical group here. Although there are different branches within realism, the basic views between realist theorists are also argued, but one thing is that the theoretical core that reflects its basic views consists of its basic assumptions or propositions, and they “What is concerned about the following two

fundamental issues: (1) How to explain the general reasons and specific reasons for the actions taken by the country for survival? (2) How to explain the motivation of the changes in the international system?" In addition, these theorists are accustomed to assume that as the foundation or logic point of its theoretical and adhere to the common theoretical core (Bai Yunkai, Li Kaisheng, 2009).

First, in terms of basic assumptions, realism theory all agrees with the international community in an anarchy, and as the logical starting point of its theory. Realist believes that the international community is in the state of anarchy, that is to say, the international community runs in a system that does not dominate everything or the world government. Therefore, similar to the relationship between people in the natural state, each country can only survive in self-protection based on its own strength.

Second, identifying the national center theory, believes that the state is essentially a rational behavior of decision-making based on national interests, which constitutes a physical actions of international political behavior: the country is a rational, main and unified behavior in the state of no government (Daniel Burstine, 1987).

Third, adhere to the philosophical position of pessimistic human nature, that is, it is believed that human nature is evil, and from this, it is believed that the essence of international politics is conflict. It is believed that international politics is the stage for national struggles.

Fourth, use rights and political theory as the core of theory, emphasizing national strength and national interests. It is believed that the country has the tendency to maximize power or security, and power conflict is the core of all conflicts, and there is no unified authority in the international community to provide security guarantees. Countries must rely on their own strength to safeguard their own interests.

Therefore, realist people attach great importance to national strength and the role of force. It is believed that international political acts — the country is divided into countries due to differences in strength. The most important thing in the international community is a strong country, and the key to the structure of the international system depends on the interrelationship between the big nations and the strong country, and the country (George Vocke Bush, 2003). The average momentum mechanism is an important aspect of understanding international politics.

Comparison of Idealism and Realism

The opposite side of the idealism and realism is mainly reflected in the diplomatic concept, which is maximized in the foreign policy, means, and behavior. In the philosophical position, the idealist is adhering to the basic assumptions that human nature is kind or can be better through education and the environment, and realists start from the cruelty brought by the war between the country, especially the war. The philosophical position that is evil and cannot be changed. The two looks at the world from their different philosophical stances and international relations, and from this to the logical starting point to interpret different international relations.

The idealism of US diplomacy attaches great importance to values and moral effects, is used to holding the banner of democracy, freedom, and human rights, advocating international mechanisms such as international law, international organizations, and international arbitration, and believes that this is the most effective way to resolve disputes and maintain world peace.

It advocates cooperation and coordination and establish fair international relations, and pursue world peace and stability, which has caused the gorgeous connotation such as morality and benevolence in American

diplomacy, acting in accordance with international law, international cooperation and coordination (Strobetalbott, 1996). The realism in US diplomatic practice focuses on national strength and national interests and rights, and pursue the power of power in the international system and the maximization of their own interests and the advantages of political power. If it does not play a role, propose that power and politics is the law of international life. This adds main connotations such as power politics, hegemonism, strength diplomacy, and political non-morality to US diplomacy. The contradiction between the consideration of realistic interests and ideological considerations, curbing the choice between strategic and cooperative strategies is also a refraction between realism and idealism.

In a macro level, idealistic diplomacy is to promote American values, political systems, and social systems, and establish a world empire led by the United States based on American moral ideals, values, and democratic models. Realist diplomacy is to ensure the national security of the United States and maximize economic interests and political power. The former is relatively abstract, the latter is reality and specific, while the two promote each other, and together constitute the national interests and strategic goals of the United States.

At the specific level, it is mainly reflected in the means or methods of US diplomacy. In order to achieve US national interests and established strategic goals, whether it is the presidents such as Jefferson, Wilson, Nixon, or the presidents such as Clinton, Bush, Obama at the same time, cooperate with each other, and different places are only focused on their strength and pattern changes. Generally speaking, the idealist diplomacy of the United States provides a very gorgeous moral coat for its realist means, while realist diplomacy provides a strong backing and foundation for the realization of idealist diplomatic goals.

In daily diplomatic activities, there is no more pragmatic than the United States, but in the pursuit of its historical traditions, there is no country that is more idealistic than the United States. “Just as in the United States for more than a decade, under the name counterterrorism”, as “leaders of counter-terrorism business” to implement power politics, with “democracy”, “human rights” or “humanitarianism” as the banner, one hand holds The Bible, holding the other hand with a grab, creating a color revolution everywhere, interference in other domestic affairs and even subverting the regime of other countries.

In the field of economy and trade, the United States often conducts anti-trade barriers and anti-dumping of anti-trade barriers on the grounds of the rules of other countries that do not comply with the WTO organizations (Henry Kissinger, 1998). Wait for sanctions, and you often make technical barriers or carry out trade protection with security as an excuse. The saying and practices in the United States are essentially the name, order, and values that the moral rules, order and values that idealism are idealism. Different diplomatic actions are adopted.

From the Monroe Doctrine to the Wilsonian Doctrine

The Early Days of the Founding of the United States: The Germination of Ideals and the Plight of Reality

In 1630, Winthrop, a British colonist, made such a declaration when he landed in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in North America, “We will be the city on the hill of the whole world, and the eyes of the people of the whole world will be on us. If we deceived God in the pursuit of this cause, if God stopped helping us as he does today, then we would be the laughingstock of the world.” As the historian Boursestine commented: “No one has done anything like Wen Throp, expressing the sense of American destiny so precisely, set the tone of American history.” (Daniel Boorstin, 1987). This is also the germ of American idealism.

Felix Gilbert once wrote: “America’s foreign policy has oscillated between idealism and realism, and her great historical moments have occurred when the two combined.” (Frederick W. Marks, 1978). So we also need to look at the reality.

After the United States became independent, because of its weak military power, the policy of “isolation” became the mainstream, and “reducing diplomatic activities, avoiding entanglement, and non-alignment” became the focus of the United States’ foreign strategy.

Just like one of the six principles of Hans Morgenthau’s political realism — “power defines interests”, in reality the United States is under the control of the will and actions of other countries. The disadvantage of strength makes it impossible for the United States to adopt a tough posture in its diplomatic strategy, and it is often in a passive position.

At this time, the United States needs a new ideal to guide the direction. In response to this dilemma, Presidents Jefferson and Madison stepped onto the stage of history. In his inaugural speech, Jefferson reiterated the unique idealism formed in the historical environment of the United States: “America is the hope of the world, and the success of this democratic experimental field in the United States will herald the future success of democracy throughout the world.” (Edited by Philip Foner, 1963). He linked the autonomy of the United States with the future of mankind, and formulated a realistic foreign strategy based on this — to ensure the strength of the United States through expansionism. It successfully acquired the Louisiana area and began to seek maritime power.

The Monroe Doctrine: The Change of Diplomatic Focus and the Development of Idealism Under Realistic Conditions

But, as historian Brad Perkins puts it, “Jefferson and Madison were diplomatically bungling and humiliating the nation.” (Warren I. Cohen, 2004). The United States was dragged into the vortex of the European war. Facing Britain’s plundering at sea, Jefferson and Madison were superstitious about commercial strategies to defeat the enemy, but they could not avoid the loss of the United States after all. Trade issues have sparked wars.

After the war, the actual conditions in the United States changed:

- 1) The rise of national industries brought about by the industrial revolution increased the importance of the inland market.
- 2) European and American countries have strengthened their penetration into Latin America, threatening the interests of the United States.

The victory of the war also developed the idealism of the United States. It proved that the United States has sufficient military strength to maintain its own security. Nationalism is at an all-time high, and they have strengthened their ideals. Henry Adams commented: “In 1815, for the first time, Americans no longer doubted the way they were going.” (Henry Adams, 2004).

These influences culminated in the Monroe Doctrine of 1823. In order to protect the expansion interests of the United States in the Americas and prevent European and American countries from infiltrating the Americas. Monroe and Adams revisited “independence” and “freedom” in American idealism. In his address to Congress, Monroe said: “The American continent, with the conditions of freedom and independence it has assumed and maintained, should not be dominated by any European powers in the future.” It should be regarded as the object of future colonization. Under this ideal, the United States has formulated a series of realistic policy systems for

Latin America, which are based on the “principle of the American system”, “principle of mutual non-interference”, and “principle of non-colonization”. It distinguished the image of “protector” of the Americas from the image of “dictator” of Europe, and declared the diplomatic independence of the Americas. The Monroe Doctrine largely laid the foundation for the United States’ subsequent diplomatic strategy, “gradually becoming a tool for the expansion and defense of the Western Hemisphere.” (Warren I. Cohen, 2004).

From a realistic perspective, Wang Wei and Dai Chaowu wrote: “The proposal of the Monroe Doctrine not only shows the reality of the international pattern that the American system is separated from the European system, but also promotes the historic shock and split of the pattern and structure of international relations. Therefore, it has great world-historical significance.... Thus, these principles laid the ‘theoretical’ basis and strategic guidelines for the United States to rule the Americas in the future.” (Wang Wei, 2007).

From an ideal perspective, as the scholar Ammon said: “The United States has reached a place so far away from 1776, and has finally formed its own national identity.” (Ammon, 1990).

Scholar Mark Gilderhurst argues: “The Monroe Doctrine, enunciated in Congress in 1823, established a rhetorical style that was associated years later with similar statements during and after the Cold War. Often in the spirit of idealism and high principle Expressed in language, this affirmation of the President’s purpose is often aimed at advancing the human cause, or at least a large part of it, by upholding the values of liberty, democracy, and peace. This language sometimes obscures the relevance of defending strategic and economic interests The less noble ends of these actions, and usually involve some kind of threat of countermeasures if other countries go beyond what the United States deems appropriate.” (Gilderhus M. T., 2006). This should also prove that idealism and realism are inseparable in the US diplomatic strategy.

Roosevelt’s Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine: The Vision and Interest Expansion of an “International Police”

Under the protection of the Monroe Doctrine, the industrialization, urbanization and frontier development of the United States are proceeding smoothly, and the United States has gradually become a developed country in the world, and as Kissinger said: “Once the strength of any country increases greatly, no one wants to Transforming power into global influence.” (Henry Kissinger, 1997). Therefore, the next step of the United States’ foreign strategic goal is to expand overseas and establish its status as a major power in the world.

Consistent with the previous discussion, the implementation of realist policies in the United States is often based on its national ideals. At this stage, Roosevelt played a key role in his corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. Social Darwinism had a great influence on Roosevelt’s view of progress in civilization. He emphasized the values of “progress” and “civilization”, and made inferences based on this: “In America, as elsewhere, the intervention of a particular civilized country will eventually be required...., in order to abide by the Monroe Doctrine, he also has to exercise the power of the international police, although he (the United States) is not willing to do so.” (Thomas G. Paterson, 1984). Through the advanced nature of its own civilization, endowing itself with the identity and power of an “international policeman” has enabled the United States to link its own national interests with the progress of human civilization, thereby implementing a realistic foreign strategy that helps the United States expand its interests around the world. For example, interventions in the Dominican Republic, Cuba.

Since then, Roosevelt's Corollary have overturned the U.S. diplomatic tradition of non-interference in other countries' internal affairs. "The tradition of isolationism was broken, and the U.S. turned to internationalism. Roosevelt's diplomacy took a big step on the road to forming the tradition of internationalism." (Li Qingyu, 2010).

From a realistic perspective, scholar Frank Ninkovich writes: "It also marked an epochal break with traditional isolationist attitudes toward Europe. The Monroe Doctrine posited a wall between Europe and the United States, with two radically different system of domestic governance and foreign relations, whereas the Roosevelt corollary postulated a global process, typified by Anglo-American rapprochement, in which these differences were greatly reduced or disappeared altogether." (Frank Ninkovich, 1986). This brings European countries closer to the United States, giving the United States the greater international influence it desires.

From an ideal perspective, as the scholar Greg Russell puts it: "Although Roosevelt was always a defender of the national interest standard, he did not ignore the mutual concerns of great powers in an increasingly interdependent world. As a statesman, he did not see a nation's interests or power as something entirely independent of the broad ethical foundations of Western civilization. It cannot be denied that Roosevelt's homage to civilization often manifested a gap between the purpose of American foreign policy and the demands of world order by an almost miraculous coincidence... When Roosevelt's efforts won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906, the awarding committee cited his ability to 'infuse peaceful ideals into practical politics' as a major factor in their decision." (Russell G., 2008). This ideal of linking national interests with the responsibility of the United States to exert influence on a global scale has continued to play its role in later generations.

Wilsonianism: The Contradiction Between Idealism and Realism

"The whole world has become a single neighborhood, every part has become a neighbor of the rest, no country can survive and develop alone, and the tasks and responsibilities of neighborhood relations are entrusted to each country." (Arthur S. Link, 1982). Wilson, who was at the intersection of the 19th and 20th centuries, saw the trend of global cooperation and the interests behind this trend. Therefore, the United States must enter the world political stage to a greater extent and build a new world order.

Based on the thinking method of "Roosevelt's inference", Wilson further emphasized the responsibility and mission of the United States. In a speech in 1914, he said: "How should we use the influence and power of this great country? Should we continue to Playing the old role to use these powers only for expansion and profit?... We built this country to maintain human rights." And his way of maintaining human rights is mainly reflected in his "Wilson Ten Four Points", and Wilson's conception of an idealized postwar world order. It can be roughly summarized into three key words: free trade, national self-determination, and the League of Nations.

According to Bluntschli, "History itself brings about a growing emotional unity first within nations and then between them, awakening a general consciousness of human community" (Wilson, 1886). Therefore, the scholar Stephen Wertheim believes that the community of power is the goal of Wilson's international alliance, and he hopes to knit mature countries together through a unified emotion (Wertheim S., 2011).

However, at this time, Wilson's ideal was too advanced to be accepted by the world. In the contradiction between ideal and reality, Wilson still compromised with utilitarian realism, and finally his ideal was shattered. In order to preserve the establishment of the League of Nations, Wilson made diplomatic compromises with Britain, France, Japan and other countries. "Mandate rule" is in vain, no different from colonial rule in the past, and "national self-determination" is finally shattered; the premise of Britain's acceptance of the "14 Articles" is

that the United States is not allowed to shake Britain's maritime supremacy in the name of trade freedom, and Wilson made a concession, recognized the privileges of Britain, and “free trade” was finally shattered; and because of the opposition of the Senate, the United States did not finally join the League of Nations, which Wilson most valued, but instead became a tool for Britain and France to consolidate their status.

To sum up, in the face of the contradiction between ideal and reality, Wilson always compromised with the immediate interests of the United States. In the end, Wilson's diplomatic ideals came to naught.

From a realistic perspective, scholar Joseph Nye Jr. argues: “Wilson failed in changing the attitudes of other world leaders and ultimately the American public toward the new world order he outlined. Initially, Wilson was viewed as a hero by the European masses, but the nationalist backers of Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Orlando proved more effective as the bargain at Versailles dragged on. His excessive idealism also contributed to the interwar austerity response. Overly ambitious transformational goals, combined with overconfidence in its own inspiring power, ultimately prove counterproductive to effective or ethical U.S. foreign policy.” (Joseph S. Nye, Jr, 2019).

From an ideal perspective, as Kissinger said: “The United States firmly believes that its own path will shape the destiny of mankind. . . . it expands across the American continent in the name of ‘Manifest Destiny’, but it claims that there is no empire; exerts decisive influence on major events but denies any motive of national interest; eventually becomes a superpower, but declares that it has no intention of practicing power politics. American foreign policy shows that the United States believes that its domestic principles are universally applicable. There is no harm to others in implementing these principles. America’s foreign engagement is not foreign policy in the traditional sense, but a project of spreading values. It believes that all other people’s aspire to copy American values.” (Henry Kissinger, 2015). Therefore, the failure of diplomatic strategy brought about by the contradiction between ideals and reality this time did not make the United States give up idealistic diplomacy, and the Wilsonian doctrine still has a profound impact on future generations.

From the Truman Doctrine to the Internet Age

The American ideal at the end of World War II

After the second world war, the United States found such a fact, if the core of the Christian civilization is still the traditional European powers, after the early 1945 Yalta conference, the old core of Christian civilization has declined in the European battlefield ruins, and the United States, with its unparalleled overall power, had become the new “spokesman” of Christian civilization. The original ideal since 1776 of “separating from feudal, chaotic Europe, establishing a pure Christian state, realizing the freedom and equality that God gave to everyone, and realizing the well-being of gifted human rights” seemed about to be realized. In response, Henry Luce, a very famous American media mogul, said “This is America’s century, America will lead the world, and it’s a great time to exert our full influence and power on the world.” (Henry Robinson Luce, 1941). Americans then revived their Wilsonianism and consciously volunteered to lead the world to a new world of “liberal democracy”. Victory has given the American people a constant and urgent need to lead the world, and the United States will assume full responsibility as a leader in international affairs, Truman said in his message to Congress in December 1945. In this new world, the United States should become the leader of democracy and freedom, and spread the perfect institutional form, lifestyle, ideology and culture to all the world, so as to realize the harmony and stability of the world.

The Transformation of American Ideals under the Soviet Threat

However, this ideal of a “liberal and democratic” world soon met a red giant called the Soviet Union, and in 1946, when the Greek civil war broke out in full swing, it went head-to-head with another ideal called communism. Griswold, the head of the U.S. aid mission to Greece, had reported to the State Department with no small amount of concern that “the Communists could win because of economic collapse and popular resistance to the existing political and social structure”. At this time the Soviet Union was a militarily powerful red giant, forcing the Americans to reacquire the fact that the Soviet Union had become another global superpower. “If this continues,” wrote U.S. Ambassador to Britain Lewis Douglas, “then we are in grave danger of losing half of Western Europe.” (David Horowitz, 1974). Forced by the urgent realities of the situation, on March 12, 1947, then President Harry S. Truman pushed for direct U.S. action against Greece to contain Soviet power, and with it, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. In his memoirs, then-President Harry Truman described the introduction of the Truman Doctrine as a turning point in American foreign policy (Harry S. Truman, 1955). In this situation, Americans had to move from the ideal of building a new world to the reality of a crisis-ridden world.

Former U.S. Secretary of State Acheson argued that building a strong military and adding elements that promote political unity would create a viable world system that would stabilize international power contrasts. At this time, the United States believed that in a two-tiered world pattern, only political, economic, military and other hard power could help it defeat its rival, the Soviet Union, thereby eliminating communism and spreading the concept of freedom and democracy throughout the world. As Acheson stated in his 1958 congressional testimony, “If the United States is to contain Soviet ambitions for world domination, it must do two things. First, the United States continues to maintain an open attitude of consultation with the flatterers Second, the United States has to create the position of strength that will enable the Western Alliance to maintain a combined force capable of standing up to the Soviet Union at the governance, economic, and military levels. Only by accomplishing the latter will we have the capital to be able to negotiate with the Soviet Union.” Then hard power, especially strong military power, became the most important realistic need of the United States. Thus, from Truman to Eisenhower to Johnson, the United States engaged in a series of hard power confrontations with the Soviet Union, including intense military competition and proxy wars.

The Transformation of U.S. Foreign Strategy Under the Real Crisis

However, after more than two decades of hard power confrontation with the Soviet Union, the Americans found new realities. Militarily, the Korean and Vietnam wars in the 1950s and 1960s dragged U.S. military power into the mud. Economically, the huge military spending over a long period of time resulted in a deterioration of the U.S. financial situation, while the political sphere was equally unpromising. Black movement leader Martin Luther King Jr. said “History has unfortunately made some peoples (whites) the oppressors and some peoples (blacks) the oppressed, but between the two paths of uprising, violent confrontation, and acquiescence and submission to oppression there is a third path, which is to organize massive nonviolent resistance in the name of love.” (King M. L., 2010). On the other hand, Stokely Carmichael, the leader of the Black Panther Party, has triggered the slogan of “black power”. He contends that there is deep-seated “institutional racism” throughout the United States that prevents blacks from gaining access to key social positions, substantial power and social resources. The racial violence of white racialists and white police

officers is a direct manifestation of this nature, which prevents racial integration from being achieved.

Therefore, Blacks can no longer depend on Whites, but should unite to fight for power on their own strength and achieve Black self-determination in all political, social, and economic spheres (Stokely Carmichael, 1967). A series of “marches on Washington”, Martin Luther King’s “I Have a Dream” and the emergence of the Black Panther Party in the United States brought the government's image into serious crisis. It became increasingly unrealistic to continue to insist on the export of hard power by force, so on July 25, 1969, Richard Milhous Nixon, with his “Guam Doctrine”, adjusted his foreign strategic policy since Truman and instead adopted a policy of military contraction to stabilize his country’s international position. Nixon replied, “The United States will avoid getting involved quietly because it will drown itself. I am not criticizing how we got involved in the Vietnam War but I know we can learn something useful from our past experience. We must avoid further involvement in such wars in the future.” However, the threat from the Soviet Union still existed, and the strategy of “peaceful evolution” became an excellent way for the United States to reduce the loss of its own hard power while gradually destroying the communist concept. For the next two decades until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the U.S. pursued the strategic system of peaceful evolution outlined by Nixon in “1999: Victory Without War” to the end and achieved the ultimate victory in the Cold War (Pan Rui, 2004).

The American Ideal of Democracy After the End of the Cold War

After the successful peaceful evolution, reality once again ushered in a change and the United States became the world’s sole superpower. The Cold War left a huge military, political, scientific and technological legacy for the United States, shaping its unrivaled hard power after the Cold War. In 1989, Francis Fukuyama declared in his book “The End of History” that “liberal democracy” is “the last form of human ideology and polity” and that “liberal democracy is the last form of human ideology and polity”. “The ideal of liberal democracy has been perfected”. “He saw the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War as marking the end of an era. This is what he said in 1989 when he wrote his essay of the same name, and it was a starting point for what was later expanded into a book.” (Francis Fukuyama, 1989). Thus, the United States, which had won the Cold War, was truly at the top of the world and rightly turned once again to the ideal of a “perfectly free and democratic world” and proceeded to promote this ideal throughout the world.

But contrary to expectations, after the “End of History”, the world has not ushered in a future of American-style liberal democracy, but rather a wild ride in the direction of multipolarity, pluralism and Internetization, and the methods that won the Cold War may not apply at all to the post-Cold War globalized world, and the strategies that applied to the mechanized-electrified era may lose their effectiveness in the Internet-smart era. The strategy that was applied in the era of mechanization-electrification may lose its effect in the era of Internet-intelligence. Once again, America's beautiful ideals have met the challenge of reality, only this time, American idealism will be faced with a new and unknown reality.

Blocked, Busted Investment Boom, The Dream, and Reality of Metaverse

The growth of the Metaverse will lead to a surge in investment in a wider range of sectors. Firstly, this will lead to a further boom in the virtual goods market. Virtual goods, which currently stand at around US\$50 billion, are expected to grow to US\$190 billion by 2025. Secondly, it could drive rapid growth in AR/VR. Spending related to the global AR/VR market will reach US\$12 billion in 2020 and is expected to grow at a 54% CAGR over the five years 2020-2024; total AR/VR devices shipped reached 5.12 million in 2020 and are

expected to reach 43.2 million by 2025. Third, it will further contribute to the rapid growth of cloud computing, as the implementation of the Metaverse will require larger-scale data storage and computing requirements. Fourth, for the content or platform builders themselves, who can build an immersive virtual world with integrated social, entertainment, advertising, e-commerce, and other features, their business value illustrates geometric growth as the user value chain expands (Huang J., Sun P., Zhang W., 2022).

ROBLOX

On March 10, 2021, ROBLOX rose 54% on the day of its IPO, while the company's valuation increased sevenfold in six months compared to its last pre-IPO financing six months earlier, reaching almost \$40 billion outright, making this track the hottest in the primary market for a short period. Roblox and the Metaverse it represents became the hottest topic in the US stock market, with another Metaverse favorite, Facebook, the most risen underlying in the FAAMG, hitting a new all-time high of nearly \$1 trillion market cap.

Roblox reached more than 55 million daily active users in February 2022, according to a report by metaverse online gaming platform Roblox (Stefanie Notaney & Anna Yen, 2022).

Roblox has experimented with different business models. Initially, revenues came from advertising and a premium membership model called Builders Club. But after a few years, the company shifted to its current model: selling Robux (in-game virtual currency). The two key points of the Roblox platform's success are the open economy and decentralization (devolution to game developers), and the company's business figures have exploded since opening up the platform. Developers and creators use the company's platform and the engine and tools provided by the company to continuously create content, which the company calls Experiences, and then players play on the platform and build social relationships with other players based on the platform. In other words, Roblox's investment strategy is to develop gaming platforms that give users a new and more authentic social network.

According to an announcement from Roblox, developers will receive more than \$250 million in share input from the platform in 2020 through the operation of the strategy, which, according to the company's previously announced distribution of revenue from developer-created content, means that Roblox has generated more than \$1 billion in third-party game revenue alone this year. In the first nine months of 2020, more than 960,000 developers earned game tokens Robux. 1,050 of these developers earned \$10,000 in revenue, with 250 developers earning \$100,000 through Robux. Although the company is still in the red, with an operating loss of \$59.9 million and a net loss of \$5.04 million for 1Q21. However, because it is supported by almost twice the amount of player recharges as operating revenue, the company has a healthy operating cash flow and free cash flow, allowing it to continue to operate steadily.

Facebook

Facebook, which has its heart set on VR, is also a firm practitioner of another meta-universe. Mark Zuckerberg has committed more than \$10 billion to its Reality Labs division (Jacob Kastrenakes, Alex Heath, 2021) which produces hardware related to the metaverse, such as VR glasses.

Back in September 2019, Facebook released Facebook Horizon, a VR social platform, and launched a public beta version in August 2020. Users can build environments and games in it to socialize with friends. In an interview, founder Mark Zuckerberg talked about how “Facebook Horizon’s development cycle is taking longer than we expected because we have high hopes that the app will play a big role in building a broader,

cross-VR and AR meta-universe”.

Facebook has recently acquired Crayta, a meta-universe platform like Roblox. Crayta currently allows for character creation, with a focus on medium to lightweight games, and the ability to interact with other players during the switching and playing of game scenes, creating a rich social scene. It would seem that Facebook’s investment strategy is to push for a change in VR technology and to create VR-based social experiences that are not limited to personal space and can be interacted with (DeAngelo Epps June, 2022).

It was only after years of investment that this Facebook set of ecology seemed to start to turn around until last year when the VR hardware Oculus quest 2 was a big seller. In terms of investment in Oculus, Zuckerberg said in Facebook’s 1Q2021 results that it would invest a 2,000-strong R&D team into the VR business. During an AMA Q&A on Instagram a few days ago Zuckerberg confirmed that Facebook is building a microkernel-based operating system. He said, “We’re building a microkernel-based operating system Ultimately, we need to be able to design and customize each layer of the stack from essentially the ground up to deliver the performance and efficiency that (AR/VR) these systems need.”

Meta reported net revenues of \$10,285 million for the fourth quarter (Q4) of its fiscal year (FY) that ended December 31, 2021, on total revenues of \$33,671 million. the Reality Labs segment reported revenues of \$877 million for the fourth quarter of FY 2021, representing approximately 3% of the company’s revenues. Compared to the same period last year, revenue from this segment increased by 22.3%. The segment reported fourth-quarter operating Losses of \$3.3 billion and an operating loss much larger than the \$2,099 million operating loss reported by the segment in the prior year quarter, which also reduced the company’s overall operating income.

Thus, it seems that meta is still relying more on advertising for profitability, and more effort is needed to create a new interactive four-way social scene through VR technology. One academic study found that "through its recent rebranding, Meta has embraced the option of gradually shifting from an advertising revenue model to a transaction-based revenue model. Nonetheless, Meta’s core offering aimed at fostering social communities remains intact, even as the company aims to provide a more digital, virtual, and enhanced environment. Contrary to the increasing number of companies changing their BM from hardware to software companies, Meta is focusing on hardware and software development to make the metaverse accessible to the mass market and encourage user loyalty by increasing the cost of the exchange. Meta’s strategic acquisition of Oculus planned partnerships with hardware and software providers such as Ray-Ban, Microsoft, and Rockstar Games, and the development of Horizon World and Horizon Workroom has therefore created the conditions around which to develop the most social network.” (Kraus S., Kanbach D. K., Krysta P. M. et al., 2022).

Behind the hype, the meta-universe continues to grow: Microsoft says its \$69 billion acquisition of gaming company Activision Blizzard will “provide the building blocks for the meta-universe” (Microsoft, 2022). Fortnite has more than 20 million active users (DAUs) per day (William E. Ketchum III, 2020) and hosts concerts (on 24 April last year, more than 27 million indie gamers attended Travis Scott’s show last April 24) and generated more than \$14 billion in transactions between 2018 and 2020. Naver Z’s Zepeto – Asia’s largest metaverse platform with over 300 million global subscribers (Joo-Wan Kim, 2022) and a Galaxy S22 scavenger hunt in April in partnership with Samsung (Kathy B., 2022).

Conclusions

It seems that every influential company is investing huge amounts of money into virtual reality. All are

making progress in developing games, and practical applications, and developing virtual reality technology using virtual reality, but it is impossible to tell which strategy will yield the greatest benefit.

While promoting globalization and international information flow, the Internet also profoundly impacts the ideological field. From the metaverse's current technical and ecological characteristics, its features, such as high immersion and virtual and reality fusion, are the best Petri dishes for spreading ideological and cultural soft power. In such a new communication scene, ideologies may be more radical and have more substantial social control, which will cause a more severe impact on mainstream ideologies and traditional social governance. This is why countries compete around the meta-universe's digital resources, core technologies, and technical standards.

Since the metaverse is still exploring whether it can be a tool for ideological communication, combining its various characteristics and development directions, ideological communication in the metaverse is just around the corner.

The development of a metaverse based on the ease of forming a new type of international political ideology in the communication scene further highlights the impact of cybersecurity on national security. The Internet era has made cybersecurity a new issue in international politics, and the United States and other major Western developed countries have made cybersecurity one of the core parts of national security. Its importance is on par with military and economic security. Cybersecurity has also become an important area of competitive gaming between different countries, and the metaverse will further strengthen this dynamic. Due to the high immersion and virtual reality integration characteristics of the metaverse, cybersecurity issues will be more directly translated into real national security issues. This will also drive countries to take measures to deal with it and push them to be stricter in metaverse standard design and ecological construction.

References

- Alan Singer, *A Collection of Speeches by U.S. Presidential Candidates*, p. 220.
- Arthur S. Link (Ed.). *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Vol. 12, p. 18.
- Bai Yunkai, and Li Kaisheng (2009). *Introduction to the Theoretical Genre of International Relations*, p. 63.
- Christian A. Herter (1950). Conversation between The Secretary and Representative. Christian A. Herter, March 21, 1950, USSR and Containment folder, Box 77, Acheson Papers, TL.
- Daniel Boorstin (1987). *Americans: A Trailblazing Journey*, Press and Culture Section of the U.S. Embassy, p. 3.
- Daniel Burstine (1987). American: Pioneering process, p. 11.
- Dean Acheson, *Strength and Diplomacy*, p. 17.
- DeAngelo Epps June (2022). You can create games on Facebook now thanks to the Crayta partnership.
- Carl, E. H. (2005). *Twenty Years of Crisis (1919–1939): Introduction to International Relations Research*, Palgrave Macmillan, p. 10.
- Foreign Relations of the United States (1948) Washington, 1974, pp. 28–29.
- Francis Fukuyama (1989). The end of history?, *National Interest*, 16, 3–18.
- Frank Ninkovich (1986). Theodore Roosevelt: Civilization as ideology, *Diplomatic History*, 10(3), 221–245.
- Frederick W. Marks III (1978). Morality as the driving wheel in Theodore Roosevelt's diplomacy, *History of Diplomacy*, 2(1), 43–62.
- George Vocke Bush (2003). State of emotional counseling, available online at: <http://www.cctv.com/special/414/0/35855.html>.
- Gilderhus M. T. (2006). The Monroe Doctrine: meaning and inspiration, *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36(1), 5–16.
- Henry Adams (1891). *A History of the United States*, Volume IX, New York, p. 220.
- Henry Kissinger (1997). *Great Diplomacy*, Hainan Publishing House, p. 20.
- Henry Kissinger (2015). *International Order*, CITIC Press, p. 412.
- Henry Luce (1941). *Life Magazine*, February 17, New York.

- Huang, J., Sun, P., and Zhang, W. (2022). Analysis of the future prospects for the metaverse, in: *7th International Conference on Financial Innovation and Economic Development (ICFIED 2022)*, Atlantis Press, pp. 1899–1904.
- Jacob Kastrenakes, and Alex Heath (2021). Facebook is spending at least \$1 billion this year on its metaverse division, *Verge*, October 25.
- James Dalti, Little Robert Pafalz Graff. *The Theory of International Relations in the Debate*.
- James Doliti (2003). *Little Robert Pafalz Graff: The Theory of International Relations in the Debate*, p. 71.
- James Germany, and Dai Yuan (2003). *Criticism of International Relations*, p. 201.
- Joo-Wan Kim (2022). Metaverse platform Zepeto user base exceeds 300 million, *Korea Economic Daily*, March 4.
- Joseph S. Nye Jr. (2019). The rise and fall of American hegemony from Wilson to Trump, *International Affairs*, 95(1), pp. 63–80.
- Kathy, B. (2022). Creating your own living space in the Metaverse, *New Straits Times*, April 15.
- Kos-Stanišić, L. (1998). Henry Kissinger: Diplomacy, *Politička misao: časopis za politologiju*, 35(2), 254–259.
- Kraus S., Kanbach D. K., and Krysta P. M. et al. (2022). Facebook and the creation of the metaverse: Radical business model innovation or incremental transformation? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.
- Li Qingyu, Ren Liming, and Dai Hongxia (2010). *American Diplomatic Tradition and Its Creators*, p. 133.
- Meta Platforms Inc. (2021). Meta to announce fourth quarter and full year 2021 result.
- Microsoft (2022). Microsoft to acquire Activision Blizzard to bring the joy and community of gaming to everyone, across every device, *Microsoft*, January 18.
- Pan Rui (2004). A study of U.S. diplomatic strategy in the cold war era — From the Truman doctrine to the Reagan doctrine, *International Business Studies*, (2), 51, 54, 59.
- Paulrviotti (1999). MARKV KAUPPI. International Relating Steel: Realism, PLURALISM, Globalism, pp. 37–37.
- Philip Foner (1963). *Selected Works of Jefferson*, The Commercial Press, p. 36.
- Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, 1969, pp. 548–552.
- Russell G. (2008). Theodore Roosevelt’s diplomacy and the pursuit of a balance of power in Asia, *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 38(3), 433–455.
- Stefanie Notaney, and Anna Yen (2022). Roblox reports fourth quarter and full year 2021 financial results, Roblox Corporation, February 15, available online at: <https://ir.roblox.com/financials/annual-reports/default.aspx>.
- Stokely Carmichael, and Charles V. Hamilton (1967). *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*, New York: Random House, pp. 4–7.
- Strobetaibott (1996). Democracy and the natinatrintrest. *Foreign Affairs*, 75(6), 47–63.
- Thomas G. Paterson (Ed.) (1984). *Major Problems in American Foreign Policy*, Vol. 1, D.C. Heath, p. 424.
- Truman’s Memoirs, Vol. II, 1965, p. 119.
- Wang Wei, and Dai Chaowu (2007). *Ideological History of American Diplomacy 1775-2005*, People’s Publishing House, p. 104.
- Wang Yizhou (1998). *Western International Political Science: History and Theory*, p. 56.
- Warren I. Cohen (2004). *Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations*, pp. 113, 182.
- Wertheim S. Wilson’s Fantasy (2011). Why debating Wilson’s vision didn’t save America’s foreign relations, *IO*(4), 343–359.
- William E. Ketchum III (2022). Fortnite’s Travis Scott concert was historic but he’s not the only artist getting creative, *NBC News*, April 30.
- Wilson (1887). The study of administration, *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197–222.
- Zhou Yuntao. The combination of national interests and average diplomacy — Take several historical facts of the United States and East Asian relations as an example, *Southeast Asia Research*.