

**FROM MULTILATERALISM TO UNILATERALISM:
THE SHIFT OF US FOREIGN POLICY DURING
GEORGE W BUSH, 2001-2008**

*Dissertation submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

K.LALBIAKCHHUNGA



**AMERICAN STUDIES PROGRAMME
CENTRE FOR CANADIAN, UNITED STATES
AND LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI-110067
INDIA
2009**



CENTRE FOR CANADIAN, US AND LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI - 110067

Date: 28.07.2009

DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation entitled “**FROM MULTILATERALISM TO UNILATERALISM: THE SHIFT OF US FOREIGN POLICY DURING GEORGE W BUSH 2001-2008**” submitted by me in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of **Master of Philosophy** of Jawaharlal Nehru University is my own work. The dissertation has not been submitted for any other degree of this University or any other university.


K. LALBIAKCHHUNGA

CERTIFICATE

We recommend that this dissertation may be placed before the examiners for evaluation.


Prof. Chintamani Mahapatra
CHAIRPERSON


Prof. Christopher S. Raj
SUPERVISOR

Dedicated to

My Family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I express my sincere gratitude and thanks to Prof. Christopher S. Raj for his patience, support and invaluable advice. He read all my draft and gave his valuable time and ideas for my humble work, he gave every effort to improve my work and furnish my dissertation. The limitations in this research though remains are my own and mine alone.

My special thanks to all my friends, scholars and librarians who have assisted me in my research. I am highly indebted to all the faculty members of Centre for Canadian, United States and Latin American Studies for their valuable guidance.

I also thanks to my family members for their unending support through prayers, their patience in my entire endeavour

27.07.2009


K. Lalbiakchhunga

CONTENTS

	Page Nos.
Acknowledgement	
Abbreviations	
Introduction	1- 10
Chapter I. Roots of American Unilateralism under George W Bush	11-30
Ideological Root	
Conservative Root	
Republican Party	
Evangelical Root	
Neoconservative Root	
Chapter II. From Multilateralism to Unilateralism	31-54
Liberal Internationalism, Democratic Party and Clinton Administration	
Bush Foreign Policy Vision	
Bush Foreign Policy before 9/11	
Multilateral Policy of George W Bush	
9/11 and the Herald of Offensive Unilateral Profile	
National Security Strategy 2002 and 2006 and the Bush Doctrine	
Chapter III. Unilateralism in Practice: Case Studies	55-76
International Criminal Court	
Kyoto Protocol	
Iraq War	
Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty	
Comprehensive Test Ban treaty	
Conclusion. Implication of Unilateralism	77-88
Realist View	
Liberal Internationalist/Institutionalist View	
Constructivist View	
Promotion of American Ideology	
References	89-99

Abbreviations

ABM Treaty	- Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty
ANZUS Treaty	- Australia, New Zealand United States Security Treaty
ASPA	- American Service members' Protection Act
CEE	- Central and Eastern European
CSTO	- Collective Security Treaty Organisation
CTBT	- Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
FSU	- Former Soviet Union
GHG	- Green-house gas
GATT	- General Agreement on tariff and Trade
IAEA	- International Atomic Energy Agency
ICC	- International Criminal Court
INF Treaty	- Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty
ISAF	- International Security Assistance Force
MNC	- Multinational Corporation
NATO	- North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	- Non-Governmental Organisation
NSS	- National Security Strategy
OAS	- Organization of American States
PNAC	- Project for New American Century
PSI	- Proliferation Security Initiative
SCO	- Shanghai Cooperation Organization
UNFCCC	- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNSC	- United Nations Security Council
USA PATRIOT ACT	- Uniting and Strengthening American by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act
WMD	- Weapon of Mass Destruction

Introduction

Introduction

American foreign policy may be defined as the necessary relations Americans have with other nations in order to preserve and expand the prosperity of the United States (Gardner 1973: 1). Indeed peace and prosperity, stability and security, democracy and defense are the enduring values and interest of American foreign policy. Freedom from the dictates of others, commercial advantage, and promotion of American values and ideals are among the persistent foreign policy goals tied to these values and interests. In order to achieve these goals, the US has pursued different means in foreign policy since the founding of the nation in 1776. Isolationism, multilateralism/ internationalism and unilateralism with added features of realism, liberalism are the competing strategies the nation had tried during the last two centuries as a means to achieve its policy goals.

When independent was won, the challenge before American was to preserve the new America. While laying the foundation of the country's foreign policy, the Founding Fathers strongly committed their nation to isolationism. In his farewell address to the nation in 1796, George Washington made it clear that the US had a true policy to stay clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world. Similarly, President Jefferson in his inaugural address (1801) issued his primary dictum of 'no entangling alliance.' For him, a policy of aloofness- isolation was the best ways to preserve and develop the nation as a free people although at the same time envision an 'Empire of Liberty.' President John Quincy Adams also stated that America applauds those who fight for liberty and independence, but she goes not abroad, in search of monster to destroy. These statements have clearly indicated that isolationism as a foundation stone of US foreign policy.

This isolationism was put to an end by Monroe Doctrine in 1823 which proclaimed that the Western Hemisphere should be free from European encroachment. However this proclamation was shelved for almost a century because US was not powerful enough to put it into practiced. The reality came in 1898 when US defeated Spain in a war and this put an end US isolationist policy and began to asserted its rightful role in world politics. As the 19th century draw close and especially after the closing of the frontier, the US also became an imperialist power by unilaterally acquired Philippines. It asserted its

dominance over Latin America by proclaiming the right to intervene through Roosevelt Corollary.

The United States was historically ambivalent about international law. This ambivalence could be seen throughout the 20th century. On the one hand US took leading role in multilateral treaties such as the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Kellogg Briar pact, the United Nations Charter, the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty and UN Human Rights Covenants.

On the other hand, as the histories of the League Covenant, Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Havana Charter on the International Trade Organization suggest that the United States recoiled from adhering to the far reaching obligations of those multilateral treatise. This pattern has persisted till today. Surveying the post Cold War making of multilateral obligations, the United States continues to lead in fostering negotiations, but there is increased tendency on its part to opt out of the resulting treaties, usually by refusing to ratify them. US failed to ratify Comprehensive Test ban Treaty, Kyoto Protocol and International Criminal Court of which all together form a mother of international treaty in their own respective area.

During the Cold War period, although there were instances of unilateral actions, but by and large the American policy makers commonly saw unilateralism as a last resort, to be pursue only when multilateralism carried a great cost or it was impossible in its international policies. This may be attributed to Cold War politics where both the Super Powers needed allies to carry on their own ideology. The end of Cold war brought a new environment where this competition is supposed to be replace by cooperation.

Ronald Reagan come to White House with a strong determination to defeat the Soviet Union, tough in its dealing by declaring its as 'Evil Empire.' However a policy of cooperation and peaceful coexistence was adopted in his second term, which was signified by various meetings and one of the most successful disarmament treaty signed in human history the elimination of Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile called the INF Treaty in 1987. This was upheld by President George HW Bush and President Bill Clinton. The Gulf War in 1990s was fought under the aegis of United Nations.

Clinton period was the period of internationalism, however it does not mean that there was no unilateralism. Clinton increased military budget although the Cold War was ended and Warsaw Pact was dismantled, intervened in Haiti, continued bombing suspected site in Iraq and Afghanistan.

However Clinton period was often regarded as a period of the triumph of international cooperation and multilateral initiative as he signed mother of international treaties like Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Kyoto Protocol and International Criminal Court (Rome Treaty). When Clinton reluctantly signed International Criminal Court Treaty, he said that, “nevertheless, it was important to sign the treaty to reaffirm our strong support for international accountability” and to place the United States in a better position to negotiate changes in the court's structure and rules” (Myers: 2001). Thus Clinton indicated his belief in drawing international system in favour of United States within the system itself and consider soft power as a means of global influence and unilateral force as a last option not an equal option with soft power.¹ Clinton believes in gradually gain the acceptance of American proposals by others through negotiations within the system itself instead of looking for alternative as George W Bush did.

The cursory look of Bush foreign policy would convince that it is based on multilateralism because all policy at first instance called for multilateral approach. The so called Bush Doctrine which was espoused in National Security Strategies and various speeches and actions would give that impression. But the underlying multilateralism is that multilateralism under US leadership, under US auspices and US initiative in other words multilateralism by the US, for the US and the US. But the content and the intention of such multilateral policies and initiative and subsequent actions appear or seems that US foreign policy under George W. Bush to be unilateralism.

In a complete turnaround, Bush administration made that if international treaty/ agreement is not in favour of US, or others cannot agree on US terms, then proposing alternatives or going alone was the rule of the thumb. Bush believed in changing

¹ Soft power is a term coined by Joseph Nye Jr. to describe the ability to influence others apart from traditional military power. It includes co-optive- power getting others to want what you want through international institutions like World Bank, IMF, WTO, MNCs etc and soft power resources like cultural attraction, ideology, and international institutions

international system from outside if it does not favour American interest; he gave equal importance to soft and hard power to achieve American national interest by abandoning international cooperation to achieve a desired objectives. In reasserting unilateralism, the Bush administration actions included:

- abrogate the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty and restarted Reagan era Star War programme.
- undermined the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty by expressing its intention to test nuclear weapons (mini-nukes) and scrapped Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- repudiated the international scientific consensus to curb global warming and withdrew from global effort such as the Kyoto Protocol.
- renounced the US signature on the Rome Statute- a treaty creating International Criminal Court (ICC) and campaign aggressively to exempt all US personnel from its jurisdiction, even threatening to veto UN peacekeeping operations if it did not get its way.
- invaded Iraq without the sanction of UN Security Council.
- suspended support for UN's family Planning programme and balked supporting the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

Unilateralism is nothing new in American foreign policy, indeed it is intertwined with the domestic thinking and belief and it is the manifestation of local values and belief outside the country's border. In fact every country's foreign policy has the element of multilateralism and unilateralism. Multilateralism is pursued when there is positive sum game whereas unilateralism is pursued where zero sum rule the games. Indeed Clinton's period (1993-2000) was marked by the intertwined of multilateralism and unilateralism so is George W Bush period (2001-08). But Clinton was called a globalization president and his era was labeled as a triumph of liberal internationalism/ multilateralism whereas Bush was called an unilateral president.

Concept of Multilateralism and Unilateralism

Unilateralism

Literally the word unilateralism means one-sidedness, a doctrine or agenda that supports one sided action. Such action may be in disregard for other parties, or as an expression of commitment towards a direction which other parties may find agreeable. Unilateralism is a particular method by which a state or political actor interacts with the international environment; that is, a method by which it solves its international problems and manages its relations with partners and opponents. Unilateralism is more than an orientation that maximizes self interest, it is a principle for action aimed at limiting commitments while maintaining autonomy of action (Bertele and Mey: 1998).

In an era of globalization where each other's well being is defined in terms of cooperation where nations played a positive sum game, while unilateralism is a perception on any country with a blame of building or searching for self interest even at the cost of others. But even a cursory view of international system, nation states foreign policies begins as a one-sided and unilateral act. This is because behind every political act is a unilateral definition of one's own interests (Bertele and Mey: 1998). Every state has a definite purpose and depend upon their capabilities strive to assert a policy which could serve their interest on the best possible way.

The necessity of the support of allies for containing the Soviet Union during the cold war compelled US to adopt multilateral activities. As far as possible it tries to secure the support of international institutions especially UN, in fact Uniting for Peace resolution was a means invented by US. However, there were many cases where unilateralism was practiced in form and spirit, covertly and overtly. CIA led regime change and covert and overt wars like Cuba, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Iran and Afghanistan.

Multilateralism

According to Ruggie (1992) multilateralism at its core refers to coordinating relations among three or more states in accordance with certain principles. According to this definition, multilateralism consists of three principles- i) Indivisibility ii) non-

discrimination or generalized organizing principles iii) Diffuse reciprocity. Indivisibility is illustrated by collective security arrangement wherein an attack on one is considered as an attack on all. Non discrimination implies that all parties must be treated similarly, as in the use of Most Favour Nation (MFN) status in trade agreement. Diffuse reciprocity implies that state do not rely on specific, quid pro quo but on long term assurance on long term balance in their relation. According to Oxford Dictionary of Politics (2004) multilateralism is an approach to international trade, the monetary system, international disarmament and security, or environment based on the idea that if international cooperative regimes for the management of conflicts of interest are to be effective, they must represent a broad and sustainable consensus among the states of international system. Multilateralism therefore lends itself to issue where clear common interests in the international community are identifiable.

Thus the term refers to multiple countries working in concert on a given issue. Most international organizations such as United Nations and World Trade Organization, regional organizations such as ASEAN, EU, NAFTA and security organizations such as NATO, Warsaw Pact, and Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) are multilateral in nature.

According Ikenberry (2003) multilateralism involves the coordination of relations among three or more states according to a set of rules or principles. It can be distinguished from other types of interstate relations in three ways. **First**, because it entails the coordination of relations among a group of states, it can be contrasted with bilateral, "hub and spoke," and imperial arrangements. **Second**, the terms of a given relationship are defined by agreed-upon rules and principles- and sometimes by organizations-so multilateralism can be contrasted with interactions based on ad hoc bargaining or straight- forward power politics. **Third**, multilateralism entails some reduction in policy autonomy, since the choices and actions of the participating states are-at least to some degree-constrained by the agreed-upon rules and principles.

It is recognizable that during the interwar years the exclusionary nature of bilateral bargains and frequents resorts to unilateral action had contributed to the breakdown of the international political economy resulted in the onset of war. As a result, multilateralism

became the norm in such post-war agreements such as Bretton Woods's agreements, United Nations and other organizations established under the aegis of UN as well as regional alliances.

However the painstaking effort of world leaders since the end of World War II has encountered mounting challenges in the period after the end of Cold War. The United States has become increasingly dominant on the world stage militarily as well as economically; as such it has more and more capacity to use its hard and soft power to achieve its policies.

From the outbreak of World War II until the collapsed of Soviet Union, the presence of powerful aggressor states encourage for strong domestic support for a compact between power and cooperation. Even before the United States entered World War II, many of the leading strategic thinkers viz. Isaiah Bowman, Edward Mead Earle and Spykman had concluded that distance was no longer a reliable guarantee of the nation's security. Instead the United States would have to prevent any single or group of powers from establishing control over the Eurasian Heartland² and Rimland³- the huge landmass extending from Iberia to Siberia. Doing so would require not just the projection of US military power, but also the consensual help of allies that shared the United States' strategic priorities. This was the guiding factor behind US foreign policy approach towards multilateral cooperation during the cold war period as well as after the end of cold war.

American idealism was the motivating force behind creation of United Nations during the waning days of second World War. American values shaped the world organization, whose political institution was modeled after its own.

² Heartland Theory is a geopolitical hypothesis, proposed by British geographer Halford Mackinder in 1904, that any political power based in the heart of Eurasia could gain sufficient strength to eventually dominate the world. He predicted "Who rules East Europe commands the Heartland, Who rules the heartland commands the World-Island, Who rules the World-Island commands the world."

³ Rimland concept is proposed by Spykman in 1930s which comprised most of Europe, middle east, Indian subcontinent, China, Siberia, Asia Minor and predicted "Whoever rules the Rimland rules Eurasia, Whoever rules Eurasia controls the destiny of the world." He advocated the alliance of US, Soviet Union and Britain to preserve world peace because the unification of Rimland as a menace to both US and USSR

In 1947 it formed Rio Treaty with Latin American countries followed by North Atlantic Treaty organization (NATO) in 1949. Under its security umbrella, regional multilateral security organizations were established on the pattern of NATO like Australia, New Zealand, United States Security Treaty (ANZUS) in 1951, Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) in 1954, Baghdad Pact (later known as Central Treaty Organization) in 1955. These organizations committed member states to share the risk and responsibilities of collective security while upholding their individual right as well as their obligation according to the UN Charter. US meticulously used these multilateral organizations to promote its own interest and as a base for its fight against communism.

The first successful multilateral action undertaken by the US through UN was the *Uniting for Peace Resolution*⁴ during the Korean war. During the initial stages of the functioning of UN, its members were countries sympathetic to the US and Allied powers. In the first seven years (1946-1953), of the 800 resolution adopted by the General Assembly, the US was defeated in less than 3 percent and in no case were important US security interest involved (Kiani: 2003). This proves the fact that the US not only had profound influence in the UN Security Council, but also the ability to steer the General Assembly away from what perceived as its core security interest.

In 1953, in his address to the UN General Assembly President Eisenhower proposed *Atom for Peace* which was a motivating force behind the establishment of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in 1957. It become the world's centre of cooperation in the nuclear field. The Agency works with its member states and multiple partners worldwide to promote safe, secure and peaceful nuclear technologies. The most successful multilateral action during the cold war was the Gulf war in 1991 where the UN Security Council unanimously approved UN sanction for the liberation of Kuwait occupied by Iraq. The US was the main contributor of man and armaments etc and contributed more than half million troops.

⁴ Uniting for Peace Resolution is a devise adopted by UN General Assembly if Security Council fail to maintain its obligations to maintain international peace and security due to dissension among the veto holding countries. The first resolution was passed by General Assembly in 1950 on the insistence of US after Soviet Union veto resolution to intervene in the Korean war

However the multilateralism during the cold war was never a collective consensus of world opinion except on the Gulf war. This is because of the divergent attitude and zero sum approach of cooperation by the two Super Powers. International relation had revolved around super power politics. There was no consensus on what is threat to human kind, instead both were the enemies of each other. Thus if one state go against either of the super power, it could always find political, economic and military support from the belligerent super power.

By 1991, the Soviet Union finally collapsed and marked the end of Cold war. In the US perception, the forces of the free world had triumphed over Communism. In the absence of any immediate geo-strategic-survival threat to the US from the Soviet Union, the possibility of nuclear confrontation dissipated and the hopeful prospects also surfaced worldwide that the arm race would be rolled back and the diversion of billions of dollar for social sector.

It was also hopeful that the end of cold war would reaffirm US commitment to the ideals of the UN, pursue it sincerely and thereby edify the UN and help regain its efficacy and prestige. Seemingly a new era of rule of law, international cooperation and multilateralism of a new kind was going to drawn.

In November 1992 President Bush ordered a policy review that culminated into National Security Directive (NSD) 74. This directive, the first US policy statement since the Truman administration advocated active US support for UN peacekeeping, recommended a variety of US and UN initiative.

Lower trade and investment barrier all over the world was the economic strategy of President Clinton. He became known as the globalization president. The administration signed the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), it also completed the Uruguayan Round of GATT which led to the establishment of World Trade Organization in 1995 which serve as a means for multilateral trade negotiations. This brought about the greatest reforms in world's trading system and opened economic markets around the world.

After the end of cold war, important changes made in multilateralism have been visible-

Firstly, one of the most glaring changes in multilateral activities was the participation of US and Soviet Union/Russia in UN peace keeping activities. During cold war, the United Nations undertook a relatively small number of peace keeping operations which mostly aimed at stabilizing the areas of cold war competition. Accordingly, the UN Security Council's permanent members refrained from contributing peacekeeping troops although they provided significant financial and occasionally logistic support. After the end of cold war in most cases there was a consensus among permanent members and their participation. Since the evolution of peace keeping mechanism, there were more than sixty (60) peace keeping mission undertaken by UN, amazingly more than two-third of the operations was sanctioned after the end of cold war.

Secondly, another area in the post cold war era has been humanitarian intervention. Cold war era intervention were mostly aimed at restoring peace and legitimate authority in a war torn countries. Since the threat of survival is minimize to negligible level, humanitarian concern has gained importance international relations.

Thirdly, the end of cold war signifies the emergence of economic and other concern as a major push factor for multilateralism. Regional economic co-operations like Mercosur, NAFTA, EU, APEC, SAARC and a host of regional free and bilateral free trade areas were established.

Multilateralism does entail a certain principles follow by participating countries, a shared role and responsibility and interest where each has a certain role in decision making but this does not necessarily means equal role and influence.

The present research would focus on the foreign policy of George W Bush especially the unilateral policies since 2001 and examine how his foreign policy has been different from his predecessor Bill Clinton, that seen to be multilateral foreign policy. It would analyse look upon the historical unilateral practices looking at the roots of this unilateralism from different perspectives and try to integrate with the mainstream international relations theories' views on unilateralism and the implication of unilateral foreign policy in international peace and security as well as its cost for US itself.

Chapter I

Roots of American Unilateralism under George W Bush

Roots of American Unilateralism

The ideas, values and themes on which George W Bush viewed the world is not new instead it has a long tradition in US foreign policy. In fact the US foreign policy is the result of amalgamation of different ideologies which were the fall out of domestic in nature. The conservative thinking has always leaned towards this notion in foreign policy where Republican Party is by and large identified. Even if a country has pursued a liberal foreign policy with cooperation and interdependence as the rule of the thumb, a change ensues when the very survival of a nation is at stake opting for the militaristic foreign policy is always the option if a country has the capacity.

According to the Realist theory of international relations a country's foreign policy is determined by its national interest. This is true in every country's foreign policy where US is no exception. After 9/11 said Dr. Rice (2002), the then Assistant to the President on National Security Affairs and subsequently Secretary of State, "there is no longer any doubt that today America faces an existential threat to our security—a threat as great as any we faced during the Civil War, the so-called "Good War", or the Cold War." The US thus by treating War on Terrorism as an open war like any other wars fought in the past, invoked past policies but with more sharpness, unequivocal and more open approach.

Like his predecessors President Bush's goal of sustaining a democratic peace and disseminating America's core values resonate with the most traditional theme in US history. Since the establishment of America as a nation, the Founding Fathers forswore entangling alliances might embroil the fragile country in dangerous Old World controversies and tarnish the United States identity as an exceptional country (Leffler: 2004). To maintain its uniqueness and exceptionalism US frequently followed unilateralism as a foreign policy means. Even before it became a world power, President Monroe declared a doctrine which prohibited Europeans to interfere in the new world and in 1899 the US made a unilateral *Open Door Policy* declaration on China to safeguard its commercial interest.

In 1904 President Theodore Roosevelt announced a new corollary to Monroe's doctrine, unilaterally asserting the right of United States intervention in Western hemisphere to

preserve order. It was meant to thwart prospective European interventions and protect the national interest of United States. Since World War II US became a global power, and the leader of capitalist countries. Its global influence, role and activities increased manifold reaching every nook and corner of the world, the leadership began thinking it was a time to export its values and cultures, and setting a model for the world simultaneously promoting ideological as well as proxy war with Soviet Union and Communism. This often required unilateral actions to obtain desired result and sustaining its goals. The end of Cold War left the world with one dominant Super power with no immediate or potential challengers for decades to come.

The terrorist attacked on World Trade Center happened a few months after George W Bush assumed Presidency which exposes the limits of US power. US responded to this unprecedented event with dramatic and sweeping new policies. It created a Federal Agency called Department of Homeland Security and the USA PATRIOT Act was passed. Externally it attacked Afghanistan to weed out Al Qaida, responsible for 9/11 attacked and subsequently announced a new doctrine which legitimizes unilateralism-preemptive strike at the enemy wherever in the world. Instead of waiting for enemy to fire America as during the World War I and II, America will pursue its enemy and eliminate before they could harm or reach American interest and American soil. Thus there was a clear departure from its policy of deterrence and containment during the Cold War and the policy of sanction as was in force against some belligerent countries notably Iraq and Cuba.

Is this unilateralism unprecedented? Looking at the foreign policy of US in the past 250 years, there were many instances where unilateralism was invoked. American foreign policy is in fact influenced by its ideological belief, its Christian culture, its political system founded on the principle of equality and individual freedom etc. These have a great impact on its political system as well as guided its relations with the outside world which compelling it to act unilaterally.

The roots of George W Bush administration's unilateralism can be traced from these distinct beliefs and exceptionalism and the new political movements which led the resurgence of these ideas and doctrine which arises from this perception. These can be

divided into- Ideological, American Conservatism, foreign policy of Republican Party, role of Evangelicals and the neoconservatives.

1. Ideological Roots

The Christian tradition, introduced by the first comers, reinforced by nearly all their European successors and perpetuated by conscious effort was the chief foundation stone of American intellectual development (Curti 1964: 3). Americans developed their ideological belief and existence from European tradition of conservatism which was term as Old World, but asserted its difference and were modified according the practical needs of the new land, with extreme conservatism on Christian belief.

There are two most important ideological beliefs that played vital role in American policies-

a) Exemplarism and Vindicationism: According to Thomas Jefferson all men, not simply Americans possessed unalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And when any form of government, not just Britain's peculiar mix of crown and parliament, became destructive to people's welfare, they were justifying in abolishing it (Brands: 1998). The liberal democratic country established in US although challenged by different forms of government, is the most successful form of government the world has ever experienced. The exemplarist argue that the United States should promote democracy by offering a benign model of a successful liberal democratic state while the vindacationist argue that the United States must move beyond example and undertake active measures to spread its universal values (Monten: 2005). Because freedom is inevitably link to democracy, democracy to peace, peace to trade, trade to free market and a free market to a freedom itself (Bailey: 2005).

The concept of *city upon hill*, phrase derived from the metaphor of *Salt and Light* in the Sermon on the Mountain, Jesus gave in the Gospel of Matthew. Verse fourteen of Matthew chapter five states that "*you are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hidden*" has a very profound impact on the ideological development of

Americans. It was interpreted that America should be shining upon hill and its values, culture and ideologies cannot hide, and all other nations would look upon it as well as American should spread shared this gospel to other nations of the world. The phrase enters American mind through the sermon delivered by John Winthrop *A Model of Christian Charity* in 1630.

b) Exceptionalism: Exceptionalism is the most powerful force that permeates American blood since the foundation of America till today. American exceptionalism is a ubiquitous theme of US politics from states to states and local to national arenas with deep cultural roots. It has been used to legitimize both idealist and pragmatic, domestic as well as foreign policies. For most part, where exceptionalism has been cited by US leaders it has justified or rallied approval for, an international foreign policy. Originating in the Puritan vision of the New World ‘City on a Hill’, the idea of exceptionalism evolved in tandem with an evolution in the United State’s power (Levy 2001: 23). According to Jeanne J. Kirkpatrick “American exceptionalism express the conviction that the US has a moral mission which flow out its identity and which should guide its policies. Our exceptional character, which was originally used to justify disdaining alliance and quarrels of the so called Old world, has often been cited as the ground to improve the world” (Kegley and Wittkopf 1996: 259). US national political identity is expressed in foreign policy primarily through the idea of exceptionalism (Monten: 2005). American Exceptionalism has also rooted from this ideology which refers to the belief “that the United States differs qualitatively from other developed nations, because of its unique origins, national credo, historical evolution, and distinctive political and religious institutions.” The United States was the first nation ever to base its very sense of nationhood on a set of universal principle derived from natural rights, as enunciated in its Declaration of independence (Bennett: 2000).

John L. O’Sullivan in 1839 wrote that “Our national birth was the beginning of a new history, the formation and progress of an untried political system, which separates us from the past and connects us with the future only; and so far as regards the entire development of the natural rights of man, in moral, political, and national life, we may confidently assume that our country is destined to be the great nation of futurity”

(O'Sullivan: 1839). Derived their principle from this ideology the Neoconservatives hold the view that American leadership is good both for America and for the world; and that such leadership require military strength, diplomatic energy and commitment to moral principle (PNAC: 1997). The manifest destiny served as a legitimizing myth of empire.

Manifest destiny helped reconcile the national mythology of exceptionalism and virtue with ambition and acquisitiveness. Americans thus understood their territorial expansion particularly in American way, drawing on ideas deeply embedded in their cultural heritage and self-identity. The American leadership knew very well that territorial expansion as embraced by this Manifest Destiny is not practicable today but put into practice in different form- through NATO expansion and tried to control 'energy rich region under its hold and strategically important regions like the Middle East, Central Asia. Iraq war was another means to control the Middle East region and the colour revolutions in East Europeans countries and Central Asian countries, Georgia's Rose Revolution (2003), Ukraine's Orange Revolution (2004), and Kyrgyzstan's Tulip Revolution (2005) were all regime not friendly to US.

The history of American foreign policy begins with the fight for their own independence from the Old world. Americans envisioned a New World free from what they saw as the corrupting influences of the old. To put into practiced Americans had a peculiar belief about foreign affairs is that the United States has a peculiar destiny because they are a different people, a beacon of light for the world. When it was used to explain the United States` contribution to the revolutions in Eastern Europe, exceptionalism was evoked in the Puritan 'city on a hill/ exemplar tradition. Various member of Bush (George HW Bush) administration argued that American economic success, political freedom, and military power had stimulated dissent and revolt in the East (Levy 2001: 146) This idea of creating a morally superior society accordingly run deep in the United States and has spawned endless attempt to achieve it and here the hope of world salvation lays it. When the society is small and weak, its achievement requires separation from the corrupt and its world mission is realized by a mere survival and by serving as a model to the world. Once firmly established and strong, the potential for a more aggressive strategy of protection and world salvation open up (Bailey: 2005).

The most vocal expression of this ideology came out in Monroe doctrine in December 1823. It separated the world into new and old world where old war ideology, practiced in the form of war, colonization, exploitation, corruption etc were not allowed to enter the new world. In fact Monroe set up United States as a protector of the new world. During the Cold war US claimed itself as a protector of the free world and Ronald Reagan even called Soviet Union as Evil Empire the phrase derived from American notion of good and bad. Those that are not accepted American values of freedom are evils and this has another nomenclature in George Bush connotation in the form of Axis of Evil.

The United States achieved its present position by actively promoting American principles of governance abroad- democracy, free markets, and respect for liberty. During Reagan years, the United States pressed for changes in right wing and left wing dictatorship alike, among both friends and foes in the Philippines, South Korea, Eastern Europe and even the Soviet Union because the policy of putting pressure on authoritarian and totalitarian regimes had practical aims and, in the end, delivered strategic benefit. In a speech to a joint session of Congress after the 9/11 attacks, George W. Bush adopted a homiletic tone when he reminded us, "Our nation is chosen by God and commissioned by history to be a model to the world of justice" (Fredericks: 2003). This long term ideological also make Bush administration in particular and Republic Party in general believe that promotion democracy is the cornerstone of US foreign policy not only because it is the best form of government but also a powerful instrument to defeat terrorism

II. Conservatives Roots

According to Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics (2004) Conservatism is a political philosophy which aspires to the preservation of what is thought to be the best in established society, and opposes radical change. Americans migrated from Europe to start a new life owing the new opportunities offered by the vast untapped land and resources. American policy, values and belief was founded in opposition to European ideals and

traditions, and from the beginning the guiding rule of American foreign policy was to keep out of European affairs (Dunn and Woodard 1996: 22).

United States is perhaps the first country in modern world founded on the principles of equality and individual freedom. This political philosophy is unequivocally laid down in the Bill of Rights adopted in 1790. Since then the nation's aim and objective was to preserve and protect this very foundation within and outside the country. The American conservatives trace their root to the ideology of an English political thinker Edmund Burke who in turn found inspiration from the tested traditions of nature and the Holy Scripture. He approached the problems of society in the knowledge that "we owe an implicit reverence to all the institution is of our ancestors" and that "ideas of religion and government are closely connected" (Dunn and Woodard 1996: 27& 28).

Viewing from this perspectives a conservative approach to foreign policy should reflect these values as well as the respect for history, experience, the institution, policy, practice etc. When the first settlers reached America it was a vast and empty land where the rule of the jungle i.e. survival of the fittest was the law of the land. Social Darwinism has a great impact on their thinking. The American economy owed its success to hard, continuous work, frugality, self-disciplined living and individual initiatives. The institutions, political system, economic system grew out from these peculiar conditions of the land which was by and large based on individual initiatives. Thus they wanted to keep this freedom and individualism intact.

At the same time they wanted to export these values to other parts of the world. Thomas Jefferson while making the American Declaration of Independence declared that life, liberty and pursuit of happiness are the inalienable right of every individual and he summed up American values and democracy as Empire of Liberty. He saw North America as a vast area for planting the ideas of democracy and liberty (Holmes: 1993). Tocqueville argued that what was happening in America (American war for democracy) was only the first step towards the inevitable triumph of equality and democracy around the world.

The role of conservatives in American politics is conspicuous, as a result wooing the conservative vote in election is an important campaign strategy right from the start of party primaries. In 2000 Republican primary those 64% of those voters identify as somewhat conservatives vote for Bush while only 31% vote for McCain, and 74% of very conservative vote for Bush while only 14% vote for McCain (Stanley and Niemi: 2006). According to the survey done by General Social Survey, national Opinion Research Centre, University of Chicago, in March 1973 the percentage of voters identified was 29%, 32% in 2000 and 37% in 2004. Presidential vote in general election by groups done by Network Exit Polls 1988-2004 reveals that more than three-fourth of conservative's votes for republican because of ideological reason, as depicted by the statistic below:

Year	Percentage from total voters	Vote share	
		Republican	Democrat
1988	35	80	19
1992	30	64	18
1996	33	71	20
2000	29	81	17
2004	34	84	15

Source: Presidential Vote in General Election by Groups, Network Exit Polls 1988-2004, on Stanley, Harold W. and Niemi, Richard G. (2006), *Vital Statistic on American Politics 2005-2006*, Washington DC: CQ Press, pp- 124

The conservative ideas of Reagan like a strong national defense, free market and free trade and offensive-defensive, covert and overt struggle against enemy during 1980s has given a great impetus to George W Bush, as these policies were regarded as a policies that helped the demise of Soviet Union during the Presidency of his father George HW Bush. In the run up for White House Governor Bush promise for a strong national defense and vowed to increase defense spending, the idea emanating from conservative ideology as well as the success during 1980s.

Candidate Bush positioned himself in the 2000 campaign as a president who would lead the country with Compassionate Conservatism⁵ at home and with strong American values abroad (Moens 2004: 87). Traditionally conservatism is by and large associated with Republican Party. Bush administration was dominated by conservatives with almost no moderates, comprising different variants of conservatives like neo-conservatives, cultural conservatives, and conservative Christian groups.

One of President George W. Bush's stated reasons for starting the war in Iraq was to bring democracy to that country. He stated in December 2006 that "[We] are committed to a strategic goal of a free Iraq that is democratic, that can govern itself, defend itself and sustain itself." More broadly, the Bush Administration has viewed democracy promotion as an instrument for combating terrorism (Epstein: 2007). The conservatives view foreign policy must reflect national interest, that American foreign policy must be judged by this criterion: does it serve the just interests of the United States? They view International Communism as a single greatest threat to liberties which American practiced and that United States must win the war and completely reject the coexistence with communism. Bush reflects this principle on war on terrorism when he said " Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."

III. Republican Party

American political system has a very loose party system and this is the fall out of the suspicious of political party by the founding fathers. However the necessity of party for the smooth functioning of democratic system compelled them to have a political party. Parties in United States are active during the election time only, retreat in between the elections, as a result the ideologies and policies of the party are by and large centered around the President. President George W Bush became the undisputed party leader during his Presidency. Parties adopted their policies in view of the prevailing situation of

⁵ Compassionate conservatism has been defined as the belief that conservatism and compassion complement each other. At its core is concern for the poor, as against a traditional Republican preoccupation of free trade, private big industrial house and an explicit belief that government has a responsibility for poor Americans.

the time and mostly carried forward the ideals of the Presidential candidates. The party's ideals and policies and the cause it stand for years have a profound influence on the incumbent President's policies whether domestic or foreign.

The Republican Party was born in the early 1850's by anti-slavery activists and individuals who believed that government should grant western lands to settlers free of charge. The first informal meeting of the party took place in Ripon, Wisconsin, a small town northwest of Milwaukee. The first official Republican meeting took place on July 6th, 1854 in Jackson, Michigan. The name "Republican" was chosen because it alluded to equality and reminded individuals of Thomas Jefferson's Democratic-Republican Party.

In 1856, the Republicans became a national party when John C. Fremont was nominated for President under the slogan: "*Free soil, free labor, free speech, free men, Fremont.*" Even though they were considered a "third party" because the Democrats and Whigs represented the two-party system at the time, Fremont received 33% of the vote. Four years later, Abraham Lincoln became the first Republican to win the White House.

The Republican activists denounced the Kansas-Nebraska Act that would have allowed the expansion of slavery into Kansas as proof of the power of the Slave Power—the powerful class of southern slaveholders who were conspiring to control the federal government and to spread slavery nationwide. The name Republican gained such favor in 1854 because *republicanism* was the paramount political value the new party meant to uphold. The party founders adopted the name Republican to indicate it was the carrier of republican beliefs about civic virtue, and opposition to aristocracy and corruption. Besides opposition to slavery, the new party put forward a progressive vision of modernizing the United States—emphasizing higher education, banking, railroads, industry and cities, while promising free homesteads to farmers. They vigorously argued that free-market labour was superior to slavery and the very foundation of civic virtue and true American values.

Foreign Policy:

a) Strong National Defense: Traditionally the foreign policy of Republican Party has been anchored by the commitment to a strong national defense. Although they believe that the world's problems will not be solved by the military alone, but force remains the first and last line of defense of US freedom and security (Hagel: 2004). Throughout the Cold war period the moderate Republican felt that the best way to counter communism was sponsoring economic growth through foreign aid, maintaining a strong military and keeping strong ties with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and other regional military alliances. With these basic principles of influencing, President Reagan introduced deep tax cuts and launched a massive buildup of U.S. military forces. The Republican Party reasserted that it is the solemn purpose of our foreign policy to secure the people and free institutions of our nation against every peril; to hearten and fortify the love of freedom everywhere in the world; and to achieve a secure environment in the world in which freedom, democracy, and justice may flourish (Platform: 1980).

The Republican platform during Reagan period was definitive that the Soviet Union must quit all support to communist regimes particularly in Nicaragua, and the party also opposed a Palestinian State and insisted that Jerusalem remain undivided (Batchelor 1996: 359). These Reagan policies were carried forward by George HW Bush and during his Presidency Cold War came to an end. This has been a great impetus for George W Bush when he came to the White House as a best means to deter the possible challenge of American supremacy. Reagan's approach to communism was a clear example of his approach to fight terrorism and the source of legitimization of preemptive/ preventive strike which was espoused by National Security Strategy 2002.

b) Conservative Policy: The party controlled the presidency from 1896 to 1932 with brief interruption by Woodrow Wilson 1912- 1920, running on the platform of unilateralism in intervention on Latin American through Roosevelt Corollary, opposition to the League of Nations, high tariff and promotion of business interest i.e. free trade with minimal government intervention in economic matters. The First World War was won by the Allies mainly because of American contribution but the Republican opposition to multilateral institution (the League of Nations) failed the Senate to ratify the Treaty of

Versailles. These anti-League internationalist were mostly Republicans and a few Democrats, who believed that the United States had to preserve a free hand to act abroad, not tie its fate to the whims and interest of others (Daalder and Lindsay: 2003). In consistent with their support for free trade and economic liberalism, it opposed Roosevelt New Deal programmes.

The most glaring aspect of unilateral approach was made in the Republican Platform adopted in 2000 where it declare that a well trained American military is the world's best guarantee to peace, its readiness to prevent war also be maintain and asserted that American will deploy defenses against ballistic missile and develop the weapons and strategies needed to win battles in the new technology era. It also declined to serve under the United Nations command. The Party's commitment of modernizing and revolutionize the armed forces was carried out by scrapping Anti- Ballistic Missile Treaty and reviving Reagan's Star War programme. Platform 2004 states that while international organizations can serve the cause of peace, Republicans believe they can never serve as a substitute for, or exercise a veto over, principled American leadership.

Historically American intervention and unilateral ventures were mostly during the Presidency of Republican Party. The Republican Party was the main force behind the ended of isolationist policy at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. The Spanish-American War was regarded as a war that end US isolationism. This war transformed US into an imperialist country by defeating Spanish and acquiring Philippines, Puerto Rico and Guam. These events opened a new era in American relations with the rest of the world. President McKinley and Vice President Roosevelt was the champion of imperialism. President McKinley was shot dead one day after he claimed, in a speech on America's new role, that "isolation is no longer possible or desirable" (Kegley and Wittkopf: 1996). Almost all American military intervention and military assertiveness since the inception of Republican Party took place under a republican President; from Spanish war to Roosevelt Corollary Washington Naval Accord, Afghanistan war, both the Gulf war etc. Both the World War broke out during Democrats Presidency, even though US supported the Allies, it is obvious that it would not enter the

war if German submarine did not attacked US ship or Japanese did not attacked Pearl Harbour.

IV. Evangelical Root

To become a President of the United States, a person's religious background played a very crucial role and it became a very important deciding factor for a party candidate right from the starting of campaign. Christianity has a strong impact on American Foreign policy, both in its creation and in how it is pursued. The United States was founded by the Puritans who escaped from religious prosecution in England. The role of religion in American politics is one of the most spectacular moments in its history. Although the interplay of religion in American politics is nothing new but in the foreign policy level, religion and belief assert its presence in the contemporary era only when the Evangelicals tried to influence government policies in various ways.

Evangelicals were one amongst Christian groups in US who believe that only born again Christian can be considered as a true Christian and believe that the word of the Lord is the only word that bears the truth, and is therefore the only one that has to be followed. They want to keep the will of Jesus Christ and lead a life according to tenets of the Bible and belief in the infallibility of Bible. They on the basis of belief divided the world into believers and non-believers in terms good and evil.

In fact until the late 1970s, evangelicals tended not to take part in US politics, and a large proportion of them did not even take part in Presidential election (Hularias: 2008). During the cold war era, the primary foreign policy concern of the Christian right and its precursors was the anticommunist struggle. Support for unilateralism was part of a larger mission of throwing off internationalist constraints and unleashing U.S. power to conduct a more vigorous crusade against "Godless" communism (Oldfield: 2004).

Evangelical Worldview

For Biblical reason the Evangelicals support Israel because they are the only nation in the world chosen by God. In the Bible, Genesis 12: 3 a promised was made by God to Abraham, *"I will bless those who bless you, but I will curse those who curse you and*

through you I will bless all the nations” In all multilateral forum including UN Security Council and General Assembly, US blocked any resolution against Israel and maintain its unambiguous support at any level. That the Jewish people have miraculously survived the ordeals of the 20th century is proof that they are watched over by God and "reads like a story out of the Bible." They see the God of Abraham blessing the United States if we stand by Israel (Feuerberg: 2006).

Evangelicals believe strongly in the Christian responsibility to the world. For this reason, they are often open to "social action and cooperation with nonbelievers in projects to improve human welfare." The demands to save souls for Christ, help the needy, and proclaim the gospel, have a special urgency for the evangelicals (Feuerberg: 2006). The Evangelicals had a strong sympathy to their fellow believers prosecuted in different parts of the world. They urged the government to take steps to prevent these prosecutions, and the fallout of this pressure was made into reality in 1998 when the congress passed International Freedom Act. This act created three significant government bodies to monitor and respond to violation of religious freedom: the State Department Office of International Religious Freedom, the Commission on International Religious Freedom and the Special Advisor on Religious Freedom within the national Security Council. However Clinton administration paid only lukewarm attention to the act.

For decades, US policy has sought to avoid intermingling government programs and religious proselytizing. The aim is both to abide by the Constitution's prohibition against a state religion and to ensure that aid recipients don't forgo assistance because they don't share the religion of the provider (Stockman: 2006, Huliaras: 2008). However in December 2001, Bush created a new Centre for Faith-Based and Community Initiative within the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (Huliaras: 2008). The president has tripled direct humanitarian and development aid to the world's most impoverished continent since taking office which stand at \$4 billion in 2006 as against \$1.4 billion in 2001, this was mainly outcome of the issue raised by evangelicals (Fletcher: 2006).

According to the Realist perspectives national interest is the most important determinant of a country's foreign policy. Bush who claimed himself as a Realist encountered a

confrontation between national interest and the push of evangelicals to intervene in Sudan. Sudan is rich in oil and natural gas, uranium and it has world's fourth largest copper deposit, Richard Boucher, the then State Department Spokesman announced that sanction in Sudan would undermine our financial market competitiveness and end up impeding the free flow of capital worldwide (Green: 2001). There was a constant pressure from the evangelical to end Christian brothers and sister prosecuted by the Sudanese government. They were successful in convincing President Bush to appoint a special envoy to Sudan in an effort to help end the state-sponsored persecution of Christians.

Role in politics: The survey of religion and politics in the United States by The Pew Forum in 2004 identified the Evangelical percentage of the population at 26.3%; while Roman Catholics are 22% and Mainline Protestants make up 16%. In the 2007 Statistical Abstract of the United States, the figures for these same groups are 28.6% (Evangelical), 24.5% (Roman Catholics), and 13.9% (Mainline Protestant). The latter figures are based on a 2001 study of the self-described religious identification of the adult population for 1990 and 2001 from the Graduate University Center of the City University of New York.

According to the survey done by CNN 78% of the White Evangelical/ born again Christian voted for Bush whereas Democrat candidate Kerry secured only 21% of vote, out of 41% who attended church every week, 61% voted for Bush whereas only 39% voted for Kerry. The political consciousness of evangelical is impressive in 2004 election, before 1970s most of them neither took part in the Presidential election nor political process. According to findings of The Pew Forum (2005), in 2004, 63% came out for voting, out of this 78% of Evangelical Protestant voted for incumbent President while only 22% voted for Senator Kerry. In USA the evangelical group account 15% of total voters. The breakup of evangelical vote according to the finding is the following:

Evangelicals	Bush	Kerry	Turnout
Traditionalist Evangelical Protestant	88	12	69%
Centrist Evangelical Protestant	64	36	52%
Modernist Evangelical Protestant	48	52	65%

The influence of Evangelical world view is obvious in Bush foreign as well as domestic policies. The Evangelical coalition with strong grassroots network played a significant role in the Republican congressional victories of 1994, thus in the run ups to the 1996 and 2000 campaign the Christian's Annual Convention became a require stop for GOP presidential aspirants (Oldfield: 2004). In the *National Security Strategy 2002* it stated that "while the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, to exercise our right of self defense by acting preemptively. And our responsibility to history is clear: to answer these (9/11) attack and rid the world of evil". The wording is in tune with the evangelical belief which divides the world into good and evil.

As for US policy in Iraq, President Bush, himself a "born again" Christian, has sometime invoked a notion of America's latter day manifest destiny, "I believe freedom is the Almighty God's gift to each man and woman in this world" (Waldman: 2004). Bush's focus on religious issues such as abortion, religious school vouchers, same sex marriage, and Israel helped mobilize his white, evangelical base which becomes a strong voting base for himself and the party.

V. Neoconservatives

The roots of neoconservatism lie in a remarkable group of largely Jewish intellectuals who attended the City College of New York in the mid- late 1930s and early 1940s, a group that included Irving Kristol, Daniel Bell, Irving Howe, Seymour Martin Lipset, Philip Selznick, Nathan Glazer and a bit later, Daniel Patrick Moynihan (Fukuyama 2006: 15). This group started out as a strong anticommunist and more inclined towards Trotskyism.

Basically neo-conservativist emerged from the ranks of liberal Democrats who became disillusioned with the politics of liberalism, the welfare state and the deterioration of

American culture. Their break with liberalism of the 1970s came in large part because they saw a threat to democracy as well as themselves, from mounting social disorder, anti-Semitism and particularly in foreign affairs- what they view as the ascendancy of wishful thinking (Ehrman 1995: 34).

During 1960s American politics had shifted dramatically as results of civil rights movement which compelled the government to resort towards public spending on social reconstruction. President Johnson started a fight for poverty and Great Society campaign which were bitterly opposed by the neoconservatives to this wind of change in American political system. The neoconservatives who as a liberal had been increasingly isolated within the party, they saw this shift as opposed to the interest of the United States and most Americans. Moynihan in his study of Negro Family argued that the black poverty had complex origin in culture and family structure and could not be solved through incentives that failed to take account of social habit (Fukuyama 2006: 20).

They condemned Kissinger's détente with Soviet Union as a failure of nerve to stand up to an evil enemy regime. Fierce anti-communism, a strong nationalism backed by a powerful military and an assertive internationalist leadership aimed at rolling back and eventually defeating communism underpinned this neo-conservative perspective.

They departed from Democratic switch over their loyalty to Republican Party, highly influence Reagan's first period but once again were unhappy with his policy shift towards peaceful negotiation with the Soviet Union. Neoconservative is often referred as an ideology, a movement. It has much to say about domestic politic issues such as labour policy, taxation or education: but it also expounds a particular approach to foreign policy (Ritchie and Rogers 2007: 139).

Views on Foreign Policy

1. Benevolent Hegemony: Many Neoconservatives argued during the late 1990s that the United States should use its military predominance to assert benevolent hegemony over strategically important parts of the world (Fukuyama 2006: 95). Kristol and Kagan (1996) argued that having defeated the "evil empire," the United States enjoys strategic and ideological predominance. The first objective of U.S. foreign policy should be to

preserve and enhance that predominance by strengthening America's security, supporting its friends, advancing its interests, and standing up for its principles around the world. Citing American preponderance in military and economic system of the world which was a powerful force to deter any nation to act against American interest, and thus it means that a leader with preponderant influence and authority over all others in its domain. This hegemonic status is a gift and Americans have to take it as granted. American hegemony is the only reliable defense against a breakdown of peace and international order (Kristol and Kagan: 1996). The appropriate goal of American foreign policy, therefore, is to preserve that hegemony as far into the future as possible. To achieve this US must go back to Reagan's foreign policy which unequivocally called for militarization. President Bush in his speech at the Citadel in 1999 vowed to rebuild American armed forces and promised to rewrite the Anti-ballistic Missile treaty if Russia is willing and if not, scrapped the treaty and accuse Clinton administration of neglecting national defense.

2. American leadership: The neoconservatives believes that American leadership is good both for America and for the world; and that such leadership requires military strength, diplomatic energy and commitment to moral principle (PNAC: 1997). America is an exceptional country, the first country in the world founded pure on the basis of equality and liberty, it is a country stood upon the hill where everyone can see. Thus, they had a mission to enlighten the world through its superior system as Theodore Roosevelt once implored the Americans to look beyond their daily lives and embrace as a nation a higher purpose in the world (Kristol and Kagan: 2000). They cherished the foreign policy of Roosevelt and Reagan who made Americans proud of their leading role in world affairs.

3. Unilateralism: According to neo-conservatives, the United States quite legitimately requires complete freedom of action as a global hegemon and whilst coalition of the willing are important and useful, the United State should be willing and be able to act unilaterally where and when it sees fit in order to safeguard its interests (Ritchie and Rogers: 2007). The neoconservative believe that international institutions regimes and treaties that constraint US behavior are unnecessary and damaging, they see the whole point of multilateralism is to reduce American freedom of action by making it subservient

to, dependent on, constricted by the will and interests of other nations(Ritchie and Rogers: 2007, Krauthammer: 2004).

According to Mearsheimer (2005), the key to understanding why the neo-conservatives think that military force is such a remarkable instrument for running the world is that they believe that international politics operate according to bandwagoning logic. Their belief is consolidated by global order after the world, the potential challenger of American supremacy were allies of US where US share a deep and prosperous relationship. By using military might as an instrument, the rest of the world will fear the United States that they will never think about challenging Washington instead, they will throw up their hands and jump on to American bandwagon.

Among the neoconservative think-tank the most influential group is the Project for New American Century. Created in the spring of 1997, the Project for New American Century, the core doctrine as articulate in its Statement of Principles put forward a clearly nationalistic and particularly militaristic approach to international relations. This Statement of Principles was signed by twenty five (25) people, nine of whom occupied senior position in Bush administration's first term. They are Elliot Abrams (Special assistance to President and Senior Director on National Security Council for Near East and North African Affairs), Dick Cheney (Vice President), Paula Dobriansky (Under Secretary for Global Affairs), Francis Fukuyama (member of President Council on Bioethics), Zalmay Khalilzad (Ambassador to Iran), I. Lewis Libby (Chief of Staff for Vice President), Peter W Rodman (Assistant Secretary of State for International Security), Donald Rumsfeld (Secretary of Defense) and Paul Wolfowitz (Deputy Secretary of Defense). Other signatories include former vice President for George HW Bush, Dan Quayle and George W Bush's brother Jeb Bush.

In 1992 a few months after the end Cold War, defense policy draft was prepared by the Pentagon which was done by neocon Dick Cheney (Secretary of Defense) and Paul Wolfowitz. It maintained that the objective of defense strategy is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, either on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere, that poses a threat on the order of that posed formerly by the Soviet Union...and the U.S. must show the leadership necessary to establish and protect a new order. In tune with this

view Bush emphasized the rising China as a competitor not a strategic partner. In his book *A charge to Keep* (1999: 240) Bush said that the world seeks America's leadership, looks for leadership from a country whose values are freedom and justice and equality. America must not retreat within its borders. Our greatest export is freedom, and we have a moral obligation to champion it throughout the world.

After the end of Cold War US is endowed with unprecedented military might and economic superiority, the Kuwait was liberated with only 147 US soldiers lost their lives. During Clinton period US experiences encounters where easy victory for US was the thumb rule. The kind of confidence given by this facts is one the causes of haste decision on military solution after 9/11 attack and unilateralism. The roots of Bush administration's unilateral approach is not a single source, rather it is an intermingling of multiple sources. His foreign policies like promotion of democracy, American values and freedom are in fact based on the ideological belief of Americans since the country began its journey. In its quest for a role a place and status in world affairs where survival of the fittest is the rule, it expressed these beliefs in different ways to suit the situation of the time which serve its national interest on the best possible way. However as Cuming (2007) argued that prior to Iraq war there had been a series of American wars in which US leaders often manoeuvred the other side into firing the first shot, Iraq thus represent a fundamental departure from earlier American way. The fundamental shift is that unilateralism is pursued in a more explicit way and preemptly become a documented strategy.

Chapter II

From Multilateralism to Unilateralism

From Multilateralism to Unilateralism

Since the foundation of the nation, US have pursued different variants of foreign policies- isolationism, multilateral engagement, liberal internationalism and realism. From the United States' emergence as a great power at the end of nineteenth century until 1940s, its political class favoured power or cooperation, but not the two together. Theodore Roosevelt favoured power while Woodrow Wilson favoured cooperation (Kupchan and Trubowitz: 2007) Throughout the Cold War the ideological and proxy war with Soviet Union was so intense that both the variants of foreign policy followed the same policy with little different. When the security of the nation is at stake, Americans lay aside their partisan differences and support their government policies as was seen during second world war, cold war etc. The end of Cold War and the subsequent decline of military security brought a sharp different in dealing other countries.

In several instances, the US considered preemptive strikes and preventive wars as foreign policy options. In the early days of the Cold War, some policymakers argued for a preventive war against the Soviet Union. If the US launched a devastating first strike, it would prevent the Soviets from acquiring nuclear capabilities. The justification given for such an attack was that "the uniquely destructive power of nuclear weapons required us to rethink traditional international rules." At the time, President Truman decided against a preventive strike citing that such actions were inconsistent with the American tradition. He stated, "You don't prevent anything by war, except peace." Instead of a surprise first strike, the nation dedicated itself to the strategy of deterrence and containment, which successfully kept the peace during the long and frequently difficult years of the Cold War (Kennedy: 2002). In accordance with Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, President Eisenhower also brought to the forefront the necessity and responsibility of occupying and reconstructing the Soviet Union if the US were to win a preventive war. Rejecting preventive war as a viable policy option has remained consistent throughout subsequent presidencies as an anathema to American moral values.

In 1953, President Eisenhower stated, “All of us have heard this term ‘preventive war’ since the earliest days of Hitler. . . In this day and time, I don’t believe there is such a thing; and frankly, I wouldn’t even listen to anyone seriously that came in and talked about such a thing.” (Jonathan Schell: 2003). During the Cuban missile crisis, the option of preventive strike was discarded by Kennedy administration.

After US waged a covert war in Nicaragua and the subsequent uncovering of misleading of Congress by Reagan administration, there has been a paradigm shift in US foreign policy. Reagan administration since Reykjavik summit in 1985 started cooperation with Soviet Union which President Reagan himself declared earlier as evil empire. The Party Platform in 1984 declared that stable and peaceful relations with the Soviet Union are possible and desirable, although opposition to Soviet policy of communist expansion was as steadfast as earlier. This led to a series of meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan and with George HW Bush which later culminated into a successful cooperation in various fields, most notable was the INF Treaty in 1987 and the also the commitment to withdraw by Soviet Union from Afghanistan. In the wake of Cold War tensions, President George H.W. Bush advocated the promotion of U.S. interests through coalitions, multilateral agreements and regional and international bodies like NATO, the European Union and the United Nations. The U.S. proved to be highly successful in establishing a diverse coalition of willing to support military action in the Persian Gulf conflict.

After the end of Cold war, US became the only surviving Super power, its power and influence has no precedent in the history, and the international system did not return to multipolar system till today. Instead as Paul Schroeder called it, nation states are bandwagoning towards the US power. The United States was as Bill Clinton quipped the “indispensable nation” that was uniquely positioned to keep world politics on a stable and cooperative course. The United States was the chief sponsor of the rules and institutions of the system and it more or less operated within that consensual and loosely arrayed governance system (Ikenberry: 2006).

In order to understand and explain how American foreign policy shift from *Multilateralism* to *Unilateralism*, an understanding of foreign policy of Clinton administration and foreign policy perception of Democrat Party and the underlying policy

is a necessary ingredient. Democratic Party foreign policy in general and Clinton foreign policy in particular is basically identified with liberal internationalism, multilateralism whereas George W Bush administration identify with unilateralism. Between 1993- 2000, Bill Clinton administration signed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Kyoto Protocol, Rome Treaty on International Criminal Court whereas Bush administration rejected these multilateral initiatives and legitimized preventive warfare since 9/11 episode.

I. Liberal Internationalism, Democratic Party and Clinton Administration

According to liberalism, liberal states founded on individual rights like equality before law, free speech and other civil liberties, private property and elected representatives are fundamentally against war because when the citizens who bear the burden of war elect their governments, war become impossible. Further citizens appreciate that the benefit accrued from trade could be enjoyed only under the condition of peace. Liberal states do exercise peaceful restraints and a separate peace exists among them (Doyle 1995: 83, 89). Liberal Internationalist believe that peace, welfare and justice are realized significantly through international cooperation (Zacher and Mathew 1995: 117)

Historically the two variants of International Relations theories Realism and Liberalism has played important role in defining international system. Although realism was regarded as a dominant theory, liberalism has a strong claim of being the historic alternative. The outbreak of World War I has convinced scholars and statesmen that balance of power and increased security in terms military advancement and preparedness is a futile effort to bring peace in the world. Liberal thinking thus got ascendancy with the painstaking effort of President Wilson and the subsequent establishment of League of Nations and the evolution of Collective Security system, but this was thrown into dust by the rise of Fascism in Europe mainly because of economic chaos and revengeful attitude of defeated countries.

The post- World War II international environment gave a new opportunity with establishment of United Nations, learning from past experience US extended credit to war ravaged countries of Europe and Japan through Marshall Plan. Thus the liberal view

of international order was founded by the establishment of democracy in Europe and Japan. However this beacon of hope was extinguished by the emergence of Cold War and the division of world into socialist and capitalist blocs.

In the 1990s liberalism appeared resurgence as a new kind of cooperation that was achieved in Gulf war. The new world order emerged after post-cold war discarded zero sum game world order. The post Cold war international order is in fact a fertile soil for developing liberal theory of international relation once again, since the opportunity after world war II was subsided by the Cold War international rivalry. International peace and cooperation was booming, the increasing peacekeeping mission may be a good example. Out of 63 peace keeping operations undertaken by UN, only 18 were sanctioned during Cold War, the remaining 45 or more than 70 percent were authorized after Cold War.

According to Charles Krauthammer (2004) Liberal Internationalism is the foreign policy of the Democratic Party. Internationalism of Democratic party got ascendancy during President Wilson presidency, he formulated his 14 Point as a guide for future cooperation but unfortunately failed to obtain Senate's ratification. To Wilson, foreign policy was not just pursuing American national interests but the interests of humanity at large (Cole: 1999). Wilson believed representative governments held the key to world stability. Woodrow Wilson believed the United States and Great Britain could promote the course of peace throughout the world by championing the cause of self-government (Wimer 1982: 195).

Looking back historically, it was during the Presidency of Democratic Party that most of multilateral forum took shape. President Wilson was the brain behind League of Nations, and the United Nations, International Monetary Fund, World Bank, GATT and a host of regional cooperative institutions were coming up under active participation of US especially Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. This experience and spirit of international cooperation is always a guiding principle for Democratic presidents in the future.

Although belief in peace and prosperity, cooperation and collective security, the US did not abandoned the use of force, it was apparent that American military budget would be

reduced in post cold war years, on the contrary it was higher than Cold War budget. In the Platform adopted by Democratic Party in 1992 it stated that the United States must be prepared to use military force decisively when necessary to defend American vital interests. The burdens of collective security in a new era must be shared fairly, and US should encourage multilateral peacekeeping through the United Nations and other international efforts.

Bill Clinton's Presidency in most ways represented a continuation of the traditional Wilsonian approach of building a world order based on the rule of law. Clinton and his advisers argued that globalization increased economic, political and social ties among nations and that this growing interconnectedness made fulfillment of Wilson's vision all the more important (Daalder and Lindsay 2003: 12). Democratic Party Platform (1996) stated that to halt the spread of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, we (United States) must lead renewed international effort to get tough with companies that peddle nuclear and chemical warfare technologies, strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency, and enforce strong sanctions against governments that violate international restraints. A Comprehensive Test Ban would strengthen our (American) ability to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, which may be our (American) greatest future security threat. We must press for strong international limits on the dangerous and wasteful flow of conventional arms to troubled regions. During Clinton administration, 27 UN Peace Keeping operations were authorized, nine operations more than the whole period of Cold War.

The Clinton administration, which downgraded further the reliance on military force to meet the security threats facing the United States, predicated its strategy of engagement and enlargement upon the assumption that the future security of the Euro-Atlantic region depended upon the successful transitions to democracy and the market economy in the CEE⁶ states as well as the republics of the FSU (Former Soviet Union), particularly the Russian Federation (Sperling and Tossutti: 2007).

⁶ CEE Countries refers to the group of Central and Eastern European countries, formerly called the Eastern Bloc during the Cold War. It includes Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech

Clinton administration displayed a serious degree of multilateralism, meaningful consultation with allies, concern with preventing humanitarian disasters and support for peacekeeping operation (Jervis 2005:54). In fact, the Democratic Party believe that there is a price to be paid for America's security and its leadership in world affairs, it believed in paying its dues in UN and taking active part in the global fight against starvation, infant mortality, natural disasters and environmental degradation and other worldwide problems as a means to strengthen American security and expression of American values. Liberal Internationalists believe that legitimacy is worth quite a lot in international politics, and that loss of legitimacy is the same as the loss of material power. The United States typically will have more power than others within these (international) institutions and can usually drive decision in the direction it wants, if it is clever, patient and willing to compromise. These small costs are expected to produce large dividends in political support or at least toleration (Posen: 2007).

II. Bush Foreign Policy Vision

American foreign policy under George W. Bush, does not herald a revolution, it upheld almost all key foreign principles of Clinton administration. He believes in democratic promotion as a effective tool to fight terrorism, the need to contain terrorism and dubbing hostile states as *rogue state*, sanctions, most importantly American leadership and global engagement are all the key principles of Clinton administration (NSS 1995, 1999).

Condoleezza Rice (2000) wrote that “We (America) should proceed from the firm ground of national interest and not from the interest of an illusory international community.” From this assumption American interest defined by Bush and his team was that terrorism is a threat to all mankind; international trade benefit United States as well as others; a strong national defense; and non-interference in conflict where US has no stakes etc. The Clinton administration's NSS (1999) identified three categories of interest that justified the calibrated use of American armed force: vital interests, important interests, and humanitarian interests. Vital interests were defined generally as the defense of American territorial integrity, national survival, and defense of allies. Important interests were

Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Serbia and Montenegro.

defined as interests that do not affect national survival, but ‘affect importantly our national well-being and the character of the world in which we live.’ Humanitarian interests only called for the use of American armed forces where military capabilities are necessary to alleviate human suffering and when ‘the risk to American troops is minimal’

Bush has a strong belief in American value of individual freedom, equality, democracy and rule of law and promotion of these values to the world. America should not retreat from exporting freedom, and this is a moral obligation which it has to champion throughout the world. He believed in American engagement in world politics but only within areas where American national interest are at stake and if necessary unilateral military actions. He said “If America’s strategic interests are at stake, if diplomacy fails, if no other option will accomplish the objective, the Commander in Chief must define the mission and allow the military to achieve it” (Bush 1999: 55).

Although unilateral in a situation where there is high politics like in security matters or at the level of compromising national interest he believe in international cooperation to shape and tackle world problems and prospects. Outlining the duties of American president in his speech at Ronald Reagan Library he said “He should work with our strong democratic allies in Europe and Asia to extend the peace. He should promote a fully democratic Western Hemisphere, bound together by free trade. He should defend America’s interests in the Persian Gulf and advance peace in the Middle East, based upon a secure Israel. He must lead toward a world that trades in freedom. And he must pursue all these goals with focus, patience and strength. Peace is not ordained, it is earned.” He believes that “building a durable peace requires strong alliances, expanding trade and confident diplomacy. It requires tough realism in our dealings with China and Russia. It requires firmness with regimes like North Korea and Iraq, regimes that hate our values and resent our success. And the foundation of our peace is a strong, capable, and modern American military” (Bush 1999: 239).

According to Daalder and Lindsay (2003) “The logic that underlay Bush’s foreign policy has its roots in a strain realist political thinking best labeled hegemonist. At its most basic, the hegemonist argument contents that America immense power and the

willingness to wield it, even the objections of others, is the key to securing America's interest.”

Bush world view has been dominated by the threat of weapon of mass destruction (WMD) and terrorism which he said a President must check the contagious spread of weapons of mass destruction, and the means to deliver them. In his campaign speech at Citadel, he said the threat of biological, chemical and nuclear terrorism – barbarism emboldened by technology (and) these weapons can be delivered, not just by ballistic missiles, but by everything from airplanes to cruise missiles, from shipping containers to suitcases. What made Bush's foreign policy different and potentially even radical were not its goal but its logic about how American should act in the world (Daalder and Lindsay 2003: 40)

Being an industrialist, he strongly advocated market economy base on free competition and minimal government intervention in economic affairs, tax reduction and cutting social security spending. “I'll never forget the contrast between what I learned about the free market at Harvard and what I saw in the closed isolation of China. Every bicycle looked the same. People's clothes were all the same. In a free market free individuals to make distinct choices and independent decisions. The market gives individuals the opportunity to demand and decide, and entrepreneurs the opportunity to provide” (Bush 1999: 61)

III. Bush Foreign Policy before 9/11

In his campaign speeches, Bush strongly advocated the urgent need for revamping defense forces military preparedness to meet the complex situations of post- Cold War world order, and he accused Clinton administration for not giving priority to military modernization and undermining American security. Although he was aware that increase military spending foreign policy was not a top priority list during the 2000 election campaign. In fact President Bush was a not a foreign policy expert, he himself admitted that he had much to learn about world affairs.

The focus of the Bush administration's first 180 days was on tax cuts, education reform, faith based welfare and social security reforms. There was no foreign policy revolution

on the agenda. There were no foreign policy initiatives to compete with the domestic limelight except for missile defense and military transformation (Moens 2005: 88). Contrary to the notion, common perception in US and overseas, that the Bush team was hawkish and interventionist from the start, instead it leaned towards the realist view that the United States should avoid meddling in the domestic affairs of the other nations. He promised that his foreign policy would focus on enduring national interest rather than idealistic humanitarian goals (Gordon: 2006).

Declaring himself as a realist, Bush administration had pursued a realistic foreign policy based on pragmatism and practical need of the time. Although Bush declared China as a strategic competitor, he at the same time understood the necessity of having close relationship with China. Bush successfully resolved the confrontation with China on the Spy Plane accident in 2001. His administration's dealing with spy plane incident was attacked and condemn by the neoconservatives as a national humiliation that revealed Bush's weakness fear: fear of the political, strategic and economic consequences of meeting a Chinese challenge. This however shows that Bush was not guided by the neoconservative foreign policy in the first eight months, in fact he personally believe that by not escalating the conflict, American interest would be serve better by resolving the crisis through careful diplomacy.

In security matter, especially national defense in general and homeland security in particular, his policy during the first few months was more or less guided by defensive realist paradigm. Even though he dismayed those who expected a sharp increased in defense budget, he decided to proceed with the Clinton administration's proposed 2002 defense budget request of \$310 billion (Daalder and Lindsay: 2003). However in spite of this, in 2001 budget he earmarked \$3 billion for research and development of Missile Defense alone. On December 14, 2001, Bush withdrew the United States from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, bedrock of U.S.-Soviet nuclear stability during the Cold War-era. Bush argue that Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with Soviet Union was obsolete as Soviet Union no longer exist and it serve only the past where American security threat came from possible missile from rogue nations. Besides defense modernization and moving beyond the ABM Treaty, the Bush administration did not really have an overall

foreign policy blueprint before the attacks of September 11, 2001. His foreign policy could be summed up as he is for freedom, free trade and a strong defense (Moens 2005: 103).

His administrations officially declared the Kyoto Protocol dead and announced US withdrawal from Kyoto negotiations. Denounced the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, scrapped Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, rejecting a convention on International Criminal Court, he said that he would not hand over any American to ICC.

His foreign policy came out from domestic influences and necessity, although free trade was his top priority but at the same time followed a protectionist policy. In the summer of 2001 Bush hinted that he would be prepared to adopt protectionist measures for the steel and farm industries among others, to show that if given trade promotion authority, he would defend American interest.

Regarding Middle East policy Bush stand had been a firm support to the cause of Israel. He believes that American President should defend America's interests in the Persian Gulf and advance peace in the Middle East, based upon a secure Israel. Bush has maintained a desire to resume the peace process in Israel, and openly proclaimed his desire for a Palestinian state to be created before 2005. He outlined a road map for peace in cooperation with Russia, the European Union, and the United Nations, which featured compromises that had to be made by both sides before Palestinian statehood could become a reality. He started an internal policy review process on the Israeli-Palestinian crisis and he refused to give the Palestinian issue the same profile as Clinton had done in the last few years. Bush put US engagement on hold by declining to send an envoy to peace talk at Taba, Egypt in January 2001. The White House eventually eliminated the post of special envoy that Dennis Ross had for eight years, and three months in the administration since then the NSC staff did not have a senior director for Middle East affairs.

The administration's policy on Iraq was firmly tied on non invasion although there was discontentment regarding effectiveness of sanction. He said "The coalition against Saddam has fallen apart or it's unraveling, let's put it that way. The sanctions are being

violated. We don't know whether he's developing weapons of mass destruction. He better not be or there's going to be a consequence should I be the president. But it's important to have credibility and credibility is formed by being strong with your friends and resoluting your determination.”

Summing up his foreign policy before September 11, may observed that it was a mixed of defensive unilateralism and search for credibility and legitimacy. Defensive unilateralism because his decision to abstain from international initiatives like Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Kyoto protocol, International Criminal Court and scrapping of Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty were founded on the obligations which would curb American domestic interest, economically as well as moral ethics and homeland defense system. In search for credibility and legitimacy the administration asserted its perception and gave important respect to international organizations and opinion of international community. Although the Congress authorize the administration to overthrow Saddam regime in Iraq and also a strong pressure from neoconservative groups, Bush was deterred by international opinion not to take any action to oust the regime.

IV. Multilateral Policy of George W Bush

Since the end of Second World War, United States is a country that utilized international forum and multilateralism most, whatever the end may be, whether its own specific national interest or global fortune. Although George W Bush period was often termed as an era of unilateralism, but there was an element of multilateralism in his foreign policy too. He declared that America would work closely with its allies to deny terrorists and their state sponsors the materials, technology, and their expertise to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction. American foreign policy spelled out by Condoleezza Rice is to renew strong and intimate relationships with allies who share American values and can thus share the burden of promoting peace, prosperity, and freedom (Rice 2000).

National Security Strategy- “The United States National Security Strategy does commit us to preemption under certain limited circumstances” said Colin Powell, “above all, the president’s strategy is one of partnerships that strongly affirms the vital role of NATO and other US alliances including UN” (Powell: 2004) The National Security Strategies

and Strategies for Combating Terrorisms were indeed intertwined which called for multilateralism i.e. alliance formation, maintaining, strengthening and utilizing multilateral institutions already at hand. The strategies had a clear view that war on terrorism and checking the proliferation of weapons of mass destructions could not succeed without the cooperation from world community.

A comprehensive strategy spelled out for combating the new dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction includes a variety of other measures to contain and prevent the spread of such weapons. In his speech at the UN General Assembly, he said that US will work with the U.N. Security Council to meet common challenge, advocate the need of cooperation from friends and allies and seeking the cooperation of Russia and China in developing realistic strategies using political, economic, and military instruments to deter and defeat the proliferation efforts of others. Republican Party Platform 2000 also stressed the need to address threats from both rogue states and terrorist group — whether delivered by missile, aircraft, shipping container, or suitcase. Andrew K. Semmel, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Nonproliferation in November 14, 2005 said that “A central element of the (Bush) Administration’s strategy against proliferation is a commitment to effective multilateralism to confronting the real problems that we face with realism and determination in league with our international partners.”

North Korea Nuclear Stalemate- The main reason behind Bush unilateralism was War on Terrorism, and the fear of weapons of mass destruction being falling in the hands of terrorist. He used this as the reason to defy UN Security Council’s opinion and invade Iraq in March 2003. If we view from this perspective, Bush should invade North Korea instead, Bush administration’s multilateral credentials have been most visible in the context of protracted North Korean nuclear crisis. Throughout the crisis Bush maintain his strong preference for a multilateral diplomatic solution of North Korean nuclear issue. He feared the episode would lead to conflict among the states of Northeast Asia or to the isolation of United States, given the varied and vital interests of China, Japan, Russia, South Korea and United States. Instead it became an opportunity for cooperation coordination as the efforts toward verifiable denuclearization proceed. And when North Korea tested nuclear device, the five other parties already were an established coalition

and went quickly to the Security Council for a Chapter VII resolution. That in turn put considerable pressure on North Korea to return to Six Party talks and to shut down and disable its Yangbon nuclear reactor. The parties intend to institutionalize these habit of cooperation through the establishment of a Northeast Asia Peace and Security Mechanism- a first step toward a security forum in the region (Rice: 2008)

Iranian Nuclear Issue- The Iranian nuclear issue has been pursuing through multilateral initiatives where International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and UN Security Council are the agency. US took a leading role in imposing sanctions and other punitive measures. Instead of taking up the issue unilaterally and regime change, international organization is allow to play a prominent role.

War Against Taliban - Although initiated war against Afghanistan unilaterally to capture Osama bin Laden and uprooting Al-Qaida as well as Taliban regime that provided a safe haven for the terrorist group after 9/11, US received massive international support. In fact, War on terrorism was fought with a truly multilateralism. The Afghan war enjoyed a broad international support, traditional allies and foes alike extended their support. Many countries offered troops, aircraft, naval vessels and other formed of direct as well as indirect support. After eliminating Taliban regime the reconstruction and stabilization of Afghanistan was undertaken by a multilateral initiative. Twenty months after the fall of Kabul half of the military forces in Afghanistan were from countries other than United States (Daalder and Lindsay 2003: 116). The International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) is an international stabilization force led by NATO with the authorization of the United Nations Security Council on December 20, 2001 through resolution 1363. On July 31, 2006, the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force assumed command of the south of the country, and by October 5, 2006, also of the east Afghanistan.

Proliferation Security Initiative- On May 31, 2003 President Bush announced Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) with the purpose to increase international cooperation in interdicting shipments of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), their delivery systems, and related materials. PSI participants are committed to following interdiction principles to establish a more coordinated and effective basis through which

to impede and stop shipments of WMD, delivery systems, and related materials flowing to and from states and non-state actors' proliferation threat, consistent with national legal authorities and relevant international law and frameworks, including the UN Security Council. Initially, 11 nations signed on to the Statement of Interdiction Principles that guides PSI cooperation. As of December 2007, 86 nations have formally committed to PSI participation. PSI has no secretariat but an Operational Experts Group coordinates activities. The State Department credits PSI with halting 11 WMD related transfers from 2004 to 2005, and more than two dozen from 2005 to 2006. PSI participants conducted 32 joint interdiction training exercises as of October 2007 (Nikitin: 2008).

PSI's long-term objective is to create a web of counter proliferation partnerships through which proliferators will have difficulty carrying out their trade in WMD and missile-related technology. Under the initiative of Bush, G-8 Leaders agreed a new Global Partnership to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction and related materials and technology. The United States, the G-7 and the European Commission have agreed to raise up to \$20 billion for projects pertaining to disarmament, nonproliferation, counterterrorism and nuclear safety over the next ten years. The United States intends to provide half that total.

V. 9/11 and the Herald of Offensive Unilateral Profile

The American-Mexico war in 1812 was the last war fought by US on its soil and Japanese attacked on Pearl Harbour in Hawaii in 1941 was the last explosion on its soil, the next major threat to its homeland security was the Cuban missile crisis. US fought the two World Wars and the Cold War outside its territory, none of the great wars had inflicted any heavy damage on its territory, in fact, it was the American industry which heavily contributed to the victory of the Allies in the second World War and its timely intervention in western Europe through Marshall Plan and NATO that saved west Europe from communism. The September 11 attacked on World Trade Centre exposed American vulnerability despite being a Super power. The attacked was a so disastrous and unprecedented that it shook the very foundation of conventional security based on military preponderance over other nations. It heralded a new era of security dilemma where deterrence and mutual assure destruction of the cold war proved to be futile.

American response to the attacked by non-state actors is decisive, unprecedented and changes the whole perception of American threat assessment which undeniably leads to pursue an offensive unilateralism to hunt down terrorist.

Although the unilateralism was dominating Bush foreign policy since his ascendancy into the White House, but by and large the pre- 9/11 policy was more or less defensive in nature. There was no assertive right to intervene in other countries instead, the administration maintain that American power would be used sparingly only where American national interest is involve. US policy of offensive unilateralism has been the fallout of its interest defines in terms of power and the underlying threat perception since the end of Cold War.

American government failed to defend the country from the terrorist attack and terrorist acquired a capability to such destructive power revealed the need for a strong measure against the terrorist. If the catastrophic destruction can be inflicted by non-state actors, then many of the concepts that informed security policy over the past two centuries- balance of power, deterrence, containment and the like- lose their relevance (Fukuyama 2006: 68). Now, Bush foreign policy turned John Quincy Adams on his head and argued that the United States should aggressively go abroad searching for monsters (terrorists) to destroy.

9/11, Offensive Unilateralism and American Threat perception after Cold War

The post Cold war period did not create an idealist vision of peace, instead the threat perception still remain. So President George HW Bush promised of New World order remain a myth in the world haunted by another threat namely weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. "The NSS made the concept of preemption explicit in the heady aftermath of September 11, and it did so for obvious reasons" argued Colin Powell (2004), "One reason was to reassure the American people that the government possessed common sense. As President Bush has said and as any sensible person understands if you recognize a clear and present threat that is undeterrable by the means you have at hand, then you must deal with it. You do not wait for it to strike; you do not allow future attacks to happen before you take action. A second reason for including the notion of

preemption in the NSS was to convey to our adversaries that they were in big trouble. Instilling a certain amount of anxiety in terrorist groups increases the likelihood they will cease activity or make mistake and be caught.” These threat perception had come into reality through the attack on World Trade center, this in turn herald a new era of foreign policy based on American primacy.

Weapons of Mass Destruction- The National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (2002) declared that “the possession and increased likelihood of use of WMD by hostile states and terrorists are realities of the contemporary security environment. It is therefore critical that the U.S. military and appropriate civilian agencies be prepared to deter and defend against the full range of possible WMD employment scenarios.”

Notwithstanding there was no permanent foe and specific enemy for US, the post cold war military budget of US was higher, which means that there was a threat perception in American mind. The collapse of Soviet Union created a new kind of threat; the threat of nuclear weapons and their delivery system falling in the hands of non-state actors like terrorist groups as well as the chance of failed or hostile state having the nuclear technology in post- Soviet states. Bush maintained that even in this time of pride and promise, America has determined enemies, who hate American values and resent its success – terrorists and crime syndicates and drug cartels and unbalanced dictators...The Empire has passed, but evil remains.

On June 21, 2000, the President issued Executive Order 13159 to invoked the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1701 and declared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation. Even after the expiry of the emergency in June 21, 2002, President Bush extended for another years.

Terrorism- Another form of threat perception existed in the form of Islamic extremism or terrorism in general. During the 1990s US became the victim of terrorism that attacked US embassy in Kenya and Tanzania and attacked on USS Cole in Yemen. In fact,

between 1993 and 1998, fifty four Americans had been killed in terrorist attacks and in February 1998, Osama bin Laden issue instruction to kill Americans (Leffler: 2003). However before 9/11, President Bush and his advisers were aware of the threat of terrorism, but did little to deal with it.

September 11 changed the US threat perceptions because it brought two threats that were more deadly in combination than earlier existed separately: radical Islam and weapons of mass destruction (Fukuyama 2006: 67). Terrorism is an age old concept, it was manifested in various form to suit the needs of the time. The history of the world is the struggle for power, whoever is wise and politically who were master in using terrorist technique to achieve his aim would survive. But the drastic different between terrorism of the past and present is that terrorist can do as heavy damage as the state could do.

State sponsored terrorism always more potent in their capabilities, this is true in case of Al Qaida also. To carry out such a massive attacked and destruction, terrorist needed a safe haven where training could be imparted without any hurdle. Al-Qaida gained many of its capability through its capture of the Afghan government. It could not have operated as it did without the acquiescence of the state (Jervis 2005:40) In his address to Congress in September 20, 2001 he made a vowed that “we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.... We will rally the world to this cause by our efforts, by our courage. We will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail.”

The most spectacular development of war on terrorism is the spirit of cooperation among nations as countries set aside their ideological difference, came forward with sympathy, gave a helping hand in every possible contribution they could. Even Russians which had a strained relation due to American withdrawal from AMB Treaty embraced a high degree of cooperation with United States largely on American terms. It endorsed not only American war against Afghanistan but also facilitating it by not opposing an American military presence in Central Asia, previously seen as Russian sphere of influence (Jervis 2005: 53). There was no outcry against American unilateral stance. Governments around

the globe would have backed almost any response to the atrocities of September 11th. Indeed, there was complete multilateral support for invading Afghanistan, toppling the Taliban, rebuilding that country and pursuing al Qaeda operatives even among Islamic nations. Thus, due to the gravity of the situation, a coalition was easily formed around the core NATO countries that reacted in support of military action.

In the summer of 2002, President Bush announced his policy of regime change in Baghdad, followed by the assertion that he needed no legal authority from either Congress or the United Nations to invade that country and topple Saddam Hussein. However, significant resistance from Secretary Powell within the administration together with former Secretary of State Baker, former National Security Advisor Scowcroft, and the president's own father stalled this initiative and he was persuaded to seek both congressional and U.N. approval before acting (Kelly: 2003).

VI. National Security Strategy 2002 and 2006 and the Bush Doctrine

The 2002 National Security Strategy (NSS) of the United States and the expanded version in 2006 describe the broad strategic goals that have become known as the *Bush Doctrine*: military primacy, global transformation, preemption, preventive war and a willingness to act unilaterally. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America is a document prepared periodically by the executive branch of the government of the United States for congress which outlines the major national security concerns of the United States and how the administration plans to deal with them. The document is purposely general in content (contrast with the National Military Strategy) and its implementation relies on elaborating guidance provided in supporting documents. The National Security Strategies are issued by the President and pertain to the U.S. government as a whole. The current mandate for the President to deliver to Congress a comprehensive, annual "national security strategy report" derives from the National Security Act of 1947, as amended by the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.

It has been issued, on a more or less annual basis, by each administration since Congress mandated its issuance in 1986, but prior to the September 2002 NSS of George W. Bush,

the strategy report was little more than a statement of existing policy. The NSS portrayed the Bush Doctrine as a logical extension of the Cold War strategy of deterrence of the new threats of terrorism. The 2002 NSS, however, was not merely the first statement of its kind by a new administration, it was an extraordinary document due to the fact that it provided the blueprint for the new era that began with the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, as well as a framework for U.S. action resulting from those attacks.

The most controversial aspect of the Bush administration's grand strategy, the doctrine of preemption and preventive war was laid down in the National Security Strategy of the United States (NSS) published in September 2002. It explicitly mentioned that "while the United States would constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country." What was revolutionary about the NSS was its expansion of traditional notions of preemption to include what amounted to preventive war. Bush in his speech at West Point (2002) articulated that deterrence the promise of massive retaliation against nations -- means nothing against shadowy terrorist networks with no nation or citizens to defend. Containment is not possible when unbalanced dictators with weapons of mass destruction could deliver those weapons on missiles or secretly provide them to terrorist allies. Bush administration argues that in the age of nuclear terrorists, the very distinction between preemption and prevention was outmoded; the restrictive definition of the former needed to be broadened (Gaddis: 2005)

Outlining the future American world view, in the second Presidential debate in October 11, 2000, he said "If we're an arrogant nation, they'll resent us, if we're a humble nation, but strong, they'll welcome us. And it's -- our nation stands alone right now in the world in terms of power, and that's why we have to be humble." The NSS 2002 and the subsequent policy called Bush Doctrine as better known is thus a sharp break from his view before September 11 which was characterized by defensive unilateralism and that saw American leadership, and especially its use of force, restricted to defending narrow and traditional vital interest (Jervis 2005: 79).

The fact that the United States granted itself a right that it would deny to other country is based, in the NSS, on the implicit judgment that the United States is different from other countries and can be trusted to use its military power justly and wisely in ways that other powers could not (Fukuyama 2006: 101).

Factors behind National Security Strategies and Bush Doctrine

The fact that US draft a National Security Strategy which strongly favours unilateralism may be because of the following reasons:

First of all, the fact of unprecedented American power is hardly in dispute. Those who oppose it find themselves frustrated by the seeming invincibility of American imperialism. Accepting this supremacy the NSS 2002 admit that “today, the United States enjoys a position of unparalleled military strength and great economic and political influence.” With less than 5 percent of world population, the United States generates about 30 percent of total world economic product, “a percentage that has actually increased in recent years.” (Donnelly: 2003)

For the past decade and well before that, the US has been spending more on its defense forces, absolutely and relatively, than any other nation in history. While the European powers chopped their post-cold war military spending, Chinese modernization was highly limited as compared to US military advance, and Russia's defense budget collapsed in the 1990s and the US Congress duly obliged the Pentagon with annual budgets ranging from about \$260bn in the middle of the decade to this year's \$329bn (Kennedy: 2002).

Secondly, American face no immediate threat from any nation in the world, indeed the greatest rival Soviet Union's inheritor plunged to a lowest level. The two other candidates as great-power balancers to American primacy, the People's Republic of China and the European Union, likewise are not immediately up to the challenge but are only competitors. Instead the reality of today is that Europe was aligned with US, thus strengthening American power, China notwithstanding high economic growth and military modernizations will need very long period to surpass the US, and to become a challenger and adversary. The proliferation of WMD and terrorist attack had resulted in comprehensive U.S. threat assessment which concludes that the normal constraints of

international politics counterbalancing powers no longer immediately inhibit the exercise of American might. At the same time, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction promises to upset the normal rules of power among nation-states, devaluing the conventional military strength amassed by the United States. This undercuts the general peace won by the victory in the cold war and would complicate any future great-power competition or challenge to the American-led international order. Small rogue states and violent, but nevertheless weak, international movements like Islamic radicalism are coming to have a disproportionate weight in global security calculations.

Thirdly, America strongly believe that their values, institutions which guaranteed individual freedom, democratic system and God' chosen nation etc made a strong contribution in the strategy which says that "We seek instead to create a balance of power that favors human freedom: conditions in which all nations and all societies can choose for themselves the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty." And this Bush doctrine of preemptive strike is that this right is exclusively granted to the United State. The opportunities to expand the Pax Americana also rest upon one of the few solid truths of social science: Democracies rarely proclaim war on other democracies. Promotion of Democracies which became a cornerstone of US foreign policy is the logical extension of this believes. One of the reasons it is so hard to imagine the European Union becoming a genuine competitor to the United States is that there are no serious, direct transatlantic geopolitical disputes.

Fourthly, When the nation was attacked by terrorist, unprecedented global support was garnered. For the first time, article V of NATO was invoked, which provide an attack on one member of the alliance will be regarded as an attack on all members. Not only NATO, the OAS invoked the Rio Treaty provision of Collective security, and Australia sought ANZUS Treaty on collective defense clause. In addition the UN Security Council quickly enacted several resolutions that required members states to pursue terrorists, dismantle financial support system to terrorism, the nation as well as the Congress was unanimous in strong action against the perpetrators. On September 14, 2001 authorized the use of armed forces against terrorist. Under such hyper pressure and expectation from

citizens, aggressive national strategy and emergence of the US as national security state become easier.

American principles, interests, and systemic responsibilities were argued strongly in favor of an active and expansive stance of strategic primacy and a continued willingness to employ military force. Within that context, and given the ways in which nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction can distort normal calculations of international power relationships, there is a compelling need to hold open the option of and indeed, to build forces more capable of preemptive strike operations.

Nature of National Security Strategies and Bush Doctrine

Democracy, Freedom and Free Enterprise- The main tenets of Bush doctrine espoused in the NSS 2002, 2006 and the underlying policies was promotion of democracy, freedom and free enterprise. This is not a new idea or new development, it is a persistent American policy. The NSS 2002 start with the great struggles of the twentieth century between liberty and totalitarianism ended with a decisive victory for the forces of freedom and a single sustainable model for national success: freedom, democracy, and free enterprise. This is indeed a continuation of traditional American foreign policy guide since President Wilson. In pursuit of these goals, the first imperative was to clarify what it stand for; that is the United States must defend liberty and justice because these principles are right and true for all people everywhere. However unfortunately these goal engenders all the controversy and right to empty strike and the well documented and explicit unilateralism in the Bush doctrine.

Security Threat and American Leadership- The second pillar is American and the world live in a time not only of opportunity but also of great threat posed primarily by terrorist and rogue states. These threats cannot be contained by deterrence, to thwart their action preventive war or preempty strike is necessary. In his radio address in March 8, 2003 he said “The attacks of September the 11, 2001 showed what the enemies of America did with four airplanes. We will not wait to see what terrorists or terror states could do with weapons of mass destruction.” The perceived need for preventive wars is linked to the fundamental unilateralism of the Bush doctrine, since it is hard to get a

consensus for such strong actions and other states have every reason to let the dominant power carry the full burden.

Indeed, the idea of preventive war and unilateralism is a historically approved foreign policy of US; if a nation pursues national interest relation cannot smooth any time and would transformed itself to became a zero-sum game especially in security related matters. The security situation after 9/11 as stated in NSS 2006 was truly a war, a war against non-states entity.

Doctrine of Preemption, Preventive War and Unilateralism- President since 1986 has declared similar general goals for the nation's future: peace, prosperity, and influence in a world stable but steadily improving economically, politically, and in the physical well being of its citizens. The adoption of the new national security strategy is not a great transformation of American foreign policy, but a continuation of the objectives established at the end of the Cold War because the conceptual view of America's role in the world at the end of the Cold War has remained consistent throughout both Republican and Democratic presidents.

President Bush's doctrine establishes a clear break from historical antecedents. At the first instances, he failed to distinguish between preemptive strike and preventive war. Traditionally, pre-emptive action refers to times when states react to an imminent threat of attack. By contrast, preventive military action refers to strikes that target a country before it has developed a capability that could someday become threatening. The Bush Administration's new National Security Strategy asserts that global realities now legitimize preventive war and make it a strategic necessity (Kennedy: 2002). Another important feature is the militaristic approach to problem solving and the need for maintaining military superiority in order to wage a unilateral preemptive strike anywhere, any place, the doctrine itself maintain that American forces would be strong enough to dissuade the potential adversaries from pursuing a military buildup in hopes of surpassing or equaling the power of United States.

The former Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott (2003) described that Mr Bush, as the first president to take office in the twenty-first century, has broken with his ten

predecessors, Republican and Democrat, from the end of the Second World War. By and large, those earlier occupants of the Oval Office—from Truman to Eisenhower to Nixon to George Herbert Walker Bush to Clinton believed in a foreign policy that combined American leadership with institutionalized, codified cooperation with other countries. Bush has a pessimistic view of other countries regarding an equal negotiation, rather his view on multilateralism may be best described by his famous acronym of the *Coalition of the Willing*.

Chapter III

Unilateralism in Practice: Case Studies

Unilateralism in Practice: Case Studies

The foundation of strong and prosperous international relation, international cooperation and international treaty should be compromise, accommodation and exploration of win-win situation. When a country plays a highly unilateralism, the whole international fabric was victimized. Bush administration although continued the policies of his predecessor was highly unilateralist and over protective which cost US his predecessor's hard earned internationalism. Indeed, Americans regard themselves as law-abiding and chide others who are not. But to many in the world, the highly visible deviations from international legal obligations by the United States, such as failing to pay UN dues and attacking a nation without UN approval, are sign of lawlessness (Chayes: 2008). US refused to accept very many international treaties and world opinions citing that it is encroaching American sovereignty is the fallout of an extremely narrow interpretation of sovereignty.

Today, international commons is not only tradition concept of collective security and protection of basic human rights but includes new issues such as global climate change, preservation of endangered species, and the use of outer space, as well as, the virtual commons of cyberspace which needs collective action to promote, conserve and utilize. This increasing interdependence and global commons in fact necessitated global endeavour because no country is outside the purview of globalization. People around the world were thrilled when the Cold War was over because they hope that these global commons would be promoted independent of militaristic view of foreign relation and the hope on the surviving Super Power was so huge that it has no parallel in history. This global expectation was fulfilled to some extent by Clinton administration although there was an element of unilateralism.

This scenario became entirely changed when Bush entered office in 2001, within six months of taking office, Bush had pulled out of the Kyoto Protocol on global warming, withdrew from Anti-Ballistic Missile, herald new competition on space weapons, opposed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the pact establishing International Criminal

Court (ICC), backed away from establishing a body to verify the 1972 Biological weapon Convention and watered down a UN agreement aimed at controlling the proliferation of small arms.

Bush prior to entering office, held strong views about how decision should be made and how the decision making process should be managed. Bush explicitly wanted to approach the job of policy making like that of a chief executive officer. With an MBA from Harvard Business School, experience as CEO of two companies, and witnessing the inner operation of his father's presidency, George W. Bush believes that the best way to formulate policy was for an executive surround themselves with knowledgeable experts and to rely on them to be responsible for the ground work of constructing policy while he would be responsible for making the final decision (Mitchell 2005: 174). This view of administration was effectively pursued by Bush which could be seen in different decision making process.

I. International Criminal Court

Background

The International Criminal Court (ICC), governed by the Rome Statute, is the first permanent, treaty based, international criminal court established to help end impunity for the perpetrators of the most serious crimes of concern to the international community. It was adopted in Rome, Italy on 17 July 1998 by the *United Nations Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court*. The ICC is an independent international organization, and is not part of the United Nations system. Its seat is at The Hague in the Netherlands. The creation of the International Criminal Court which promises to hold individuals accountable for the most heinous violations of international humanitarian law is the latest attempt by the international community to affect this paradigmatic shift.

International Criminal Court is not unique to the 20th Century. The Hague Peace Conference of 1809, convened for the primary purpose of promoting peace and stability by limiting or reducing armaments, also created the Hague Convention for the Pacific

Settlement of Disputes and the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The international community has long aspired to the creation of a permanent international court, and, in the 20th century, it reached consensus on definitions of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes.

In 1948, following the Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals after the Second World War, the United Nations General Assembly first recognized the need for a permanent international court to deal with the kind of atrocities that had recently taken place. Since then, the need for such a court has been discussed off and on at the.

In the 1990s after the end of the Cold War, tribunals like the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda were the result of consensus that impunity is unacceptable. However, because they were established to try crimes committed only within a specific time-frame and during a specific conflict, there was general agreement that an independent, permanent criminal court was needed. The need finally culminated after a long and arduous work, in July 1998 in Rome, when 120 Member States of the United Nations adopted a treaty to establish for the first time in the history of the world, a permanent international criminal court. This treaty entered into force on 1 July 2002, sixty days after sixty States have become parties to the Statute through ratification or accession.

US policy towards ICC

The protection of US sovereignty vis-à-vis international law has been a long standing issue, which the founding fathers warned of *entangling alliance*. Policy of isolationism was followed in the early years and the charter on League of Nations was rejected by Senate on this ground. In 1945 President Truman had to assure the Senate that Article 43 of the UN Charter which obligated members to make available to the Security Council armed forces, assistance and facilities would not rob Congress of its rights to declare war (Carter 2005: 368).

In several public statements, President Bill Clinton indicated his support for the establishment of a permanent international criminal tribunal. In October 15, 1995, in an

address at the University of Connecticut, Clinton remarked “By successfully prosecuting war criminals in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, we can send a strong signal to those who would use the cover of war to commit terrible atrocities that they cannot escape the consequences of such actions. And a signal will come across even more loudly and clearly if nations all around the world who value freedom and tolerance establish a permanent international court to prosecute, with the support of the United Nations Security Council, serious violations of humanitarian law.” (Franck and Yuhan: 2003).

When the UN set up Preparation committee for the Establishment of ICC in 1995 US responded by creating the position of ambassador at large for war crimes in the State Department and David Scheffer was appointed in 1997. In his September 1997 address to the UN General Assembly, President Clinton endorsed the establishment of permanent international criminal court to prosecute the most serious violations of international criminal law (Carter 2005: 370). At the Rome Conference, America changed its the position along with China, Russia and France that the UN Security Council should control the work of the ICC by referring critical situations for investigations and by instructing countries to cooperate.

As its condition was not incorporated, when the treaty was finally put vote in Rome in 1998, President Clinton refused to endorse it, while administration officials have strongly supported the creation of an international court. In the waning days of his administration, Clinton reluctantly signed the treaty in December 31, 2000. In his statement, Mr. Clinton said: *"The United States has a long history of commitment to the principle of accountability from our involvement in the Nuremberg tribunals that brought Nazi war criminals to justice, our leadership in the effort to establish the international criminal tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. Our action today sustains that tradition of moral leadership"* (Myers: 2001). Clinton administration was not happy with the treaty although signed the treaty. Even though signed lately, Clinton administration took part in every negotiation and tried to influence others in favour of its positions. This shows Clinton administration's belief in international treaty, yet like any other country the US try to gain as much as possible for its national interest. Clinton's view was truly

international in nature and his belief in negotiation instead of closing the door was a marked difference from what his successor did.

On May 6, 2002, the United States notified U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan that it “does not intend to become a party to the treaty” and disavowed any legal obligations arising from its signature on December 31, 2000. Marc Grossman (2002) said “Notwithstanding our disagreements with the Rome Treaty, the United States respects the decision of those nations who have chosen to join the ICC; but they in turn must respect our decision not to join the ICC or place our citizens under the jurisdiction of the court.” In his remarks at the Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ President said “The International Criminal Court is troubling to the United States. It’s troubling to the administration, and obviously trouble with the United States Senate as well.”

Ari Fleischer (2002) also noted that “The United States continues to feel very strongly that the International Criminal Court is not in the interests of the United States, that as we learned in the aftermath of the Serbian attacks on -- into Kosovo and to Bosnia, that there are existing mechanisms that can be set up to make certain that people who engage in criminal wrongdoing can be brought to justice. But under the ICC's charter, people can be brought before a court even if they do not subscribe to the International Criminal Court treaty. And the President thinks that is a way that Americans will ultimately be targeted, often for political reasons. And we will not and we do not support that.” On June 30, 2002, the United States vetoed a draft U.N. resolution to extend the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia because the members of the Security Council refused to add a guarantee of full immunity for U.S. personnel from the jurisdiction of the ICC, a move that provoked strong opposition from ICC supporters concerned with the viability of that institution, and that also raised some concerns about the future of United Nations peacekeeping (Elsa: 2002).

Causes of Rejection

The primary objection given by the United States in opposition to the treaty is the ICC’s possible assertion of jurisdiction over U.S. soldiers charged with “war crimes” resulting

from legitimate uses of force, and perhaps over civilian policymakers, even if the United States does not ratify the Rome Statute. According to Marc Grossman (2002), Under Secretary for Political Affairs, the US rejection to the International Criminal Court were-

First, we believe the ICC is an institution of unchecked power. In the United States, our system of government is founded on the principle that, in the words of John Adams, "power must never be trusted without a check." Unchecked power, our founders understood, is open to abuse, even with the good intentions of those who establish it.

Second, the treaty approved in Rome dilutes the authority of the UN Security Council and departs from the system that the framers of the UN Charter envisioned.

Third, the treaty threatens the sovereignty of the United States. The Court, as constituted today, claims the authority to detain and try American citizens, even though our democratically-elected representatives have not agreed to be bound by the treaty. While sovereign nations have the authority to try non-citizens who have committed crimes against their citizens or in their territory, the United States has never recognized the right of an international organization to do so in the absence consent or a UN Security Council mandate.

Fourth, the current structure of the International Criminal Court undermines the democratic rights of our people and could erode the fundamental elements of the United Nations Charter, specifically the right to self defense.

Fifth, we believe that by putting U.S. officials, and our men and women in uniform, at risk of politicized prosecutions, the ICC will complicate U.S. military cooperation with many friends and allies who will now have a treaty obligation to hand over U.S. nationals to the Court — even over U.S. objections.

Congress has passed several riders effectively precluding the use of funds to support the ICC. Congress passed the American Service members' Protection Act of 2002 (ASPA) as

title II of the supplemental appropriations bill for 2002, which was signed by the President on August 2, 2002 (Elsa 2002: 8). Section 2004 (e) of ASPA states that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agency or entity of the United States Government or of any State or local government, including any court, may provide support to the International Criminal Court. Covered entities are prohibited from responding to a request for cooperation by the ICC or providing specific assistance, including arrest, extradition, seizure of property, asset forfeiture, service of warrants, searches, taking of evidence, and similar matters. It prohibits agents of the ICC from conducting any investigative activity on U.S. soil related to matters of the ICC.

On the diplomatic front, the Bush administration attempted to leverage its power as a permanent member of the Security Council to carve out for itself an exemption from the Court's jurisdiction (Franck and Yuhan: 2003). The opposition of the United States to the International Criminal Court appears as either a puzzle or an embarrassment to many of the nation's traditional supporters argues Paul W. Kahn (2003). "A puzzle, because it is not at all obvious why the United States should feel so threatened by this new court. Supporters of the Court point out that there are ample provisions in the Rome Statute designed to protect a mature democracy's capacity to engage in legal self-regulation and self-policing. An embarrassment, because the United States appears to be exempting itself from rules of the game that it believes should apply to others. The US claim for special status undermines the very idea of the rule of law as a single, principled normative order to which all are bound. Even worse, it may undermine the great international effort of the last century to subject the use of force to the rule of law."

A profound thinking of ICC principles and objective reveals that the objections of ICC are not based on realistic fears about the dangers posed to Americans serving abroad, but rather stem from a particular ideology regarding international law and its institutions. Careful examination of US rejection reveals that they are mere allegations. In fact there are many international treaties which impose legally binding obligations to nation states in and outside the United Nations.

Article 13 of the Rome Statute establishes three avenues by which cases may be brought before the ICC: referral by a state party, referral by the U.N. Security Council acting under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter, or investigation by the ICC prosecutor. At the beginning of the negotiation, US vehemently argued for a mandatory UN Security Council's approval for referring a case to ICC, the obvious reason is that US can veto any proposal to be referred to ICC.

The rejection of ICC comes from American belief that its action are right and being a nation upholding rule of law, any breach of human rights can be vindicated by the purpose it suppose to serve. The Rome Statute does not subject U.S. personnel to new liability; acts of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes are subject to universal jurisdiction instead the punishable crime enumerated in the statute are part of international treaty already in force where US is an active member. The only possible reason is that US does not want its citizens be tried outside its jurisdiction, and thereby upholding unilateralism and to maintain its primacy over anything in the world.

II. Kyoto Protocol

Background

Advances in science and its application aware mankind the negative impact of reckless used exploitation of environment. During the past two decades, the nations of Europe and the United States have played prominent roles in ongoing and complex negotiation that have attempted to tackle many of the world's most important problems.

The Kyoto Protocol is an international agreement linked to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The major feature of the Kyoto Protocol is that it sets binding targets for 37 industrialized countries and the European community for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. These amount to an average of five per cent against 1990 levels over the five-year period 2008-2012. International efforts to address climate change began in earnest with the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was established and entered into force in 1994. The parties to the near universal treaty, including the United States, agreed to cut

emissions with the objective of preventing dangerous anthropogenic interference with Earth's climate system in a way that recognized common but differentiated responsibilities of various countries. More than 150 states signed the treaty in Rio De Janeiro and the United States was the first industrialize nation to ratify the convention which entered into force on March 21, 1994.

The FCCC established a conference of parties (COP), composed of all member countries to discuss the key unresolved issues. Kyoto Protocol itself is the fruit of COP meeting called COP-3. Under the protocol, participating developed countries collectively committed to reduce their average annual greenhouse gas emissions between the years 2008 and 2012 to 5.2 percent below their 1990 levels. The Protocol came into effect on February 16, 2005 after Russia ratified the treaty in 2004.

US Policy on Climate Change: When the UN General Assembly established the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) for a Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) in 1990, US was a signatory. The Convention, drafted by the INC, was adopted on 9 May 1992. It was signed in June at the UN Conference on Environment and Development, or the Earth Summit, in Rio de Janeiro by 154 states and the European Union (EU) including US and the Convention entered into force on 21 March 1994.

In February 1995 the INC was dissolved and the Conference of Parties (COP), comprising all members who have ratified the Convention, became the decision making body of the Convention. The COP is responsible for promoting and reviewing the implementation of the Convention, and keeping the entire process on track.

The United States signed the Kyoto Protocol on November 12, 1998. However, the Clinton Administration did not submit the Protocol to the Senate for ratification, acknowledging that one condition outlined by Senate Resolution 98, passed in mid-1997 meaningful participation by developing countries in binding commitments limiting greenhouse gases had not been met.

Foreign policy of US Presidential campaign 2000 was largely dominated by environmental related issue because Democrat candidate Al Gore has a strong reputation as an environmentalist. In the second Presidential debate, Bush said that the causes of climate global warming has not known yet. The implication of this perception of Bush was that Kyoto Protocol to reduced green house gas was a flawed idea. For Bush it is an unfair punishment to developed countries.

In February 2nd 2002, President Bush announced a U.S. policy for climate change that will rely on domestic, voluntary actions to reduce the greenhouse gas intensity (ratio of emissions to economic output) of the U.S. economy by 18% over the next 10 years. While his decision dealt a serious blow to the possibility of U.S. participation in the Kyoto Protocol, Bush was not alone in his opposition. Prior to negotiation of the Kyoto Protocol, the U.S. Senate passed a resolution saying the U.S. should not sign any protocol that failed to include binding targets and timetables for both developing and industrialized nations or that would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States.

Causes of Rejection

1. It does not provide long term solution: The Kyoto Protocol does not provide the long-term solution the world seeks to the problem of global warming. The goals of the Kyoto Protocol were established not by science, but by political negotiation, and are therefore arbitrary and ineffective in nature. According to Bush the Kyoto Protocol was fatally flawed in fundamental ways, but the process used to bring nations together to discuss our joint response to climate change is an important one.

2. Unfair Treaty: President claimed that the Protocol is unfair for developed countries and this would hurt the world economy in general and US economy in particular. It completely exempted, many countries of the world such as China and India, who are two of the top five emitters of greenhouse gasses in the world from the Protocol. In his letter

to senators Bush said “I oppose the Kyoto Protocol because it exempts 80 percent of the world, including major population centers such as China and India, from compliance, and would cause serious harm to the U.S. economy.”

3. Against American National Interest: In his meeting with Gerhard Schroeder in 2001, Bush said that “Our economy has slowed down in a country -- in our country. We also have an energy crisis. And the idea of placing caps on CO₂ does not make economic sense for America. I'm also worried about the fact that people may not be finding jobs in America.” Bush stress in using commonsense in regulation and suggested that United States should not carry the burden for cleaning up the world's air. Bush proposed rules that would force electric utilities to limit greenhouse gases and other emissions, but added that he would rely on market style regulations such as cap and trade policies, which would allow polluters to buy and sell emissions rights (Carter 2005: 343).

According to Dr. Harlan Watson (2005), Senior Climate Negotiator and Special Representative, U.S. Department of State President Bush's climate change policy has three basic components designed to address both the near-term and long-term aspects of climate change: (1) slowing the growth of GHG emissions; (2) laying important groundwork for both current and future action through major investments in science and technology, and institutions; and (3) promoting international cooperation. Irony to this policy is that US under Bush was willing to severe ties with its Atlantic allies by rejecting Kyoto Protocol. At his meeting with German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, Bush said “We will not do anything that harms our economy, because first things first are the people who live in America.” (Andrews: 2001)

This is a complete turnaround from Clinton's policy of multilateral effort to combat climate change and global warming, Bush relied on US alone, American strategy to tackle the problems. In tandem with its policy of not harming American economy, Bush administration announced a **Clear Sky Initiative** and **Climate Leaders** programme on February 14th 2002. The Clear Sky Initiative will cut sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxide and mercury emissions.

Even though US walk alone, the rest of the world decided to find a solution through global initiatives and multilateral cooperation. With Australia having signed the Kyoto Protocol, US was the only developed country outside the climate treaty. This negative action of US is significant because international community friends and foes alike alienated themselves from US policy, perhaps, the first time in US diplomatic history.

III. Iraq War

During the Gulf War in 1990, the United States secured a near-unanimous resolution from the United Nations (U.N.) Security Council to support the use of force to remove Iraqi forces from Kuwait if Saddam Hussein did not withdraw them by mid-January 1991. Eventually, an alliance of willing states, biggest of its kind succeeded in forcing Iraq to withdraw its troops from Kuwait. This was the greatest diplomatic and military victory by the coalition of US and other members. Twelve years later, the United States secured a fully unanimous resolution from the Council authorizing “serious consequences” in Iraq if it did not comply with previous U.N. resolutions on inspections for weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Yet when the United States invaded Iraq in March 2003, the U.N. consensus had disappeared, with several Security Council members criticizing the United States for taking military action without a second resolution explicitly authorizing force.

After decisively defeating Iraq in the Gulf War, George HW Bush followed the policy of containment to prevent Iraq’s rearmament. This policy was followed by Clinton administration wholeheartedly. In fact Clinton administration was extremely reluctant to use force against Iraq beyond selective retaliation for Iraqi infringement of the no flying zones. This reflected the administration’s commitment to the authority of the United Nations that lay at its heart of its Iraqi policy. Any use of force by the United States was portrayed not as a US attacked on Iraq to meet US objectives, but a UN attack against Iraq to meet UN objectives (Ritchie and Rogers 2007: 28). Nevertheless, Clinton administration had decided to regime change in Iraq. There was a heavy pressure on Clinton to wage a war against Iraq, and the Congress itself passed a resolution to that

effect. However, Clinton Administration was unwilling to use force beyond air and missile strike for domestic reasons, and its reluctant to use ground troops and accept military casualties dominated military planning (Ritchie and Rogers 2007: 29)

Bush Administration and Iraq

When Bush entered office it did not have a full fledged strategy for Iraq (Ritchie and Rogers 2007: 53), and the first 100 days was in fact dominated by domestic issues. Bush had campaigned on a platform of restricting U.S. involvement in world affairs, famously stating in a debate with then-Vice President Al Gore that “I don’t think our troops ought to be used for what’s called nation-building.” According to the CIA Director George Tenet and his deputy for operation James L. Pavitt, there were three major threat to American national security, **One** was Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda terrorist network, which operated out of a sanctuary in Afghanistan. Bin Laden terrorism was a “tremendous threat” which had to be considered “immediate,” they said. A **second** major threat was the increasing proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, WMD—chemical, biological and nuclear. This was of immense concern, they said. **Third** was the rise of China, especially its military, but that problem was 5 to 15 or more years away. Iraq was barely mentioned. (Woodward: 2004).

Iraq issue was first discussed in a principal committee meeting on February 5th 2001, chaired by Rice. The members included Vice President Cheney, Secretary of State Powell, Secretary of Defence Rumsfeld and Deputy CIA Director John E. McLaughlin. The meeting was dominated by increasing intelligence, UN sanction, weapon inspectors and operation of no flying zones (Woodward: 2004). There was attempted to topple Saddam Hussein at the government policy leveled. Instead on March 1st when the principal meets again Powell was given the task of devising a plan and strategy to refocus the U.N. economic sanctions on weapons control (Woodward: 2004).

At the same time many of the Bush critical decision makers including Cheney, Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz had expressed the desire to remove Saddam Hussein from power well before September 11, and after September 11, advocate regime change as part of new war

on terrorism, Wolfowitz admitted in May 2003, when September 11 occurred, the question of attacking Iraq became a part of US global strategy, with only the timing to decide (Ritchie and Rogers 2007: 73, Kolko 2007:140). They are intellectual godfather and fiercest advocate for toppling Saddam (Woodward 2004: 21). When the Project for New American Century (PNAC) sent a letter to President Clinton on January 16, 1998 for removing Saddam Hussein, it was signed by among others Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, John Bolton, Richard Armitage, and Elliott Abrams. It would be obvious that containment policy of George HW Bush and Clinton's policy of containment would be replaced by a new policy.

When the neoconservatives enjoyed ascendancy in the Bush administration, they established a record of vigilance on matters of Iraq. In other words the decision to confront Iraq was in many ways a victory for a small group of conservatives who, at the start of the administration, found themselves outnumbered by more moderate voices in the military and the foreign policy bureaucracy. Their tough line on Iraq before Sept. 11, 2001, was embraced quickly by President Bush and Vice President Cheney after the (9/11) attacks (Kessler: 2003).

After September 11, 2001 Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld created a new office in the Pentagon, the Counterterrorism Evaluation group later known as the Office of Special Plans. The task was to provide the Secretary with advanced analysis of intelligence on Iraq, links between Middle Eastern states and terrorist networks, and issues related to the war on terrorism. The director of the Special Plans operation was Abram Shulsky, who served in the Pentagon under Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle during the Reagan Administration, after which he joined the Rand Corporation and the office was overseen by Under-Secretary of Defense William Luti, a retired Navy captain who was an early advocate of military action against Iraq. Obviously the findings would be in favour of Iraq's non-compliance of UN Security Council's Resolution for disarmament and presence of WMD and Saddam Hussein's Al-Qaida link. According to the Pentagon adviser, Special Plans was created in order to find evidence of what Wolfowitz and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, believed to be true—that Saddam Hussein had close

ties to Al Qaeda, and that Iraq had an enormous arsenal of chemical, biological, and possibly even nuclear weapons that threatened the region and, potentially, the United States (Hersh: 2003).

Terrorism, Weapons of Mass Destruction and Iraq

After the 9/11 attack, Iraq was scanned on every aspects, from rogue state to WMD and terrorism. The blueprint for Iraq war was outlined in Afghanistan war plan as a footnote only six day after WTC attacked (Kessler: 2003). In his Union address in 2002, President has introduced a concept of Axis of Evils,⁷ among the three countries identified as Axis of Evil his main focus was Iraq which has WMD capability as well as harbouring terrorist. The Bush administration tirelessly placed Iraq at the centre of war on terrorism and branded Saddam's regime the source of greatest threat after 9/11 (Ritchie and Rogers 2007: 87).

As early as February 2002, the Bush Administration made the decision to oust Saddam Hussein (Vaughan: 2003). New York Times also report in 2002 that "until recently," the White House said Mr. Bush had "no (Iraq) war plan on his desk." But today, Mr. Fleischer said, "I am not saying there is no (war) plan on his desk." (Schmitt and Sanger: 2002)

On October 11, 2002 the US Congress passed the Joint Resolution to Authorize the Use of United States Armed Forces Against Iraq, providing the Bush Administration with the legal basis for the U.S. invasion under US law and authorizing the administration to take action against those responsible for the attacks of September 11 and those who harboured such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons. This became a great moral booster for the unilateralist among Bush administration. It actually gave Bush the authority to use force against Iraq without getting approval from the UN first (Glennon: 2003).

⁷ Axis of evil is a term coined by United States President George W. Bush in his State of the Union Address on January 29, 2002 in order to describe governments that he accused of helping terrorism and seeking weapons of mass destruction, these countries are Iran, Iraq and North Korea.

When US introduced a Security Council Resolution on October 25, 2002 Bush warned that "If the United Nations doesn't have the will or the courage to disarm Saddam Hussein and if Saddam Hussein will not disarm, the United States will lead a coalition to disarm [him]" (Glennon:2003). This resolution later known as Security Council Resolution 1441 was unanimously passed by the Security Council.

The wind of change could be realized from Bush State of the Union address in January 2003, when he said "before September the 11th, many in the world believed that Saddam Hussein could be contained. But chemical agents, lethal viruses and shadowy terrorist networks are not easily contained. Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans this time armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known. We will do everything in our power to make sure that that day never comes."

On February 24, 2003 the United States, the United Kingdom, and Spain introduced a resolution that would have had the council simply declare, under Chapter VII of the UN Charter that Iraq has failed to take the final opportunity afforded to it in Resolution 1441, although the weapon inspector report that there was no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. As the three permanent members viz., France, Russia and China opposed the resolution, US withdrew the resolution and proceed to wage a war on Iraq the following month without express UN sanction.

In the months leading up to the first Gulf War, the United States succeeded in building an international coalition through the Security Council, which, in turn, ultimately prompted domestic support from Congress; in the months preceding the second Gulf War, the United States initially secured a unanimous Security Council resolution 1441, which demanded once more that Iraq comply with the previous sixteen resolutions calling for arms inspections to verify that Iraq had destroyed its WMD. The Security Council declared that Iraq was in "material breach of its obligations" and stated that this resolution marked "a final opportunity [for Iraq] to comply with its disarmament obligations." But US failed to garner support for a second resolution that explicitly

authorized the use of force. US, despite failure in UN, proceed without UN authorization which showed a marked unilateralism of Bush administration. Bush relied on *coalition of the willing*, a coalition dictated by US, for the intervention in Iraq for overthrowing Saddam Hussein.

IV. Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty

Background- The concern for national security and diverting large amount of national resources on military during the heydays of Cold war did not contributed and ensure the level of security. Neither it allowed the two super power to hold their respective blocs according to their wishes. The disillusion which resulted into détente gave rise to a new approach to security, the most important one is the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

The ABM Treaty was signed at Moscow May 26, 1972, and it entered into force October 3, 1972. In the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems the United States and the Soviet Union agreed that each may have only two ABM deployment areas, so restricted and so located that they cannot provide a nationwide ABM defense or become the basis for developing one. Both Parties agreed to limit qualitative improvement of their ABM technology. Article V (1) said that each party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based. According to Article XV (1), this treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

The US and the USSR signed a Protocol to the treaty which entered into force in 1976 which reduced the number of ABM deployment areas from two to one, whereby it was agreed to deployed either around each party's national capital area or, alternatively, at a single ICBM deployment area. The Treaty was further modified by amendments, various common understandings, and protocols.

While asking his view on withdrawing from ABM Treaty, Clinton (1999) said “I, personally, think that would be a terrible mistake. Look, we are for all of our ups and downs and rough edges, we are working with the Russians, and we have made real

progress in reducing threats as a result of it. If we just scrap the ABM treaty.....our insecurity will increase.” Basically due to increased missile capability of North Korea, in 1999 Clinton allowed a limited deployment of ABM system. As this would go beyond the limit of ABM Treaty, he sought amendment of the treaty. In September 2000, he deferred the deployment of the system.

Policy of George W Bush

Foreign policy of Bush focus on security from terrorist attack and weapons of mass destruction, revamping military preparedness etc. During his campaign he vehemently criticized Clinton’s neglect of national security.

Turn around on Clinton’s view on ABM Treaty, occurred on December 13, 2001 when President Bush submitted to the Russian Federation formal notification of intent to abrogate the Treaty. This presented a serious challenge to maintaining international peace, security, and multi-lateral arms control agreements. On 13 June 2002 the unilateral withdrawal of the United States of America from the ABM Treaty came into effect. On the pretext that the ABM treaty hinders American government’s ability to develop ways to protect its people from future terrorist or rogue state missile attacks (Perez-Rivas: 2001). Thus while Clinton viewed AMB Treaty enhance American security, Bush believed that it contradicted American security needs. What Bush wanted is a neoliberal market style freehand in security sphere. Obviously no country can outwit America military hardware and software, he believes that the scrapping of this treaty would strengthened American superiority in latest military technology.

President Bush said that “the United States will withdraw from the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty "at a time convenient to America” (Sanger: 2001). Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld has been a leading supporter of a national missile defense system, unabashed about his willingness to defy international treaties and the objection of allies to build such a system (Kupchan 2002: 216). He also made a forceful case for deploying a national missile defense, stating that the United States needed to develop a new kind of

deterrence against emerging missile threats. He also derided the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972, which prohibited such defenses, as "ancient history." (Meyers: 2001)

Causes of Rejection-

1. Threat Perception- The main components of Bush campaign slogan are threat from terrorist attack and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Bush argues that there is a constant threat of ballistic missile attack on America. He said that "In 1972, just nine countries had ballistic missiles, but today, that number has grown to 27 and it includes hostile regimes with ties to terrorists." The White House released an ABM Treaty fact sheet that stated "Under the terms of the ABM Treaty, the United States is prohibited from defending its homeland against ballistic missile attack. We are also prohibited from cooperating in developing missile defenses against long-range threats with our friends and allies. Given the emergence of these new threats to our national security and the imperative of defending against them, the United States is today providing formal notification of its withdrawal from the ABM Treaty."

2. Obsolete Treaty- ABM Treaty is a Cold War era treaty for the purpose of securing survival for a threat generated by Cold War. It is no more effective and relevant for defending a country. The 1972 ABM treaty was signed by the United States and the Soviet Union at a much different time, in a vastly different world and one of the signatories, the Soviet Union, no longer exists and neither does the hostility that once led both the countries to keep thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert, pointed at each other. (Perez-Riva: 2001)

3. Need for New Approach to Defense- Bush administration asserted that as Cold War is over and Russia is no longer an enemy instead it has become a friend. According to Bush, the threat to security is coming from other front i.e. "terrorist states and terrorist networks that might not be (able to) deterred by our nuclear forces, so we need a new approach. This approach combines deep reductions in offensive nuclear forces with new advanced conventional capabilities, and defenses to protect free people from nuclear blackmail or attack."

In simple language anti-ballistic missile is hitting a bullet with bullet, it need sophisticated technology. It is easier to achieve a technology that can avert anti-ballistic missile than developing a foolproof anti-ballistic missile. US unilateral withdrew to this AMB Treaty prompted Russia to a new militarization, developing a new ballistic missile and China to developed anti-satellite missile.

V. Comprehensive Test Ban treaty

Background- UN Disarmament effort culminated into various multilateral treaties on limiting nuclear armaments. However they are partial in nature, no comprehensive treaty was evolved. The negotiation on CTBT was initiated in 1977 by UK, US and Soviet Union but it was suspended during 1980s. However the negotiation was were taken up seriously in Conference on Disarmament at Geneva during 1993-96. At the UN General Assembly, US and India were co-sponsor of CTBT in 1993. After prolong negotiation and changing stand of sponsor countries as well as nuclear weapon states, it was opened for signature in 1996 intended to prohibit all nuclear weapon testing and explosions. Although the CTBT has achieved near universal adherence, however, Article XIV of the Treaty requires ratification by 44 named states, before the Treaty can enter into force. As of May, 2009, 180 countries signed the treaty and 148 countries ratify it.

US Policy Towards CTBT- Way back in 1993, President Clinton said, “A test ban can strengthen our efforts worldwide to halt the spread of nuclear technology in weapons,” in pursuance of his commitment to test ban, the first country to sign the CTBT was the US. President Bill Clinton signed the CTBT on September 24th, 1996 using the same pen with which President John F Kennedy had signed the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963. This was a sentimental demonstration of the US concern for nuclear testing and its desire to ban all test.

On September 22, 1997, President Clinton submitted the CTBT to the Senate for ratification. In October 13, 1999, the US Senate failed to ratify the CTBT with 48 for and 51 against. This drew condemnation from Bill Clinton and the White House Administration, environmental groups and other governments. The grounds for rejection

was that if the US ratified this treaty, it would not stop others trying to go nuclear and therefore the US should not ratify on the grounds of national security.

Bush Nuclear policy and CTBT- President Bush took office with the strong agenda to change and revitalize the US nuclear posture. In his speech at National Defense Academy in 2001 he said, “I am committed to achieving a credible deterrent with the lowest-possible number of nuclear weapons consistent with our national security needs, including our obligations to our allies. My goal is to move quickly to reduce nuclear forces.” The nuclear forces would be change to meet the realities of post-cold war world. In the wake of 9/11 and the rise of nuclear programs in Iran and North Korea, the risk of nuclear proliferation has become more stark; some claim the treaty would curb that risk (Medalia 2008: 2).

In 2001 the administration came out with Nuclear Posture review which was described by officials as creating a new triad in an effort to reduce the role of nuclear weapons that might not be credible against rogue states, yet ironically one of the first act of the administration is to create a new nuclear strike option against those very states (Kristensen: 2008). As most of US nuclear weapons were of cold war origin and meant for deterrence against Soviet bloc, they need to revitalized, sharpened, in order to meet the new challenge which need testing. J.D. Crouch, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy, presented an unclassified briefing on it on January 9, 2002, dealing in part with the CTBT and nuclear testing stated that there would be “no change in the Administration’s policy at this point on nuclear testing. We continue to oppose CTBT ratification.” (Medalia 2009: 2)

At the White House, however, press secretary Ari Fleischer told reporters that Bush has not ruled out conducting nuclear testing "to make sure the stockpile, particularly as it is reduced, is reliable and safe. So he has not ruled out testing in the future, but there are no plans to do so." (Pincus: 2002) . On November 22, 2002, the U.N. General Assembly adopted resolution 57/100 (164 for, 1 against (U.S.A.), 5 abstentions) urging states to maintain their nuclear test moratoria and urging states that had not signed and ratified the

CTBT to do so as soon as possible and to avoid actions that would defeat its object and purpose.

Bush administration was adamant on its ambivalence towards nuclear testing and committed to sharpening nuclear weapons and military readiness to meet the possible future enemies. On June 25, 2007, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice stated that “the Administration does not support the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and does not intend to seek Senate advice and consent to its ratification. There has been no change in the Administration’s policy on this matter. By reducing the likelihood of the need to return to underground nuclear testing, RRW [the Reliable Replacement Warhead] makes it more likely that the United States would be able to continue its voluntary nuclear testing moratorium. We cannot, however, provide guarantees regarding the voluntary moratorium. We may find at some future time that we cannot diagnose or remedy a problem in a warhead critical to the U.S. nuclear deterrent without conducting a nuclear test” (Medalia 2009: 6).

Thus under Bush administration, there was a possibility of reducing nuclear stockpile but the chance of blanket ban on testing was impossible because the policy of the administration had develop a new and smart nuclear weapons that can withstand any future security challenges.

Conclusion

Implication of Unilateralism

Implication of Unilateralism

United State is the most powerful and most influential country in the contemporary world and it will maintain this position for decades to come or may be a century or more. However, on the top chessboard, military power is largely unipolar. As we have seen the United States is the only country with both intercontinental ballistic nuclear weapons and large, state of the art air, naval and ground forces capable of global deployment. But on the middle chessboard, economic power is multipolar, with the United States, Europe and Japan representing two-thirds of the world product, and with China's dramatic growth likely to make it a major player entry in the century. (Nye 2002: 39) Without the knowledge of these distribution of power, the foreign policy could be a complete failure.

There is no doubt multilateralism significantly enhanced US power. The voting pattern in UN General Assembly is of course a reliable proof of it. Except on the question of Israel, General Assembly more or less voted in favour of US policy. Multilateralism moreover enable the US to share the burden of its policy initiatives. But unilateralism since 2001 and especially after 9/11 highly defective for healthy international system.

The doctrine of preemption contained in the National Security Strategy released in 2002 alarmed the rest of the world without conferring any concrete advantages on the United States. This Bush New Doctrine was not in fact a policy of preemption (i.e., a first strike intended to forestall an imminent attack). Rather the new doctrine sought to justify a policy of preventive war (i.e., a war fought to forestall a shift in the balance of power, independent of whether or not the opponent was planning to attack). Preemption is a legitimate act in international law but preventive war is not (Walt 2005: 224).

The new unilateralism is in part a product of the new multilateralism, which offers fewer opportunities for the United States to exercise political control over others and fewer ways to escape the binding obligations of the agreements (Ikenberry: 2003). He argued that some of the other new multilateral treaties that are being negotiated today represent slightly different trade-offs for the United States. In the past, the United States has embraced multilateralism because it provided ways to protect American freedom of action: escape clauses, weighted voting, and veto rights. But US must realize that international peace and security is not guaranteed by military preponderance, it is about collective effort and endeavour.

The case of unilateralism is viewed by different scholars, different school of thought from different angles. International relations theories have agreed on the principle that unilateralism is a threat to world peace and security as well as the wellbeing of humanity as a whole, it hampered collective effort in fighting global problems and a stumbling block on the way of human progress.

I. Realist View

The most pervasive argument against unilateralism is that it will spark or hasten counterbalancing by other major powers. The argument is derived from balance-of-power theory, long a staple of realist thinking and practice. According to Realist perspective, if a nation acquire preponderance power over the other, others form either a coalition to counter that state or militarizing themselves. However this realist vision was belied in the post cold war international development. During 1990s international order shifted from militarism to a new form of globalization which focus more on human security, economic growth, concern for human right. As such nations found it more constructive to bandwagoning than balancing US power.

At the same time, the US power grew to significant extent that no power is powerful enough to challenge its might, but if the US is pursuing unilateral approach, other states may attain a power which can significantly check US power if not balance. Charles Kupchan (2002) argues that preponderant power alone can do a nation more harm than good. When unchecked, primacy often invites enemies and provokes the formation of

hostiles, countervailing coalition. When wielded with prudence, however, dominance handsomely rewards the nation that possesses it, securing not only its well being, but extending through international system a stable order crafted in its image. But the post-cold war world order signified that “the United States is unlikely to face a challenge to its preeminence unless it act so arrogantly that it helps others to overcome their built-in limitations” (Nye 2002: 169).

The predominance of US in every sphere viz. military, economy, culture, media, science and technology etc convinced the realist that the traditional realist assumption of balance of power is impossible. Thus they resorted to soft balancing of US, and warned that these policies may be converted to open, hard-balancing strategies if and when security competition becomes intense and the powerful state becomes threatening (Walt: 2005, Pape: 2005, Paul: 2005, Nye: 2003)

Soft balancing involves tacit balancing short of formal alliances. It occurs when states generally develop ententes or limited security understandings with one another to balance a potentially threatening state or a rising power. Soft balancing is often based on a limited arms buildup, ad hoc cooperative exercises, or collaboration in regional or international institutions.

Thus the militaristic approach of foreign policy by US brought back the past theory into the fore front once again. The regrouping of European Union and its focus on military aspect to deal with European problems is one major initiative. Since 1949, European security was managed by NATO which was more or less under the command and control of US. The expansion of NATO was seen as a means to enhance American influence because the east European countries were economically dependent on US whereas the leading west European countries like France and Germany can no longer be contained by US.

But the power and influence of US is too far reaching and superior, which cannot be balanced even by a coalition of major powers. Unable to balance American military power, France, Germany, Russia and China created a coalition to balance American soft

power by depriving the United States of the legitimacy that might have been bestowed by a second UN resolution (Nye: 2003).

In Asia a new regional grouping in the form of Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) was established in 2001, dominated by two most powerful revisionist power viz. Russia and China. On July 16, 2001, Russia and China signed the Treaty of Good Neighbourliness, Friendship and Cooperation which calls for joint actions to offset a perceived US hegemony and the rise of militant Islam in Asia (Paul: 2005).

Reiterating and strengthening their stand, on July 1st 2005, Russia and China made a joint declaration on International Order of the 21st Century in Moscow, it stated the unacceptability of monopolizing global affairs, dividing states into those who lead and those who are led, imposing models for social development from the outside and applying double standards. All countries of the world must strictly abide by the principles of mutual respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in internal affairs of each other, equality and mutual benefit (and) peaceful coexistence. The text was an explicit outraged against US unilateralism and its sponsored *colour revolution*⁸ in Central Asia and Eastern Europe.

Primacist and unilateralist elements in US were endorsing nuclear primacy strongly in private, while they advocate against it strongly in the public. The withdrawal from ABM Treaty and rejection of CTBT were an unambiguous example of it. For unilateralist hawks, nuclear primacy is thought to provide maximum deterrent credibility....indeed US nuclear primacy has driven the Russians and Chinese into major nuclear force modernization and possibly into dangerous prompt launch deployment postures (Ross: 2008)

US withdrawal from anti-ballistic missile created a sense of insecurity, and the subsequent development of Strategic Defense Initiatives was responded by Russia with a

⁸ Colour revolutions is a term used to describe related movements that developed in post-communist societies in Central and Eastern Europe, and Central Asia in the early 2000s. These revolutions were supported by US. Participants in the colour revolutions have mostly used nonviolent resistance. These movements all adopted a specific colour or flower as their symbol. The colour revolutions are notable for the important role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and particularly student activists in organizing creative nonviolent resistance. Colour Revolution took place in Georgia's Rose Revolution (2003), Ukraine's Orange Revolution (2004), and Kyrgyzstan's Tulip Revolution (2005).

new missile thus creating a new arm race. Russia knew that it has no resources to finance huge money on missile defense, it developed a new missile that could escape from American ABM. China tested a new Anti-Satellite missile in order to have a minimum deterrence capability against US. Now China is well on its way to having the greatest number of fighter planes, surface ships, missiles and submarines in the (Asia-Pacific) region (Blumenthal: 2009).

President Bush has vigorously pushed for the expansion of NATO which now became a bone of contention between Russia and the West. The extension of membership to the former Soviet Republics and former Warsaw Pact members means that NATO is on the threshold of Russian territory. Since NATO continued as a military alliance even after the end of Cold War and evermore active and spreading its tentacles outside Europe, the expansion is seen by Russia as a new threat to its security. American policy of encircling Russia through NATO expansion and colour revolutions made it to vigorously seeking an alternative security alliance in the form of CSTO, a coalition of Central Asian countries and China.

The very fact that instead of attacking North Korea which was on the threshold of nuclear weapon state and having the capacity to strike American territory, its invasion of Iraq obviously make us to believe that there were other motive other than political, oil? It created a scar to other governments that the United States is no longer interested in taking into account world society before making decisions, but only interested in preserving American society at the expense of the rest of the world.

II. Liberal Internationalist/Institutionalist View

Liberal Internationalist/Institutionalist believe that peace, welfare and justice are realized significantly through international cooperation, cooperation can include an acceptance of moral norms, adherence to international law, or collaboration through international organization (Zacher and Matthew 1995:117). The first victim of unilateralism is international system. This is true in case of US unilateralism and its subsequent abandonment of world opinion that is garnered through UN.

The UN is the hope of humanity especially for small states for maintaining world order. Although many shortcomings and failures, through UN international peace and security was guaranteed in the past, but the most powerful nation on the earth threatened the very foundation which it espoused in the past as the basis for international cooperation. For more than a half century the United Nations is the depository of collective actions/cooperations, but because of the abandonment of multilateralism by US who often considered itself as protector of the world, governments around the world will consider world organizations such as the United Nations to be a farce.

The United States lacks both the international and the domestic capacity to resolve conflicts that are internal to other societies and to monitor and control transnational developments that threaten Americans at home (Nye: 2003). By acting alone, bypassing world opinion the US is escalating the threat and complicated the problems because today's global problems are trans-national in nature. In fact traditional definition of national interest has been replaced by global interest because of globalization.

The Institutionalist argued that increased unilateralism threatens major reductions in the efficiency gains that can be realized from institutionalized cooperation. In the Bush administration the main argument against multilateralism is that it might reduce the effectiveness of US military operation. It is true that it may delayed the decisions, sometime compromise efficiency due to multiplicity of power centre but Bush administration miserably failed to realized that apart from sharing of operational cost, the benefit of multilateralism is legitimacy.

Unilateral control may be impossible on some global issues. Nye argued that (2002: 163) In instances where we do not have the unilateral capability to produce the outcomes we want, our sovereign control may be enhanced by membership in good standing in the regimes that make up the substance of international life. Fighting global issues like terrorism, global warming and climate change, disarmament etc need a concerted action involving global community.

Supporters of unilateralism advance several arguments based on the proposition that the United States is so powerful that it can have just the international institutions it wants and

need not defer to any it does not want. They assert that the United States can reduce its commitment to international institutions it does not favor, such as the United Nations and the International Criminal Court, without having other countries reduce their commitments to institutions Washington does favor, like the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund or World Bank. They also assume that the United States is so powerful that it can generate the multilateral cooperation it needs precisely on its own terms, as long as it is willing to go it alone if necessary (Brooks and Wohlforth: 2005).

US unilateralism in fact dashed away the great achievement fulfilled by international institutions. Through sanctions under the aegis of UN, Libya rolled back its nuclear programme, Iraq before the Gulf war in 1991, was a threshold country for nuclear weapon, but after decades of sanction and vigilance, there was no trace of weapons of mass destruction. Undermining international regime as well as international public opinion is grave danger to international peace and security.

The Europeans responded the moves of Bush administration with a mixture of anguish and pique, emotions they did not hesitate to share with the President during his first visit to Europe during the summer of 2001 (Kupchan 2002: 66). A public opinion taken later in the summer in France, Germany, Italy and Great Britain found strong and widespread opposition to Bush foreign policy. Almost 85 percent of those surveyed disapproved of Bush's decision to withdraw from the Kyoto Agreement, while more than 70 percent opposed his intention to rescind the ABM Treaty and develop a missile defense system. And 78 percent believed that Bush made a decision entirely on US interests without taking Europe consideration.

According to Kupchan (2002), competition will bound as predicted by Huntington but this competition will take place among power blocs, not as between civilization as envisioned by Huntington. If a country dominated by Buddhist and have a long cultural affinity could have a bitter relation as such or if the relation among India, Pakistan and Bangladesh who has a same history till 1947 could have such animosity, the chance of strain relationship between Europe and US cannot be rule out in the future if US goes on without mending the wounds already inflicted upon Europe.

III. Constructivist View

The bottom line of constructionist view is that hegemony without legitimate authority is likely to be nasty, brutish, and short. "Coalitions of the willing" are not permanent; they last only as long as the carrots and sticks necessary to maintain them (Brooks and Wohlforth: 2005). More to the point, for the first time since World War II, a majority of Europeans has come to doubt the legitimacy of U.S. power and of U.S. global leadership (Kagan: 2004). The vast majority of Europeans, although they sometimes chafed under U.S. dominance and often questioned U.S. actions in Vietnam, Latin America, and elsewhere, nevertheless accepted U.S. leadership as both necessary and desirable (Kagan: 2004).

US power is most effective when it is seen as legitimate, and when other societies believe it is being used to serve their interest as well as those of the United States (Walt 2005: 229). The United States decision to go into Iraq without the blessing of the Security Council meant that other states viewed the USA's action illegitimate, were less willing to support it, and thus raised the cost to the United States when it went ahead (Barnett 2008: 163). Bush administration believed that because its motives were unquestionably pure, America could launch a preemptive, unilateral attack on Iraq that everyone would regard as a war of liberation rather than of conquest. Vice President Cheney said that Once Hussein was ousted, though, "a good part of the world, especially our allies, will come around to our way of thinking" (Lindsay and Daalder: 2003)

The United States attacked on Iraq was opposed by nearly every government in the world, that meant the United States has completely disregarded its respect for other sovereign nations by preemptively striking Iraq in direct opposition to major players on the world stage. This action of US made realized those states who have no positive relation with US the need for a credible deterrence against possible future attack.

By abandoning multilateralism, the US proceed towards self inflicted difficulty and embarrsment. There is no doubt that there must be some operational hiccups in multilateral operation, but the positive gains is too huge to ignore. For example according to the estimate of Joseph E. Stiglitz and Linda J. Bilmes (2008) Iraq cost the US

Exchequer \$12 billion a month, and this would go up to \$16 billion if Afghanistan is included. They estimated that US already spend more than \$1.5 trillion. The GDP at Purchasing Power Parity of US was estimated at \$14.29 trillion in 2008. In other words while US spend only \$4 billion on Afghanistan, its expenditure in Iraq was thrice the former. In Afghanistan peacekeeping, reconstruction etc were done by international community but no doubt US took the primary role.

While in Iraq, only a handful of small countries, who cannot share the financial burden of US deployed few hundred military forces. Kishore Mahbubani (2008) argues that until this point (invasion of Iraq) both the United States and the United Kingdom had been among the primary custodians of international law. Since 2003, both the nations have frequently called for Iran and North Korea to implement UN Security Council resolutions. But how can the violators of UN principles also be the enforcers?

Bush went to war against Iraq assuming that America's unrivaled power made it, in effect, omnipotent. The United States could crush any foe, quickly and at little cost. Once the United States led, others would surely follow. "The fact of the matter is for most of the others," Vice President Dick Cheney explained days before the war began, "they don't have the capability to do anything about it anyway."

Militaristic approach of foreign policy without legitimacy is a dangerous policy. In this case the past history must be a credible proof of it. Militarism was the main cause of world war I and II, the prolonged Vietnam war. Viewing from this perspective the nuclear test of North Korea can be justified because of US behavior towards Iraq and Iran. If a country threaten the very survival of other nation, it should be a legitimate act for a country to defend itself whatever the cost it may be.

IV. Promotion of American Ideology

One important area where a country can control others is promotion of its ideology viz. political system, culture, In January 2005, Dr. Condoleezza Rice before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee listed three top priorities for her administration's diplomacy: "*First*, we will unite the community of democracies in building an international system that is based on shared values and the rule of law. *Second*, we will

strengthen the community of democracies to fight the threats to our common security and alleviate the hopelessness that feeds terror. And *third*, we will spread freedom and democracy throughout the globe. That is the mission that President Bush has set for America in the world and is the great mission of American diplomacy today” (Epstein et. al 2007: 2)

The idea of American willing and strive to promote their ideology viz. democracy, individual liberty, free trade etc are sham by its own practices. It support dictators in different parts of the world, it followed a protective measure in its economic activities which was the main hurdle in WTO negotiations. Democratic promotion in Central Asia and Eastern Europe proved to be an Achilles Heel for itself. It isolates Russia which was a staunch supporter in war against terror. Russia does not made any opposition when US open military base in Central Asia which was a meant for war on terrorism. The closed down of American bases in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan were largely the politics played by Russia in particular and SCO in general. Now it was closed down as a result US now needed Russian support to ensure the supply for its troops would not hampered.

President Bush appeared to encourage such an interpretation when he made a supportive appearance with Malaysia’s de facto dictator, Mahathir Mohamed, in May 2002. The president praised that regime’s muscular pursuit of terrorists while remaining silent on human rights abuses like indefinite detention of political prisoners and restrictions on press freedom. (Corothers: 2003). In the actual policy the promotion of favourable regime in some countries in the name of democratic promotion occurs while strengthening and supporting friendly regime even if it is a dictator.

Conclusion

American foreign policy was more or less influence by multilateralism especially after the end of world war II. US was an initiator and supporter of almost all international cooperation adopted under the aegis of United Nations and of regional cooperations. Today the world become more and more globalized due to improvement in information technology, transportation system, thus what happens in one region affected the other region.

In such a state of affairs, cooperation is an extreme necessity because of increasing global commons. Bill Clinton, the first US President after the Cold War, realized this stark necessity vigorously pursue international cooperation in various fields. During his period, many international agreements were concluded and he vigorously pursued free trade, Uruguay Round of GATT talk was concluded; he was rightly called *Globalization President*.

When Bush came into office, he scrapped, denounced and pursue the militaristic approach of foreign policy. His very act delegitimize US which was earned after a hardworking effort of his predecessors.

On the one hand the success of American unilateralism and preponderant and zero tolerant approach in pursuing terrorism proved very successful, not even a single attacked on America by terrorist organization has taken place since 2001.

On the other hand, a strong physical force as a solution in fight against terrorism, would not be the answer, of course there is some kind of measurement to deal with the terror, but the way American way of dealing with terrorism is the assertion of military might. Strong military measure may deter civilians in cooperating with the terrorist organization but those terrorist who are willing to blow up their body can never be deterred. US could not yield sufficient support of Vietnamese people and the military mission was a great debacle for the Super Power and it had to withdraw from Vietnam. Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan incurred a heavy loss that it had to withdraw. Meanwhile US heavily fighting through Mujahedeen could not garner the cooperation of the Afghan rulers in subsequent years. Instead it was attack by the very means it used to attacked Soviet Union in Afghanistan.

The US potential to sustain the rule in Kabul and Baghdad is a big question, more over can US sustain its hold on these two war torn countries. Can the Iraqi people treat US a friend who rob their civilization?

US resorted a war against Iraq on the pretext of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, no doubt these are not only US national security threat but a global threat also. But international community could not cooperate with the US in its war because it

went against international opinion. The Gulf war in 1990s was a successful mission because UN Security Council gave a green signal to go with a clear cut mission that is to liberate Kuwait. In 2003, US again waged a war, but there was no clear cut mission because its decision was based on CIA intelligence gathering on Saddam's link with Al-Qaida which other countries could not access and against UN weapon inspectors finding, which gave a clean chit to Iraq. Without international cooperation and legitimacy, US will not be able to defeat its enemies.

If the United States wants to make its privileged position acceptable to others, then the American politics must acquire a more serious and disciplined attitude towards the conduct of foreign policy (Walt 2005: 245). Globalization has changed the international system conspicuously. It brought forward the importance of other elements like NGOs, MNCs which were considered outside policy negotiation. 1500 NGOs successfully thwarted World Trade Organization negotiations in 1999, now developing countries under the aegis of G-20 became a powerful negotiator on their behalf.

Although the United States does well on the traditional measures of hard power, these measures failed to capture the ongoing transformation of world politics brought about by globalization and the democratization of technology (Nye: 2003).

Walt (2005: 246) argues that the ability to defeat other armies and our influence over the world economy do not give the United States either the right or ability to impose these principles on others, and it hardly gives 5 percent of the world's population the obligation, capacity, or right to govern vast areas of the world by force.

The greatest mistake made by the Bush administration was that it heavily focused on military power alone. There is no doubt that the US achieved an easy victory over the Taliban in Afghanistan but it cannot be called a successful mission because the terrorists are not crushed. The worst feature of the President's decision is that it debases the Treaty process even further and diminishes the confidence of foreign powers that the United States is willing to take its treaty obligations seriously.

References (* indicate primary source)

Andrews, Edmund L., (2001), Bush Angers Europe by Eroding Pact on Warming, New York Times, Sunday, April 1, 2001, [Online: web] Accessed March 23rd 2009, URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/04/01/world/bush-angers-europe-by-eroding-pact-on-warming.html?sec=&spon=&pagewanted=all>

Bailey, J. , (2005) *Moral Purity and its Enemies: Explaining the Deep Roots of US Foreign Policy*, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Hilton Hawaiian Village, Honolulu, Hawaii [Online: web] Accessed 30th December 2008, URL: http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/6/9/2/3/pages69233/p69233-1.php

Batchelor, John Calvin, (1996), *Ain't You Glad Joined the Republicans? A short History of the GOP*, New York: Henry Holt and Company

Barnett, Michael (2008) Social Constructivism, in John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens eds. *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press

Bennett, William J., (2000), "Morality, Character and American Foreign Policy", in Robert Kagan and William Kristol (Eds), *Present Danger: Crisis and Opportunity in American Foreign and Defense Policy*, San Francisco: Encounter Books

Bertele, Manfred and Mey, Holger H., (1998), Unilateralism in Theory and Practice, *Comparative Strategy*, Vol. 17 (2), 197-207 [Online: web] Accessed July 28th , 2008, URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/014959380843141>

Blumenthal, Dan, (2009) The Erosion of US power in Asia, *Far Eastern Economic Review*, May, Vol. 172 (4), pp- 16-19

Brands, H. W., (1998), *What America Owes to the World: The Struggle for the Soul of Foreign Policy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Brooks, Stephen G., and Wohlforth, William C., (2005) International Relations Theory and the Case against Unilateralism, *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 3 (3), Sept., 2005, pp. 509-524, [Online: web] Accessed on December 30th, 2008, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3689021>

* Bush, George W., (1999) A period of Consequences, The Citadel, South Carolina, September 23, 1999, [Online: web] Accessed 30th December 2008, URL: http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/program/news99/92399_defense.htm

* _____ (1999) "A Distinctly American Internationalism," Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, Simi Valley, California, November 19, [Online: web] Accessed 9th February 2009, URL: <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/wspeech.htm>

* _____ (2001) Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, September 20, [Online: web] Accessed 9th February 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>

* _____ (2002), Remarks at the United Nations General Assembly, [Online: web] Accessed 9th February 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html>

* _____ (2003) State of the Union Address, January 28, 2003, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>

* Bush, George W. and Hughes, Karen (1999) *A charge to Keep*, New York: William Morrow & Company

Caporaso, James A., (1992) International Theory and Multilateralism: The search for Foundations, *International Organization*, Vol. 46 (3), 599-632

Carter, Ralph G., (2005) *Contemporary Cases in U.S. Foreign policy: From Terrorism to Trade*, Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc

Chayes, Antonia (2008), How American Treaty Behavior Threatens National Security, *International Security*, Vol. 33 (1), Summer, p- 45-81.

Clinton, Bill (1999) Press conference by President, October 14, 1999, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/abmt/news/991014-abmt-potus.htm>

CNN.com, Election Results 2004, Accessed 8th January 2009, URL: <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2004/pages/results/states/US/P/00/epolls.0.html>

Corothers, Thomas (2003) Promoting Democracy and Fighting Terror, *Foreign Affairs*, January-February, p. 89-90

Curti, Merle (1964), *The Growth of American Thought*, New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill

* Democratic Party Platform (1992), A New Covenant with the American People, [Online: Web] Accessed February 10, 2009, URL: <http://64.203.107.114/histdocs/platforms/democratic/dem.992.html>

* _____ (1996), *Meeting America's Challenges, Protecting America's Values*, [Online: Web] Accessed February 10, 2009, URL: <http://64.203.107.114/histdocs/platforms/democratic/dem.996.html>

Donnelly, Thomas (2003), *The Underpinnings of the Bush Doctrine*, National Security Outlook, AEI Online (Washington) Publication Date: February 1, 2003 [Online: web] Accessed March 5th 2009, URL: http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15845/pub_detail.asp

Doyle, Michael W., (1995) *Liberalism and World Politics Revisited*, in Charles W. Kegley Jr (Eds.), *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and The Neoliberal Challenge*, New York: St. Martin Press

Dunn, Charles W. and J. David Woodard (1996), *The Conservative Tradition in America*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield

Elsa, Jennifer (2002) *U.S. Policy Regarding the International Criminal Court*, September 3, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009 URL: <http://italy.usembassy.gov/pdf/other/RL31495.pdf>

Epstein, Susan B. et. al (2007), *Democracy Promotion: Cornerstone of U.S. Foreign Policy?*, CSR Report for Congress, December 26, 2007.

Erhman, John (1995), *The Rise of Neoconservatism: Intellectual and Foreign Affairs 1945-1994*, New Haven: Yale University Press

Feuerberg, Gary (2006), *Evangelical Influence in Foreign Affairs*, *The Epoch Times*, October 2, [Online: web], Accessed January 5, 2009, URL: http://www.christianaggression.org/item_display.php?type=ARTICLES&id=1159910680

* Fleischer, Ari (2002) Press Briefing, October 10, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021010-2.html#15>

Fletcher, Michael A., (2006), *Bush Has Quietly Tripled Aid to Africa*, *The Washington Post*, Washington DC, December 31st 2006, [Online: web], Accessed on February 8, 2009, URL: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/12/30/AR2006123000941.html>

Franck, Thomas M., and Yuhan, Stephen H., (2003) *The United States and International criminal Court: Unilateralism Rampant*, *International Law and Politics*, Vol 35, p- 519-558, [Online: Web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://www.tamilnation.org/humanrights/icc/usandicc.pdf>

Fredericks, James (2003) America's God-given role in the world: Belief in a sacred mission drives U.S. policy, *National Catholic Reporter*, August 15, 2003, Reference Publication, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1141/is_36_39/ai_106914821

Fukuyama, Francis (2006) *America at the Crossroad: Democracy, Power, and the Neoconservative Legacy*, New Haven: Yale University Press

Gaddis, Lewis (2005) Grand Strategy in the Second Term, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 84 (1): pp- 2-15.

Gardner, Lloyd C., (1973) *Creation of the American Empire: US Diplomatic History*, Chicago: Rand and McNally Company

Glennon, Michael J., (2003), Why the Security Council Failed, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 82 (3), p-16-35

Green, Joshua (2001) God's Foreign Policy, *Washington Monthly*, November, [Online: web] Accessed 30th December 2008, URL: <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0111.green.htm>

* Grossman, Marc (2002), American Foreign Policy and the International Criminal Court, Remarks to the Center for Strategic and International Studies Washington, DC May 6, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009 URL: http://www.amicc.org/docs/Grossman_5_6_02.pdf

Hagel, Chuck (2004), A Republican Foreign Policy, *Foreign Affairs*, 83 (4): p-64-76

Hersh, Seymour M., (2003) Selective Intelligence: Donald Rumsfeld has his own special sources. Are they reliable?, *New Yorker*, May 12, 2003, [Online: web] Accessed March 18, 2009, URL: http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2003/05/12/030512fa_fact?currentPage=all

Ikenberry, John G., (2003) Is American Multilateralism in Decline? *Perspective on Politics*, Vol. 1 (3), [Online: web] Accessed February 20th 2009, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3688710>

_____ (2006) Liberal International Theory in the Wake of 911 and American Unipolarity, Paper prepared for seminar on "IR Theory, Unipolarity and September 11th – Five Years On," NUPI, Oslo, Norway, 3-4 February 2006. [Online: web] Accessed February 12, 2009, URL: http://www.princeton.edu/~gji3/Microsoft_Word_-_Ikenberry-Liberal-International-Theory-in-the-Wake-of-911-and-American-unipolarity-Oslo-word%20doc.pdf

Jervis, Robert (2005) *American Foreign Policy in the New Era*, New York: Routledge

Jonathan Schell (2003), The Case Against War, *The Nation*, February 13, 2003 [Online: web] Accessed February 12, 2009, URL: <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20030303/schell>

Kagan, Robert (2004) America's Crisis of Legitimacy, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 83 (2), March- April, pp. 65-87

Kagan, Robert and Kristol, "William (2000), National Interest and Global Responsibility", in Robert Kagan and William Kristol (Eds) *Present Dangers: Crisis and Opportunity in American Foreign and Defense Policy*, San Francisco: Encounter Books

Kahn, Paul W., (2003) Why the United States is so opposed? [Online: Web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: http://www.crimesofwar.org/icc_magazine/icc-kahn.html

Kegley Jr., Charles W. and Wittkopf, Eugene R. (1996), *American Foreign policy: Pattern and Process*, New York: St. Martin Press

Kelly, Michael J., (2003), The Bush Foreign Policy 2001- 2003: Unilateralist Theory in Multilateral World, and the Opportunity for change offered by Iraq, *Washington University Global Studies Law Review*, Vol. 2 (221), [Online: web] Accessed December 30, 2008, URL: http://law.wustl.edu/wugslr/issues/Volume2_1/p221kelly.pdf

Kennedy, Edward M., (2002) The Bush Doctrine of Pre-Emption, A speech delivered on the Floor of the US Senate on October 7th, [Online: web] Accessed February 12, 2009, URL: <http://ics.leeds.ac.uk/papers/vp01.cfm?outfit=pmt&folder=339&paper=389>

Kennedy, Paul (2002) The Eagle Has Landed: The New U.S. Global Military Position, *Financial Times [UK] Weekend*, 01 February 2002 [Online: web] Accessed March 7th 2009, URL: <http://www.uta.fi/FAST/US2/REF/pk-ft102.html>

Kessler, Glenn (2003) U.S. Decision On Iraq Has Puzzling Past Opponents of War Wonder When, How Policy Was Set, *Washington Post*, January 12, 2003, [Online: web] Accessed March 31, 2009, URL: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A43909-2003Jan11?language=printer>

Kevin J. Cole (1999) The Wilsonian Model of Foreign Policy & the Post-Cold War World, [Online: web] Accessed 9th February 2009, URL: <http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/cc/Cole.html>

Kolko, Gabriel (2007) *The Age of War: The United States Confronts the World*, New Delhi: Viva Books

Krauthammer, Charles (2004), Democratic Realism : An American Foreign Policy for a Unipolar World, American Enterprise Institute, February 10, 2004, [Online: Web] Accessed 15th January 2009, URL: http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.19912,filter.all/pub_detail.asp

Kupchan, Charles A., (2002) *The End of the American Era: Foreign Policy and the Geopolitics of the Twenty-first Century*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf

Kupchan, Charles A., and Trubowitz, Peter L., (2007), Dead Center: The Demise of Liberal Internationalism in the United States, *International Security*, Vol. 32 (2), pp- 7-44

Kurt Wimer, (1982) "Woodrow Wilson and World Order" in *Woodrow Wilson and a Revolutionary World, 1913-1921*, edited by Arthur S. Link (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 149. Qouted from Kevin J. Cole (1999) The Wilsonian Model of Foreign Policy & the Post-Cold War World, [Online: web] Accessed 9th February 2009, URL: <http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/cc/Cole.html>

Leffler, Melvyn P. (2003) 9/11 and the Past and Future of American Foreign Policy, *International Affairs*, Vol. 79 (5), pp- 1045 - 1063

Leffler, Martin P. (2004), Bush's Foreign Policy, *Foreign Policy*, September- October.

Levy, Siobhan MacEnvoy (2001) *American Exceptionalism and US Foreign policy: Public Diplomacy at the End of the Cold War*, New York: Palgrave

Lindsay, James M., and Daalder, Ivo H., (2003) Unilateralism Disgraced, [Online: web] Accessed 13th June 2009, URL: http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2003/1001iraq_daalder.aspx

Mahbubani, Kishore (2008) The Case Against the West, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87 (3), May/June, pp. 111-124

Martin, Lisa L., (1992) Interest, Power and Multilateralism, *International Organization*, Vol. 46 (4), 765-792.

Mearsheimer, John J., (2005) Hans Morgenthau and the Iraq War: Realism versus Neo-conservatism, [Online: web] Accessed September 30th 2008, URL: http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-americanpower/morgenthau_2522.jsp

Medalia, Jonathan (2008) *Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty: Issues and Arguments*, Congressional Research Service, March 12, 2008

_____ (2009). *Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: Background and Current Development*, Congressional Research Service, January 28, 2009

Monten, Jonathan (2005), The Roots of Bush Doctrine: Power, nationalism and Democracy Promotion in US Strategy, *International Security*, Vol. 29 (4): p- 112-156

Myers, Steven Lee, (2001) US Signs Treaty For World Court to Try Atrocities, *New York Times*, January 1, 2001, [Online: web] Accessed March 1, 2009, URL: <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9D0CE0D7153BF932A35752C0A9679C8B63>

_____ (2001) Bush Candidate For Defense Job Sees Overhaul, *New York Times*, January 12, 2001, [Online: web] Accessed March 22, 2009, URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/01/12/us/bush-candidate-for-defense-job-sees-overhaul.html?n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/People/B/Bush,%20George%20W.&pagewanted=1>

Nikitin, Mary Beth (2008) *Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI)*, Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, February 14, 2008

Nye Jr., Joseph S., (2002) *The paradox of American Power: Why the World's only Super Power Can't Go It Alone*, New York: Oxford University Press

_____ (2003) U.S. Power and Strategy after Iraq, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 82 (4), July- August, pp. 60-73

Oldfield, Duane (2004), The Evangelical Roots of American Unilateralism: The Christian Right's Influence and How to Counter It, *Foreign Policy in Focus*, March [Online: web] Accessed September 23 2008, URL: <http://www.fpiif.org/papers/2004evangelical.html>

* O'Sullivan, John L. (1839), Manifest Destiny, [Online: web] Accessed January 5, 2009, URL: http://www.civics-online.org/library/formatted/texts/manifest_destiny.html

Pape, Robert A., (2005) Soft Balancing against the United States, *International Security*, Vol. 30 (1), summer, pp- 7-45

Paul, T.V., (2005) Soft balancing in the Age of US Primacy, *International Security*, Vol. 30 (1), summer, pp- 46-71

Perez-Rivas, Manuel (2001) U.S. quits ABM treaty, December 14, 2001, <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/12/13/rec.bush.abm/>

Picus, Walter (2002) "U.S. Aims for 3,800 Nuclear Warheads," *Washington Post*, January 10, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed March 12th 2009 URL: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A22393-2002Jan9.html>

Powell, Colin L., (2004) A strategy of Partnership, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 83 (3), p- 22-34

* Republican Platform (1980) [Online: web] Accessed 30th December 2008, URL: <http://64.203.107.114/histdocs/platforms/republican/rep.980.html>

* _____ (2000), Renewing America's Purpose. Together [Online: web] Accessed December 30, 2008, URL: <http://64.203.107.114/histdocs/platforms/republican/rep.2000.html>

* _____ (2004), A Safer World and a More Hopeful America, [Online: web] Accessed December 30, 2008, URL: http://64.203.107.114/histdocs/platforms/republican/2004_republican_platform.pdf

*Rice, Condolizza (2000) Promoting National Interest, *Foreign Affairs*, January/February,

* _____ (2002), A Balance of Power That Favors Freedom, A Wriston lecture delivered at Manhattan Institute in October 1, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed 30th December URL: <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/wl2002.htm>

* _____ (2008) Rethinking National Interest: American Realism for a New World, *Foreign Affairs*, July/ August Vol. 87 (4), p- 2-26

Ritchie, Nick and Rogers, Paul (2007), *The Political Road to War with Iraq: Bush, 9/11 and the drive to overthrow Saddam*, New York: Routledge

Ross, Douglas Alan, (2008) Nuclear Weapons and American Grand Strategy: Essential Pillar or Terminal Liability? *International Journal*, Vol. LXIII (4), Autumn, pp- 847-873

Ruggie, John Gerard (1992) Multilateralism: The Anatomy of an Institution, *International Organization*, Vol. 46 (3), 561-598

Sanger, David E., (2001), Bush Flatly States U.S. Will Pull Out of Missile Treaty, *New York Times*, August 24, 2001, [Online: web] Accessed March 22, 2009, URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/24/world/bush-flatly-states-us-will-pull-out-of-missile-treaty.html>

Schmitt, Eric and David E. Sanger (2002), Threat and Responses: The White House; Bush has Received Pentagon Option on Attacking Iraq, *New York Times*, September 21, 2002, URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/21/world/threats-responses-white-house-bush-has-received-pentagon-options-attacking-iraq.html>

Semmel, Andrew K., (2005) Address to the National Strategy Forum Chicago, Illinois November 14, 2005, [Online: web] Accessed 9th February 2009, URL: http://www.nti.org/e_research/official_docs/dos/state111405Semmel.pdf

Shannon, Vaughan P., (2003) The Middle East Peace Process and the War on Terror, in Patrick Hayden et.al *America's War on Terror*, Burlington VT: Asgate

Stanley, Harold W. and Niemi, Richard G. (2006), *Vital Statistic on American Politics 2005-2006*, Washington DC: CQ Press

Stiglitz, Joseph E. and Bilmes, Linda J. (2008) The Iraq War Will Cost Us \$3 Trillion, and Much More, *Washington Post*, March 9, 2008, [Online: web] Accessed on June 3rd

2009, URL: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/03/07/AR2008030702846.html>

Stockman, Farah et.al (2006), Bush brings faith to foreign aid, *The Boston Globe*, Boston, October 8, 2006, [Online: web], Accessed on 8th February 2009, URL: http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2006/10/08/bush_brings_faith_to_foreign_aid/

Talbott, Strobe (2003) War in Iraq, revolution in America, *International Affairs*, Vol. 79 (7), pp- 1037- 1043

* Text of the International Order of the 21st Century, A Joint Declaration made by China-Russia on July 1st, 2005, [Online: web] Accessed June 4th 2009, URL: <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1436001/posts>

* The American Conservative Union (1960) The Sharon Statement, [Online: web] Accessed January 5, 2009, URL: <http://www.fiu.edu/~yaf/sharon.html>

* The Graduate Center of The City University of New York (2001), American Religious Identification Survey, [Online: web] Accessed December 30, 2008, URL: <http://www.trincoll.edu/NR/rdonlyres/AFCEF53A-8DAB-4CD9-A892-5453E336D35D/0/NEWARISrevised121901b.pdf>

* The Pew Forum (2004), The American Religious Landscape And Politics, [Online: web], Accessed December 30 2008, URL: <http://pewforum.org/publications/surveys/green.pdf>

* _____, (2005) The American Religious Landscape and the 2004 Presidential Vote: Increased Polarization, [Online: web] Accessed December 30 2008, URL: <http://pewforum.org/publications/surveys/postelection.pdf>

* The New York Times (1992), Excerpts From Pentagon's Plan: 'Prevent the Re-Emergence of a New Rival', *The New York Times*, New York City, March 8, 1992, [Online: web] Accessed 9th February 2009, URL: <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9E0CE1D7173AF93BA35750C0A964958260&sec=&spon=>

* The White House, (1995) A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement, [Online: web] Accessed December 30, 2008, URL: <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/nss/nss-95.pdf>

* _____ (1999) A National Security Strategy For A New Century, [Online: web] Accessed December 30, 2008, URL: http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/other_pubs/nssr99.pdf

- * _____ (2001), President Bush Discusses Global Climate Change, July 2, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/06/20010611-2.html>
- * _____ (2001), Remarks by the President to Students and Faculty at National Defense University, May 1, 2001, <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/05/20010501-10.html>
- * _____ (2001) ABM Treaty Fact Sheet, (December 13, 2001), [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/12/20011213-2.html>
- * _____ (2001) Text of a Letter from the President to Senators Hagel, Helms, Craig, and Roberts, July 2, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/03/20010314.html>
- * _____ (2002) Notice: Continuation of the National Emergency with Respect to the Risk of Nuclear Proliferation Created by the Accumulation of Weapons-Usable Fissile Material in the Territory of the Russian Federation, [Online: web] Accessed 9th February 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020619-17.html>
- * _____ (2002) Fact Sheet: G-8 Summit -- Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, [Online: web] Accessed 9th February 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020627-7.html>
- * _____ (2002), The Clear Skies Initiative, Feb 14th 2002, July 2, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/02/clearskies.html>
- * _____ (2002) President Announces Clear Skies & Global Climate Change Initiatives, July 2, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/02/20020214-5.html>
- * _____ (2002) Remarks by the President and German Chancellor Schroeder in Photo Opportunity, July 2, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/03/20010329-2.html>
- * _____ (2002) Remarks by the President to the Travel Pool During Tour, Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 2, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed March 12, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/07/20020702-1.html>

* _____ (2003), President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point, New York, June 1, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed February 26, 2009 URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html>

* _____ (2007), America and Its Allies Against Ballistic Missile Attack: President Bush Explains Need For Missile Defense System In Europe, Discusses Progress Defending America From Attack, [Online: Web] Accessed February 28, 2009, URL: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2007/10/20071023-5.htm>

Waldman, Peter (2004), Evangelicals gave US Foreign policy an Activist Tinge, *Wallstreet Journal*, 26th May, [Online: web] Accessed 5th January 2009, URL: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB108552288320121114.html>

Walt, Stephen M., (2005) *Taming American Power: The Global Response to US Primacy*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company

Woodward, Bob (2004), *Plan of Attack*, New York: Simon and Schuster

Zacher, Mark W., and Matthew, Richard A. (1995), Liberal International Theory: Common Threads, Divergent Strands, in Charles W. Kegley Jr (Eds.), *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and The Neoliberal Challenge*, New York: St. Martin Press