
The United States and Global Agenda-Setting on Security: An Assessment of the Impact of the 'Bush Doctrine' on the International System, 2002 – 2012

Dr. Austine Uchechukwu Igwe* & Amaechi Alex Ugwuja**

*Department of History & International Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria;

Email- drsky2002@gmail.com;

**Department of History and International Relations, Paul University, Awka, Nigeria;

Email: ugwujalex@yahoo.com

Abstract

The international arena where the intercourse between and amongst sovereign states occur accommodates cooperation and competition but most often, it is characterized by conflicts. The 'zero-sum' nature of the international system actuates states to always design strategies and policies which ensure that their interests are protected at all times. It has always been that the state(s) with the preponderance of clout always sets the agenda on security hence, the 'Bush Doctrine' formally known as "the National Security Strategy of the United States" is therefore nothing other than a foreign policy design of the United States which seeks to sustain American global hegemony by obliterating all obstacles - of which terrorism is topmost. The Bush Doctrine, in order to achieve its set goals, makes use of pre-emption, unilateralism and the so-called extension of "freedom". The Bush Doctrine was essentially a reaction to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks against the U.S, and it has since come to incorporate core issues of American foreign policy viz. military primacy, economic dynamos and the "new multilateralism. The question, however, are: has the Bush Doctrine impacted positively or negatively on the contemporary international system? Has it attenuated the phenomena of terrorism or increased its occurrence? This study, therefore with the theoretical lenses of the Hegemony Stability Theory (HST), appraises the impact of the Bush Doctrine on the international sector. The contention is that the Bush Doctrine, rather than reducing the occurrence of terrorism, has incited terror mongers both internationally and domestically; the Doctrine has equally alienated American traditional allies and worsened the international system. Finally, some policy options are recommended for the Third World states that have had to haplessly and helplessly bear the brunt of America's Bush Doctrine.

Key Words: Bush Doctrine, International system, Hegemon, Zero Sum Game, Security, Balance of Power.

Introduction

Just about a decade after the demise of the Soviet threat, where both the United States and the Soviet Union sought to destroy each other and emerge the global hegemon, the United States (and perhaps the world) has found itself in a precarious situation again. This time, the U.S (and the world) is increasingly challenged by a faceless enemy called terrorism. In response to the September 11, 2001 attacks on the twin symbols of the U.S global military and economic hegemony: the Pentagon and World Trade Centre, the Bush Administration crafted an extensively publicized strategy which became known as the Bush Doctrine, (formally, the National Security Strategy of the United States). The Bush Doctrine integrates principles of justice with a power-based national security strategy. It is a combination of the war on terrorism and a grand strategy of global leadership and the preclusion of rivals, regional and global. Snauwaert (2004: 125) argues that the Bush Doctrine constitutes “a national security strategy that posits the moral justifiability of a radical doctrine”. The Bush Doctrine favours pre-emption, i.e. attacking first. It conceives terrorism as an imminent threat, linked to the threat of the proliferation and potential use of weapons of mass destruction. President Bush stated:

The greatest danger to freedom lies at the perilous crossroads of radicalism and technology. When the spread of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, along with ballistic missile technology- when that occurs, even weak states and small groups could attain a catastrophic power to strike our great nation. Our enemies have declared this very intention and have been caught seeking these terrible weapons. They want the capability to blackmail us, or to harm us, or to harm our friends...and we will oppose them with all our power (George Bush, 2002: 2).

It has always been the prerogatives of the state(s) with the preponderance of power to set the agendas of the international system in the areas of global economy and security. It cannot be denied that the United States is the hegemon of today's world. The Bush Doctrine is therefore an agenda – setting design of the United States in the area of global security, especially, with regard to the menace of terrorism. It has been in operation since 2002 when it was first employed against Afghanistan. The overall impact of the Bush Doctrine on the international security sector is thus, the aim of this study. The questions that seek answers are: has the Bush Doctrine impacted positively or negatively on the contemporary international system? Has it attenuated the

phenomena of terrorism or increased its occurrence? For ease and convenience, apart from the introduction, this paper is structured under four major sub-headings and conclusion/recommendations.

Conceptual Clarifications

The Bush Doctrine

The Bush Doctrine is officially known as the “National Security Strategy of the United States. It came about as a reaction to the September 11 attacks. The Bush Doctrine is essentially designed and promulgated to prevent “terrorists” and “dangerous regimes” from developing and acquiring or using Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). The Bush Doctrine also pushed for the expansion of democratic “freedom” in Middle Eastern Muslim countries and elsewhere in the world.

The Bush Doctrine has roots in the recommendations of Paul Wolfowitz ,who was an under- secretary of Defense under President George W. Bush, and Lewis Libby who became vice president Dick Cheney’s chief of staff. These two men had long before September 11, 2001 been ceaselessly calling for a security policy that will work to ensure that all “terrorists” and “hurtful regimes” are stripped of the capabilities of possessing WMD which would be collateral to the interest of the U.S (both counterforce and counter value),(Woodward, 2002). With the al-Qaeda sponsored terrorist attacks of September, 2001, the advocacy of Wolfowitz and Libby found automatic endorsement and *mutatis mutandi*, the then U.S president George W. Bush adopted it as an official security strategy of the U.S. Even though Americans have had a change of regime and the Republican Party no longer controls the rein of power, it is still clear that the Bush Doctrine of pre-emptive attacks against the so-called terror mongers and their supporters is still in force in the US. For example, the Obama regime has avowedly declared that his position is to follow the path of his predecessor to “rid the world of terrorism” (Tailor, 2010: 45 – 53). This is amply demonstrated by his refusal to withdraw American troops in Afghanistan and his hard line position on the Iranian and North Korean nuclear debacles. In this way, we can see that the Bush Doctrine is still in active force in the U.S security undertakings.

The International System

The international system is the forum where the relations amongst and between sovereign states takes place. It is actually used to describe the sum total of the goings- on between states, and other subjects of international law. These other subjects of international law include: international organizations, state-like entities, transnational corporations etc.

The relations between states could be bilateral but owing to the emergence and growing powers of international organizations (which are sometimes stronger than some states); the international system is becoming more multi-lateral. The modern international system is noted to have commenced in 1648 with the treaty of Westphalia which enshrined the principle and respect of sovereignty as an inviolable doctrine of inter-state relations (Palmer and Perkins, 2005: 5). Although, this is not to assume that violation of states' sovereignty ceased out rightly; states still find reasons to invade one another. One of the most crucial causes of conflicts in the international system is the deep- seated conflict of interests and the incompatibly of temperaments; each state seeks to grow economically and militarily strong to impose its will on others.

In this way, the political configuration of the international system determines its nature. When there are different competing power centers, the system is referred to as 'multi-polar'; when there are two powerful blocs demanding authority, it is said to be 'bi-polar'. When there is only one state strong enough to assert authority, the system is described as 'uni-polar'. The present writer is inclined to agree with Chinweizu that the contemporary international system is unipolar- with the United States as the uni-pole. Chinweizu avers that "when America emerged as the most powerful nation on earth and the leader of the imperialist West, she entered fully into the task of winning a new frontier that was nothing less than the whole world"(Chinweizu in Eze, 2004: 18).

Theoretical Framework: Hegemony Stability Theory

With regards to the vortex of issues that have characterized the international security system of the 21st century, the Hegemony Stability Theory has much explicatory and analytic clout to explain, predict and prescribe a panacea to the reality under investigation. It is hereby adopted.

The Hegemony Stability Theory (HST) is a hybrid theory that draws on the realist, liberal and historical-structuralist perspectives. The centrality of its thesis is that a relatively open and stable international system is most guaranteed when there is a single dominant or hegemonic state that: has a sufficient share of resources and is able to provide leadership; and is willing to pursue policies necessary to create and maintain a liberal world economic order (Gilpin, 1987: 86).

The Hegemony Stability Theory (HST) is rooted in research from the fields of political science, economics and history. The proponents of this theory include A.F.K, Organski, Robert Gilpin, Robert Keohane, George Modelski and Immanuel Wallenstein. However Charles P. Kindleberger is one of the scholars closely associated with HST, and is even regarded by some as the father of HST (Feraro, 2002).

Even though there appears to be different shades and variants of the HST, for example, Organski's *Power Transition Theory*, George Modelski's *Long Cycle Theory* and Immanuel Wallenstein's *World Systems Theory*, there seems to be a general concurrence that the stability of the international system, in terms of politics, economy, international law, and so on, relies on the hegemon to develop and enforce the rules of the system (Modelski, 1987). The proponents of this theory are thus, inclined to believe that hegemony (which is the holding by one state a preponderance of power in the international system so that they can single handedly dominate the rules and arrangements by which international relations are conducted) is indispensable for the stability of the international system. They argue that just as domestic or municipal societies cannot function effectively without leadership, so can the international system fare poorly without some hegemonic leadership (Rourke, 2001).

Advocates of the Hegemony Stability Theory agree that the hegemon must exercise leadership *via* its relatively large market which must be a source of considerable power and must be used to create an economic sphere. They also posit that the hegemon's economy must be flexible and mobile, whilst its national currency must be central and crucial to the international economy (Robert, 2002). The Bush Doctrine is known to have derived its philosophical cum intellectual basis from the Hegemony stability Theory. Paul Wolfowitz who is believed to be the earliest propagators of the ideas that found anchor in the Bush Doctrine has been noted to be an ardent believer in the HST.

The Hegemony Stability Theory has, however, received myriads of criticisms from many scholars, especially those opposed to real *politik*. These critics argue that just like political realism HST regards power as the sole and most decisive variable in international relations, such that the weaker states now fall easy prey to the dominant hegemonic state (Mearsheimer, 2001). Critics of the HST contend that the theory is historically conflict inductive. These critics, therefore, aver that the HST whilst aiming at establishing collective security in the international system nonetheless creates balance of terror, instead of collective security.

Contemporary advocates of the Hegemony Stability Theory have, however, added another dimension to the HST (in response to these criticisms). These later proponents posit that there are many types of hegemon. They maintain that international stability is sustained or ruined by the type of hegemon that enforces the rules of the system. They posit that there are “benevolent hegemons”, who are interested in promoting generalized benefits and rely on rewards rather than coercion to ensure compliance by other states. There are also “mixed- motives and strategic hegemons” who have an interest in general as well as personal benefits and rely on coercive methods when necessary to achieve their objectives. Finally there are “exploitative hegemons” who are only interested in their own self-interests and use coercion to enforce compliance (Feraro, 2002). And it would appear that the United States falls into the last category. Although, hegemony seems to have stabilizing effects on the international system, Ogunbanjo, (2002: 180) calls for caution in the exercise of hegemonic influence in the system. In the light of the above explanations we can see that the salience of using the Hegemony Stability Theory in an appraisal of the 21st century international system vis-à-vis the Bush Doctrine can never be gainsaid.

Operation of the Bush Doctrine and its Impact on the International System: The Case of Afghanistan and South Asia

Myriad reasons were adduced for the America’s attack of Afghanistan but chief among them was the allegation that the suspects of the 9/11 attacks- the al-Qaeda group were haboured in the mountainous wilderness of Afghanistan. Muzzarat (2002: 4) writes that “the propinquity with a Taliban ruled Afghanistan brought the war on terror to the door step of South Asia”. This development had been fore-

shadowed by President Bush in his address to the joint session of the U.S congress on September 20, 2002. Bush had declared that:

Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign. We will starve terrorists of funding, turn one against another, and drive them from place to place until there is no refuge or rest. And we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe havens to terrorism. Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.(George Bush, 2)

With these threats characteristic of the U.S, she quickly invaded Afghanistan in what is known as “Operation Enduring Freedom”. This American invasion of Afghanistan has had more negative than positive influence on the international security system. In the first instance, it has led to the destabilization of regional peace and security in South Asia. Recall that the international system is systemic, that is to say that whatever happens in any of its component units affects the entire system. America’s war in Afghanistan is fast becoming another Vietnam. The war that started in March 2002 is yet to have a conclusive end. The fragile peace that has been patched between Pakistan and India on one hand, and Afghanistan and Pakistan on the other hand, has been disrupted in the struggle between India and Pakistan to remain relevant to the U.S strategic calculus in the region. RaziaMuzarrat argues:

... the post 9/11/ development worsened the security environment of the region. The South Asian countries decided to join the U.S led war against terrorism because of their interests. India was prompt in offering its support in the hope that such a configuration of the situation in South Asia would enhance its leadership position in South Asia, especially in the light of its historic struggle with Pakistan. Pakistan decided to join because of predictable economic incentives and salvaging its Kashmir policy from total destruction. (Muzzarat, 2002: 7)

What is more, America’s invasion of Afghanistan has given a new and frightening impetus and fillip to terrorists. Terrorists now premise their formidability in the context of the fact that America with all its military and economic clout has not been able to comprehend their *modus operandi*, not to talk of checkmating their operations. This belief has indubitably been the newest source of inspiration for terrorists both old and aspiring. Caldor (2010: 13) thus, writes:

America's strategic failure to totally eradicate the so-called bastions of terrorism in Afghanistan has boomeranged on the international community. The invincibility of these terrorists appear to have been proved... the duplication of terrorism in domestic affairs is thus not unconnected to America's 'tepid' and macho- man combat measures....

We can therefore see that America's hardline policy of non-negotiation with terrorists which have found legislative anchor in the Bush Doctrine costs the international system so much. The late John Paul II is known to have advised that "compromise is not always an indication of weakness". In line with this, Elochukwu Anas maintains that "refusal to talk with an enemy only helps to embolden his psychosis and make him a more deadly adversary" (Anas, 2009: 41). America's current stand on terrorism as operationalized in the Bush Doctrine is hurtful to the progress of the international system. This is because it appears to be an orchestration designed to showcase the Muslim world as a terrorist civilization. This has ensured the easy conversion of Muslims (even those not given to radicalism) to become stronghaters of every vestige of Western civilization. The recent exacerbation of domestic terrorism in Nigeria, Kenya and Mali and so many other countries in the world are apt cases in point.

Again America's war in Afghanistan has led to the death of thousands of casualties. It is estimated that America has lost more than 10,000 soldiers, Pakistan 35,000 combatant soldiers excluding, Pakistani citizens domiciled in Afghanistan.(Muzzarat, 2002: 12) Afghanistan itself is estimated to have lost up to three million lives from 2001-2011(Muzzarat, 2002: 13). Trillions of dollars that would have been spent for the betterment of humanity has been pumped into the so-called war against terrorism without any corresponding success. Akbar S. Zaibadi writes that Pakistani people are beginning to feel crushed under the heavy yoke of the so- called partnership for combating terrorism. Zaibadi (2011: 5) reveals that the fighting has cost Pakistan three times more than the aid provided and 35,000 victims" One can therefore argue that the Bush Doctrine of pre-emptive attacks against terrorist organizations has been a destabilizing catalyst in the South Asian sub-continent and hence, impinges on the international security sector. In all, it may not be out of place to argue that the operationalization of the Bush Doctrine in Afghanistan has created more problems than it hoped to solve.

The Case of Iraq

America's invasion of Iraq, in March 2003 under the aegis of the Bush Doctrine (pre-emptive attacks against terrorism and those that harbour them) has more than the Afghan imbroglio shown how hurtful America's hegemony could be to the international system. The case of Iraq has openly displayed the fact the Bush Doctrine is deleterious to the workings of multilateralism which is a cardinal foundation for international peace. President George Bush had unequivocally averred that "multilateralism cannot be an excuse for inaction"(Powell, 2003: A8). For reasons which according to Ota (2005: 172) "range from the ridiculous to the absurd", the United States on 19 March, 2003 launched air raids on Iraq. Part of the reasons for attacking Iraq according to the American decision makers was that:

The U.S has the sovereign authority to use force in assuring its own national security.. that after 9/11 attacks the U.S cannot live under constant threat of blackmail from desperate terrorists and rogue states... that twelve years of diplomacy to disarm Saddam Hussein without war have failed because the Iraqi regime has used diplomacy as a ploy to gain time and advantage and has uniformly defied the Security Council's resolutions(Ota, 2005:173).

A stronger reason for the American invasion of Iraq according to Collin Powell was that:

There is a danger that Iraq may use chemical, biological and nuclear weapons on the U.S and its allies, or perhaps put such weapons at the disposal of terrorists who would not hesitate to use them to kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country or any other... Iraq has a history of reckless aggression in the Middle East, and it has a deep hatred for the U.S and its allies (Powell, 2003: A8).

Thus, on the eve of the U.S war with Iraq, President Bush in his speech to the American nation invoked the Bush Doctrine and gave Saddam Hussein and his sons forty-eight (48) hours to leave Iraq. Bush declared that "in an age of unseen enemies, waiting for the opponents to attack first is suicide"(Powell, 2003: A8). Iraq was in this manner subjected to a three month merciless aerial bombardment; supported by ground operations by the so-called "Coalition of the willing", and what John Kerry was to later succinctly term the "coalition of the bribed"(Ota, 2005:174). In any case, it is now incontestable that the reasons advanced by the U.S for attacking Iraq all lacked merit. In the first instance, no nexus has been established between Saddam Hussein and the al-Qaeda terrorist network as allegations of production of

weapons of mass destruction by Iraq have been discovered to be spurious. Hans Blix, head of the I.A.E.A task force who investigated the U.S allegation against Iraq, has given a clean state to Hussein that regard. (Ota, 2005:174).

What is more, unlike the 1990-1991 episode where Iraq attracted worldwide condemnation, in the 2003 episode, America's traditional allies did not see the wisdom in rushing to war with Iraq when the I.A.E.A inspectors were still at work. Adogamhe (2006: 119) writes that "the more determined President Bush was to wage pre-emptive war in Iraq, the more unnerved the international community was about the human cost of such a war and the destabilizing impact of such a war internationally". The German Chancellor, Gerhard Schroeder, the Russian President Vladimir Putin and the French President Jacques Chirac all denounced the war; that "it would not only bring about human casualties but also destabilize the international community in general" (Adogamhe, 2006: 119). President Putin of Russia, considered the fact that "there are 20 million Muslims living in Russia, we cannot afford not to consider their opinion and we fully share their alarm" (Adogamhe, 2006: 119).

In tandem with the ongoing, Ota (2005:174) affirms that:

By ignoring the U.N and by invading and occupying Iraq, the United States was only trying to actualize its economic and political motives in the Gulf. The U.S never really had any legitimate reasons for invading and occupying Iraq. If anything, reasons changed as each one faced a contradiction. As earlier stated, the three main reasons adduced by Washington to justify its action in Iraq... all lack merit. On the contrary, the main reasons for the U.S invasion of Iraq can be categorized into two: namely economic and political reasons.

Moreover, even American citizens decried the zero advantage obtained in the war in Iraq. This can be gleaned from the communiqué issued by the American Association of International Affairs Scholars (AAIAS)-- an academic forum of more than 3000 specialists in international studies. Part of the communiqué read:

As scholars of international affairs, we recognize that war is sometimes necessary to ensure our national security or other vital interests. We also recognize that Saddam Hussein is a tyrant and that Iraq has defied a number of U.N resolutions. But military force should be used only when it advances U.S national interests. War with Iraq does not meet this standard(AAIAS, 2003:2)

These scholars also aver that “even though Saddam Hussein (was) a murderous despot, no one has provided credible evidence that Iraq cooperated with al-Qaeda”. Furthermore, they contended that the first Bush Administration did not try to conquer Iraq in 1991 because it understood that doing so could spread instability in the Middle East and other parts of the world. Additionally, they held that “that concern remains a valid concern today” (AAIAS, 2003:2). Yet despite these warnings, President George W. Bush proceeded with his “Coalition of the Bribe” to invade Iraq on 19th March 2003.

As stated earlier, the Iraqi war has been considered more hurtful to the international system than the Afghan war. The outrage and unity that 9/11 attacks brought to the international system was punctured by America’s invasion of Iraq. Dominique de Villepin, the then French Foreign Minister registered French opposition thus:

We are advancing to war even though today it is possible to disarm in peace. Is war today really necessary? It is not because the inspections are going ahead on ground. I would like to tell our American, British and Spanish friends that the Iraqi crisis is not a problem between the United States and France, but between those who want to move ahead in the logic of war and the international community(Adogamhe, 2006: 120)..

Furthermore, apart from losing more than 35,000 lives, the U.S spent more than 20 billion dollars in cash and military hardware. Some of the weapons according to Zaibadi (2011: 6) are now in the control of terrorists. More importantly, America’s obstinacy in the Iraqi crisis affected the cohesiveness of the European Union, African Union, the Organization of American States and even its NATO alliance. In fact, the international system was radically fragmented as a result of the America’s invasion of Iraq. Recall that Britain and Spain abandoned their European comrades to declare a total support for the Bush Doctrine. In Africa and Southern America, the dividing line was between those that sanctioned the American invasion and those who opposed it. This explains why Adogamhe (2006: 123) has argued that “the Iraqi war had become the demarcation of the new world order”. Most importantly, America’s adventurism in Iraq has fanned the bitterness and hatred of Muslims against the U.S and anyone associated with them throughout the globe. America’s tactless use of “Christian Power” has put the rest of Christendom in danger and in a dialectical confrontation with Muslims everywhere in the world. America’s involvement in Iraq has reduced her credibility and legitimacy as the dominant global

hegemon, capable of enforcing the rules that regulate the international system. This is because the U.S has been indicted for sacrificing innocent Iraqi blood for Iraqi oil. America has been seen as it is- a hegemonic power that prefers the use of naked brutal military force without minding the costs on the international system which it claims to be the protector.

Additionally, by emphasizing pre-emptive attacks and unilateralism, the Bush Doctrine postures quite antithetically to the very essence of the United Nations that encourages consultations and multilateralism. The implications of this for the international system are myriad. The Bush Doctrine made a total nonsense of the provisions of the U.N Charter on ‘respect for other states’ sovereignty’. As noted elsewhere in this study, President Bush confirmed this when he gibed that “multilateralism cannot be an excuse for inaction” what hope, therefore, lies for the stability of the international system? That hope is indeed very slim. Ota (2005: 189) observes:

The U.N has the primary responsibility of maintaining world peace and security and its failure to distinguish between legal and illegal use of force as exemplified by the U.S invasion and occupation of Iraq portends great danger for international law and the future of the United Nations. Similarly, it is doubtful whether international treaties and the idea of sovereign equality of states in the international system would remain sacrosanct.

The Bush Doctrine has exposed the weaknesses of the United Nations. The inability of the United Nations to call the U.S to order has had the tendency of encouraging the use of force and open violations of weaker states’ sovereignty in the recent past. The United States and her NATO allies now police the rest of the world. By implication, the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of many poor and militarily weak states in the international system can no longer be guaranteed. This is because the Bush Doctrine has, *ipso facto*, made Article 38 of the U.N charter dull, null and void and of no effect whatsoever.

The Bush Doctrine and the future of the 21st Century International System

We have shown plausible linkages in support of the thesis that the Bush Doctrine (which the Obama Administration has not repudiated) is hurtful to the international system. What is however, undeniable is the fact that a modicum of hegemonic authority has stabilizing effects on the international system.

However, the U.S appears to have gone too far in the exercise of its hegemonic clout and the implications of her actions has spelt more disaster for the system.

The international system *vis-à-vis* its peace and stability was to be ensured by Bush Doctrine and yet terrorism continues to gain currency as a result of the inability of the U.S to combat it *via* the Bush Doctrine. The ego of terrorist networks like al-Qaeda remains unscathed and countless domestic terror-mongers are encouraged to sign a memorandum of understanding with al-Qaeda. This has had serious implications for national governments as they devote a consequential amount of time and resources (which would have been used for developmental purposes) to fight terrorism. Nigeria and Mali are apt cases in point. Since the domestic and international systems are inter-linked, the pathologies created by the Bush Doctrine do not only destabilize the international system but crisscrosses to the domestic sphere as well.

Again, the volatile and intractable crises in the Middle East are exacerbated by the unwavering posturing of the Bush Doctrine. The seemingly Syrian crisis and the Arab Spring have amply buttressed how dangerous the Bush Doctrine could be in the Middle East, North Africa and the Maghreb. What is more, the North Korean nuclear stand-off also demonstrates how malignant the Bush Doctrine is to the international system. Adogamhe (2006: 123) has noted that even when the North Korean authoritarian regime was willing to abandon its nuclear weapons project and only asked for economic assistance in exchange for abandoning the project entirely the U.S refused. Instead the U.S demanded an unconditional surrender of its multi-billion dollars nuclear project, “of course, North Korea refused to give-up its nuclear programme”(Ogubanjo, 2002: 195). Now the Far East is at the risk of a nuclear mishap, as a nuclear North Korea will lead to proliferation of nuclear weapons in the region. These are all fall-outs of the Bush Doctrine of obstinacy, arrogance and confusion.

The United Nations appears to be most affected by the Bush Doctrine. These trends have been analyzed elsewhere in this study; what is important to note is that multilateralism and pluralism that are crucial for human progress and for which the United Nations was created to guarantee *ab initio*, is now eroded by the Bush Doctrine.

Conclusion and Recommendations

What prospects are there for the current international system in the light of these myriad hurtful effects of the Bush Doctrine? First, this study submits that the U.S has carried herself as an exploitative hegemon; one who is interested in only her self- interests and who uses coercion to guarantee the achievement of her interests. The U.S cannot therefore, be relied upon to provide stability to the international system. It should be known that hegemonic benevolence is more effective than brute military dominance, because you can force the horse to the water but you cannot force it to drink.

The supporters of the Bush Doctrine are quick to point to the fact that since the international system is anarchic, American hegemony is necessary to maintain world order and prevent other states from destabilizing the international system. Thus, proponents of the doctrine would argue that the woes the world suffers with U.S. preeminence would have been worse without American's stabilizing presence. But the grim reality today is that the Bush Doctrine is more destructive than protective of the international system. The United States may believe that the Bush Doctrine helps Americans and millions all over the world but the truth of the matter is that the Bush Doctrine has only show-cased American as a bully that meddles in the affairs of other states. Goldstein (2006:124) admits that "despite America's unrivaled power, the Bush Doctrine is making America an unpopular and lonely supper power in global geopolitics".

Terrorism which was the focal point of the Bush Doctrine appears to be on the increase while the Bush Doctrine is becoming prostrate in its fight against terrorism. Robert Wright has argued that the Bush Doctrine fuels terrorism, Wright rightly submits that:

War on terrorism demands an understanding of how so much the world has come to dislike America. When people who are born with the same human nature as you and I grow up to commit suicide bombings or applaud them, there must be a reason. And it is at least conceived that their fanaticism is needlessly encouraged by American policy or rhetoric(Wright: 2002:15).

The future of the international system, therefore, relies on the synergy of states that will challenge the unwholesome hegemony of the U.S. In fact, the emergence of a benevolent hegemon and the strengthening of the United Nations and other mechanisms that encourage multilateralism is the anti-

dote for the negative influences of the Bush Doctrine in the international system. Ogunbanjo (2003: 195) captures this better when she contends that:

The long trajectories of history unmistakably point to the coming of a world in which China and perhaps other great powers will rapidly rise to challenge U.S. financial prominence and political clout, even if U.S. military supremacy remains unchallenged in the short run. China, Japan and others are growing in economic power relative to the United States, and this suggests that the pecking order of the world's countries is likely to look very different by the year 2020 than it does now

The U.S cannot hold the whole world to ransom. If anything is certain in history, it is that “empires rise and empires fall”. The oppression and arrogant display of power as orchestrated now by the U.S has been one of the oldest factors that have led to the demise of many an empire. The U.S cannot be an exception.

With respect to the Third World where Nigeria unfortunately finds itself, the solution lies in using soft economic power to resist U.S exploitative designs in the international system. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) has been doing well in this regard. More than this, intensive integration of their economies and concerted action against all inimical positions should be given a newer impetus among Third World countries. Since economic conditions are primary in human considerations, the Third World states should intensively re-activate the cooperation among them. This must not be developed along the pattern of North-South interactions which has been the greatest purveyor of underdevelopment (Ugwuja, et al, 2014). Third World states should recognize their strengths and weakness; they should recognize that among them, there are the poor and less poor, the large and small, the landlocked and littoral states. These disadvantages and advantages should be blended together to give incentive for growth and mutual development among them. It is only when development is achieved by the Third World, especially, Africa, will they; have the courage and the wherewithal to resist all encrustations and encumbrances placed on them by bullies such as the United States.

References

- Adogamhe, P.G (2006), “Rethinking the North/South Relations: Analysis of the U.S/Nigerian Hegemonic Overtures” in *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, 32, (1).
- Anas, E (2009) “Constraints on the War Against Terrorism”, *Uzu: Journal of History and International Studies*, 2, (1).
- Bernstein, R. (2003) “Diplomacy: Europeans Still seek a solution to Avert war” *The New York Times*, Tuesday, March 18.
- Bush, G (2002), “Remarks by President George W. Bush at the 2002 Graduation Exercise of The U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York”, Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-2/html>, (Accessed, 18/06/2012).
- Bush, G. (2002), Address of President Bush to the Joint Session of the U.S Congress on September 2, 2002, Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/speech_to_joint-congress/2/9/02/htm. (Accessed 2/07/2012).
- Caldor, E.K (2010), “The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terror”, *Asian Review*, 3, (2).
- CNN, “Iran and the Role in Syria Peace”, Tuesday, July 10, 2012.
- Eze, R.C (2004), *Determinants of Nigeria’s Relations towards the Western Countries*, Enugu: Lauramby Publishers.
- Feraro, V (2012), “The Theory of Hegemonic Stability”, retrieved from <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pol116/hegemony.htm>. (Accessed 20/06/2012).
- Gillpin, R (1987), *The Political Economy of International Relations*, Princeton: Princeton University press.
- Goldstein, J.S (2006), *International Relations*, New Delhi: Pearson Educational Books/Dorling Kindersley Publishers Inc.
- Heisbourg, F (2008), “A Work in Progress: The Bush Doctrine and its Consequences” in *The Washington Quarterly: Journal of Strategic and International Studies*, 34, (2).
- Mearsheimer, J.J (2001), *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: WW. Norton and Company, 2001.
- Modelski, G. (1987), *Long Cycle in World Politics*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Moon C. and. Bae, J. Y (2005), “The Bush Doctrine and the North Korean Nuclear Crisis”, in *Asian Perspective*, 27,(4).

- Muzarrat, R (2010) "U.S War on Terrorism and Its impact on South Asia", retrieved from www.google.com/american-invasil-of-afghanistan.htm (Accessed 2/07/2012).
- Ogunbanjo, B (2002), "Great Power Politics: Past, Present and Future", *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, 28, (1 & 2).
- Ota, E.N (2007), "United States Adventurism in the Gulf: What Peace? Whose Security?" *Unizik Journal of arts and Humanities*, (1).
- Palmer, D and Perkins, C (2005), *International Relations*, (New Delhi: ATBS Publishers, 2005).
- Powell, C (2003), "Powell on Iraq: We Reserve Our Sovereign Right to Take Military Action", *New York Times*, (Monday January 27, 2003).
- Robert, M (2002), "Hegemony Stability Theory", retrieved from <http://Faculty.Maxwell.syr.edu/merupert/teaching/Hegemonic%20stability%20theory.htm>. (Accessed, 20/06/2012).
- Rourke, J (2001), *International Politics on the World Stage*, Guilford CT: McGraw Hill/Dushkin Publishers, 2001.
- Snauweert, D.T (2004) "The Bush Doctrine and Just War Theory", *OJPCR: Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 1, (6),
- Taylor, J.S (2010), "Barrack Obama and George W. Bush: Two Parties, One Doctrine", *American Journal of International Affairs*, 15, (1).
- "The War in Iraq Does Not Benefit the U.S" A Communiqué Published by the American Association of International Affairs Scholars, retrieved from <http://www.google.com> (Accessed 4/07/2012).
- Ugwuja, Alex, *et al* (2014), "South - South Cooperation and the Prospects of a New International Economic Order: An Insight into the India-Brazil-South Africa (IBSA) Dialogue Forum" *International Journal of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)* 1, (8).
- Woodward, B. (2002), *Bush at War*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wright, R. (2003), "Two years Later, A Thousand years ago", the *New York Times*, (September 11, 2003).
- Zaibadi, A.K, (2011), "Who benefits from U.S Aid to Pakistan?", *Policy Outlook: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, (2).