CHAPTER – 2

UNITED STATES SECURITY STRATEGY AND ITS MULTILATERAL RELATIONS

The end of the cold war marked the beginning of a new phase for the US as it added a new feather in its cap—the United States’ unipolar moment. The United States had enjoyed the status of a major power after the end of the second world war, but sudden demise of the Soviet Union during early 1990s enhanced its status from a great power to a sole super power as no other state seemed to challenge its strength that time across the world. The United States’ geographical position along with its economic, military and political strength provides plenteous opportunity to it to maintain the status of an influential, powerful and mighty State and exercise its ascendancy and supremacy all over the world.

The United States is situated between two wide Oceans i.e. the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean. Such of its geographical status protects it from any outer States’ and intercontinental attack with conventional war weapons. Besides, the US has the largest and mightiest military strength in the world. It contributes a major part of the finances of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and hence indirectly controls and regulates their functioning. The United States is one of the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council having veto power along with four other nations. But because of its strong influence and support among United Nations General Assembly member nations, it runs United Nations Security Council on its own and almost compels other permanent members of the Security Council to take its line in international affairs. The United States has its military bases in every continent and in many island countries which helps it to keep control and employ its authority over other nations across the world.

Therefore, it would be necessary as well as interesting for our purpose to analyze the United States’ different policies in order to understand how this country seeks to keep its primacy over other countries and how it uses it power and policies to influx and influence other nations to maintain its hegemony in world affairs. This chapter deals with the United States’ defense, foreign, economic and climate change policies in post cold war era to explain the US strategy to ensure its security and prominence.
Map 1 – Geographical uniqueness of the United States of America

The interesting fact of international politics is that a nation, no matter how much it is powerful, has to keep trying for its survival and always make strategies and update its policies to ascertain its security.\(^2\) Therefore, every nation has to work on some survival strategy and depend upon friendly relations with other nations to avoid conflict in international affairs and work for own development. Likewise, the United States of America, even having immense power, influence and strength, has to prepare strategies and establish multilateral relations for its security and peaceful coexistence with other nations. Therefore, this chapter seeks to analyze and understand the security strategy and multilateral relations of the United States after the demolition of the Soviet Union in order to explain the US endeavor to maintain its status of a sole super power. Although, it is difficult to separate defense, foreign and economic policies of a state because all of these policies are interlinked and no such dividing line can be drawn, but for the purpose of our convenience, we would study US policies under such categories.

THE US FOREIGN POLICY IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA

The period from 1989 to 1991 is said to have been the transition period in international politics when slow process of disintegration of the Soviet Union was going on and the cold war was at its last stage. On the one hand the world was getting prepared to take breath in a new kind of political environment, on the other the United States was in search of a new role to be played by it at international political theatre. At such point of time, the then US President George Herbert Bush came up with his concept of the new world order. In his speeches delivered during the months of August and September 1990, he talked about his theory of the new world order and the United States’ possible role in such neo global political condition. In August 1990, during a press conference he used the term ‘new world order’ for the first time regarding the post cold war international political posture. In the month of

---

\(^2\) Our experience of history shows that even the greatest empires and some powerful nations also had their downfalls because of lack of long term foreign policy and security strategy and mismanagement of international relations. Ancient Roman Empire, The Ottoman Empire, The British Empire also fell apart in the due course of time for being over confident and unrealistic about international politics and because of diminution in foreign policy’s far sightedness.
August itself, he proposed an active and ambitious role for the United States in a so called unpredictable world. In this speech the US president said that the recent changes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union had transformed the security environment and widely lessened an immediate threat to Europe and the danger of global war. He said that still the United States remained a central factor for peaceful change with important stakes in Europe, Pacific, and Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf. He warned that the world was still dangerous with various emerging threats which were not linked to the earlier patterns of the US-Soviet relationship and these threats could arise abruptly, unpredictably, and from unexpected corners. The President argued that terrorism, hostage taking, renegade regimes with unpredictable rules, new sources of instability—all required a strong and engaged United States with military forces which were able to respond to threats in whatever corner of the globe they may occur.³

Later, while addressing the joint session of the US Congress on September 11, 1991, he said,

“we stand today at a unique and extraordinary moment...out of these troubled times can emerge a new world order, a new era, free from the threat of terror stronger in the pursuit of justice, and more secure in the quest for peace, an era in which the nations of the world, East and West, North and South, can prosper and live in harmony.... A new world order should be a world where nations recognize the shared responsibility for freedom and justice, a world where the strong respect the weak.”⁴

In October 1991, while addressing United Nations General Assembly annual conference, he echoed his vision of the new world order. In his speech he said that the new world order meant open borders, open trade and open mind. He added that the new world order modeled democracy on the experience of the United States which was the world’s first democratic hemisphere.⁵

From his above mentioned speeches, it appeared that the United States believed in harmonic and friendly relations with other nations based on equal terms where there would be no space for any hegemonic ambition by great powers. But George Bush expressed his true intentions while releasing ‘National Security Strategy of the US’ in August 1991. In the preface of this Strategy, he wrote, “we must work with others, but we must also be a

---

³ Richard A Melanson, American Foreign Policy since the Vietnam War, M E Sharpe, Armonk, 1996, p.214
⁵ ibid.
leader…the new world order is not a fact- it is an aspiration- and an opportunity”. Later, he explained that ‘opportunity’ for the United States. He wrote,

“We have within our grasp an extraordinary possibility that few generations have enjoyed- to build a new international system in accordance with our own values and ideals, as old patterns and certainties crumble around us…. It is up to our generation in America and the world- to bring these extraordinary possibilities to fruition. And in doing this, American leadership is indispensable. That is our challenge.”

Thus it seemed that the United States was desirous to seek world leadership in the new era of unipolarity. The US such ambition became apparently clear when in January 1991, it attacked Iraq. In fact, in the month of August 1990, the then Iraqi President Mr. Saddam Hussein had invaded Kuwait and occupied it. When Kuwait sought world’s support, the United Nations tried to solve it diplomatically. But Iraq was not ready to leave Kuwait. Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia expressed its fear that Iraq could attack it. The United States stationed its troops in Saudi Arabia. The UN gave a deadline to Iraq of January 15, 1991 to withdraw from Kuwait. When Iraq refused to do so, on January 16, 1991, the United States attacked Iraq. Although, it was a military action authorized by the United Nations and in which a coalition force of 34 nations took part, this war is mainly known for the United States aggression against Iraq. Also known as, Operation Desert Storm, it turned out to be a hi-tech war carried out by the US forces with modern weapons and various missiles.

This war proved to be a boon for the US policy interests for a number of reasons. First, this war showed the US leadership quality in global political matters. The US led the coalition forces and the war as well. Second, it paved the way for the United States to make its permanent presence in the Middle East. The United States made its permanent military base in Saudi Arabia from which it could control the politics of Persian Gulf. Besides, the US got a better opportunity to play more active decisive role between Israel and Palestine. Third, the proceedings and outcome of the war proved to marginalize the role of the United Nations in world affairs. The way the US hijacked the whole issue, the United Nations appeared to become a puppet in the US hand. Fourth, the result of the war certified the military might of the United States and established its Army’s strength and supremacy.

---

6. ‘Bush outlines new world order concept,’ The Patriot, New Delhi, August 16, 1991
7. This Operation is also known for LIVE telecast of the war by American CNN TV channel. For the first time, people across the world, saw missiles attacking on Iraqi targets. It was a new experience for people as war pictures directly came in their house and war became lively for them.
8. Alvin Z Rubinstein, ‘New World Order or Hollow Victory?’, Foreign Affairs, Vol.70, No.4, Fall 1991, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, pp.53-65
In the beginning of the year 1992, the US Defense Department drafted a plan for the next 6 years (1994-1999), which envisaged Pentagon strategy of a post cold war world system. This document stated that Pentagon would ensure that no superpower emerged in Western Europe, Asia, or the areas of the former Soviet Union. The document said, “we must account sufficiently for the interests of the advanced industrial nations to discourage them from challenging our leadership or seeking to overturn the established political and economic order….Finally we must maintain the mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role….While the United States supports the goal of European integration, we must seek to prevent the emergence of European-only security arrangements which would undermine NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) particularly the alliance’s integration command structure.”

This document was the part of the US initiative after the demolition of the Soviet Union to stay as a sole super power and fulfill its hegemonic ambition. It showed the United States step by step and detailed tactics to achieve this goal. This document singled out strategies for different regions of world and outlined the US necessary plans to execute them region wise.

The Presidency of George Herbert Walker Bush ended on the note of triumph over Iraq. His policies appeared to have been based on pragmatism after the collapse of communism in the European Hemisphere. He sought to avail fairly this opportunity in order to establish the US world leadership globally at that transition period.

In January 1993, Democrat leader William Jefferson Clinton, popularly know as Bill Clinton, became next US president. On the eve of his oath taking, he formulated his vision of the role to be played by the United States during his tenure. He stated that his Government would follow a policy of ‘active international engagement’ in the background of the US singular role established by his predecessor. He said that his administration would support the quest for peace in West Asia and the efforts to secure a reduction in nuclear arsenals and weapons of mass destruction and prevent their proliferation.

Clinton Administration issued a strategic statement in July 1994 titled ‘A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement’ which called for an active policy directed
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9 Quoted in ‘Pentagon Document : U.S. bid to stop birth of superpower,’ The Times Of India, New Delhi, March 12, 1992

10 This document was categorized as a ‘classified inscription’ by the US Defense Department, which was supposed to be kept secret. But it was leaked in American newspapers. When European and Asian nations showed their rage on the US aggressive plans, the US officials defended their stand and said that the US wanted to prevent emergence of any hostile superpower against the United States and not opposed of friendly nations desirous to be great powers.

11 ‘Clinton sees need for strong U.S. leadership,’ The Hindu, New Delhi, January 20, 1993.
towards enlarging the number of democratic countries with free market economies and sustaining security with military forces ready to fight.\textsuperscript{12}

On May 22, 1993, the US Secretary of State Warren Christopher announced a new policy toward Africa based on human rights and promotion of democratic and economic development rather than the geo-political concerns of the cold war period. He said that the new policy emphasized the links of conscience and cooperation between the two continents. It also featured substantial US economic aid. Mr. Christopher said that in the dynamic and changing world, the US would move to a productive new relationship with Africa. He added that Clinton Administration would provide strong and visible support for the movement to freedom in Africa- to democracies and free market. He emphasized that the United States would work with the nations of Africa to address the health, environmental and population issues that threaten lives and imperil sustainable development. He said that the United States would help Africa build its capacity for preventive diplomacy and conflict resolution so that the Africans could live free of the terror of war.\textsuperscript{13}

On May 27, 1993, the Clinton Administration announced that it would begin an aggressive effort to isolate and weaken Iran which it perceived as an emerging threat to Western interests in the Gulf and to the existence of Israel. The announcement said that the United States would persuade its reluctant allies to join the efforts by cutting off loans, investments and arms sales to Iran, which has been viewed as a permanently hostile state towards the United States’ interests. The Administration also said that Washington would seek the help of Russia and China which were allegedly selling offensive arms to Iran and also assisting it in acquiring a nuclear reactor. The United States believed that the acquisition of the reactor was a prelude to obtain sensitive nuclear material and technology. The Clinton Administration said that its policy would be based on effectively preventing Teheran from building a powerful military machine which could be used to intimidate West Asian nations.\textsuperscript{14}

On January 10, 1994, the US President Bill Clinton arrived went to Belgium and assured his European allies that Europe remained central to American foreign policy and urged them

\textsuperscript{13} ‘US Africa Policy based on human rights declared,’ \textit{The Patriot}, New Delhi, May 23, 1993
\textsuperscript{14} ‘Clinton keen on Curbing Iran’s military growth,’ \textit{The Hindu}, New Delhi, May 28, 1993
to build a new security alliance in the continent with former countries of the Soviet Union. Mr. Clinton was addressing a gathering of the NATO country leaders. He stressed that the US was committed to ensure the security of European countries. He promised to keep 100,000 American troops in the region.\textsuperscript{15}

Bill Clinton’s leadership quality and foreign policy decision making ability were tested on the issues of civil wars going on in Bosnia and Somalia. Somalia was facing a civil war between military ruler General Mohammed Siad Barre and the rebels of the Hawiye clan’s United Somali Congress. Because of the political disturbances, thousands of Somalis suffered. They were looted and harassed by both sides of armed men. At this juncture, the United Nations Security Council passed the Resolution 794 and allowed the US led military forces and directed them to use all necessary means to establish a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia. On getting directives from the United Nations, the United States moved actively and sent its troops along with other nation’s forces in Somalia on humanitarian basis in December 1992 during the Bush Presidency.\textsuperscript{16}

Same was the case with Bosnia where an ethnic conflict was going on between the Serbs and Bosnian Muslims. During George H Bush regime, the US deployed its troops in Bosnia, The Bush Administration has imposed political, diplomatic and economic sanctions against Serbia for violating human rights against its neighbors in the Balkans. Mr. Baker, the US Secretary of State declared to take some measures against the Serbs for the alleged bloodshed in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He said that the US contacts with the Yugoslav military would be suspended and the Yugoslav consulates in San Francisco and New York would be closed. He said that the United States would not recognize the federation of Serbia and Montenegro until all forces were withdrawn from neighboring states and minority rights were respected. On Yugoslavia, he said that the US goal would be to get maximum cooperation from the European community and in punishing the Serbs for the bloodshed in Bosnia- Herzegovina.\textsuperscript{17}

But, when Bill Clinton became president, in a major policy shift, he showed his willingness to offer the US troops as peacekeepers as part of its proposed initiative to end the

\textsuperscript{15} ‘Europe Central to the US Policy,’ \textit{The Statesman}, Calcutta, January 11, 1994
\textsuperscript{17} ‘US imposes sanctions against Serbia,’ \textit{The Hindu}, May 24, 1992
ethnic warfare in Bosnia and Herzegovina. His four part plan included diplomatic, military, economic and humanitarian role of the United States in this region.18

Later in the year of 1995, he defended his peace plan for Bosnia saying that if the US was not an essential part of the peacekeeping mission in the Balkans, the NATO efforts would not have succeeded. He reminded people that the United States had vital interests in the Balkans. He said,

“Bosnia lies at the very heart of Europe, next door to many of its fragile new democracies some of our closest allies. Generations of American have understood that Europe’s freedom and stability is vital to our own national security. That is why we fought two wars in Europe, that is why we launched the Marshall plan to restore Europe, that is why we created NATO and waged the cold war and that is why we must help the nations of Europe to end their worst nightmare since World War II now.”19

In the same speech, Bill Clinton talked about his vision of the United States policy for the coming years. He said,

“American leadership in global affairs was all the more needed under the changed circumstances…. As the cold war gives way to the global village, our leadership is needed more than ever because problems that start beyond our borders can quickly become problems within them. We, are all vulnerable to the organized forces of intolerance and destruction, terrorism, ethnic, religious and regional rivalries, the spread of organized crime and drug trafficking, just as surely as fascism and communism, these forces also threaten freedom and democracy, peace and prosperity. And they too demand American leadership.” 20

To understand the geopolitical importance of the Balkan region, here we can have a look over the map of this area and try to understand Bill Clinton’s theory of US vested interest in Balkan states.

---

18 ‘Major shift in American stand on Yugoslavia,’ *The Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, February 11, 1993
19 Quoted in ‘U.S. has stake in Bosnia: Clinton’, *The Hindu*, New Delhi, November 29, 1995
20 Quoted in ibid.
Map 2 – Geopolitical significance of the Balkan region

On January 10, 1994, the US President Bill Clinton and other NATO leaders agreed to invite former Warsaw Pact adversaries to become limited partners in the western military alliance. The NATO Secretary Gen Manfred said that they were concerned about the security of Central and Eastern Europe and the NATO would not leave them alone. At that time, NATO proposed only an interim cooperation deal for Poland, Hungry and other new democracies rather than extending the security guarantees that would accompany full membership in the alliance. For that purpose, NATO had launched a scheme called ‘Partnership for Peace’ offering military cooperation programmes to East European and former Soviet States.22

On December 3, 1995, the United States and the European Union signed an agreement and termed it as a guiding document to take their relationship in 21st Century. The US President Bill Clinton vowed that his country would remain as closely tied to Europe as it was during half century of the cold war. He signed the document which was termed as ‘New Transatlantic Agenda; with the Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez whose country was holding the European Union’s rotating presidency. The document encompassed cooperation on Bosnia, the West Asia peace process, trade, security, human rights, aid, democracy, health and crime-fighting. The declaration pledged to keep NATO at the heart of transatlantic security at the same time strengthening the European Union’s own fledging defense mechanism.23

In May 1997, Clinton Administration presented its ‘National Security Strategy for a New Century.’ This Strategy stated,

“In designing our strategy, we recognize that the spread of democracy supports American values and enhances both our security and prosperity. Democratic governments are more likely to cooperate with each other against common threats and to encourage free and open trade and economic development—and less likely to wage war or abuse the right of their people. Hence, the trend towards democracy and free markets throughout the world advance American interest.”24

Bill Clinton appointed Martin Indyk as the Middle Eastern specialist on the National Security Council. Indyk put forth the administration’s Middle East Policy on May 18, 1993 in a speech delivered before the Washington Institute. The Clinton Administration’s

22 ‘NATO opens door for East European Bloc,’ Indian Express, Calcutta, January 11, 1994,
23 ‘Clinton signs transatlantic pact with EU,’ The Economic Times, December 4, 1995
The approach to the Persian Gulf was described in Indyk’s speech as ‘dual containment’ of Iran and Iraq and support for Saudi Arabia and Turkey to help stabilize the region. He talked about three challenges faced by the US in Middle East: to turn the Arab-Israeli peace process into ‘peacemaking’, to contain Iran and Iraq despite their ‘determined efforts to rebuild their arsenals’ and to combat the rise of ‘violent movements cloaked in religious grab.’ Working on the strategy of peacemaker, the US mediated between Arabs and Israelis and both sides reached on an agreement and signed joint Declaration of Principles on September 13, 1992 in Oslo. All parties expressed their thankfulness for the US support and sought its future support as well.\(^{25}\)

Middle East has been a key factor in the US foreign policy and strategically vital for its policy interests since the cold war period. But, after gaining triumph in the first Gulf war in 1991, the USA has got success in stationing its troops in this region. The US maintains 25,000 troops in this area, naval bases in Bahrain and strong ground forces in Saudi Arabia. The cost to maintain such military presence in this region is overwhelming but the US perceives it essential to keep its presence in this region in order to keep a tab on this strategically important and economically rich area.\(^{26}\)

After September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the Bush Administration presented its ‘National Security Strategy of the United States’ in September 2002. The document declared that the United States and the world confronted a new and unprecedented reality: the simultaneous existence of terrorist networks with global reach and rogue states with weapons of mass destruction. The administration argued that the terrorists might get access to these weapons and use them against the US and its friendly states. The government decided to counter this threat with a different strategy: the strategy of preemptive measures.\(^{27}\) The document said that if possible, a preemptive attack would be launched multilaterally but if necessary, the USA would go all alone and dismantle the enemy who planned to harm the US and its allies. It was believed as a major decision by the Bush Administration and a shift in the US policy which earlier maintained the policy of deterrence. The Bush Administration


\(^{27}\) Preemption is a strategy of anticipating the attack and striking first against the enemy who is planning to harm the USA and its allies.
decided to do something more to so called rogue states rather than merely disarming them from weapons of mass destruction. It also wanted to work on the policy of ‘regime change’ by overthrowing the current government and replacing it with a government which would be more friendly towards the US.  

However, the US policymakers argued that the government never abandoned deterrence as its policy. They said that National Security Strategy of 2002 also listed deterrence as the US basic goal. But, the US president made it clear that his government would not rely solely on the deterrence policy and whenever necessary, it would adopt the policy of preemption. Besides, Bush Administration also believed that the preemption and deterrence doctrine could become complimentary and strengthen each other. The threat to attack other states proactively would prevent states acquiring Weapons of Mass Destruction or giving support to terrorists. In this connection, coercive diplomacy could also be seen as deterrence. 

In Middle East, Iran is a vital strategic interest point for the United States. On March 17, 2000, in a speech, the US Secretary of State Madeline Albright outlined the US stakes in Iran. She said, “Iran is obviously a country of great strategic importance…As President Clinton has said, the United States must bear its fair share of responsibility for the problems that have risen in the US-Iranian relations…We want to see the free flow of oil in the Gulf.” In fact, the US is very much interested to mediate in disputes of Gulf area and give this region a stable and smooth character for economic and political reasons. During 1990s, the US was anxious about the tensed relations between Iran and Iraq and wanted to ascertain and establish peace across the Gulf region. During his visit to Gulf countries, on April 8, 2000, the US Secretary of Defense, William Cohen expressed such of his desire in a speech. He said,

“…The US is committed to ensure a peaceful Gulf and protect it from missile attacks…Such threats will exist as long as Iraq and Iran pursue efforts to either build or maintain weapons of mass destruction…We are going to talk about the combined Defense Initiative, something which is very important throughout the Gulf region and that is to make sure that all of us are prepared to deal with a chemical or biological attack upon any of the countries throughout the Gulf, including US forces…”

---

31 Quoted in ibid, p.797
During the presidency of Bill Clinton, the US adopted the policy of dual containment regarding Iran and Iraq. But later, in the initial years of George W Bush tenure, the focus shifted to make soft and warm relations with Iran. The purpose of this policy was to isolate Iraq completely and give Iran its due importance keeping Iran’s strategic toehold in Gulf region.\(^\text{32}\) For this purpose, the US wanted to convince Gulf countries to accept the concept of ‘Cooperative Defense Initiative’ (CDI). The US wanted to include Jordan, Egypt, Oman, Qatar, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia (all of them US allies in this region) in this program. CDI is a program similar to Theatre Missile Defense System providing nuclear shield to its friendly nations of Middle East.\(^\text{33}\)

The Middle East has been of great strategic significance for the United States. It always wanted to uphold and ascertain peace, stability and security in this region to ensure a free flow of oil from here to the United States. For this purpose, it has been necessary for the US to remain in this region and work as a peacekeeper and watchdog of Middle East. We can have a look over the map of Middle East and discuss about the states of these region geopolitically powerful and strategically important.

\(^{32}\) Iran’s border covers half of the Gulf coastline which is connected with Strait of Hormuz through which oil trade takes place in the world. Iran has borders with Caspian Sea, the Caucasus and Central Asia which has huge oil reserves. Therefore, it is necessary for the United States to keep stable and safe relations with Iran in order to ensure free flow of oil from this region.

\(^{33}\) Dean Mathew, no.26, pp. 797-806.
The Middle East comprises of major states such as Iran, Iraq, Israel, Palestine and Saudi Arabia. After the end of the cold war, for the United States, it has been always essential to be a part of peace settlement process between Israel and Palestine. Therefore, in 1990s, it started taking active participation in the conflict between the Arabs and the Jews. In March 1991, the United States President George H W Bush, told a joint session of Congress that after winning

Map 3 – Middle East Region


34
war in Iraq, the United States wanted to create new opportunities to establish peace and stability in West Asia. Therefore, he outlined four key issues to be addressed in the Middle Eastern region. First, he emphasized to create strong regional security arrangements. He said that it would involve the United States participation in joint exercises and strengthened US naval presence in the region. Second, controlling future inputs of weapons of mass destructions in the area and denying Iraq all kind of access to the instrument of war until it mended its way. Third, he vowed for determined efforts to put an end to the Arab-Israeli quarrel. He expressed his hopes that it would provide for Israel’s security and recognition and at the same time ensure legitimate rights of the Palestinians under the principle of ‘Territory for Peace’.  

Fourth, he emphasized the need for the economic development and improved living standards for the new desperate oil-poor or haves not states. He indicated that income from the rich natural resources of the region should not be diverted to military expenditures. 

The US policy makers perceive that Iran has not only posed a constant threat for the United States policy interests but also an opportunity as well. Since the establishment of Islamic rule in 1979, each administration in Washington has tried various forms of diplomacy to reduce Iran’s hostility towards the US interests and presence in the Middle East. Since the beginning of its second term, the Bush Administration has sought a broad approach towards Teheran to deal with several issues of US concerns such as Iran’s nuclear ambitions and its efforts to establish itself as a regional hegemon. The Bush Administration wanted to present choices between moderation and isolation to Iranian leaders. 

From 1991 to 2001, mainly containment was the US policy towards Iraq. After the 1991 Gulf war, Saddam Hussein was permitted to continue as Baghdad’s ruler, but United States was continuously concerned about his ability to develop weapons of mass destruction and threaten its neighbors and create instability in this region. During this period, the United States’ policy towards Iraq had four dimensions. First, Clinton Administration maintained its military presence in the Persian Gulf region in order to deter Saddam Hussein for future aggression. Second, with its allies, the US created and enforced no-fly zones in both north

---

35 ‘Territory for Peace’ concept expresses the idea of Israel giving a homeland to the Palestinians in exchange for Arabs giving recognition to Israel’s right of exist within its original border.
and South Iraq. Third, it encouraged UN inspectors to locate and dismantle any weapons of mass destruction within Iraq. Fourth, it tried to create international support to continue economic sanctions against Iraq to weaken Saddam Hussein’s regime and its military capability.\(^{38}\) Later, after 9/11, the US strategy towards Iraq turned into preemptive aggression and it resulted in US attack on Iraq in 2003.

From 11/9 (November 9, 1989, when the Berlin wall fell down) to 9/11 (September 11, 2001, when terrorists attacked the USA), the United States’ policy was focused on its world leadership, hegemonic ambition and foreign policy and its homeland security concerns appeared to remain ignored. Thus, the event of September 11, 2001 terrorist attack took place when 19 terrorists of Al Qaeda terrorist outfit hijacked 4 American air planes and attacked on some buildings of its vital interest. The terrorists smashed 2 hijacked planes into the famous twin towers of World Trade Center and within minutes both towers collapsed. One more plane collided with the US Defense Department office Pentagon and damaged some portion of it.\(^{39}\) Al Qaeda was established by Osama Bin Laden who was very much vocal against the US policies during 1990s. He had criticized the US presence in the Middle East and its policies against some Islamic countries. It was an attack not merely on some American buildings; but on the US ideology, its democratic values and its fight for human dignity and liberty. This attack brought several changes in the United States policies. The US adopted the policy of ‘Preemption’ under the leadership of George W Bush. Following this policy, the United States attacked Afghanistan in the month of October 2001 in order to uproot all bases of Al Qaeda from its soil and within a few weeks alleged radical and fundamentalist Taliban rulers were evicted from power. In the year of 2002, the then President addressed his nation and explained his doctrine of Preemption. He said,

“Defending our Nation against its enemies is the first and fundamental commitment of the Federal Government. Today, that task has changed dramatically. Enemies in the past needed great armies and great industrial capabilities to endanger America. Now, shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to our shores for less than it costs to purchase a single tank. Terrorists are organized to penetrate open societies and turn the power of modern technologies against us.…. To defeat this threat we must make use of every tool in our arsenal—military power, homeland defenses, law enforcement, intelligence, and vigorous efforts to cut terrorist financing.…."

Our enemies have openly declared that they are seeking weapons of mass destruction…. The United States will not allow these efforts to succeed…. And, as a matter of common self-Defense, America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed…. While the United States will 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 pre-emptively against such terrorist, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country….”

In the month of August 2002, then US Vice President Dick Cheney spoke about the US firm unilateralism policy which included the theory of the preemptive use of force. He delivered a speech to the Veterans of War in late August and talked about the dangers posed by terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. He said, “Containment is not possible when dictators obtain weapons of mass destruction, and are prepared to share them with terrorists who intend to inflict catastrophic casualties on the United States.” Cheney concluded that the combination of Saddam Hussein’s capabilities and intentions created the conditions for preemptive action. He said,

“There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction…no doubt he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies, and against us…. If the United States could have preempted 9/11, we would have, no question. Should we be able to prevent another more devastating attack, we will, no question. This nation will not live at the mercy of terrorists or terror regimes.”

To implement this policy furthermore, the US attacked Iraq in March 2003 alleging that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction which could fall in hands of terrorists. But this attack seemed to be the part of US grand strategy to change the geopolitical map of Middle East in its favor. George W Bush wanted to uproot the regime of the then Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and establish a US-friendly government there. Washington partially became successful in its strategy because it uprooted Saddam Hussein’s rule and installed a pro-US government there which it could easily control. Through its strategy over Iraq, the United States sought to achieve several aims. First, because of a pro-US government in Iraq, it could have uninterrupted access to Iraqi oil. Second, the United States could keep its active presence in this region. Third, it could easily mediate Israel-Palestine peace process. Fourth, it could curb ambitions of Iran to be a regional power.

But the United States could not succeed fully in its plan as later it was found that Iraq did not possess weapons of mass destruction during Saddam Hussein’s regime and the US

President George Bush was criticized for misleading the world community. It became an approaching disaster for the US to keep its military presence in Iraq. After the end of Saddam Hussein’s regime, violence broke out in Iraq and Shiāt–Sunni ethnic conflict resurfaced on the ground. Almost everyday there has been bomb explosions and there was immense pressure on the United States to withdraw its troops from Iraq. Therefore, on February 27, 2009, President Obama announced a plan to responsibly end the war in Iraq. He said,

“By August 31, 2010, our combat mission in Iraq will end and Iraqi Security Forces will have full responsibility for major combat missions. After August 31, 2010, the mission of United States forces in Iraq will fundamentally change. Our forces will have three tasks: train, equip, and advise the Iraqi Security Forces; conduct targeted counterterrorism operations; and provide force protection for military and civilian personnel.” 42

In response to the 9/11 attacks, the Bush Administration decided to adopt a three-fold policy to secure the US interests in Middle East region: defeating terrorism, promoting democracy and to stop the development of weapons of mass destructions in this area. Nine days after the 9/11 attacks, the US President George W Bush addressed the Joint Session of the US Congress and declared,

“Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated…we will direct every resource at our command…to the disruption and to the defeat of the global terror network….We will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice.”43

Since Afghanistan was Al Qaeda’s home, so it was inevitable to be prime US target. Later, the US claimed to prevent birth of another Afghanistan in Middle East, when George Bush declared that the United States and countries cooperating with it must not allow the terrorists to develop new home bases and together they would seek to deny them sanctuary at every place. His administration was determined to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as terrorists could acquire them and it could pose serious threats for the US interests. Bush claimed that Saddam Hussein was developing weapons of mass destruction which could be hazardous for security and human civilization. The Bush Administration wanted to apply the ‘domino theory’ of cold war era in Middle East through Iraq. It believed that after uprooting the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq and installing a democratic

42 Quoted in http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/foreign-policy Accessed on June 7, 2011
government, it would work as a role model for other countries in that region. On September 12, 2002, Bush explained his theory in the United Nations. He said,

“The people of Iraq can shake off their captivity. They can one day join a democratic Afghanistan and a democratic Palestine, inspiring reforms throughout the Muslim world. These nations can show by their example that honest government, and respect for woman, and the great Islamic tradition of learning can triumph in the Middle East and beyond. And we will show that the promise of the United Nations can be fulfilled in our time.”

While shaping National Security Strategy of the United States, in September 2002, the then President George W Bush said that the United States must and would maintain the capacity to defeat any attempt by an enemy—whether a state or non-state actor—to impose its will on the United States, its allies, or its friends.45

Before this in January 2002, speaking before Joint session of Congress, Bush outlined his plan which was later known as Bush Doctrine. He said,

“[W]e will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans and bring terrorists to justice. And…we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world…. Yet time is not on our side. I will not wait on events while dangers gather. I will not stand by as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America will not permit the world’s most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world’s most destructive weapons.” 46

During the decade of 1990, the United States was involved in preventing ethnic conflict and genocide. Discussions were going on among the US policy makers whether the US military should be used primarily for humanitarian interventions and post conflict stabilization. But 9/11 attacks put abrupt ends on that discussion. The global nature of the challenge faced by the United States-terrorism- was obvious before the US leaders. This new reality transformed not only US foreign policy but also the role of history’s biggest military alliance–NATO. On September 12, 2001, NATO members invoked the NATO’s collective defense provisions, under which an attack against one alliance member was believed to be an attack against all of them. At first, the Bush Administration rejected any direct NATO involvement in military operations in Afghanistan, but later it realized that such involvement was necessary to meet the new challenges emerging in new millennium. In August, 2003,

44 Quoted in ibid, p.154.
NATO took formally take charge of the International Security Assistant Forces (ISAF) which was given the work to provide security in post-Taliban Afghanistan. 47

While writing an article in Foreign Affairs in 2003, former US Secretary of State, Madeleine K Albright, echoed US voices towards the world community. She wrote,

“Either, or Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.
There are only two powers in the world. One is America, which is tyrannical and oppressive. The other is a warrior who has not yet been awakened from his slumber and that warrior is Islam.
Make no mistake about it: the choice for sure is between two visions of the world.”48

The Bush Administration made promotion of democracy its policy as the part of its war on terrorism. But the critics argue that these are two different agenda and should not be mixed. They underline that promoting democracy is a larger cause and has nothing to do with the terrorist groups who are not mass based organizations. They are not organized on democratic principles and they would not stop their violent activities even if every Muslim country of the world becomes a democracy. 49

Colin L Powell who was the Secretary of State during Bush Administration, wrote an article in Foreign Affairs in 2004 and outlined George W Bush’s foreign policy. He wrote,

“…the war on terrorism has become the United States’ number one foreign policy priority. It will remain so for as long as necessary….It is somewhat odd, therefore, to discover that our foreign policy strategy is so often misunderstood by both domestic and foreign observers. U.S. strategy is widely accused of being unilateralist by design. It isn’t. It is often accused of being imbalanced in favor of military methods. It isn’t. It is frequently described as being obsessed with terrorism and hence biased toward preemptive war on a global scale. It must certainly is not.”50

He emphasized that president’s strategy was rooted in the promotion of freedom and dignity worldwide. He stressed on the importance and primacy of partnership in his administration and clarified George Bush’s strategy. He wrote,

“Partnership is the watchword of U.S. strategy in this administration. Partnership is not about deferring to others; it is about working with them. Beyond upholding the partnerships we have inherited, the president seeks new ones to deal with new challenges.”51

51 ibid, pp.25-26
On May 24, 2004, then US President George W Bush delivered a speech at the US Army War College, Pennsylvania and announced his administration’s policy for Iraq and the specific steps being taken to implement it. He supported the idea of establishing a democratic government in Iraq which would result in weakening terrorist activities. He said,

“The rise of a free and self-governing Iraq will deny terrorists a base of operation, discredit their narrow ideology, and give momentum to reformers across the region. This will be a decisive blow to terrorism at the hearts of its power, and a victory for the security of America and civilized world....
Our coalition has a clear goal, understood by all -- to see the Iraqi people in charge of Iraq for the first time in generations. America's task in Iraq is not only to defeat an enemy, it is to give strength to a friend - a free, representative government that serves its people and fights on their behalf....
There are five steps in our plan to help Iraq achieve democracy and freedom. We will hand over authority to a sovereign Iraqi government, help establish security, continue rebuilding Iraq's infrastructure, encourage more international support, and move toward a national election that will bring forward new leaders empowered by the Iraqi people....”

He said that the US would provide necessary forces and support to achieve these goals. He said that the US actions were guided by a vision. He expressed his belief that freedom could advance and change lives in the greater Middle East, as it has advanced and changed lives in Asia, Latin America, Africa and Eastern Europe.

The United States-Saudi Arabia relationship has changed after 9/11. Both Washington and Riyadh termed their ties as ‘special partnership’ during the cold war period because both benefited from each other. Saudi Arabia was the main source of oil for the United States. The US requirement of energy and oil was fulfilled by Riyadh and in return the United States provided security guarantee to Saudi Arabia by positioning US forces in Saudi territory. It ensured Washington’s presence in Gulf region as well. But, the developments after 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US, has changed their equations. 15 out of 19 hijackers of the planes on September 11, 2001, were Saudi citizens. Later when the United States attacked Iraq and Saddam Hussein was evicted from government, most of the suicide bombers who were involved in killing the US forces in Iraq, were Saudis. So, now Washington looks at Riyadh with suspicion. Today Saudi Arabia is not regarded as non-NATO ally by the United States and Saudi Arabia also does not regard the United States as a security guarantor. On the contrary, it regards Washington as a cause of its insecurity. Saudi Arabia does not want to be called as a ‘moderate ally’ of the United States in Arab world. Now it is trying to make
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54 non-NATO ally is a designation given by the United States government to close allies who have strategic working relationships with US armed forces but are not members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
distance from Washington and seeking to establish better relations with Pakistan, Turkey, Russia and China.\(^{55}\)

Apart from enhancing multilateral efforts to contain Iran’s nuclear program, the United States has taken several unilateral and bilateral measures to adjust and harmonize its relationship with Tehran. The measures included increased efforts to build a democratic opposition to Iran’s regime, direct talks with Tehran about its alleged activities in Iraq and congressional efforts to further tighten U.S. sanctions on those who might aid Iran. The Bush Administration sought to achieve two goals through these policies: First, make Iran ready give up its nuclear weapons program and second bring leadership change and democracy to Iran. \(^{56}\)

The US primary interest in the Persian Gulf is to ensure the free, stable and uninterrupted flow of oil from the region to the United States and to the rest of the world as well. Today, roughly, 25 per cent of the world’s oil production comes from the Persian Gulf. Saudi Arabia alone shares almost 15 per cent of oil production which is expected to increase in future. Saudi Arabia is the world’s largest oil producer and also has most of the oil reserves. Besides, it also has a majority of the world’s excess production capacity. Saudi Arabia uses this capacity to control the price of oil by increasing or decreasing production as required. But the US is not only concerned with keeping oil flowing out of the Persian Gulf, but it also has an interest in preventing any potentially hostile state from gaining control over the region and its resources. \(^{57}\)

The United States’ attack on Iraq had deepened the fundamental and strategic differences between both countries. Under Saddam Hussein, Iraq was a Sunni dominated country, but after his ouster, a Shiite supported government was established in Baghdad which changed the equation between Shiite and Sunni in Persian Gulf region and shifted the balance of power in the favor of Iran. Besides, the United States promotion of democracy in Arab world also raised eyebrows in Riyadh because Saudi Arabia is under monarchy and its position will be under threat if democracy is encouraged in this region. However, in spite of differences,
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\(^{57}\) Kenneth M Pollack, ‘Securing the Gulf,’ *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.82, No.4, July-August 2003, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, pp. 2-16
both countries share some common grounds which compel them to cooperate. Iran is a common threat for them and both want to curtail Teheran’s ambition to become regional power. Both nations want the free and uninterrupted flow of Saudi oil into international market. Besides, both countries face serious threat from Al Qaeda as well.\textsuperscript{58}

The US President George W Bush delivered a speech at White House on March 19, 2004 regarding Operation Iraqi Freedom. In this speech he expressed his views and visions on establishing democracy in Greater Middle East. He said,

“The rise of democratic institutions in Afghanistan and Iraq is a great step toward a goal of lasting importance to the world. We have set out to encourage reform and democracy in the greater Middle East as the alternatives to fanaticism, resentment, and terror. We've set out to break the cycle of bitterness and radicalism that has brought stagnation to a vital region, and destruction to cities in America and Europe and around the world. This task is historic, and difficult; this task is necessary and worthy of our efforts.”\textsuperscript{59}

Later, in late May 2006, China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States restarted their efforts to formulate an offer for Iran after the Security Council failed in early May to reach on an agreement on a legally binding draft resolution on Iran’s nuclear program. These countries continued their efforts to offer new package of incentives and disincentives so that Iran could end its gas centrifuge-based uranium-enrichment program. Iran has a pilot centrifuge facility and is believed to be constructing a larger commercial facility. Tehran has told the IAEA that the pilot and commercial facilities would contain approximately 1,000 and 50,000 centrifuges, respectively.\textsuperscript{60} Iran suspended the program in late 2004 before beginning negotiations with France, Germany, and the United Kingdom which was supposed to resolve concerns about its enrichment program. Those negotiations ended when Iran restarted its uranium-conversion facility in August 2005.\textsuperscript{61}

Central Asia is also important for the US policy interests. After 9/11, Washington entered into new understanding with every government in the region. Those governments perceived Afghanistan as threat and were eager to cooperate with the United States to maintain peace in their region. The US seeks to transform Afghanistan and the entire region of Central Asia

\textsuperscript{58} ibid.
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into a zone of secured sovereign nations which share common interests with the United States. The United States wants to encourage free market economies and democratic systems of government in this region which maintain positive relations with the United States. The United States wants to achieve this goal by establishing Greater Central Asia Partnership with every nation of this region. For the United States, Central Asia offers an opportunity to promote democracy and maintain the democratic peace theory accepted by both the Clinton and Bush Administrations. American energy companies are interested to get access to the region’s oil and gas resources. Besides, strategically they act as balancer between Moscow and Washington.

The US campaign to promote democracy globally and the way George W Bush made democracy promotion a centre theme of his foreign policy has faced criticism. Some autocratic governments have won public sympathy by arguing that opposition to western democracy promotion is resistance not to democracy but to American interventionism. Countries such as Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan have shut down democracy promotion programs running in their countries by the support of the United States. African countries Zimbabwe has driven out western Non Governmental organizations from its soil. In Latin America, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez always criticizes American democracy promotion policy. In July 2005, Uzbekistan government evicted US personnel from the Karshi-Khanabad air base which Washington had used as a ground for combat and humanitarian missions in Afghanistan. The government did not give any reason but the order was issued when the United Nations airlifted 439 Uzbek refugees from Kyrgyzstan to Romania-a move which was supported by Washington but opposed by Tashkent. Besides, in Middle East region, in 1996 also terrorists had attacked Khobar towers in Saudi Arabia where American troops were housed. The attack raised security concerns for the US and for the Saudi Arabian government. It was a lesson for the Saudi government that the US military presence was a domestic political threat for it. Finally, in 2003, Washington was compelled to withdraw 5000 troops from Saudi Arabia. These events illustrates that the US foreign
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policy is facing opposition and its democracy promotion campaign is not welcomed everywhere.  

In the aftermath of 9/11 attacks, the United States and Russia pledged to cooperate on security issues and mainly against terrorism. Russia agreed to share intelligence information about the terrorist organizations, their location, and their infrastructure and training facilities. It also agreed to allow the United States to use former Soviet air bases in Central Asian nations. On May 24, 2002, the US President George W Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin signed a joint statement in which they reaffirmed their commitment to fight terrorism in all its forms and commended the efforts of the worldwide coalition against terrorism after 9/11. The joint statement also urged nations of the coalition to continue their efforts to destroy terrorists’ financial, logistic, communications and other operational networks and deny them any kind of safe place to reestablish their roots. Both sides also expressed their satisfaction in US-Russia cooperation in counter terrorism efforts.

The United States has prolonged relationship with Latin American countries. Since the launch of Monroe Doctrine in 1824, the US had always maintained a smooth and influential relationship with Latin America. The US Department of State declares that the United States’ goal is to strengthen Inter-American community formed by economic partners that are democratic, stable and prosperous, friendly neighbors that help secure the region against terrorism and illegal drugs and nations that work together in the world to advance shared political and economic values.

After Barack Obama became the President of the United States, his administration decided to take an active interest in Latin American and Caribbean affairs. The policy makers of his administration considered several reasons for early engagement with this region. The first reason was some transnational issues such as energy security, global warming, pollution and other environmental concerns, crime, narcotics, and public health. Second, Latin America is economically important to the US because it is a major source of energy and other resources for the US goods and services. Third, both Americas share their border so its raises
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the problems of migration, narcotics, arms and human trafficking between them. Therefore they need to cooperate to maintain peace and tranquility in their border and adjacent area. During the presidency of Bill Clinton and George W Bush, the USA viewed Latin America from the viewpoint of international terrorism only. But the Obama Administration decided to be strategic but selective and concentrate on major issues and regions where new initiatives could produce more positive results. Therefore, the new government decided to work on some specific fields such as immigration, trade, energy, and narcotics to improve relations with Latin America.\textsuperscript{68}

While nominating Susan Elizabeth Rice as ambassador to the United Nations (UN), the US President Barack Obama announced that the multilateralism in general and for the United Nations in particular would be essential in the US foreign policy during his administration. He said that the global challenges faced by international community needed global institutions which worked. He decided to restore the US funds for UN Population Fund which indicated president’s determination to strengthen the US role in the world through active participation in multinational efforts and institutions. In fact, the UN’s universal membership provides legitimacy to the US policies. So the newly appointed ambassador said that as a global institution, the UN should enhance and not diminish the US influence and should bring more security to the US people and to the world.\textsuperscript{69}

\textbf{US DEFENSE POLICY IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA}

After the end of the cold war, non-proliferation has been a major defense policy concern for the United States because the US has a consistent security threat from the spread of weapons of mass destruction and acquiring nuclear capabilities by the ‘rogue states.’\textsuperscript{70} In this connection, in May 1992, in a major policy speech the US President George H W Bush spelt out four key elements to form the US Defense strategy in the post cold war era. In a

\textsuperscript{70} The United States has categorized Syria, Libya, North Korea, Iraq and Iran into ‘Rouge States’ because some of them allegedly support terrorist activities and according to the US some of them have nuclear capability and at the same time they are liberal to some terrorist organizations.
commencement address as the US Naval Academy at Annapolis in Maryland, he said these elements were forward deployment, a premium on rapid response and retention of the capability to reconstitute sufficient forces to meet the future threats. He pointed out that from 40 years of the cold war to the 40 days of gulf war, forward deployment of forces had contributed to the world stability and helped America keep dangers far from its shores. He said,

“The nature of challenge we are likely to face will put a premium on rapid response. We live in a day when clear and present dangers are few, when new threats can emerge with little or no morning. .. We have got to keep our technological edge, keep our research and development focus on the next generation of weapons that you will need to succeed.”

One major part of the US defense policy is its arms sale to various countries to keep alive its arms industry. During the first gulf war of 1991, the war against Iraq was a major source of income for the arms countries. Since 1989, Middle East has been a marketplace for the US arms and weapons. Saudi Arabia is a major purchaser of American arms in this region. The USA invests a large amount of capital for the research and development of arms.

Later, in the year of 1993, declaring the necessity to counter the spread of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them, the United States Secretary of Defense, Mr. Les Asbin, announced a new military programme called the ‘Defense counter-proliferation initiatives’. While presenting his new initiative, Mr. Aspin argued that the traditional means of preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, such as political and diplomatic dissuasion, technology denial, arms control and international pressure might no longer be adequate instruments. He emphasized that counter proliferation would supplement the traditional tools of non-proliferation. He outlined 5 elements of the new defense initiative. First was the creation of the counter proliferation mission within the Pentagon. Second, review of the planned equipment purchases by the American forces in the context of the new emphasis on counter–proliferation. The focus would be on developing star war weaponry to neutralize missile capabilities of the emerging powers also called ‘scud hunting’ by the Pentagon. Third, to make doctrinal adjustments in war fighting against regional adversaries equipped with mass destruction weapons. Fourth was the dramatic expansion of the intelligence capabilities in the Pentagon on proliferation. And the fifth,
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instituting cooperation between the United States and its allies in the area of counter-proliferation. The provisions of this initiative and determination of Mr. Asbin showed the US endeavor to maintain its nuclear dominance in the world and prevent other military powers to emerge while using its capability of coercion and cooperation.

To stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, in 1993, the Presidents of Russia and the United States, Mr. Boris Yeltsin and George Bush, signed in Moscow a nuclear arms reduction treaty, START-II. It called for the elimination of about two-thirds of their strategic weapons by the year 2003. Under the treaty, Russia and the United States pledged to abolish all land based missiles with multiple warheads and reduce other components of the nuclear arsenals up to about 3,500 warheads for the US and 3,000 for Russia. Although it seemed to be an equal treaty, it gave a clear edge to Washington on Russia because Russia had agreed to scrap its deadliest SS-18 multiple warhead missiles, a significant feature of its nuclear forces. On the other hand, the US was permitted to retain almost half of its sea-based multi-warhead missiles, the strongest component of its nuclear deterrent.

On February 17, 1995, the Clinton Administration announced a liberal export policy and a commitment to aggressively promote American exports of conventional weapons systems. Asserting that arms exports were a legitimate instrument of American foreign policy, the White House expressed its hopes that the sales would help US friends and allies, deter aggression, promote regional security and facilitate joint military operations by the United States and its allies. At the same time, the White House claimed that the new policy would seek to restrain arms transfers that might be destabilizing or threatening to regional peace and security or help in the proliferation of advanced strategic technology among the United States' adversaries.

On April 5, 1996, Clinton Administration released its annual National Security Strategy document which reflected its defense policy interests. In this document the White House linked the nuclear weapons programs of different countries with the fate of bilateral relations with the US. The report underlined that stemming the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and their missile delivery systems were critical priority for the United
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States. The document outlined American non-proliferation efforts which included the corolling of North Korea’s nuclear program, continuing agenda of curbing the nuclear aspirations of Iran and Iraq and the bilateral agreements with Russia, Ukraine and South Africa committing to adhere to the guidelines of the MTCR. Among the success of the US non-proliferation efforts, the document listed Russia’s decision not to transfer space-launch vehicle technology with potential military applications to India. Thus the report concluded that the US sought to prevent additional countries from acquiring chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them.

The document vowed to use government’s full range of intelligence capabilities to detect any such activities. It said that in achieving the US global non-proliferation goals and preventing the build-up of nuclear arsenals, Washington had not ruled out the use of force. The report also warned that if such efforts failed, the US forces must be ready to deter, prevent and defend against their use. The document reiterated that while Washington should keep the right to squash the nuclear ambitions of the rest of the world, its own forces would continue to maintain a sizable nuclear armory. Defending the use of military means and arguing that the military capabilities of American forces needed to be further enhanced, the report observed,

“We are placing a high priority on improving our ability to locate, identify and disable arsenals of weapons of mass destruction, production and storage facilities for such weapons and their delivery system….The US would continue to maintain nuclear forces of sufficient size and capability to convince any future hostile foreign leadership with access to strategic nuclear forces from acting against our vital interests and to convince it that seeking a nuclear advantage would be futile.”

It is obvious from the report that the US policy had shifted from soft approach to a tough stand in dealing with proliferation. This document recommended that the counter proliferation should be assigned to the US armed forces as a military mission. This was the first time when Pentagon came up with such detailed doctrine regarding response against post cold war nuclear scenario.

On May 28, 1996, the United States, Germany and Italy signed an agreement to jointly develop a battlefield missile defense system. The Memorandum of Understanding was signed among the three nations and they committed themselves to the medium extended air defense
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system program. The document said that the goal of the program would be to provide a battlefield missile system that would provide maneuvering forces with round the clock cover against short and medium range tactical ballistic and cruise missiles and aircraft. 78

In December 1997, the United States issued a guideline which called on the Pentagon to focus its strategic planning on deterring the use of nuclear weapons rather than on winning a nuclear war outright. The document said that the United States would continue to maintain nuclear weapons as the cornerstone of the nation’s strategic defense. It said that the United States still reserved its right to be the first to use nuclear arms during a conflict, rather than vowing to use them only once attacked. The guidelines said that Russia and many other former Soviet Republics were improving their relations with the United States, some new and potential threat for the US interests have emerged such as China, North Korea, Iran and Iraq.79

On January 9, 2000, the US President Bill Clinton unveiled a comprehensive $91 million national cyber security plan to protect the country from the threat of cyber terrorism that could potentially destroy the country’s critical infrastructure. He said that the moat vital sectors of the US economy such as power generation, telecommunications, banking and finance, transportation and emergency services were potentially susceptible to disruptions from hackers, terrorists, criminals or even nation states. The US plan for information systems protection was believed as the first attempt by any nation to develop a plan to defend its cyberspace.80

On February 15, 2001, the US President George W Bush laid out ‘The Blueprint of a New Architecture for the Defense of America and its Allies.’ The President based it on light, high-tech weaponry and a missile shield that might one day render tanks and aircraft carriers obsolete. The emphasis in his speech on creating new weapons rather than updating old ones reflected a fundamental evolution in the US military thinking. Small terrorist groups were considered as important threats along with hostile states and satellite guided, pilotless weapons could be used to destroy targets at long range. He said, “On land our heavy forces
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must be lighter. Our light forces will be more lethal…. In the air, we’ll be able to strike across the world with pin-point accuracy, using both aircraft and unmanned systems.”

In September 2001, the then Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld identified six goals of Bush Administration for military transformation. Those goals were:

“► Above all, protect critical bases of operations (most importantly, the U.S. homeland) and defeat weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery;
► Project and sustain power in distant anti-access and area denial environments;
► Deny enemies’ sanctuary by developing capabilities for persistent surveillance, tracking, and rapid engagement;
► Leverage information technology and innovative network-centric concepts to link up joint forces;
► Protect information systems from attack;
► Maintain unhindered access to space—and protect U.S. space capabilities from enemy attack.”

On May 24, 2002, the U.S. President, George W. Bush, and the Russian President, Vladimir Putin, signed a nuclear disarmament treaty and hailed a new era in relations that the U.S. leader said would lead to ‘incredible cooperation.’ The treaty, the first strategic arms reduction pact in nearly 10 years, obliged the U.S. and Russia to slash their nuclear arsenals by two-thirds to between 1,700 and 2,200 warheads over the next decade, bringing them down to their lowest level ever. Both sides vowed to cast aside old doubts, old suspicions and welcome a new era in relations between both nations. The nuclear arms treaty and a separate strategic partnership accord signed along with a series of other cooperation accords underscored the new relationship between the former Cold War rivals in the wake of the September 11 attacks. After talks with his U.S. counterpart Mr. Putin said that both countries spoke about an absolutely new quality of relationship, regarding questions of security, questions of reducing both nations’ strategic potentials and creating a new secure world. They also signed a joint statement on combating terrorism, in which they have mentioned their desire to closely interact with Shanghai Six, of which China was a key member along with Russia.

One major component of the US defense policy is National Missile Defense System (NMDS). The George W Bush Administration made NMDS its first national priority after
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coming to the power. On May 1, 2001, President Bush delivered a speech emphasizing the importance and need for the System. He said,

“Unlike the Cold War, today’s most urgent threats stem not from thousands of ballistic missiles in Soviet hands, but from a small number of missiles in the hands of [the world’s least responsible] states—states for whom terror and blackmail are a way of life…In such a world Cold War deterrence is no longer enough….We need new concepts of deterrence that rely on both offensive and defensive forces. Deterrence can no longer be based solely on the threat of nuclear retaliation. Defenses can strengthen deterrence by reducing the incentive for proliferation…. We need a new framework that allows us to build missile defenses to counter the different threats of today’s world. To do so we must move beyond the constraints of the 30-year-old ABM Treaty….Russia and the United States should work together to develop a new foundation for world peace and security in the 21st century. We should leave behind the constraints of an ABM Treaty that perpetuates a relationship based on distrust and mutual vulnerability….Perhaps one day we can even cooperate on a joint defense.”

In fact, for any kind of development of missile system, it was inevitable for the United States to withdraw from Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty concluded with the Soviet Union during the cold war period. And it did so in 2001 when on December 14, President George Bush served a formal notice to Russia that Washington was withdrawing from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in order to deploy an NMD. But the critics of this program argued that only two nations in the world have potential to harm the US with nuclear loaded Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles and they are Russia and China. But, NMDS is not designed to handle any attack from Russia and China. It can only prevent any minor attack of one or two missiles launched by a rogue state such as North Korea or Iran.

But, the supporters of missile defenses, both inside and outside the Bush administration, argued that without NMDS, the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the U.S. vulnerability that it generated would limit the United States’ ability to secure its foreign policy goals. The then Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld had argued that a policy of intentional vulnerability by the western nations could give rogue states the power to hold the Americans hostage to nuclear blackmail-in an effort to prevent the United States from projecting force to stop aggression. Likewise, Walter Slocombe who worked as undersecretary of defense in the Clinton administration, emphasized that without defenses, potential aggressors might think
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Intercontinental ballistic missiles to shorter ranged theatre missiles. The US requires to deploy various kinds of missiles in different sites of the world to implement this strategy.
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that the threat of strikes against U.S. cities could coerce the United States into failing to meet its commitments.\textsuperscript{88}

The following diagram illustrates the functioning of this system.\textsuperscript{89}

\begin{figure}
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\caption{How NMDS works}
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One major element of the US defense policy is keeping the right of first use of nuclear weapons against the US enemies. Bush Administration strategic documents and its weapons development program clearly state first use scenario. The Administration argued in its 2001 Nuclear Posture Review that ‘new capabilities must be developed to defeat emerging threats such as hard and deeply buried targets, to find and attack mobile and relocatable targets, to defeat chemical or biological agents, and to improve accuracy and limit collateral damage.’

Unveiling the new nuclear weapons strategy in January, 2002, J D Crouch, then the assistant secretary of defense for international security policy, emphasized that the policy was designed to assure allies and friends, dissuade competitors, deter aggressors and defeat enemies. The administration claimed to have moved from the ‘threat-based approach’ of the cold period to a more flexible and forward looking ‘capability-based approach.’ It has been argued that the three dimensional approach of intercontinental ballistic missiles, bombers and submarine-launched ballistic missiles is being supplemented by missile defense and a responsive infrastructure in the defense industry that can adapt swiftly to changing conditions. The idea of discouraging any hostile state to emerge as the US competitor was apparent in National Security Strategy of 2002, which stated that the US forces would be made strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military build-up in hopes of surpassing, or equaling, the power of the United States.

On December 11, 2002, the Bush administration released a three-dimensional strategy to tackle threats posed by biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons. The strategy talked about three-fold policy approach taken by the Bush administration to deal with weapons of mass destruction. These strategies included counter proliferation, nonproliferation, and weapons of mass destruction consequence management. The strategy reiterated the administration’s keenness to act pre-emptively against potential adversaries and opponents. It also discussed about using nuclear weapons against any attack on the United States with weapons of mass destruction. This strategy focused on the Bush administration’s policy to defend the United States against the spread of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. The administration argued in this strategy that there was no single solution to every country’s pursuit or

possession of weapons of mass destruction. The document stated that since each of these regimes was different therefore the United States needed to adopt country-specific strategies. Later, this approach was used by Washington in Iraq and North Korea through different means. The strategy said that it was not possible to stop proliferation completely so the United States wanted to counter or deter the potential use of weapons of mass destruction through interdicting weapons and technology transfers and applying the preemption strategy which meant striking adversaries before they attack.\cite{92}

In December 17 2002, the Bush Administration announced that it would deploy a limited missile defense system which would comprise a small number of ground- and sea-based missile interceptors. He said that it would be ready for use since the beginning of 2004. President Bush issued a statement and described the initial deployment as ‘modest’. But at the same time he declared that it would serve as a starting point for improved and expanded capabilities later. He claimed that missile defense would add to the US ability to prevent those who may consider attacking the United States with missiles. Bush argued that the U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty in June 2002 made it possible for the United States to explore, test and deploy missile defenses. However, all of the systems which were said to be ready for deployment were believed to have been inherited from the Clinton administration, which was bound by the ABM Treaty. Only deployment of the ground-based interceptors was prohibited by the accord, which prevented Washington and Moscow from deploying nationwide defenses against strategic ballistic missiles.\cite{93}

President Bush announced the formation of the US Africa Command or AFRICOM on February 6, 2007 and the new Unified combatant Command became operational on October 1, 2008. AFRICOM consolidates US Defense Department activities in Africa that were earlier divided among three unified commands. According to the Department of Defense, AFRICOM has been created because Africa is growing in military, strategic and economic importance in global affairs. The Department emphasizes that the United States seeks more effective ways to prevent and respond to humanitarian crises and improve cooperative efforts


to stem transnational terrorism and sustain enduring efforts that would contribute to African unity and bolster security on the continent.\textsuperscript{94}

Theresa Whelan, the deputy assistant secretary of defense for African affairs, testified in August 2007 that AFRICOM would focus on building African regional security and crisis response capacity. She said that it would promote greater security ties between the United States and Africa and provide new opportunities to enhance the United States bilateral military relationship and strengthen the capacities of Africa’s regional and sub-regional organizations. She stated that the US military engagement in Africa would remain primarily focused on building partnership capacities, conducting theatre security cooperation and building important counter-terrorism skills. She emphasized that AFRICOM was not formed merely to fight terrorism, or to secure oil resources, or to counter China. While some political scholars argued that AFRICOM was intended to protect oil, combat terrorism and counter China.\textsuperscript{95}

In April 2009, Democrat President Barack Hussein Obama, hosting a summit on nuclear security in Prague, declared that, if required, his administration was ready to lead the world community on non-proliferation front to make this world free from nuclear weapons. He said,

“The existence of thousands of nuclear weapons is the most dangerous legacy of the Cold War…. Just as we stood for freedom in the 20th century, we must stand together for the right of people everywhere to live free from fear in the 21st century. And as nuclear power – as a nuclear power, as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, the United States has a moral responsibility to act. We cannot succeed in this endeavor alone, but we can lead it, we can start it. So today, I state clearly and with conviction America’s commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons....” \textsuperscript{96}

Historical experiences show that the non-proliferation policy becomes priority during the regime of Democrat Presidents. But pragmatic reasons compel the US to keep working on its military advancement and spreading its nuclear umbrella to its friendly nations.\textsuperscript{97}

\begin{flushleft}
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\textsuperscript{97}In fact, the US nuclear patronage not only provides security to its allies but also prevents desirous and ambitious nations to develop their own nuclear arsenals. Such of the US efforts keeps balance of power in different regions in equilibrium mode. For example, in Middle East, Iran has its civil nuclear program and because of this most of the nations of this area have also announced their civil nuclear program. It is believed that if Iran turns its civil nuclear program into military one, rest of the nations will all quickly transform their civil nuclear program into military capability making this region vulnerable. Therefore, for the safety and preservation of peace, it is in the interest of
\end{flushleft}
In March 2009, Russia and the United States announced to draft a new treaty which would replace Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START). The US President Barack Obama sought Russian help to work for strengthening existing nonproliferation treaties such as Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and Comprehensive Test ban Treaty and future treaty such as Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty.\(^9^8\)

THE US ECONOMIC POLICY IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA

After the demolition of the Soviet Union, the US policy makers were under the influence of neo liberal storm. They decided to give priority to the global market economy. The policy of free flow of culture and currency and globalization at all front--trade, investment, technology, tourism and governance were their top priority. During eight years of his Presidency, Bill Clinton defined national security in terms of globalization. The threat to globalization meant the threat to national security of the United States.\(^9^9\)

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the US attention was on enhancing its trade relations with the nations all over the globe. In this context, in 1991, the then US President George Bush called for a free trade system between the US and Latin American countries. In the changed international political and economic scenario, South American countries were also keen to bury their differences with the US and have strong and smooth ties with the remaining world sole super power. Besides, after the demise of the USSR, the Latin American countries’ decision to adopt free market economic system along with democratic governance in their countries worked as a catalyst for a warmful and progressive relations between both of them.\(^1^0^0\)

---


In June 1990, the United States announced a Brady Plan through which the Bush Administration decided to partially reduce Latin American debts towards the US. Countries like Mexico, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Uruguay and Bolivia got benefited from this decision. Along with this arrangement, a $300 million per year fund was also established through Inter-American Development Bank which would help to raise private investments in Latin American countries. This exercise was largely welcomed in both the United States and Latin American countries. In fact, these provisions worked as a background to set a clear policy agenda for the United States towards Latin America. Very soon, the debt reduction effort got transferred into an emphasis on free market trade system and new foreign investment avenues. This initiative worked as a pretext to start initial dialogue for North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the both sides.  

After becoming President, Bill Clinton welcomed ‘a new convergence of values’ between the USA and North America and called for Latin America and the United States to construct a ‘Western Hemisphere Community of Democracies.’ Setting up of NAFTA was seen a positive step in this direction. Later, the US Congress ratified NAFTA which included Canada, Mexico and the United States. Major provisions of NAFTA were to lift all tariffs within next 15 years. Foreign investors from NAFTA member countries were to be treated like domestic investors. Intellectual property would be protected by each country’s standards. By the year of 2000, all limits on investment in Mexican banks were to be lifted for the US and Canadian bank. This Agreement proved to be very much beneficial for the US as its trade increased with these countries. More than 70 per cent of Mexico’s exports goes to the US now. The US got access to the North American market because of this Agreement and it ensured sufficient flow of capital and currency to the US which proved to be boon for the US economy.

In the first week of April 1993, the US President Bill Clinton went to Russia and met his counterpart Boris Yeltsin. During this summit, the Clinton Administration announced a $1.6 billion aid package to Russia. The plan included $690 million in direct grants, 700 million in grain and other food credits and 230 million in other aid. The package was designed to help

---
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maintain political and economic reforms in Russia also. The package also included a $6 million program to help build housing units to resettle demobilized Russian troops, a $38 billion package to help repair and make more efficient oil pipelines and $50 million Russian-American joint enterprise to encourage US-Russian business venture.

On February 25, 1995, the United States and Canada signed a broad agreement opening the skies for North American Airlines to fly into more cities on both sides of the border. The agreement was meant to boost cargo and passenger services. The US President Bill Clinton said that it would mean billions of dollars in new business activity and thousands of new jobs on both sides of the border.104

When Doha Round of multilateral trade negotiations was launched in 2001, the price of oil was $25 a barrel. But by November 2008, oil price went up to $65 a barrel. Amid these changes the United States has been involved in talks with other nations on multilateral trade on WTO’s Doha platform. But rising prices of oil has impelled the US to take several unilateral actions. For example, the US House of Representatives has approved a bill that allowed the Justice Department to prosecute anticompetitive conducts by OPEC members.105

Trade liberalization is a vital part of the US globalization policy. It has helped the US economy to progress continuously and contributed to Washington’s global leadership position. The US has a strong interest in further opening international markets, moving as close as possible to global free trade, and strengthening the enforcement machinery of the WTO. In its first two years, the Bush Administration achieved two notable successes in trade policy: the passage of fast-track negotiating authority and the launch of Doha Round of WTO negotiations. Overall, it has persuaded a coherent strategy of ‘competitive liberalization’ in which multilateral, regional and bilateral agreements reinforce and catalyze one another.106

The worldwide financial and economic crisis of 2008, was a major geopolitical setback for the US which resulted in a recession in this country. This damage put the American model of free-market capitalism under risk. For bringing stability in its economy, the US government has nationalized its financial sector to a degree that contradicts the doctrine of
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modern capitalism. The US Federal Reserve lowered the federal funds rates to nearly one percent in late 2001 and maintained it near that very low level for three years. The low interest rates reflected the US government’s overly accommodating monetary policy after 9/11.107

The US-Israel Free Trade Agreement (FTA) was the first U.S. FTA which came into force on August 19, 1985. It completely reduced duties on manufactured goods as of January 1, 1995. Between both nations’ trade non-tariff barriers are functional in the areas of intellectual property rights, standards and technical regulations. Besides, tariff and non-tariff barriers continue to shape some portion of U.S. agricultural exports. Therefore, in 1996, the United States and Israel signed an Agreement on Trade in Agricultural Products (ATAP). This Agreement established gradual and steady market access liberalization for food and agricultural products effective through December 31, 2001. The FTA between both nations includes a non-binding statement of intent to eliminate barriers to trade in services such as tourism, communications, banking, insurance, management consulting, accounting, law, computer services, and advertising. It also includes an agreement to eliminate all restrictions on government procurement, and calls on Israel to relax its offsets requirements for government agencies other than the Israeli Ministry of Defense. U.S. exports to Israel increased from $2.5 billion in 1985 to $11.3 billion in 2010. The main U.S. export sectors to Israel are precious metals, electrical machinery, machinery, aircraft, medical instruments and vehicles.108

The European Union (EU) and the United States also benefit from the economic relationship with each other. Their bilateral trade has reached over €2.1 trillion. Besides, total US investment in the EU is said to be approximately three times more than in all of Asia and EU investment in the US is said to be almost eight times the EU invests in India and China together. Therefore, it seems that investment by multinationals is the fundamental factor for the relationship between the EU and the US. It is adding to the growth and jobs of both sides of the Atlantic. On April 30, 2007, the United States and European Union signed a framework for advancing transatlantic economic integration between the EU and the US. Both

sides decided to accelerate the economic cooperation and remove the trade barrier to enhance transatlantic economic integration.\textsuperscript{109}

FTAs are instrumental in opening up foreign markets to U.S. exporters. Trade Agreements reduce barriers to U.S. exports, and protect U.S. interests and enhance the rule of law in the FTA partner country. The reduction of trade barriers and the creation of a more stable and transparent trading and investment environment make it easier and cheaper for U.S. companies to export their products and services to trading partner markets. Forty-one percent of U.S. goods exports were exported to those countries which have free trade agreements with the United States went to FTA partner in 2010. The United States has 12 Free Trade Agreements with 17 countries. In addition, the United States has negotiated FTAs with Korea, Panama and Colombia, but these agreements have not yet entered into force. The United States is also negotiating a regional FTA, titled Trans-Pacific Partnership, with Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam.\textsuperscript{110}

In the summer of 2009, the United States experienced the negative impact that Wall Street could have on common Americans. Therefore, President Obama and the Treasury Department put forward proposed legislation to prevent any future risk caused by Wall Street on the US economy and preserve economic opportunity on Main Street. On July 15, 2010, Congress passed comprehensive financial reform legislation. This legislation sought to ensure that average Americans did not need to pay the price for any downturn and crisis in New York stock exchange. It also pledged to provide financial regulators the tools they needed to identify and curb careless and hasty risk-taking and prevent future crises. This legislation also sought to preserve consumer financial condition which included the creation of a new, dedicated Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.\textsuperscript{111}

The United States has used its economic policies to achieve its foreign policy goals also. After 9/11, the US has used its influence to pursue other nations to freeze assets of alleged
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terrorist organizations. In September 2006, it targeted Iranian biggest state owned bank—Bank Saderat—and banned it to process dollar transactions through the United States. It was a major setback for this bank which had at least 20 per cent of its foreign reserves in dollars and for which the oil trade, which also denominates in dollar, is its primary livelihood. 112

THE US CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA

The world is facing change in earth’s climate which is resulting in global warming, melting of glaciers and heavy rains. The world community is doing efforts to tackle this problem. In this connection, on February 14, 2002, President George Bush revealed a series of tax credits and other incentives to encourage business and farmers so that harmful emissions could be reduced. He said that the United States and the world shared this common goal so they must foster economic growth in ways that protected environment. He added that such kind of growth should be encouraged that would provide a better life for citizens, while protecting the land, the water, the air that sustained life. In his plan, Bush set a goal of cutting the intensity of greenhouse gas emissions by 18 percent over 10 years for the United States. Bush termed the Kyoto agreement an "unsound international treaty" and said he could not support it because it would result in deep cuts in the American economy and the loss of 4.9 million jobs. He emphasized that his plan would prevent the release of about 500 million metric tons of greenhouse gases. Under a different plan called the "Clear Skies Initiative," Bush said emissions from sulfur dioxide would be cut by 73 percent, nitrogen oxides by 67 percent and mercury by 69 percent, all by 2018. He hoped that the legislation would constitute significant step America has ever taken to cut power plant emissions that contribute to urban smog, acid rain, and numerous health problems for our citizens. 113

On September 28, 2007, the US President George W Bush said that major economies must lead the world to produce fewer greenhouse gas emissions. He added that they must do so in a way that did not undermine economic growth. Technology has always been the

centerpiece of the Bush administration’s approach to climate change. Speaking at the White House-sponsored summit in climate change, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice echoed this approach, calling on participants to cut the Gordian Knot of fossil fuels, carbon emissions and economic activity through a revolution in energy technology. She encouraged nations to reject the choice between economic growth and environmental protection by advancing new energy technologies that not only pose no risk to economic growth but can actually accelerate it.114

President Barack Obama announced the launch of the Major Economies Forum on Energy and Climate on March 28, 2009. The Forum was established to start a sincere dialogue among major developed and developing economies and generate the political leadership necessary to achieve a successful outcome. He said,

“climate change is one of the defining challenges of our time. …
…developed countries -- like my own -- have a historic responsibility to take the lead. We have the much larger carbon footprint per capita, and I know that in the past, the United States has sometimes fallen short of meeting our responsibilities. So, let me be clear: Those days are over. One of my highest priorities as President is to drive a clean energy transformation of our economy, and over the past six months, the United States has taken steps towards this goal.
We’ve made historic investments in the billions of dollars in developing clean energy technologies. We're on track to create thousands of new jobs across America--on solar initiatives and wind projects and biofuel projects, trying to show that there is no contradiction between environmentally sustainable growth and robust economic growth.”115

From November 29 to December 10, 2010 16th Session of the Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change was held in Cancun, Mexico. On December 11, 2010, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton issued a Press statement in which she said,

“Over the last year, the United States has worked with our international partners to build on the progress achieved at the climate change conference in Copenhagen. We have pressed for substantive steps that would advance the vision of the Copenhagen Accord. This month we joined the nations of the world in Cancun for a new round of talks aimed at mobilizing common action to meet the shared global challenge of climate change.

Today, I am pleased to announce that we secured the Cancun Agreements, a set of balanced international decisions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) which represent meaningful progress in our global response to climate change.

The Cancun Agreements represent a balanced and significant step forward. In the days and months ahead, the United States will work with our friends and partners to keep the world focused on this urgent challenge and to continue building on this progress.116

On February 18, 2011 United States and India held a workshop on hydro fluorocarbons (HFCs) and they agreed to convene a joint Task Force to examine effective approaches to reduce the use of climate-damaging HFCs. The task force was being established to recognize the challenges faced by the current phase out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) under the Montreal Protocol. The proposed Task Force will aim to develop options to reduce global HFC use. The Task Force will seek to send clear policy signals to discourage the use of HFCs and encourage the development and commercialization of low global warming potential alternatives. It was decided that the Task Force will issue a report to describe the status of HFC alternatives and examine policy aspects of various approaches that would support a global reduction in HFC use. These included national, industry-to-industry, and international options, such as bilateral approaches between the United States and India and the use of existing international agreements.117

After going through the US foreign, defense, economic and climate change policies, we find that in post cold war world politics, the US sought to move from a policy of containment of communism to the enlargement of democracy, peace and establishment of stability. Promotion of the US interest at global level has been top priority for it. On the one hand, America wants to develop multilateral relations with other countries for better enhancement of its national development and elevate its national interest, on the other, it is working towards the goal of advancing the US leadership in world affairs. In this process, this nation faced criticism, too, but because of its immense economic, political and military influence over other nations, it manages to maintain its primacy.

From 2001 to 2011, the US policies revolve around war on terror, unilateralism and proactive measures. But, because of its failures at war fronts, the United States has revived its policies from unilaterism to multilateralism. Now it is focusing on taking assistance of other nations in solving international problems rather going alone. It does not want to become

isolated but at the same time is willing to address its security concerns by maintaining shared commitments with other nations. Meanwhile, maintaining US leadership at global level is always at the center of its strategy. The US acknowledges China as a major state emerging as global player at world level. Therefore, it wants to establish friendly relations with it based on shared interests and common modalities.

The next chapter talks about China’s security strategy and its multilateral relations. Considering the fact that China is emerging as a major power at world level and posing a challenge for the US hegemonic status, it would be useful for our purpose to describe China’s all around strategy and its advancing nature of active participation in world politics.