POST 9/11 US FOREIGN POLICY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PRESIDENTS GEORGE W. BUSH JR. AND BARACK OBAMA

BY

ERIC OWARE

(10308469)

THIS DISSERTATION IS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GHANA, LEGON, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE MASTER DEGREE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

LEGON **JULY 2018**

DECLARATION

I, Eric Oware, do hereby declare that this work is entirely by my personal effort. I further declare that all the works that have been consulted or quoted have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that this dissertation has not been presented either in part or in whole for any other degree elsewhere.

…….. ……..

ERIC OWARE **DR. BONI YAO GEBE**

(STUDENT) **(SUPERVISOR)**

DATE……..… **DATE……**

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to God Almighty, my late father, Blankson Kofi Takyi (Teacher Blankson), my mother, Comfort Abena Twumwaa and the rest of my family.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am most grateful to the Almighty God for His care and protection.

I give special thanks to my Supervisor, Dr Boni Yao Gebe, for his patience, correction, direction and the provision of relevant articles which have yielded into this beautiful dissertation.

I sincerely appreciate the contribution of His Excellency Ambassador Kwabena Baah-Duodu, Diplomat-in-Residence at Legon Centre for International Affairs and Diplomacy (LECIAD), Professor Fredoline Anunobi of Georgia State University, USA, Honourable Samuel Okudzeto Ablakwa, MP, and Ranking Member of Foreign Affairs Sub-Committee of Ghana's Parliament, Dr Vladimir Antwi-Danso, Dean of Academic Affairs at the Ghana Armed Forces Command and Staff College (GAFCSC) for providing relevant information to the study through interview.

I duly appreciate the commitment of Madam Ofosuhene Juliana for her selfless contribution towards my educational needs.

I am also indebted to Mr Shariff Amaning Stephen, Headteacher at Akyem Takyiman Methodist Junior High School.

I also owe Mr Kudadzeh Justice Awuku many thanks for his encouragement.

Not forgetting Mr. Ampofo Dacosta of the Municipal Education Directorate, Kwaebibirem.

Lastly, to my family and friends who encouraged me. I thank everyone.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABM	Anti-Ballistic Missiles
ABMT	Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty
AEI	American Enterprise Institute
AU	African Union
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CMC	Cuban Missile Crisis
CNN	Cable Network News
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
EU	European Union
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
G8	Group of Eight
GAFCSC	Ghana Armed Forces Command and Staff College
GATT	General Agreements on Trade and Tariffs
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GWOT	Global War on Terror
IATP	Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICC	International Criminal Court
IJIRR	International Journal of Information Research and Review
ILA	Iraq Liberation Act
IMCHPI	International Mother and Child HIV Prevention Initiative
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMOs	International Multilateral Organizations
IR	International Relations
ISIL	Islamic State of Iraq and Levant

ISIS	Islamic State of Iraq and Syria
KPCC	Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change
LECIAD	Legon Centre for International Affairs and Diplomacy
MCA	Millennium Challenge Account
MCC	Millennium Challenge Corporation
MIDC	Million Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria
MIPS	Million Index of Personality Styles
MP	Member of Parliament
NAFTA	North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NMD	National Missile Defence
NNT	Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
NSA	National Security Advisor
NSS	National Security Strategy
PEPFAR	President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
PRC	Pew Research Centre
RAM	Rational Actor Model
SOC	Secretary of Commerce
SOD	Secretary of Defence
SOS	Secretary of State
SoUA	State of the Union Address
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNGF	United Nation Global Fund
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republic

US	United State
WBG	World Bank Group
WFP	World Food Programme
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WOT	War on Terror
WPA	War Powers Act
WPR	War Powers Resolution
WTC	World Trade Centre
WTO	World Trade Organization
WWI	World War I
WWII	World War II
YALI	Young Africans Leaders Initiative

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The United States has been known for its isolationist, neutrality and noninterventionist tendencies since independence as a result of the caution sounded by its founding fathers, such as George Washington, that future foreign policy makers should ensure they do not involve the state in any permanently entangling alliances. Things, however, changed after World War II when the US saw the need to exert its influence on the world stage to advance its interest by spreading their values through a multilateral system. The US has been accorded the founder of the current multilateral system after leading the creation of the United Nations and its agencies through funding and provision of leadership since 1945. The expectation is that being the founders of the present multilateral system, the US, as a leader, will always stick to a multilateral approach to world problems. This has often not been the case as a lot of the presidents have either resorted to unilateralism or multilateralism or both in tackling world problems. The September 11 attack on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon presents an era where America's power has been tested by terrorists and what everyone looks out for is how her leaders will approach the issue. This research studies how the first two presidents, George Bush Jr. and Barack Obama, who came after the September 11 attack, approached the challenge in the context of going it alone or involving alliances. What the researcher realised is that generally, analysts are divided, up to date, as to which of the two leaders was unilaterally or multilaterally oriented. Basing on related literature about the issues and inferring from face-to-face interviews, the researcher discovered that the policies and approaches of these leaders were determined by factors such as level of relationship between the president and Congress, War on Terror, personal attributes of the leaders, national interest among others. These determinants to a large extent influenced how Bush Jr. and Barack Obama accepted or shunned unilateralism or multilateralism in executing their policies. After careful analysis, the study revealed that President Barack Obama firmly embraced multilateral approach to solving world problems while Bush Jr. preferred unilateralism on the average. It is recommended that, in spite of achieving the national interest, the US might show considerable commitment to multilateral agreements as an example of leadership for others to emulate. It is also recommended that Congress and the Executive be encouraged to maintain bipartisanship to promote programmes and policies of international interest. Finally, the US might consider increasing aid to terror prone regions since terrorism, in part, emanates from economic deprivation.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The growing interconnectedness and interdependence of states have brought about the development of several concepts by International Relations (IR) scholars to define the relationships, interactions and actions that are undertaken by actors in the international system. Prominent among these concepts are unilateralism, bilateralism and multilateralism. The approaches for implementing foreign policies of countries in the international system are particularly measured by these three terms. Thus, implementation of foreign policies of countries can be described as unilateral, bilateral or multilateral.

Unilateralism is an International Relations concept which connotes the situation where a single country attempts to undertake a course of action without regard for norms and principles set by multilateral international agreements. It is always a one sided action by one country and has the tendency to disregard the plight of other countries. Usually, powerful countries with enough resources are those who engage in unilateral foreign policies around the world. The United States (US) attack on Iraq against the stance of the United Nations (UN) is a typical example. Mr Kofi Annan, the then UN Secretary General in an interview with the Guardian newspaper reportedly reiterated that the US invasion of Iraq, which lasted for one month fourteen days, was illegal and a breach of the UN charter.

Bilateralism or bilateral cooperation in the international system connotes an agreement between two countries based on mutual benefits. Agreements set out in bilateral cooperation are binding on only the two states involved. The US, for example, had a bilateral agreement with Ghana before the sending of the two Guantanamo Bay detainees, (Mohammed Bin Atef

and Mohammed Salih al- Dhuby), to Ghana. Bilateralism continues to exist and is employed by countries to achieve mutual benefits.

Multilateralism is a concept in International Relations which denotes cooperation among several countries to achieve a common objective in the international system. Although the concept was active during the concert of Europe, it became prominent with the formation of the United Nations Organization (UNO) on 24th October, 1945. The US is said to be the originator of multilateral cooperation after World War Two (WWII) when the UNO was formed.

The foreign policies of countries have mostly been determined by their leaders. The decision to take an action in the international system unilaterally, bilaterally or multilaterally usually lies in the bosom of the foreign policy makers, especially the leader. The Foreign Policy Decision (FPD) usually taken by these leaders are viewed through these three conceptual spectacles. Thus, based on the process involved, foreign policy analysts are able to say whether ones action in the international system is unilateral, bilateral or multilateral.

Foreign policy analysts often attempt to align with one of these three concepts. The choice is usually based on the prevailing national and international attributes. While it is common to find states with strong military and economic might pursuing unilateral decisions at the expense of laid down multilateral principles, countries with weaker military and economic might most often depend on multilateral principles and protocols to settle their impasses.

Joseph Nye, in his article "America Can't Go It Alone", opines that certain classical issues are predominantly multilateral and to manage those issues inherently requires multilateral.[1] He, however, hastened to add that not all multilateral agreements are feasible and therefore emphasized that, countries could resort to unilateralism occasionally.[2] Nye went further to

assert that unilateral tactics sometimes lead to compromises which has the tendency to promote multilateral interest.[3]

International organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), International Monetary Fund (IMF), etc. whose interests are tied around building a just and an equitable international system, have been major advocates of multilateralism. In an article published by the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Cohen, Nye and Armitage emphasized that it is better for the US to invest in multilateral organizations than to undertake unilateral military actions in remote countries. The opinion of the authors of the report was that multilateral cooperation attracts many different countries to global projects and that will result in a balanced redistribution of global resources to achieve global action.[4]

The United States foreign policy decision making has been characterized by two of these three contending concepts: unilateralism and multilateralism. These two concepts have dominated US foreign policy decision making, and it is primarily based on the leadership that prevails at a particular period as well as the dominating domestic and international phenomenon. The prevalence of unilateralism and multilateralism in US foreign policy issues has conspicuous historical antecedents.

Firstly, ever since, George Washington, the first president of the US cautioned future US foreign policy decision makers to avoid any permanently entangling foreign alliances, both the citizens and the leadership of US foreign policy making abided by the warning. For almost two centuries (1776 to 1945), the foreign policy of the US was purely isolationism and neutrality in the international system. The US acting solitary in the international milieu is what has been tagged in the US foreign policy decision making history as unilateralism. It

was the Spanish American war that marked the first stage where the US decided to enter into the broader world stage to exert her influence in the international system.[5]

At any given moment, whether the decision makers of the day will choose unilateralism or multilateralism will depend upon what foreign policy objective they intend to achieve and the prevailing circumstances affecting the national interest of the state. Foreign policies are designed to achieve the national interest which means that for most countries they are prepared to forgo international multilateral norms if that could be a stumbling block on their way to achieving the national interest. For instance, John Ikenberry argues that every hegemon, after assuming victory, will do everything possible to exercise a unilateral leadership to exert its world order.[6] Nye also posits that countries which develop buoyant economies are more likely to undertake unilateral decisions. His argument was based on the premise that developed countries have all the military and economic capabilities which are able to assist them to enforce their foreign policy interests.[7]

Holsti defined foreign policy as "ideas or actions designed by policy makers to solve a problem or promote some change in policies, attitudes, actions of another state or states, individual or non-state actors".[8]

This definition is an indication that foreign policy is usually geared towards desire for change in policy of the state involved and the ability to influence the policies of other international actors.

In foreign policy decision making in the US, presidents are much more likely to be tagged unilateralist or multilateralist based on the modus operandi for achieving foreign policy objectives. In a post 9/11 era, two leaders have both successfully served two terms of eight years: George Bush Jr. and Barrack Obama. There is a growing contention as to which of these two adopted a unilateral or multilateral approach in their foreign policies. While a

greater number of foreign policy analysts believe that Bush Jr. was more of a unilateralist compared to Obama, others beg to differ by stating that Obama's approach had no much variation from that of Bush Jr.

For instance, Lindsay contributed to the argument by emphasising that Bush Jr. was an undoubted unilateralist who held the belief that the best way to achieve the national interest was through a unilateral exercise of US powers. He buttressed his claim by citing the withdrawal of US from several multilateral agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol, the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty among others.[9] Tom Farer also described the Bush Doctrine as a unilateral action.[10] On the contrary, John Lyman's article in the International Policy Digest[11] clearly backed the fact that Obama favoured multilateralism when he referred to Obama's 2009 UN General Assembly address.[12]

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

The UN was formed to bring different countries together to fight for a common objective with the aim of providing solutions in a multilateral approach to world problems.[13] The role of the US in leading the formation of the UN, however, marked a diversion from George Washington's preferred isolationism and neutrality.[14]

In American domestic political discourse, one major interesting element is the making and administration of the foreign policy of the state**.** A very prominent individual who comes to mind accordingly is the president. A consisted foreign policy principles of the president is often called a doctrine.[15] In spite of the fact that there are legal structures responsible for the making of US foreign policies, yet it becomes imperative that at a certain point in time, the president is given the discretion to adopt a certain foreign policy approach to deal with

international problems.[16] This shows that the ideologies, beliefs, statements, conduct, choices, etc., of the president are vital in US foreign policy administration.

On Tuesday morning of September 11 2001, the US experienced an extremely shocking crack in their homeland security. A group of terrorists, made up of nineteen young men, had managed to high jack four commercial planes of which two crashed into the historic and magnificent World Trade Center, one crashing into the Pentagon and the fourth high jacked plane, United Airlines Flight 93, crashed into a field in Somerset County, Pennsylvania.[17] The incident, nonetheless, brought major changes in the foreign policy approach of the US towards the rest of the world. Laws on immigration were made tighter and the US went into war in Afghanistan, etc.[18]

In a post 9/11 era, two presidents have both successfully served their two terms of eight years each and International Relations scholars are interested in knowing which approach was adopted by each of the president. In the Grand Strategy roundtable analysis, John Mearsheimer of the University of Chicago opined that the second term of Bush's administration and the entire presidency of Obama followed a massive continuity with same basic goals.[19]

On the other hand, Lindsay argued that there were astronomic differences in the foreign policy perception of Bush Jr. and Obama.[20] To his understanding, Bush had terrorism as his main agenda and rubbished the notion that allies and international institutions should limit America's quest for freedom to wage war on terror. Obama, according to Lindsay, saw terrorism as a trans-national canker that needed cooperation from other countries to fight it.

Several comparative studies have been done extensively between Bush Jr. and Barack Obama on foreign policies towards areas like Africa, Middle East, War on Terror, Defence, etc. However, there is a lack of adequate literature that tends to extensively discuss unilateralism

and multilateralism as major concepts in a post 9/11 US foreign policy and how these choices played key roles in tackling the world problems that Americans faced. Yet, the issue of unilateralism and multilateralism continue to be relevant as to which of these two leaders adopted either of the concepts as his strategy. While some scholars believe Bush Jr. favoured a unilateralist foreign policy approach, others believe Obama preferred a multilateral approach. There are others who also believe there were no significant changes in the approaches adopted by either of the two presidents.

The aim of this research is to provide a post 9/11 comparative study of US foreign policies of George Bush Jr. and Barrack Obama in the area of unilateral and multilateral approaches to world problems.

1.3 Research Questions

1. What factors determined the foreign policies of Bush Jr. after 9/11?
2. To what extent did unilateralism or multilateralism affect the foreign policy orientation of Bush Jr.?
3. What factors determined the foreign policy of Barack Obama?
4. To what extent did unilateralism or multilateralism affect the foreign policy orientation of Barack Obama?

1.4 Research Objectives

The general objective of this research is to provide an insight into the foreign policy approach of Bush Jr. and Barack Obama through a comparative study. However, the following are the specific objectives of the study.

1. To determine the factors which underpinned the foreign policies of Bush Jr. after 9/11;
2. To understand the extent to which unilateralism or multilateralism affected the foreign policy orientation of Bush Jr.;
3. To discover the factors which determined the foreign policies of Barack Obama;
4. To understand the extent to which unilateralism or multilateralism affected the foreign policy orientation of Barrack Obama.

1.5 Scope of the Study

The research is basically a comparative study of Bush Jr. and Barrack Obama in their foreign policy approaches in the areas of unilateralism and multilateralism. The study examines the extent to which these approaches played key roles in the foreign policy administration of the two past presidents. The period covered the events after the 9/11 attack through to the end of the Barrack Obama regime. Nonetheless, the research draws some lessons from pre 9/11 era and makes references to extra US foreign illustrations where necessary. The post-Bush Jr. and Obama era foreign policy issues under Trump are also considered for the purpose of comparison, where applicable

1.6 Rationale of the Study

The foreign policy administration of Bush Jr. and Barack Obama has generated ideological discrepancies among notable scholars like John Measheimer, Lindsey, and a host of others who are divided between the foreign policy approaches of these two leaders. While some think the approaches were not the same, others feel they were the same. This contention has created a leeway for students of foreign policy to undertake a research to examine comparatively the foreign policy approach of these two distinguished leaders in order to

discover who was a unilateralist or a multilateralist by examining the actions of these leaders and the various arguments churned by some of the already mentioned scholars.

The research is also significant given the fact that these two leaders are the first to successfully complete their full tenures after 9/11 and so it is apt to examine their foreign policies to understand how each of them delivered his policies.

In addition, this research is an opportunity to add up to the literature since there are woefully inadequate literature that tends to provide a comparative study of these leaders in terms of their unilateral or multilateral engagement with the rest of the world.

Moreover, the research gives an insight into the relevance and challenges of multilateralism and unilateralism in foreign policy implementation.

1.7 Hypothesis

The foreign policy approach of President George Bush Jr. was, to a larger extent, unilateral, whereas that of President Barrack Obama was, to a larger extent, multilateral.

1.8 Theoretical Framework

The Rational Actor Model (RAM) constitutes the theoretical framework for the research. The model was developed by Graham T. Allison, an American political scientist, a professor and founding dean of the Kennedy School of Government, and an Assistant Secretary of Defence for Policy and Plans during the Clinton Administration.[21] The model was developed in 1971 to explain rational decision taken by the US foreign policy leaders during the Cuban Missile Crisis that existed between the US under President J.F Kennedy and the Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics (USSR) under Chairman Nikita Khrushchev in 1962 in his book, "The Essence of Decision".[22]

In his work, Allison asserts that the behaviour of the state is synonymous with any perfect individual. According to him, an individual is ordinarily assumed to possess inherent situational knowledge about things around him and he is, thus, assumed to know what is good and what is bad, what he wants and what he does not want and so in any given situation, the individual will analyse the impact of his choice before he makes a decision. According to Allison, the individual will always make the choice with maximum utility or benefit.

The conduct of states in the international arena is based on the assumption that states consider all options available and act rationally to increase their profit by choosing that which is more beneficial. The assumptions of the Rational Actor Model include: Firstly, the state (represented by government) is the principal and unitary actor in the international system, secondly, the government analyses a set of values, assesses them according to their costs and benefits and rank them in order of preferences and, lastly, chooses the option with the greatest benefits.[23]

According to Tulasi, the model provides an avenue for explaining actions of states in the international system by recounting the objectives and calculations made by the states concerned.[24] In this case, rationality is based on the goals and objectives of the actor and not necessarily the standards set by other body or bodies.

Allison expands his arguments by emphasizing that actions of the unitary actor is primarily based on rational choice and this rational choice has four components: Goals and Objectives, Options, Consequences and Choice.[25] The Goals and Objectives represent the ideas and desired results that the actor hopes to attain. Allison posits that issues of national security and national interest comprise the prominent categories in which the goals and objectives

originate. He buttresses his point by stressing that states seek security first before a host of other objectives.[26]

A second characteristic of the rational choice has to do with option. This refers to the available methods, techniques, etc., through which an actor employs to achieve his goals. Option is an indication that there are several opportunities out of which the individual can choose from. The individual organizes his options in order of degree and choose the choice which is most beneficial.

A third characteristic of a rational choice is consequences. It connotes the evaluation of the alternative courses of action, one after the other, to see the option with the greatest utility. In the views of Allison, evaluation of each alternative course of action generates a number of consequences. The most appropriate consequence is made up of benefits and costs relevant to strategic goals and objectives.[27]

The fourth and final characteristic is choice. According to Allison, choice constitutes value maximization. After considering all the alternative course of actions and their effects, the rational actor selects the option whose consequences rank highest in relation to his goals and objectives.[28] The rational actor has the advantage of resorting to the next option with the highest rank should the first choice backfire.[29]

In short, the rational choice of the rational actor, according to Allison, stems from strategic goals and values, perceived alternative courses of action, an estimation of varied consequences of the alternative options and a deductive evaluation of the consequences to enable the actor make a choice.[30]

In the event of the Cuban Missile Crisis (CMC), President, J F Kennedy was shown a photograph as evidence that the Soviets were erecting forty (40) ballistic missile sites in

Cuba. A strike of a missile could easily reach the US and capable of hitting places like Washington D.C, Mexico City and even Canada, therefore, threatening US security. The US, as a result, conceived the goal to ensure that the missile based is evacuated.[31]

Kennedy and his security advisors met to discuss the issue and came out with three courses of action to achieve their goal. The three options were to dialogue with the Soviets to do away with the missile site in Cuba; to utterly bomb the site in Cuba; or lastly, to block the Island with the US navy. Finally, the US resorted to blockade of the Island. Kennedy had the alternative plan of bombing the site should the first option fail.[32]

Allison developed the Model in 1969 after critically examining the circumstances and decision making process of Kennedy in the CMC. The US was represented by a unified national actor, the president and his government, who understood the problems; sought for options as course of dealing with the situation; calculated and ranked the consequences of each of the three options and finally settling on the option with the maximum value.

The assumptions of the model, wittingly or unwittingly, conform to the realists' position on the behaviour of states in the international system. Realists profess four major assumptions among others, and these are briefly discussed below.

The first assumption is that the state is a principal and major actor in the international system. States[33] are the key unit of analysis. This therefore makes the realist define the study of international relations as study of interaction among states. Realists put emphasis on the state because they posit that the state is the only entity, as a result of its sovereignty, vested with the monopoly of legitimate use of force to settle conflict within its territory and between itself and other states and international actors. Realists admit the existence of international organizations and other individual actors but they are considered less important. They put the state higher above all other bodies in the international system.

The second assumption is that the state is a unitary actor just as a single individual which speaks with one voice.[34] Government is the agent of the state with one policy and one voice for the entire state.

Thirdly, realists posit that the state is a rational actor with goals and objectives.[35] The state searches for the means to achieve its goals and objectives through a cost benefit analysis. The preference with the maximum benefit to attain the goal is chosen.

Final assumption is that the international system is anarchical.[36] This refers to lack of central government, in the international system, to enforce law and order between and among states. In an anarchical international system, states act to advance their national interest without recourse to multilateral international norms. They hold the belief that due to the anarchical nature, every state must employ its own survival methods.

Idealists argue that rational choice arrived at by the unitary actor is by no means better that the rational choice chosen by international organizations or multilateral entities. Idealist elaborate their stance to indicate that several countries come together to form a multilateral organization and these organizations follow a rational choice approach to make a decision. The rational decision made by multilateral organizations is what idealists' belief is much better than that of the individual actor.

The strengths of the model include but not limited to the following:

The decision that the state will arrive at is consistent and with high quality due to the fact that the model employs scientific method of investigation. Moreover, one understands the rationale behind the actions of states in the international system. For example, it helps the researcher to know why a government decides to undertake unilateral actions or cooperate with multilateral organizations.[37]

The model has received multimillion backlashes from critics. The theory has been criticized on the basis that in most cases the person who makes the decision differs from the one who implements the decision and so where the preferences of the decision maker and the implementer differ the intended goals might not be achieved.

Moreover, the rational decision approach requires careful consideration of facts and figures and this may take time thereby delaying decision making.

Over reliance on scientific facts and figures without paying particular emphasis on the environment and sensitive human relationships and values have no place in rationality.

The Rational Actor Model is relevant to the study of the foreign policies of Bush Jr. and Barrack Obama in the sense that until 1945, US had unilaterally conducted its foreign policy through George Washington's policy of isolationism and neutrality. Isolationism meant that the US should not be involved in any permanent alliance that will entangle the state.[38]

The US changed its foreign policy approach by playing leading role to form the United Nations Organization in 1945, and other multilateral organizations such as the IMF, IBRD etc., after WWII. After 1945, US commitment to multilateral institutions such as the UN has received uproar.[39] This model will help to understand why US foreign policy leaders continue to shift attention between unilateralism and multilateralism with particular reference to foreign policies of two past foreign policy leaders: Bush Jr. and Barrack Obama.

1.9 Literature Review

There are numerous literatures on the concepts of unilateralism and multilateralism as two opposing foreign policy approaches and how they affect decisions of leaders. Besides, in an attempt to understand the policy approaches of Bush Jr. and Barack Obama, various scholars

have written extensively to illustrate their view on how these two leaders conducted their foreign policies.

Multilateralism, bilateralism and unilateralism in foreign policy

Atsushi Tago is a professor of international Relations at the school of Political Science and Economics at the University of Waseda who has contributed immensely towards defining the interactions that exist among countries in their foreign policy making and administration.[40] Tago posits that international relations scholars have been working around the clock to demonstrate how diplomatic relations between and among countries may be understood by distinguishing their foreign policy interactions based on unilateralism, bilateralism and multilateralism.[41]

Tago underscores two approaches used by scholars to explain the relationship among states: the quantity-based and the quality based. He emphasises that the quantity criterion is based on numbers and where the number of states involved are three or more the relationship is multilateral. This makes all the institutions constituted at the end of the WWII multilateral. Examples of such organizations include UN, IMF, IBRD, among others. Interactions between only two states are bilateral; making the Cold War interaction between the US and Russia a typical example, and the situation where only one state is involved is unilateral.[42]

The quality based approach involves following international principles, protocols and paying more attention to international bodies. Under the quality based approach, countries which pay attention and respect to international norms are regarded as multilateral, and where a single country bye-passes internationally accepted regulations and conducts its activities is termed unilateral. The quality based classifies states foreign policy approaches into either multilateral or unilateral.[43]

The contribution of Tago indicates that unilateralism and multilateralism are defined in various ways just as they may be applied differently in international relations. In other words, multilateralism is has no monolithic meaning.

American Exceptionalism at Crossroads

Seogjong Song in his work titled, "American Exceptionalism at Crossroads" sets to contribute towards understanding the case of unilateral and multilateral foreign policy approaches in US foreign policy. His work provides insight into how the phrase American Exceptionalism serves as a major force underpinning US foreign policy. His work looks at how the phrase has evolved over time in almost every administration in the US. In other words, different administrations use the term to imply different things.[44] The author indicates that American exceptionalism has been applied differently by different leaders in foreign policy to achieve their goals.

Seongjong provides a scholarly definition based on the work of Tomes. He described American Exceptionalism as a term adopted by authors and historians to signify the uniqueness of American society and their role in the world.[45] Generally, Seonjgon defined American Exceptionalism as a conception that America is qualitatively different from all other nations. The term is just more than one monolithic ideology as it in cooperates issues ranging from religious liberty and political freedom to justice, economic prosperity, social mobility, equality before the law, egalitarianism, democracy, individuality, etc. The term has now developed into three other narratives namely: examplarism, expansionism and exemptionalism.[46]

John Winthrop's "a City upon a Hill" sermon in 1630 is an early example of American Exceptionalism. His sermon admonishes Americans to be an example in charity, affection and unity to the world.[47]

Alexis de Tocqueville in his book, "Democracy in America" described the US as exceptional, thus they are qualitatively unique from all other nations based on their democracy. Democracy is the centre of American exceptionalism.[48]

Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union also used the term differently when he received the news that the leader of America's Communist party, Jay Lovestone, had refused to lead the ploretariat into a political revolution like the rest of Europe, calling on Lovestone to put an end to this "heresy of American exceptionalism"[49]

Speeches of early fathers such as George Washington, John Adams and James Monroe emphasised American exceptionalism. Expressions such as: we are chosen people; we are blessed not to be like other countries, etc. sowed some seed for future leaders to feel exceptional and made the attempt to expand their values across the continents.[50]

Finally, American exceptionalism, according to Seogjong has become a campaign tool for showing a sense of patriotism from the 1980s to date and the most dramatic is in the times of Bush Jr. and Barrack Obama.

American exceptionalism was the driving force for the Bush Doctrine: Pre-emptive strikes, war on terror, spread of democracy, taking unilateral measures, withdrawing from international protocols etc. Bush tells the US he has a direct mission from God to be president and he is prepared to lead the world unilaterally into a dawn of a new era.[51] Barrack Obama, after several accusations and counter accusations from his political opponents that he is an unpatriotic American because he has abandoned American exceptionalism, finally admits he believes in American exceptionalism just as Greeks believe in Greek exceptionalism and British believe in British exceptionalism. President Obama takes the exceptionalism mantra to another level by emphasising that America cannot exempt itself from rules that apply to

everyone. Obama indicates that US demand for exemption from common multilateral norms amounts to retreat not leadership.[52]

In short American exceptionalism is applied and has come to assume different understanding by different administrations and that determines whether the leader's foreign policy approach will be unilateralist or multilatralist.

Is American Multilateralism In Decline?

John Ikenberry, a renowned professor of International Relation and US Foreign Policy at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, wrote about the foreign policy approach of Bush Jr. about five years later before the coming of Obama as a president. His work is entitled, "Is American Multilateralism in Decline?" Ikenberry is one of the earliest analysts who posit that US foreign policy under Bush Jr. took a unilateral turn.[53]

Ikenberry, in developing his thesis, recounts the history and success of the US in the growth and development of multilateralism after WWII, more than half a century. He contends that the US led in building an international order arranged around multilateral organizations, rule-based treaties and alliance partnerships and these successes, he claims, were giving way under Bush Jr. to an assertive unilateralism. The central idea of his argument is that the US is never doomed when it decides to undertake unilateral stance, due to the unipolar power it has attained after the Cold War and its opportunities which makes it easy for the US to act unilaterally. He, however, was quick to point out that given the cost and burden that acting alone will bring upon the US, it is more desirable and better for the US to maintain its multilateral predisposition built over the years.[54]

Ikenberry did not mince words to describe Bush Jr. as a defiant unilateralist who is sceptical about multilateralism, leading to the rejection and withdrawal of the US from several international protocols and agreements. He mentions the Rome Status of the International Criminal Court (ICC), the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change and the unilateral withdrawal from the 1970s Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty as some few examples.[55]

He posits, among many other revelations, that the US under Bush Jr. was particularly severe when it came to matters of security. According him, Bush did not hide his unilateralist emotions towards the rest of the world emphasizing that when it comes to the matters of US security no state can dictate for the US.[56]

Ikenberry concludes that the rise to unipolarity and a hegemon is not enough reason for US recent adoption of unilateralism in its foreign policy nor is the US doomed to shed its multilateral beliefs. He maintains that the position of US as world's most powerful state creates the opportunity for the US undertake unilateral policies but he suggests that looking at the cost involved in unilateral actions, it will be better for the US to always embrace multilateralism so others can share the cost involved.

The Bush Revolution: Remaking of America's Foreign Policy

The Bush revolution: Remaking of America's Foreign Policy, by Professors Ivo H. Daalder, President of Chicago Council on Global Affairs and James M. Lindsay, Senior Vice President and Director of Studies for the Council of Foreign Relations,[57] put emphasis on the various changes that take place during the Bush Jr. administration, ranging from his foreign policy approach, his attitude towards foreign policy to war on terror, among others. Based on his attitude and knowledge towards foreign policy, for example, a lot of pundits, according to Lindsay and Daalder, hold the view that he was naïve about foreign policy issues and that his appointees treated him as a pawn when it came to foreign policy; what even confirms this

belief was the appointment of Condoleezza Rice, who had been an advisor on Soviet Union to Bush Sr., together with seven other Republican experts on foreign affairs who were popularly called the Vulcans. This opinion turns out to be flawed as his own foreign policy appointees admitted that Bush Jr. really knew what he was about when it came to foreign affairs.

The campaign message of Bush Jr., prior to his election sought to cast slur on Clinton's involvement of US in foreign affairs. Bush unequivocally expressed the worries that Clinton had overextended US presence abroad, a situation that many thought would resort to isolationism and keep to his campaign promise that he would concentrate on domestic affairs. This also turned out to be the reverse since his administration focused mostly on international affairs to the extent of seeking Senate approval to increase military funding for the War on Terror in 2001.[58] As a president, Bush admits that he was not against Clinton's involvement in world affairs only that he was against involving the US in secondary matters.[59]

On their specificity about his foreign policy approach, Daalder and Lindsay rightly hammered how US foreign policy was revolutionised under Bush Jr. from multilateralism to unilateral tendencies. In a similar thinking with Ikenberry,[60] Daalder and Lindsay also recounts America's effort in building a multilateral world order after WWII with the establishment of NATO and WTO, among others. They claim that instead of the Bush Jr. administration riding on the benefits of these institutions, he abandoned multilateral engagements due to the 9/11 attack.

Finally, Daalder and Lindsay's position on unilateral foreign policy by Bush is seen in the controversial ideological differences that existed between Bush Jr. and his Secretary of State, Colin Powel. They indicate that the president and his appointee held a sharp difference on the best way to pursue US interests abroad. The authors posit that while Bush preferred to go it

alone, Powel preferred to working closely with international institutions. The attitude of Colin Powel led to Bush Jr. declaring that Colin Powell is an advisor to his biography and not his foreign policy.[61] It cannot be misplaced to say that Bush Jr. was not interested in broader consultation which is a key feature of multilateralism. The differences in ideology led to Colin Powel resigning as Secretary of State and being replaced by Condoleezza Rice whose attitude toward multilateral institutions in relation to the US and its foreign policies is like Bush Jr.

Obama Presidency and US Foreign Policy: Where is the multilateralism?

Another related literature worthy of reviewing is the work of David Skidmore, professor of political science at Drake University, whose areas of concentration include international political economy, US foreign policy and international relations theory.[62] In his work: The Obama Presidency and US Foreign Policy: Where is the Multilateralism? Skidmore begins his argument by indicating that if anyone was expecting Barrack Obama's administration to produce a multilateral curve from the unilateral approach of Bush Jr. that hope would be misplaced. He posits that in a post-Cold War era, the environment is strategically designed to put structural challenges on any US president, regardless of ones ideology and objectives, to undertake regular pattern in multilateral foreign policy.[63]

Skidmore underscores that it is not easy for any US president to achieve a consistent multilateral foreign policy laurels even if the person so wishes. His reasons are that both the local and international determinants which favoured US multilateral engagements have changed considerably.[64]

Skidmore maintains that at the international level, countries depended upon the US for varied assistance and cooperation which the US used to favour its hegemonic interest during the Cold War against the Soviets through structured multilateral institutions. However, in a post-

Cold War era, Skidmore maintains that these same states US assisted are calling for equal measure of respect for all members in the multilateral institutions. This development, according to Skidmore, has made multilateral engagements unattractive to US presidents who usually prefer to manoeuvre their way out to accomplish their mission on the international stage.

At the local level, Skidmore emphasised that US presidents used to have rapid and regular support from the US Congress, interest groups, among others to pursue their foreign policies due to the presence of the Soviet Union whom Americans saw as a common enemy. Skidmore emphasizes that with the end of the Cold War, Congress and other foreign policy actors do not see the need to rubber stamp any multilateral policy presented by any president. He stresses on the multiplicity of interests that have arisen among the various foreign policy actors to the extent that a president has to lobby his way out before his multilateral policy can be accepted.[65] All that Skidmore implies is that the factors which enabled both local and multilateral members to succumb to the demand of US president have changed thereby ceasing any leeway the US presidents used to enjoy.

Skidmore underscores the fact that he was not stunned to see Barrack Obama struggle to achieve his multilateral campaign rhetoric. He said Obama faced opposition from the European Union (EU), for example, as the EU leadership saw Barrack Obama's multilateral intent as a ploy to exert US hegemonic influence on the EU. He also indicated that the Obama administration continuously disregarded several examples of UN protocols, citing the cases of Omar Ahmed Sayid Khadar, a Canadian child soldier captured in Afghanistan, involvement of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in unilateral drone strikes in Afghanistan and Pakistan, describing the UN as an imperfect institution which needed reforms, among others, which questions the Obama administration's commitment to

multilateral engagements. He admitted that if Obama achieved any multilateral laurels, those were through ad hoc multilateral arrangements instead of a consistent one.[66]

In short, Professor Skidmore opines that, expectations that President Obama would break the US from unilateral approach of Bush Jr., was never fulfilled. He posits that one has to marshal convincing initiatives in order to mobilize multilateral support from the various interest groups, anything short of which will amount to opposition.

1.10. Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary sources were explored to gather data. Primary data was based on semi-structured interviews. The following people were consulted: Ambassador Kwabena Baah-Duodu, former Ambassador and Ghana's Permanent Representative to the UN, current Resident Ambassador at the Legon Centre for International Affairs and Diplomacy (LECIAD), a lecturer of Diplomacy and Ghana's Foreign Policy. The Ambassador was chosen and interviewed based on his professional credentials and his knowledge on UN multilateral relations with member states. Honourable Samuel Okudzeto Ablakwa, MP and ranking member of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Foreign Affairs and Regional Integration. The astute legislator was chosen and interviewed for his practical knowledge on relationships existing between and among nations as well as his understanding of policies churned out by other country leaders. Professor Fredoline Anunobi, Dean of International Education at the Georgia State University, USA, was also chosen for his professional credentials as US based lecturer in International Economics. He also has experience in teaching in Government and Political Science. Last but not least interviewee is Dr. Vladimir Antwi Danso, Dean of Academic Affairs at the Ghana Armed Forces Command and Staff

College (GAFCSC). The expert in International Relations was chosen for his knowledge as a former lecturer of US Foreign Policy at the LECIAD.

Secondary data was collected from peer reviewed journal articles, reports, books, and online sources, etc., from the University of Ghana (UG) Balme Library, LECIAD library, American Corner. The online sources of data will form a key component of this research with special emphasised on internationally based media such as British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), Cable Network News (CNN), the Guardian, Washington Post, New York Times and a host of others. These are sources which deal with raw data. There will be a content analysis of speeches delivered by these two presidents and any other president where applicable such as State of Union Address, National Security Strategy (NSS) and Speeches Addressed at United Nations General Assembly (UNGA).

1.11 Research Methodology

Qualitative research methodology is used in the conduct of the study. Qualitative methods have several techniques including focus group discussions, unstructured interviews among others. The qualitative research methodology is often contrasted with quantitative research methodology which involves the collection and interpretation of data using figures or numbers. Quantitative methodology covers a large number of respondents and can therefore form a basis for generalization. It is relevance is reaffirmed since it uses date derived from statistical findings. It is however unsuitable for measuring behaviour and attitude because these variables cannot be expressed in terms of figures or quantity and they can change at any given time under different conditions.

Strauss and Corbin[67] defined qualitative research methodology as a kind of research method that produces results not arrived at by virtue of statistics or any other form of quantification.

The scholars posit that qualitative research study deals with the analysis of non-mathematical deliberative procedures resulting in findings derived from data gathered.

Qualitative methodology was found suitable for the study since the motive of the study is to analyse the foreign policies of the two US presidents. This methodology is relevant on the accounts that it provides in-depth details about how an action occurred and why it occurred. The researcher undertook semi-structure interviews to seek the opinions of the relevant experts in the field under consideration. Content analysis was utilized with all of the collected data. Major themes were developed based on the responses of the research participants to offer a clear depiction of all the findings.

In studying the policy approaches of Bush Jr. and Barack Obama, the researcher will use unstructured interviews and content analysis of articles and documents to understand the approaches adopted by these leaders in a unilateral or multilateral pattern.

1.12 Arrangement of Chapters

The research consists of four chapters. Chapter one constitutes the research design which is composed of the following: Background to the study, statement of the research problem, research questions, research objectives, scope of the study, rational of the study, hypothesis, and theoretical framework, and literature review, sources of data, methodology and arrangement of chapters.

Chapter two presents an overview of US foreign policy: domestic and international determinants/sources, national interest, etc. The chapter also looks at evolution of unilateralism and multilateralism in US foreign policy prior to 9/11. Etc.

Chapter three focuses on comparative study of foreign policies under Bush Jr., and Barrack Obama: the determinants, foreign policies, doctrines/strategies, etc. in policy implementation. Chapter four focuses on summary of the research findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Endnote

[1] Nye, S. Joseph, Jr. : America can't go it alone: Unilateralism vs multilateralism. 2002 New York Times. New York, International Herald Tribune
[2] Ibid
[3] Ibid
[4]Cohen, C., Nye, S. J., Armitage L. : A Smarter, More Secure America: CSIS: November 6, 2007

[5] Lowi, J. Theodore, Ginsberg B.: American Government: Power and Freedom; 2000, 6th edition
[6] Ikenberry, J. After Victory: Institutions, Strategic restraint, And the Rebuilding of Order after Major War, 2000, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

[7]Cohen, C., Nye, S. J., Armitage L. : A Smarter, More Secure America: CSIS: November 6, 2007

[8] Holsti J.K. 1995. International Politics: A Framework for Analysis. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall Inc 7th Edition.
[9] Daalder H. Ivo and Lindsay M. James: The Remaking of American Foreign Policy: The Remaking of America;s Foreign Policy; 2003. The Brookings Institutions
[10] Farer J. Tom: Beyond the Charter Frame: Unilateralism or Condominium? American Journal of International Law. Vol. 96 No.2, (2017) pp.359-364, Cambridge University Press.
[11] Lyman J,: Obama's Multilateralism; International Policy Digest, March, 2011. Retrieved from www.intpolicydigest.org/2011/03/27/obama-s-multilateralism/
[12]President Barack Obama's UN Ganeral Address in September 2009 retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2009/09/24/us/politics/24prexy.text.html on 2018
[13] The UN Charter retrieved from www.un/org/en/charter-united-nations/index/htlm on February 14, 2018.
[14] History of the United Nations retrieved from www.un.org/en/sections/history/history-united-nations/
[15]Brands, H.W.: Presidential Doctrines: An Introduction; Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 36 No. 1, (March 2006), pp. 1-4

[16] Vercruyssen, V.: American Foreign Policy: The Bush and Obama Doctrine, 2012, retrieved from : www.academia.edu/6003706/American_Foreign_Policy_The_Bush_and_Obama_Doctrine
[17] Sources and Detailed Information-Flight 93 National Memorial retrieved from www.nps.gov/flni/learn/historycultures/sources-and-detailed-information.htm

[18] Green, M. : How 9/11 changed America: Four major Lasting Impacts (with Lesson Plan), September, 2017. Retrieved from : https://www.kqed.org/lowdown/14066/13-years-later-four-major-lasting-impact-of-911
[19]Ted, E: Grand Strategy: George W. Bush VS Barack Obama, The Skeptic, January 21, 2017. retrieved from www.nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptic on February 14, 2018
[20]Lindsay, M., J: George W. Bush, Barack Obama and The Future Of US Global Leadership; International Affairs, Volume 87, Issue 4, July 1, 2001.

[21] Allison, Graham T. "Essence of Decision." 1971. Boston: Little Brown, 536

[22] Allison, Graham T. "Essence of Decision." 1971. Boston: Little Brown, 536

[23] Ibid
[24] Tulasi, R. Kafle: Making a Difference: Allison's Three Models of Foreign Policy analysis, (2011), university of Nicosia, Cyprus. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/592889/making_a_Difference_Allisons_Three_models_of_Foreign_Policy_Analysis Accessed on June 9, 2018

[25] Allison, Graham T.: Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis: The American Political Science Review, Volume. 63, Issue 3, (Sep., 1969), pp. 689-718. Retrieved from www.jstor.org

[26] Ibid p. 694
[27] Ibid p. 694
[28] Ibid p. 694
[29]October, 22: This Day In History; 1962, JFK Announces Blockade in Cuba. Retrieved from https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/jfk-announces-blockade-of-cuba
[30] Allison, "Conceptual Models" p.294
[31] October, 22: This Day In History; 1962, JFK Announces Blockade in Cuba. Retrieved from https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/jfk-announces-blockade-of-cuba
[32] Ibid
[33]Goodin, E. Robert: The Oxford Handbook of International relations, 2010, Oxford: Oxford University Press. P. 133 retrieved from www.wikipedia.org/wiki/realism_(international_relations)
[34] Ibid
[35] Ibid
[36] Ibid
[37] Nayab, N. : Is Using the Rational Decision making approach a "Rational" Choice?, edited by Wendy Fin, 2011. Retrieved from https://brighthubpm.com/methods-strategies/12187/-is-using-the-rationa-decision-making-aopraoch-a-rational-choice/ on Monday, June 11, 2018
[38] Lowi, J. Theodore, Ginsberg B.: American Government: Power and Freedom; 6THEdition, 2000
[39]Thompson ., A. : Why Bush Bypass the UN in 2003?, Unilateralism, Multilateralism and Studies (2011), Volume 11, Number, 3
[40]Brief profile of Atsushi Tago, Retrieved from https://www.scholar.google.com/citations?user=7_ak6oYAAAAJ&hl=en&safe=strict on June 13, 2018. on Monday, June 11, 2018
[41]Tago, A. : Multilateralism, Bilateralism, and Unilateralism in Foreign Policy: Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Politics, 2017 retrieved from www.politics.oxford.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore- 9780190228637-e-499
[42] Ibid p.1
[43] Ibid p.2
[44] Seognjong S. " American Exceptionalism at Cross Crossroads" Korean journal of International Relations Volume 13, Issue 1 (April 2015) pp.239-262
[45] Ibid
[46] Ibid
[47] Ibid
[48] Ibid
[49] Ibid
[50] Ibid p. 245
[51] Ibid p. 250
[52] Ikenberry, G. John "Is American Unilateralism In Decline?"Perspectives on Politics, Vol. 1 No. 3 (2003) pp.533-550
[53] Ibid
[54] Ibid
[55] Ibid
[56] Ibid
[57] Profile of Ivo H. Daalder and Lindsay M. James. Retrieved from https://www.thechicagocouncil.org/publication/America-unbound-bush-revolution-foreign-policy on Sunday, June 17, 2018
[58] Bush request Senate for Military Budget increase recorded in the 9/11 Attack Report. Retrieved from: https://www.9-11commission.gov./report/ on Sunday, June 17, 2018
[59] Ikenberry, G. John "Is American Unilateralism In Decline?" Perspectives on Politics, Vol. 1. No. 3 (2003) pp.533-550
[60] Ibid
[61] Ibid
[62] Profile of David Skidmore retrieved from: www.drake.edu/polsci/facultystaff/davidskidmore/ on Sunday, June 17, 2018

[63] Skidmore, David. "The Obama Presidency and US foreign Policy: Where Is the Multilateralism? "International Studies Perspectives, Volume 13, Issue 1,(2012) pp.43-64 Retrieved from https://www.academic.oup.com/isp/article/13/1/43/1827784 on Sunday, June 17, 2018.
[64] Ibid
[65] ibid
[66] Ibid
[67] Strauss A & Corbin C. "Basics of Qualitative Reseacrh: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques" Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication

CHAPTER TWO

AN OVERVIEW OF US FOREIGN POLICY

2.1 Introduction

Chapter two explores issues regarding foreign policy making in the US, the institutional dynamics, objectives, attributes, domestic and international determinants and the national interest.

2.2 Understanding the Concept of Foreign Policy

There exists a great deal of relationship between domestic policies and foreign policies. It is assumed that foreign policy is the continuation of a state's domestic policies abroad. The rational relationships and interactions which occur between and among states are shaped by the foreign policies of the states involved in the interactions. Foreign policy is the pith and core of international relations and international politics. The term foreign policy defies a single definition. It has been defined in several ways by several scholars from different point of views.

George Modelski, Professor Emeritus at the Washington University, defines foreign policy as a set of interrelated activities undertaken by communities to change the behaviour of other states and to adjust its own actions in the international system.[1]Modelski's definition stresses on the part of foreign policies that aims at a change in actions of states in the international arena. The definition is limited as it ignores certain useful aspects of foreign policy that bothers on continuity. Thus, some states conduct their foreign policy in such a way to ensure that the states they interact with maintain their policies so long as they serve the interest of the state.

Northedge Frederick Samuel, a British Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics, posits that foreign policy involves the use of political power to persuade other states to apply their law making powers in patterns desired by the state involved. It is a relationship that arises from forces working outside the borders of the country and those within the country.[2] This definition suggests that what becomes a foreign policy of a particular state is determined by either external factors or internal factors or both. For example, when President Barack Obama wanted to release the Guantanamo detainees as he had promised the world, he persuaded the government of Ghana to accept two of the inmates, while a section of the Ghanaian populace asked the government to return them on grounds that the deal did not go through parliament and also poses a national security threat, the government heeded to those who supported their stay on humanitarian grounds.[3]

An American diplomat by name Hugh S. Gibson in his book titled, " The Road of Foreign Policy," posits that, foreign policy is a complete comprehensive plan grounded on knowledge and experience for steering government business with the entire world. Gibson explains further by indicating that the foreign policy of the state is geared towards the promotion and protection of the national interest.[4]

Generally, foreign policy is an embodiment of principles, objectives, interests and actions which states formulate and apply in the conduct of their relations with other states. It is also obvious from the various definitions that formulation and implementation of foreign policies are governed by self-interest of states. These interests are also chosen based on careful calculations by rational actors who are agent of the state such as presidents.

2.3 US Foreign Policy Making and Implementation: Actors and Process

The constitution of the US Article II Sub-section 2(II) identifies the President as the principal and chief actor in foreign policy.[5] Other major actors who influence US foreign policy

include but not limited to: congress, political parties, the judiciary, the media, interest groups, and trade associations.[6]

The President is required by the Constitution to appoint a host of actors to assist in formulation and implementation of his policies. Among the actors and institutions which work to support the president towards his foreign policy objectives include: the Secretary of State, representing the State Department, the National Security Coordinator, ambassadors representing US Embassies, etc.[7]All other actors and institutions are equally expected to work in support of the president.

Michael Foley's work on, "US Foreign Policy: Institutions and Process", as captured by Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, indicates that, the Executive branch, headed by the president, and the Congress are the two key institutions which have demonstrated some amount of tension in the US foreign policy but maintains that very often the former prevails over the latter. The Executive is certainly dominant in US foreign policy decision making process.[8]

The pre-eminence of the president is very outstanding as he is not bound by only the provisions in the constitution in his foreign policy decisions due to changing conditions in the international system. He is expected to take on other responsibilities which are deemed fit even if they are not stipulated in the constitution provided they are in the interest of the state.[9] In spite of the lee-way accorded the president by the constitution framers, the Executive is usually checked by the Congress based on the principle of checks and balances. The president circumvents the congressional delays often by relying on phrases such as national interest, popular will, public safety and social stability to achieve his goals and objectives. More importantly, Foley underscores that the president succeeds in canvassing for popular support to accomplish their goals. To Foley, US foreign policy process is executive centred.[10] Congress ensures that the Executive follows the traditional process of getting government

foreign policies approved by Congress before the policies can be implement them; this can lead to delay in decision making. The president, to overcome such situations especially in emergency, possesses prerogative powers granted by the constitution to undertake foreign policy action without having to be approved by Congress. Presidential prerogative was incorporated into the US constitution by the Supreme Court due to threat of war that had characterised the international system during the early stages of the Cold War.[11]

During the Cold War, Congress and other institutions which influence the foreign policy of US hardly challenged the decisions of the president; rather, they supported the executive in almost every decision. The massive support given to the executive by the Congress was due to the fact that the quantum of information which was available to the president superseded that of the Congress. The president was furnished with ample information about the international system by US Intelligence Agencies and other foreign policy actors which were not available to Congress after WWII. The lack of access to information limited the ability of Congress to oppose presidential foreign policy decisions in the post WWII era. Moreover, the US intention to assume hegemony in the International System during the Cold war resulted in a range of support from Congress to the Executive.[12]

With the end of the Cold War, the various actors and institutions outside the executive have consistently checked the presidents and criticised their policy approaches, especially in areas of unilateral and multilateral tendencies. This is partly due to the fact that the US after the Cold War had attained a hegemonic and unipolar position in the International system and the interest of the various actors have grown considerably to conflict with that of the presidents. Congress, for example, strives to be on equal level with the presidency in matters of foreign policy. Congress maintains a paramount role by resorting to the constitution and rule of law to control foreign policy actions of the president.[13]

2.4 US Foreign Policy Objectives and National Interest

The Constitution of the US unequivocally requires the president of the day to promote and protect the national interest of the US. The interest of the US is embodied in a set of foreign policy goals and objectives which have been rationally carved to meet the needs of the domestic setting.[14] The objectives of US foreign policy may differ from president to president based on the prevailing domestic and international factors. For example, one of the foreign policy objectives prior to WWII was isolationism. During the Cold War, the objectives of US foreign policy were fight for unipolar hegemony, triumph of capitalism, democracy and democratic practices. After the 9/11 attack, war on terror assumed a major policy objective of the US.[15]

Three basic goals of US foreign policy have been identified to be common to all administrations. These include: national security, economic prosperity of citizens and promotion of American values to create a better world. The security of US concern protection of territorial integrity, protection of individuals among others. The economic prosperity is implemented through trade policy and creation of employment opportunities, promoting investment opportunities in the US. Creation of a better world involves the expansion of American values such as human right protection, rule of law, democracy and democratic processes etc.[16]

Defining the national interest is subjective due to the relative nature of the term. It serves as a measuring rod for evaluating and describing the imperativeness of a state's foreign policy.[17] It can be a basis for accepting or rejecting certain foreign policy of government.[18] It is viewed as consisting of what is regarded as the 'general good' and, as a result, the state finds it most essential in its foreign policy agenda.

An article by Hillary I. Ekenam in the International Journal of Information Research and Review (IJIRR) titled "Propaganda, National Interest, And Foreign Policy: A Case Study of Russo-American Contending Dispositions To The Conflict In Kosovo," cites the definition of national interest, as stated by Professor Paul Seabury, as "those purposes, which the nation through its leadership, appear to pursue persistently through time"[19] Ikenam postulates that it is an undoubted truth among international relation scholars that, at the centre of every national interest is preservation or survival of the state.[20] National interest depends greatly on the decision of the rational individual actor. It can be expressed in terms of power, [21]that is, economic, political or military. The most consistent national interest of the US as explain in the objectives among other things include: national security issues, economic wellbeing of citizens and spread of American values such as democracy, liberal capitalism, human right protection.

The approach favoured by leaders to achieve the national interest may be fashioned out rationally to be in collaboration with other states, such as in a multilateral endeavour, or preference will be to unilaterally execute the goal with or without help of other states.[22]

2.5 Determinants of US Foreign Policy

No state is an island and, as a result, states continue to interact in the international system; this has contributed to a state of influencing or being influenced. What prompts foreign policy makers to undertake certain calculated steps is as a result of the environment and season in which they operate. The factors which affect foreign policy decision making in all states are often similar. The type of policy as well as the approach to be adopted depends heavily on the prevailing environment.

James N. Rosenau, a popular political scientist, according to Cox and Stokes, classify the determinants of foreign policies of a state in five main sources and these are: external environment (international system), domestic factors, structure of government which determines the policy formulation process, the bureaucratic roles occupied by individuals and lastly, the personality features and ideologies of the individual foreign policy officials and government experts.[23]

Cox and Stokes indicates that the international determinants draw attention to the fact that US foreign policy cannot be created without considering the multiplicity of events that take place in international politics. The US is therefore required to take note of and respond appropriately to the events that happen in international politics through foreign policy formulation. For example, the war on terror which begins in 2001 was a response to the event which led to the collapse of the WTC and part of the Pentagon in 2001. Similarly, Cox and Stokes posit that the external sources also determine the distribution of power among countries in the international system and its significance to US foreign policy.[24]

Cox and Stokes stress that the framework opined by Rosenau fails to demonstrate how the stated sources of foreign policy tend to influence foreign policy of a state. They reveal that analysts are divided over domestic and international sources of foreign policy as to which is more important than the other in terms of determining the foreign policy of a country. The authors were emphatic that many analysts insist that domestic sources are more relevant than external sources. He elaborates that the sources from the society which accentuate the non-governmental part of the society's contribution to foreign policy, the national character and value orientation of the state are too relevant to be ignored in framing a foreign policy of a state.[25] Cox and Stokes cite, for example, that the desire by US to wage war on Iraq was allegedly motivated by their wish to spread democracy and liberty to the Middle East.

Cox and Stokes elaborate on the bureaucratic sources which determine foreign policy of the US. The astute authors recount the provisions of the US constitution which requires several other bureaucratic institutions of the state, apart from the Executive and the Congress, to contribute to foreign policy process in the US. They argue that the president of the US works in close relations with the personalities such as: Secretary of State (SOS), Secretary of Defence (SOD), Secretary of Commerce (SOC), National Security Advisor (NSA), Director of Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), lobbyist, both domestic and international, and interest groups. The views of these individuals, as the authors express, do not reflect their individual preferences rather they represent the bureaucratic institutions which they represent. [26]

The fifth source opined by Rosenau which Cox and Stokes elaborate is the personal idiosyncrasies of the president. In the US constitution, it is the president alone who speaks and listens to matters of foreign policy as a representative of the state. He is the chief Foreign Service Officer. He makes treaties and appoints Ambassadors with the approval from Senate. He alone negotiates and Senate cannot interfere and Congress is even powerless to intrude.[27]

Touching on the individual sources, Cox and Stokes argue that the past experiences, personality, personal conviction, upbringing, etc. of the leader is ultimately vital in decision making. The president of the US takes the centre stage of the foreign policy process and as a result, it is relevant to understand the individual traits of the president. It is indeed impossible to explain US foreign policy direction without shedding light on the persona characteristics and beliefs of the sitting president.[28]

James Rosenau's framework aid us to realize the multiple sources of US foreign policy and helps to know what to focus on by Foreign Policy Analysts in an attempt to explain foreign policy in general.

The contribution of Boni Yao Gebe, an International Relations and Foreign Policy analyst at the Legon Centre for International Affairs and Diplomacy (LECIAD) throws more light on specific factors that determine foreign policy of states, including the US. In his article titled, "Ghana's Foreign Policy at Independence and Implication for the 1966 Coup", the analyst points out about five core factors that determine foreign policy of states which is relevant to US foreign policy.

The first factor that Yao Gebe discloses that it determines foreign policy is domestic structure. Issues such as class, economic delineations, political culture, preferences advanced by political elites, pressure from the society and ethnicity, etc. have major effects on foreign policy.[29] For example, the reportage of the local media on the devastating impact the Vietnam War was having on the US soldiers led to public outcry and pressure from the populace and other domestic actors to demand for the withdrawal of the US army from the war. In the end, the War Powers Act was passed by Congress to check the president on the involvement of the US army in international wars.

A second factor the author advances is the role and effect of the international system- its structure and forces. Yao Gebe posits that perception of the current arrangement of the international system as held by the realist school of thought indicate that the International system is anarchical and decentralised with no central authority to regularise actions of state. He indicates that anarchy and the current power distribution among states tend to pose constraints and other challenges that affect the decision taken by leaders during foreign policy formulation.[30] For instance, there is a general believe among International Relations scholars that the US decided to enter into multilateral alliance in order to get support from the International bodies and countries through cooperation to achieve their interest.

Thirdly, Yao Gebe, maintains that the role of the individual decision maker or political leaders matters most in foreign policy. He underscores that beliefs and perceptions of the elites such as the president, by and large, determines his choice of decision and actions. He mentions that it is damaging if the choice of decision was based on fear, lack of objectivity, misperception, and unwarranted set of beliefs.[31] He indicates that there is the likelihood and tendency for such leaders to commit blunder and hurt others without justification. The decision by the US under Bush Jr. to go to war in Iraq was a personal one after he was briefed by CIA that Iraq under Saddam Hussein had a great store of nuclear weapons. This led to the US unilaterally declaring war on Iraq after failing to secure authorization from the UN. In the end of the Bush administration, the president admitted that the war was misplaced because the information based on which he waged the war turned out to be false. The president admits that the war was his biggest regret.[32]

A fourth determinant the author factors in his premise is state capacity in foreign policy and international relation. Thus, the level at which the US is able to achieve her foreign policy goals and drive the actions and minds of other states in her favour largely depends on the power resources available to the US. The writer identifies a host of elements that constitute US capabilities including but not limited to geographical location and size, human and material resources, level of industrial production, level of technological advancement, military strength, leadership, patriotism, and diplomacy among others.[33]

The fifth and last is the national interest of the state. The national interest is the pivot of US foreign policy. It is the responsibility of the president of the day, with a host of support from other foreign policy actors, to determine what constitute the interest of the US given the fact the US operates in an international system with competing interest from states both large and small. The traditional US interest in international relations has been to promote her values such as democracy and capitalism across continents to create a better world, promote

economic wellbeing of her citizens home and abroad and to ensure the national security of the state.

Boni Yao Gebe's contribution to foreign policy determinants supports the conception that the decision maker in US foreign policy ought to be rational in order to separate the wheat from the chaff to be able to produce desired foreign policy result for the state.

2.6 Overview of Unilateralism and Multilateralism in US foreign policy prior to 9/11

The US has been oscillating between two continuums in terms of foreign policy approaches, from the era of George Washington to Bill Clinton, prior to the 9/11 attack- barely seven months into the eight-year administration of Bush Jr. The basic questions are that, what are the foundations of these two concepts in US foreign policy; and why do US presidents continue to adopt either or both approaches in executing their policies in her relations with the rest of the world? Attempt is taken to look at some utterances of phrases from certain US leaders which establish a pattern of foreign policy approach considered essential by their successors.

2.6.1 Evolution of US Unilateralism

Unilateralism is arguably the oldest foreign policy approach adopted by US foreign policy leaders since the state became autonomous from British domination around 1777. It was the practice of the US until 1945 when they decided to adopt multilateralism as an alternative to unilateralism. Charles William Maynes described American Unilateralism as the tendency of the US to make foreign policy decisions without much consideration for the interest and views of her allies or the rest of the countries around the world.[34]

Unilateralism in US foreign policy is basically promoted by the concept of Isolationism which is a traditional foreign policy tool of the US at independence.[35] Maynes hammers on the fact that unilateralism is not a new approach conjured by the US in her interaction with other states; however, he reveals that the practice is entombed in the international arena by birth. His position indicates that unilateralism is natural and it is necessitated by rational behaviour of sovereign states which permit no or very few absolute constraints on their liberty.[36] Maynes position is that the US is not the only country that resorts to unilateralism in the international system since the approach is a common practice among sovereign states who do not want to entertain restrictions on their policies from any supranational institution.

In order to better comprehend fundamentalism of unilateralism in US foreign policy, the researcher considers it apt to provide an exposition on two key concepts which will facilitate our understanding on the unilateralism in US history prior to 9/11. These concepts are: Isolationism and Exceptionalism.

A. Isolationism as a root of Unilateralism

The concept of isolationism remains prominent in understanding the genesis of unilateralism in US foreign policy. It is a US foreign policy tool which became prominent during the inter-war period especially in the 1930s and was observed by US policy makers in strict compliance with George Washington's fare address.

Getting to the closing pages of his two term tenure, as the maiden president of the US, Washington delivered a profound and remarkable letter to friends and citizens of the new found nation before leaving office. The letter, later on, came to be known as Washington's Farewell Address. In his letter, the former president and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces charged the future leaders of US foreign policy to, as a matter of importance, desist

from involving the US in any permanently entangling foreign alliances in the international system. The main motive behind isolationism is to discourage US alliances with Europe[37]

This speech planted the spirit of 'do it alone or go it alone' among US foreign policy makers and have equally impacted their foreign policy even up to date. Related to isolationism is the concept of non-intervention and neutrality which accentuate the isolation principle. President Jefferson, for instance, charges US foreign policy leaders after him to observe non-intervention in the international system. Jefferson believes in the US focusing its resources on domestic development of their new nation and not to intervene in the affairs of other states.

The Spanish American War of 1898 marks the first time US intervened in war in Cuba. The US declared war on Spain after the former accused the later of responsibility of bombing its war ship, the Maine, and secondly to protect economic interest of US investors and business in Cuba. Spain surrendered and appeased the US through the signing of a peace agreement which gave the US control over Spanish controlled territories of Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines Island.[38]

The World War I (WWI) episode, in which US intervenes on the part of the Allied Powers led by Great Britain to defeat the Central Powers Forces led by Germany, is another important occasion when US contravenes its non-intervention and neutrality policy in the international system. President Woodrow Wilson who proposed the policy of neutrality[39] returns to congress to seek for support for US to enter the war when German U-boats torpedoed and sank several commercial and passenger ships including the famous Great Britain's Lusitania travelling from New York to Liverpool, killing hundreds of American citizens[40]

It is relevant to note that the Central Powers were defeated and Wilson's suggestion led to the formation of the League of Nations (L.O.N). However, the US refuses to join the

supranational institution based on inspiration from Isolationism, which guides their foreign policy, after congress had rejected the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles brought by President Wilson because agreeing to the treaty would mean the US joining the League. The US was however never prepared to do away with Isolationism which had guided their external policies. They entered the war rationally to accomplish the goal of punishing their adversaries.[41]

B. Exceptionalism as a root of Unilateralism

Apart from isolationism, unilateralism in US foreign policy has its root in the concept of American Exceptionalism. Seongjong Song, an expert in International Security and Arms Control at the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Chonnam National University,[42] indicates in his work, "American Exceptionalism at Crossroads" that the concept has no single monolithic meaning and that it refers to variety of unique characteristics of the US society including political justice, egalitarianism, individuality, liberty, democracy etc.[43]

Madsen Deborah Lea, Professor of American Literature and Culture at University of Geneva, frankly posits that American exceptionalism is the conception that Americans have a unique fate distinct from all other states.[44]

Professor Songjong reveals that the concept has evolved over time and has drawn inspiration from various administrations of the US. The author's contribution includes milestones that the American exceptionalism phrase traces its root: "Winthrop's city upon a Hill" speech, Manifest Destiny and the Monroe Doctrine.

"A City upon a Hill"

On March 21, 1630, John Winthrop, leader of the Puritan Religious sect fleeing England to Massachuset due to religious persecutions, preached a sermon to his fellow colonialists on the theme: "A Model of Christianity." His sermon was based on Jesus' sermon on the Mount in which he metaphorically referred to his disciples as the light of the world and a city built upon a hill that cannot be hidden (Matthew 5:14). Winthrop indicates that the cities they would be building in their new territory will be like cities on hills which cannot be hidden. He admonished them to show love, mercy, justice etc. which is a model of Christianity without which the Lord will despise them.[45] Madsen who also has written extensively on the "City upon a Hill" indicates that the Puritans were ordained with political and spiritual destiny to create a New World[46]. According to Songjong, Winthrop admonishes the Puritans that if they will observe godly deeds they individually will be like a City upon a Hill and the eyes of all nations will focus on them. After many years, Winthrop's comments have been used several times by Roland Reagan[47]

Manifest Destiny

Julius W. Pratt in his article, "The Origin of 'Manifest Destiny'" indicates that it will be amazing for someone to read US history within the two decades prior to the American Civil War and will never encounter the phrase "Manifest Destiny" which is famously and conveniently employed to justify the territorial expansion at the time.[48]

Songjong posits that the phrase was coined by John O'Sullivan to rebuke countries who interfered with US expansion in the western part of the hemisphere. George Washington, in 1783, referred to the US as an emerging empire.[49] Songjong reveals that President Monroe of the US made it known that the Americas were no more open to European domination, a statement which came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine.

Philippe Sands and Davis Robinson in their work, "American Unilateralism" beautifully summarise Monroe Doctrine in such coherent words, "Foreign powers stay away from us- reciprocally we aim to stay away from you and will look after ourselves. That was our message: Just leave us alone"[50]

Manifest Destiny and Monroe Doctrine tend to provide a powerful mandate for ceasing European colonialists from interfering in the affairs of their newly created societies. Manifest Destiny, as used in the 19th century, according to Ekirch, cited by Songjong, connotes the belief that US expansionism is unavoidable and divinely orchestrated and that Americans are chosen purposely by God to multiply across continents.[51]

Isolationism and exceptionalism are among the few concepts which give rise to US unilateral tendency in foreign policy making.

2.6.2 Evolution of Multilateralism in US foreign Policy

Multilateralism as opined by Atsushi Tago is explained in terms of quantity based and quality based approaches. He describes quantitative multilateralism as one in which three or more states come together to accomplish a goal in the international setting. The quality based multilateralism connotes respect and conformity with international rules of engagement set by multinational bodies.[52]

Ruggie, who has been cited extensively in the work of Atsushi Tago as a scholar who favours the quality based, indicates three core values of the quality based approach to include: universally organized principles, indivisibility and dispersed reciprocity. To Ruggie multilateral principles should detest from discrimination and preferential treatment common in bilateral relations. According to Atsushi Tago, Ruggie emphasizes the need for cooperation and the rules of engagement should apply to everyone equally. Ruggie says there must be no exception for countries which are deemed powerful.[53]

The genesis of US multilateralism receives a considerable attention in the work of an American Freelance writer on Foreign Policy and International Affairs and a former Chief of the New York Times Bureau to the UN, Babara Crossette.[54] In her book, "Alone or Together: US and the World." Crossette discloses that the US has never been particularly interested in long lasting alliances of which George Washington and many other founding fathers warned the country's future foreign policy leaders about.[55]

Crossette goes on to recount the fact that in terms of policy, the US naturally would like to carry out its projects either peace or war by itself and would like to decide where and how to act.[56] The author posits that the US has a mixed feeling towards multilateral engagements. According to Crossette, multilateralism began to be used around the 1930s and 1940s to imply an organization of states joined together based on common purpose and principles.

No one could have given vivid accounts of how US moved from isolationism to multilateralism around the 1940s than Nicholas Klar; a native of Adelaide, Austria; a historian and a Humanities teacher. In his essay titled, "The US-From Isolation to Intervention," he describes the US foreign policy during and immediately after WWII as a distinct major ideological change which had worldwide implications.

Klar posits some core factors which aided change in the foreign policy of US from isolationism to multilateralism. He cited US national interest, able leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the changing public mood, the increasing influence of the military and the obvious threat of communism especially from the Soviets.[57]

He indicates by citing Terkel, that when WWII began it badly affected isolated US physically and geographically. A quick Gallup opinion pool was undertaken by December 1941 and at this time 70% of the population supported the need for US to intervene in world affairs.

Before that, the author indicates that a similar poll was conducted in 1936 and 60% were in favour of isolationism[58]

He indicates among other things that Americans came to realise that the future of their state was inextricably intertwined with that of the world. Cox and Stokes indicates that Americans came to realise that they no longer needed to be afraid of involving themselves in world affairs because they knew they had all the needed military power and economic resources to become world leader. As a result, Cox and Stokes opine that, when Roosevelt pronounced a new United Nations Organization (UNO), which was to replace the League of Nation, most Americans quickly accepted it because, unlike Wilsonian 1eague in 1919, they knew they would be able to control it.[59] Klar indicates that the Senate officially approved US membership of the UN 3 years and 7 months after Pearl Harbour attack. It also marks the first major step to put behind its isolation policy[60]

Klar indicates that it was the US who vehemently insisted on the rebuilding of the of the disrupted world trade system as a result of WWII. As a result of the hard work of the US in the UN, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) was formed in 1947. The GATT established protocols and principles for world trade until it was replaced by the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995. Crossette reveals that apart from calls for the establishing the GATT, US was simultaneously pressing for the establishment of the IMF and the IBRD.[61]

It can be inferred that US deepest commitment at this crucial moment was a rationally based initiative geared towards achieving the aim of their foreign policy; thus to ensure economic welfare in trade and also to lead the new world after the order of the US who was relatively stronger economically and militarily.

2.6.3 Determinants of US Multilateralism

Atsushi Tago, in his article,' "Determinants of Multilateralism in the US use of Force: State Economy, Election Cycle and Divided Government," he asserts that multilateralism has been the future of US foreign policy since WWII.

In the article, Atsushi Tago cites Ikenberry and Ruggie who argued that other countries prefer multilateral engagements to policies which are coercive and typically unilateral, they continued that based on this development; the US uses multilateralism as a legitimate strategy to manage alliances in order to construct a world order.[62]

Atsushi indicates three sources which determine US multilateral engagement both in the use of force and diplomacy. The determinants the author emphasises on are: state of the economy, electoral cycles and divided government.

Regarding the state of the economy, the author indicates that the US chooses multilateral approach of dealing with world problems when the US economy is weak and the country is surviving under tight fiscal budget. He underscores that in such situations, there is the likelihood that the president will prefer to share the burden with allies. Tago emphasises that the president is likely to seek for external source of funding especially in times of deteriorating economic situations. Tago cites an instance where Bush Sr. during the 1st Gulf War sought for financial assistance from Japan and Germany due to serious concerns about the economic impact of the war on US.[63]

Regarding electoral cycles, the author's position is that the US electorates use mid-term elections to pass judgment on the policies of the president. The president is likely to make his policies appear favourable to the citizens. As a result, the president endeavours to present a policy that is less risky and less burdening to the populace. The rational option for the president is to seek allies to offload cost of executing their policies.[64] Tago further indicates

that US military operations during midterm presidential campaigns are more likely to be multilateral since that has the possibility of winning popular support, the reason he assigns to the coalition during electoral periods is due in part to the fact that it will create a perception of burden sharing with other states. This shows that the presidents are rational actors who assess situations to make maximum impact for their administration and the state.[65]

His position with regards to divided government as a determinant to US multilateral relation is a thought provoking premise. He commences his argument by indicating that multilateral diplomatic support is able to permit the US presidents undertake international course of action which will be deemed legitimate without the approval from Congress. He further indicates that this is especially significant during periods where Congress is on recess.

He claims that the challenge of securing Congressional support for multilateral engagements arises in a situation where there is a divided government. Tago cites Shull and Shaw who posit that an opposition dominated Congress require a strong persuasion through compromises and bargaining. Tago indicates that a Congress which is dominated by the opposition can mount pressure on the president to destruct his policies by failing to approve such policies.[66]

What the president can do, according to Tago, is to go around Congress to lobby for legitimacy from international organizations like the UN. In his example, Tago refers to the Bill Clinton's administration in which the president, faced by a Republican dominated Congress, justified his military operation in Bosnia under support from UN and NATO in 1995.[67]

2.6.4 US Multilateral Leadership and Financial Commitments

The US has been accorded a peculiar status as the originator of the current multilateral international system with respect to her role and contribution in the formation of the UN, its

agencies and several other international organizations including the IMF, IBRD, NATO and a host of others.[68]

The US did not just see to the creation of our current multilateral international system but also ensured that it contributes immensely to the progress of multilateralism through leadership and financial commitments.

Taking the UN, for instance, a Cable News Network (CNN) reportage by Ryan Struyk indicates that the US pays between 22% to 25% of the total contribution of UN budget, China covers 8%, Russia- 2% etc. According to Struyk, President Trump lamented that the US pays a lot to the UN.[69] Apart from the UN and its agencies, the US contributes significantly towards several multilateral institutions around the world.

The US Department of State report to Congress in 2016 detailed a host of International Organizations and the corresponding donation in which the US allocates huge sums of dollars. The African Union (AU) is regular recipient of US financial aid. The AU received $3, 537,600 million for the 2016 fiscal year.[70] According to CNN news report by Patrick Goodenough, on March 20, 2017, the US contributes over 1/5th of total direct funds collected to keep NATO's civilian and military activities alive. This makes US the highest contributor to NATO operations of about 22.1%.[71]

The US holds the greatest shares in the World Bank Group (WBG). Instances from the WBG, UN, NATO etc. shows that in most of the multilateral organization in which the US is a member, the US contributes the largest financial resources above all others a situation which makes the US wield enough powers and influence in such organizations.[72]

The US also hosts the headquarters of majority of International Multilateral Organizations (IMOs). In terms of leadership the US also has majority of its citizens serving in key

leadership positions in IMOs. The US hosts the headquarters of the UN in New York, IMF in Washington DC, World Bank in Washington DC, United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF) in New York, etc.

In terms of leadership positions, the World Bank Group (WBG) presidency position ever since its creation has always been occupied by a citizen of the US. Apart from the World Bank, US citizens have been appointed to head several multilateral bodies such as the UN, NATO, World Food Programme (WFP), etc. Cox and Stokes opine that the US controlled the UN system right from its creation until the 1960s and 1970s when the membership of the UN increased to include Africans and Asians who questioned US control of the UN. According to the authors, the US cooled towards the UN considerably.[73] The under listed names are few of the many US citizens serving multilateral Organizations:

Name	Organization	Position
Dr Jim Yong Kim	World Bank	President
David Beasley	WFP	Executive Director
Anthony Lake	UNICEF	Executive Director
Steven M Shepro	NATO	Deputy Chairman

In summary, the US prior to the 9/11 incident have gone through both unilateral and multilateral foreign policy choices as approaches to foreign policy. Until 1945, the US maintained isolationist, noninterventionist and neutrality in the international system, primarily to do away with entangling alliances especially with Europe.

The US officially appreciated and adopted multilateralism from 1945 with the establishment of the UN, IMF, IBRD, etc.; these bodies possess binding principles which all members including the US must respect. In the wake of a multilateral world, leadership of the US Foreign Policy have employed not only multilateral approach but an uncountable number of unilateral operations which are considered an opposite to those who belief in multilateralism.

Unilaterally, the US has undertaken military operations during Haiti Unrest in June 1957, Venezuela Unrest in May 1958, Bay of Pigs in April 1961, Ogaden War in February 1978, Cambodia Unrest in July 1997, etc.

Multilateral operations include those that were authorized by the UN and other multilateral bodies of which the US is a member. These include: Arab-Israeli War in January 1948, Security of Berlin in June 1948, Kosovo Conflict in June 1998, etc. Tago's work indicates that the US has undertaken more unilateral military operations than multilateral ones between 1948 and 1998.[74]

2.7 Conclusion

US foreign policy after 1945 continues to oscillate between unilateralism and multilateral ism. The underlining factors include the role played by founding fathers in grounding the nation in an isolationist mode of conducting international relation. The US is also regarded as the founder of present day multilateralism which makes it a duty upon her to ensure the survival of multilateralism in the future. This is very important because there is a general perception that the collapse of the League of Nations was because US was not involved.

This means that the continuous survival of the UN is an indication of continuous commitment of the US to the programme and policies of the UN. The financial commitments and leadership roles offered by the US makes it a major player who cannot underestimate the multilateral relevance of the UN to the world.

Endnotes

[1] Modelski, G. "A Theory of Foreign Policy", London : Pall Mall Press, 1962, pp.6-7.
[2] Northedge, F.S (ed.), "The Foreign Policies," London; Faber and Faber, 1968, pp. 6-7.
[3] Let's accept the GITMO Two - Chief Imam Pleads Retrieved from https://www.myjoyonline.com on Sunday, June 12, 2018
[4] Hugh G., "The Road of Foreign Policy", New York: Doubleday, 1944, p. 9.
[5] The Constitution of the US retrieved from https://www.constitutionfacts.com retrieved on Sunday, June 12, 2018
[6] Notes on Foreign Policy and Democracy retrieved online from www.wwnorton.com/college/polisci/american-government12/brief/ch/14/outline.aspx retrieved on Sunday, June 12, 2018
[7] Ibid
[8] Cox, M. and Stokes, D., "US Foreign policy" (Second Edition.), Oxford University Press 2012.
[9] Ibid p. 140
[10] Ibid pp. 139-140
[11] Ibid p.142-143
[12] ibid
[13] Ibid
[14] Foreign policy goals retrieved online from https://www.quora.com/what-are-the-five-goals-of-foreign-policy? on Sunday June 12, 2018
[15] Notes on Foreign Policy and Democracy retrieved online from www.wwnorton.com/college/polisci/american-government12/brief/ch/14/outline.aspx retrieved on Sunday, June 12, 2018
[16] Ibid
[17] Frankel J., "National Interest," London: Pall Mall Press Ltd, 1970, pp. 15 – 18.
[18] ibid
[19] Ikenam, I. H. "Propaganda, National Interest, And Foreign Policy: A Case Study of Russo-American Contending Dispositions To The Conflict In Kosovo," international journal of information research and review, Volume 04, Issue 04, pp. 4037- 4042, 2017
[20] Ibid
[21] Morgenthau, H.J. and Thompson K.W. "Politics Among Nations: Framework for Understanding" 1985, New York: Alfred A Knopf Inc, P. 117
[22]Tago, A. : Multilateralism, Bilateralism, and Unilateralism in Foreign Policy: Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Politics, 2017 retrieved from www.politics.oxford.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore- 9780190228637-e-499 retrieved on Sunday, June 12, 2018
[23]Cox, M. and Stokes, D., "US Foreign policy" (Second Edition.), Oxford University Press 2012 p.6
[24] Ibid
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid
[27] ibid
[28] Ibid
[29] Boni Y. Gebe, "Ghana's foreign Policy at Independence and Implications for the 1966 Coup." Journal of Pan African Studies Vol. 2 No. 3, March 2008, pp.160-186
[30] Ibid
[31] ibid
[32] Bush G. "Iraq war my biggest regret, Bush admits" the Guardian; Monday 1, 2008; report by Suzanne Goldenberg
[33] ibid
[34] Maynes C. William, "US Unilateralism and Its Dangers." Review of International Studies Vol. 25 No. 3 (July 1999) pp. 515-518
[35] ibid
[36] ibid
[37] Longley R. "The Evolution of American Isolationism: Friendship With all Nations, Entangling Alliances with None." Retrieved from https://www.thoughtco.com/the-evolution-ot-american-isolationism4123832 on Sunday July 1, 2018
[38] Spanish American war for Cuba's Independence; produced by the Florida Centre for Instructional Technology, College of Education University of Florida; 2002. Retrieved from https://www.fcitusf/flourida/lessons/s-a_war/s-a_war1.htm on Sunday July 1, 2018

[39] Kolnick J. "W.W.I America". The Journal of American History Vol. 104 No. 3, 2017 pp.732-735.
[40] WWI History. Retrieved from https://www.history.com/topics/world-war-i/world-war-i-history on Sunday July 1, 2018
[41] Longley R. "The Evolution of American Isolationism: Friendship With all Nations, Entangling Alliances with None." Retrieved from https://www.thoughtco.com/the-evolution-ot-american-isolationism4123832 on Sunday July 1, 2018
[42] Profile of Seongjong Song retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Seongjong_Song
[43] Seonjgong. S.: American Exceptionalism At Crossroads; The Korean Journal of International Studies, Volume 13, No. 1, pp. 239-262 retrieved from
[44] Madsen, D. Lea "American Exceptionalism." 1998. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, p. 196
[45] Ibid p.14
[46] Ibid p.14
[47] Ibid p.14
[48] Pratt, W. J, "The Origin of the 'Manifest Destiny.'" The American Historical Review, Vol. 32 No. 4 (July, 1927), pp.795-798
[49] Ibid p.14
[50] Sands P. and Robbison D. " American Unilateralism", Proceedings from Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law), Vol. 96 (March 13-16, 2012), pp.85-94
[51] Ibid p.246
[52] Ibid p.2
[53] Ibid p.2
[54] Profile of Barbara Crossette retrieved from http://www.israelipalestinian.procon.org/view/source.php?sourceID=002125 on Saturday, July 7, 2018.
[55] Crossette B. "Alone or together: the US and the World." Great Decisions, eat Decisions (2003) pp.5-16 published by: Foreign policy Association.
[56] Ibid. p.6
[57] Klar, N. "The US-From Isolation to Intervention" retrieved from https://www.klarbooks.com/academic/isolation.html Accessed on Sunday, July 8, 2018
[58] ibid
[59] Cox p.81
[60] [60] Klar, N. "The US-From Isolation to Intervention" retrieved from https://www.klarbooks.com/academic/isolation.html Accessed on Sunday, July 8, 2018
[61] Ibid p.7
[62] Atsushi T, " Determinants of Multilateralism in US Foreign Policy: State of Economy, Election Cycle and Divided Governemnt" Journal of Peace Research, Vol 42, No. 5, 2005, pp. 585-604
[63] Ibid p. 588
[64] Ibid p. 589
[65] Ibid. p. 589
[66] Ibid. p. 589
[67] Ibid. 590
[68] Cox and Stokes P. 17
[69] CNN news item on US contribution to UN reported by Ryan Struyk on Friday, September 22, 2017 retrieved from https://www.google.com/search?Source=hp&ei=yaVIW-TUD9COmgxqnLagDO&q=distribution+of+country+c0ntribution+to+UN&oqgs
[70] US contribution to International Organization retrieved from https://www.state.gov>organization on Friday July 12, 2018
[71] US contribution to NATO reported by Patrick Goodenough on March 20, 2017 retrieved from https://www.cnnnews.com>news>article on Friday July 12, 2018.
[72] Scott, M and Gleave, M "Realizing the Power of Multilateralism in US Development Policy" July 20, 2015. Centre for Global Development. Retrieved from https://www.cgdev.org/publications/ft/realizing-powermultilateralism-us-development-policy
[73] Cox and Stokes p.54
[74] Atsushi T, " Determinants of Multilateralism in US Foreign Policy: State of Economy, Election Cycle and Divided Government" Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 42, No. 5, 2005, pp. 599-603

CHAPTER 3

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF US FOREIGN POLICY UNDER GEORGE BUSH JR AND BARRACK OBAMA

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on a comparative study of the two leaders during their tenures in US foreign policy making and administration. Emphasis is placed on core domestic factors as well as external factors that determined their foreign policies during their administrations. Again, the research throws light on some key foreign policies which the leaders undertook. In discussing their policies, emphasis is placed on the approaches involved and how they align with respect for international norms, cooperation, peace promotion, etc. which are key components of the current multilateral world.

3.2 Determinants of US Foreign Policy under Bush Jr. Administration

Foreign policies of countries do not arise in a vacuum; they are carved based on careful calculations by leaders with regards to considerations for both domestic/internal factors and international/external factors. These factors determine what policies to be taken and especially what approach to be adopted in implementing the policies.

Yao Gebe, an International Relations and Foreign Policy Analyst summarises the factors which determine a country's foreign policies into five thematic areas: domestic environment, external environment, personality of the president, how powerful or capable the state is in the international arena, national interest and quest to maintain power.[1]

3.2.1Domestic Determinants under Bush Jr.'s Foreign Policy

Yao Gebe mentions issues such as political culture, preferences of political elites, societal pressure, class and economic strata as predominant domestic determinants. Concerning Congress as a major domestic determinant of USFP, an interview with Abassador K. Baah-Duodu, an Ambassador in Residence at LECIAD of the University of Ghana (UG), the distinguished former Ghana's Permanent Representative at the UN in Geneva, reveals that composition of the Congress is a major determinant of US foreign policy as it enhances how easily or difficult a president's policies will be approved by Congress.[2]

President Bush Jr., a Republican, took over the presidency from President Bill Clinton, a Democrat, in February 2001 at a time when Democrats dominated Congress. Under this circumstance, it was usual to think that the president will have a tough time getting his policies approved by Congress. However, barely seven months into his administration, the US was attacked by terrorists. In an interview with Vladimir Antwi Danso, Foreign Policy and International Relations Analyst and Dean of Academic Affairs at the Ghana Armed Forces and Command and Staff College (GAFCSC), President Bush Jr. enjoyed massive support from both sides of the political divide in Congress as a result of the devastating effect of the 9/11. He, for example, cites that the Senate authorized his quest to wage war on terror and increased his defence budget astronomically.[3] This is supported by Franz-Joseph Meiers, who reveals that the primary contours of the Global War on Terror (GWOT) were set three days after 9/11 by Congress when it mandated the president to exert every needed and rightful force against organizations, individuals and nations who committed the attack.[4]

John C. Fortier, a Research Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and Norman J. Ornstein, a resident scholar at the AEI in Washington DC; in their paper delivered at Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University titled: "Bush Presidency: An Early Assessment," the astute scholars make it clear that Bush enjoyed a bipartisan support from

Congress in most of his famous policies and gave support for his tax cut and his "No child Left Behind" education reforms and War on Terror after the 2001 terrorist attack. They, however, clarify that the support was not without hitches.[5] The frosty relationship that ensued later is confirmed by John W. Dean, a White House Counsel during the Richard Nixon Administration, in July 14, 2006 in his article dubbed: "The Bush Administration's Adversarial Relationship with Congress…," the celebrated legal luminary posits that unlike George Herbert. W. Bush and Bill Clinton, Bush Jr.'s use of Signing Statement was not only unconstitutional and unprecedented but also an assault to the Senate Judicial Committee and the entire Congress as it rendered it as a neutral institution.[6]

Generally, Bush Jr., in spite of some hiccups with Congress, enjoyed maximum cooperation from Congress.

3.2.2 Personal Attributes of Bush Jr.

Owing to the pre-eminence of the president in US foreign policy, it is essential to have a firm knowledge about the personal idiosyncrasies of the leader of the day. Having an idea about the leader enables foreign policy analysts to appreciate his policies as well as the approach and further predict the actions of leader in certain international milieu

Yao Gebe underscores that the personal traits of the US president is a major source or determinant of his foreign policy. They are of the view that the up-bringing, beliefs, personal experiences, mood, etc. of the president have great role in his foreign policy decisions and approaches.[7] Robert H. Swansbrough in an attempt to analyse the personality and style of Bush Sr. during the Gulf Crisis indicates that the approach adopted by presidents to deal with their fellow politicians and foreign leaders may be politico (based on persuasion and bargaining), rationalist (where the facts are allowed to speak), manipulative (based on Machiavallian tactics) and the drifter (where there is no specific direction for the leader).[8]

The personality of George Bush Jr. has been analysed by various scholars with respect to his presidential leadership. An Associate Professor at the Department of Psychology in St. John's University, Aubrey Immelman, in his work titled, "The Political Personality of U.S President George W. Bush" presents an analysis of Bush Jr. and assesses the political impacts of his personality with respect to his leadership and performance.

In a summary of his analyses, Immelman posits that personality based leadership strength of Bush Jr. are charisma and interpersonally. He indicates that Bush Jr. had a confident, personable, socially responsive and outgoing tendency that enabled him mobilize popular support and retain his self confidence in the midst of adversity. He describes Bush Jr. as an outgoing leader who had confidence in his social relationships and his ability to charm others to like him and overlook his weakness.[9] He further opines that outgoing leaders like Bush Jr. usually prefer to stay off the course to do the bid of his followers in order to get their approval.

Conversely, Immelman indicates that personality type like that of Bush Jr. is much more likely to pay little or no attention to details of complex issues as they are often bored with performing repetitive and dull tasks.[10] He further indicates that exaggerated version of the out-going leader is impulsiveness and inability to tolerate inactivity. He indicates that such a leader is likely to make sudden and unplanned decisions without careful consideration for the consequences.[11]

Immelman's description of Bush Jr. is in line with policy choices and approaches adopted by Bush Jr. during his administration's war in Iraq. Bush failed to undertake a careful analysis of the claims from his security intelligence team concerning the idea that Iraq was in possession of WMD. A March 8, 2003 article published in the Telegraph report suggests that the Iraq war was as a result of the greatest intelligence failure in living memory.[12]

James P Pfiffner, Professor at the School of Public Policy at George Mason University in his publication titled, "George W. Bush: Policy, Politics, and Personality," professed a premise about the personality of Bush Jr. which is similar to that of Immelman. Pfiffner opines that Bush Jr. is decisive and impatience towards unnecessary delays. According to the author, Bush Jr. liked to act based on personal intuition. Citing an empirical evidence to substantiate his claim, the author reveals that it was as a result of impatience traits of Bush Jr. that led to his retort to Condoleezza Rice "It is unacceptable!" when the National Security Advisor (NSA) tried to explain to the president that preparations were not far advance for military deployment to Afghanistan.[13]

Pfiffner allude that when the UN Security Council decide to allow the WMD inspectors in Iraq more time to search for the WMD, Bush Jr. reacted at a press conference in these words: " Any attempt to drag the process on for months will be resisted by the United States…This just needs to be resolved quickly."[14] He describes the president trait as biased for action in the sense that the president was not ready to listen to any other variant consequences for an action which he had decided already based on the advice of his security advisors.

In an interview with Ambassador Baah-Duodu concerning the extent to which the 9/11 attack transform the foreign policies of Bush Jr., the distinguished Diplomat indicates that President Bush Jr. blamed the 9/11 attack on soft policies undertaken by previous leaders. According to the Ambassador, Bush Jr.'s Republican Party is conservative in nature which believes in the realist assumption of international relations theory. Such beliefs of the president led to his belief that refusing to act promptly will be regarded as a weak government.[15]

Commenting on Bush Jr.'s personality in an interview, a professor of International Relations and Dean of International Education Georgia State University, Professsor Fredoline Anonubi prefers to look at it from his family background. To the astute Professor, in spite of Bush Jr.'s

weakness and strength in his international relations with other states, his status as a son of an ex-president, a governor and finally emerging as president of the US enhanced his credibility and respect in international relations. As a result, the Professor reveals, Bush Jr. was able to win more states which previously were part and parcel of the former Soviet Union to joint NATO. He also indicates that it was under the influence of Bush Jr. that Russia came to join the Group of 8 (G8) nations. He adds that Bush influenced Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi to come to UN General Assembly meeting for the first time in 2009.[16]

According to James Lindsay, Bush Jr. whose father had once been a President of the US and had had a clear view of the White House, knew how to conduct his foreign policies at least based on his experience during his father's encounter with Saddam Hussein during the Persian Gulf Crisis.[17] Given his military background, it was no wonder that the president preferred the US demonstrate its full military powers abroad especially against what he considered 'Axis of Evil' and concurrently protecting allies and interest of the US.

In short the personal experiences, beliefs, mood, calculations, assumptions etc. of Bush Jr. as a person undoubtedly determined which policies he favoured and which approaches he prefers to adopt. Critically assessing the traits above, it is obvious that Bush Jr.'s traits would make him find it difficult to entertain longer negotiations and delays that is characterised by multilateral bodies due to careful consideration, would mostly let him take unilateral stance.

3.2.3 International/External Environment under Bush Jr.

The contribution of Yao Gebe to what determines foreign policies of countries indicates that a country's foreign policy may be directed or redirected based on the prevailing circumstances in the international system. The challenges posed by both state and non-state actors have the ability to influence what policies the affected state can marshal to prevent any damages posed by international actors.

Several international factors such as international lobbyist, interest groups, multilateral institutions, major world occurrences such as mass disasters etc. worked their ways to determine how the Bush Jr. administration made his foreign policy choices and approaches. Predominantly, the 9/11 terrorists attack had been the greatest event that determined how the Bush administration made his foreign policy choices and approaches.

➢ The 9/11 Attack and Bush Jr.'s Foreign Policy

On Tuesday September 11, 2001, the US was hit by a deadly attack on its homeland which led to the collapse of the magnificent World Trade Centre (WTC), and the destruction of the West Wing of the Pentagon resulting in the death of several thousands of US citizens and other immigrants living in the US.[18] The Osama Bin Laden (OBL) led Al Qaeda claimed responsibility on grounds that the US was defending Jews/Israel in their attacks against Islamic Palestinians.

Sam Webb's report on September 7, 2017, in the Sun Newspaper reveals that a latest documentary found claims that the real reason for Osama Bin Laden masterminding the 9/11 terror attack was that he blamed the US for breakdown his marriage. The writer claims that in the mid-90s when Osama was comfortably living in Sudan, the US government mounted pressure on the Sudanese government to kick Bin Laden out. Sudan did as the US commanded and Osama returned to Afghanistan where life was hard with no lights in most part of the country due to the Afghanistan Russian war outcome. The harsh condition led to his second wife leaving him and that made the former University lecturer furious with the US. Upon reaching Afghanistan, Osama began to plot an attack on the US a decade before September 11, 2001.[19] The event leading to the eviction of Osama from Sudan in which he finds refuge in a Taliban base in Afghanistan is perfectly chronicled by Yaw Gebe in his

article, "United States international relations and World leadership in the Twenty-First Century"[20]

In a speech captured by the CNN, on the night after the terror attack, President Bush Jr. made it clear that he will make no difference between the terrorists of 9/11 and countries which he perceives to be a safe haven for terrorists around the word.[21]

Honourable Samuel Okudzeto Ablakwa, Member of Parliament for North Tongu and a Ranking Member for the Foreign Affairs Sub-Committee of the Parliament of Ghana in an interview discloses that the 9/11 attack had far reaching effects on US relations with her partners and other countries. The popular and eloquent legislator opines that Bush Jr.'s mantra in his speeches such as 'Axis of Evil'- referring to Iraq, Iran and North Korea created animosity between the US and the states involved; 'either you are with us or against us' also did not go down well with US allies which did not support the reasons Bush Jr. used to attack Iraq which the UN opposed.[22]

Ambassador K. Baah-Duodu indicates that the events led to a strict search even among diplomat travelling to the US to the extent of removing shoes and searching valuables for suspected terrorists.

Dr Vladimir Antwi-Danso of GAFCSC posits in an interview the researcher had with him that, 9/11 is "the headquarters" of the Bush administration's Foreign Policy. He said it forms the pith and core of what is termed the Bush Doctrine.[23]

3.2.4 The National Interest under Bush

A major determinant of a country's foreign policy which Yao Gebe reveals, is the National Interest.[24] All of US's national interest is modelled in three thematic areas: national security, economic welfare and democratic values. In the aftermath of the 9/11 terror attack, Bush Jr.

disclosed that the attack was against the national security interest of the US, and as such, vowed to pursue the enemy wherever they are, and interview with Dr Vladimir revealed.[25]

The spread of democratic values was very dominant in Bush Jr.'s foreign policy. According to Professor Fredoline Anonubi, Bush Jr. was determined to spread democracy in other parts of the world with special emphasis on the Middle East. The professor reveals that the president aimed at making Iraq a hub of democracy in the Middle East.

3.3 Overview of US foreign Policy under Bush Jr. Administration.

During his campaign to be elected as president of the US, Governor W. Bush accused the then Bill Clinton administration of over extending the American military abroad.[26] Bush Jr.'s messages during rallies bordered on building the US economy and promoting massive tax cut and educational reforms. He believes in the fact that using US military abroad should be directed towards protecting and promoting the values and interest of the US abroad. Such attitude of candidate Bush made critics to believe that the presidential aspirant would be uninterested in foreign affairs and questioned his capability to master affairs of foreign policy.[27]

Conversely, foreign policy issues came to dominate presidential policies of the Bush administration. His foreign policy initiatives focused on challenges to US global hegemony by China and Russia, containing Iraq, deterring 'rogue' states, promoting democracy and economic welfare, building National Missile Defence (NMD), among others.[28]

From Rhetoric to Action: Prior to 9/11 Terror Attack

Assuming his duty on Saturday, January 20, 2001, the President has the opportunity to actualize his campaign rhetoric. The Miller Centre of the University of Virginia provides a

detailed events of Bush Jr.'s domestic and foreign policies within the eight year duration of the bush administration. Prior to 9/11, the president undertook the following policies: Reinstating the ban on abortion aid to international groups and organizations promoting or performing abortion; the ban was initiated during the Ronald Reagan Administration but was not enforced during the tenure of Clinton.[29]

During that same moment on March 29, 2001, the president affirmed he has decided to abandon the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol, a treaty agreed to by 180 countries to beat down global warming through emission of industrial gases.[30] Bush Jr. declared in an interview with a Danish TV that the protocol would affect US economy.[31] This decision by Bush Jr. explains his intention to act unilaterally against multilateral norms with little or no concern for the consequences for the rest of the world.

9/11 and Beyond

The events of the September 11 attack, according to Daalder and Lindsay, served as a rubber stamp for the Bush Jr.'s administration to effect its desired changes using the military might of the US. They maintain that 9/11 transformed the opinion of the administration concerning how the US should interact in the international system.[32] The National Security Strategy delivered on September 2002, was predominantly foreign policy oriented. This confirms that foreign policy came to define Bush Jr.'s presidential policies.

A summary of the president's foreign policies contained in the September, 2002 NSS include: War on terror, fight for human dignity, overcoming regional conflicts, fight against production of WMD, promote global economic growth, global market and global trade, making the world safer through the building of societies with democratic infrastructure development of agenda for co-operative action with the rest of the world and finally to equip

America's National Security Institutions (NSI) to take advantage of the opportunities that come along with the Twenty-First Century.[33]

Bush Jr.'s March 2006 NSS was the same as his September, 2002 NSS. However, he emphasised that his policies will be grounded on two pillars: promotion of freedom, human dignity and justice through the effort to promote democracies, end tyranny and extend economic prosperity based on free and fair trade and prudent development policies. The second pillar, according to the president, was facing the challenges of the Twenty-First Century by leading growing democratic countries. He emphasised on threat of pandemic disease, proliferation of WMD, terrorism, human trafficking, and natural disasters, etc. as cross border challenges which the US must lead to curb through a multilateral approach.[34]

In retrospect of Bush Jr.'s foreign policy by Melvyn Peffler, the author reveals that the first term of the president's foreign policy was characterised by American military primacy and unilateral implementation of his policies. There was an increase in the number of troops as well as skyrocketing of the military budget to fight terrorists. Melvyn indicates that the president's second term was geared towards building friendly relations with other countries through aid, free trade, free market, building democracies and ensuring multilateral cooperation in tackling challenges facing our generation.[35]

3.4 Understanding the Bush Doctrine and the Grand Strategy of the Bush Jr. Administration

The principles of Bush Jr.'s foreign policy also called Bush Doctrine and the framework for implementing these principles also referred to as the Grand Strategy are embodied in the NSS of 2002 and 2006. While the September 2002 NSS sets the pace for what the president hopes to achieve in his first term to prevent another terror attack, the March 2006 NSS at the

beginning of his second term recounts the success gained from the September 2002 NSS such as overthrow of tyranny from Iraq and the Replacement of democracy, crack down on Taliban network al Qaida in Afghanistan and challenges ahead to be tackled among others.[36]

Fred Gordon, Chair of the Department of Politics, Philosophy and Public Administration, Columbus State University, Georgia, writing in the Ledger Enquirer explains that Presidential Doctrine of the US is not law, but gives a glimpse as to how a president responds to an issue in an area of national interest.[37]

Peter Beaumont, foreign affairs editor in the Guardian, referred to the September 2002 NSS as the Bush Doctrine and reveals that the Bush doctrine constitutes the worldview of President Bush Jr. Beaumont recalls Monroe doctrine as a premier US presidential doctrine which was outlined in 1823 by president James Monroe deterring European colonial powers from attempting to come back to the Americas. The distinguish editor underscores two core principles of the Bush doctrine. He indicates that the Bush doctrine outlines strategy for pre-emptive action against rogue states and terrorist groups perceived to be manufacturing WMD and also establish US military as a global hegemon. Thus US military supremacy will never be allowed to be challenged as it occurred during the Cold War.[38]

In an interview with Dr Antwi Danso, he revealed what constitutes the Bush Doctrine came under three tenets: Pre-emptive/preventive strikes, thus, chasing the enemy wherever they are, spread of values or American democracy and regime change. He posits that Bush Jr. wanted to make Iraq the hub of democracy in the Middle East.[39] The idea of Antwi Danso is shared by Professor David Skidmore who indicates that central to the Bush Doctrine are ideas of regime change, unilateralism and pre-emptive war.[40]

According to Seongjong, Robert Jervis, Professor of International Politics at Columbia University, rather identified four principal elements of the Bush Doctrine which include:

America's readiness to consolidate its world pre-eminence against any competitor, America will employ pre-emptive measure towards rogue states and terrorist, America will have to take unilateral policies and promotion of democracy as a weapon in the War on Terror.[41]

Hal Brands, Professor of Global Affairs at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced international studies, cited by Michael Clarke and Anthony Ricketts, defined grand strategy as an intellectual framework that gives structure and form to foreign policy and serves as a purposeful and clear set of ideas regarding what a nation seeks to achieve in the world and how it intends going about doing so.[42] Brands provides that every grand strategy should have the following components: a clear knowledge and understanding of the international system; identification of the highest interest and goals of the country in the international arena; primary threats to the goals and interest and assessment of the ways that resources can be applied to deal with all competing opportunities and challenges.[43]

Skidmore and Leffler posit that Bush Jr.'s grand strategy jettisoned traditional concept of deterrence to embrace pre-emptive action or anticipatory self-defence.[44][45] Leffler indicates that Bush Jr.'s grand strategy within his first term after 9/11 was predominantly exertion of American military might abroad with focus on Global War On Terror (GWOT). The attention was focused on pre-emptive or preventive war on terrorists, crack down on tyrant regimes and "rogue" states serving as safe haven for terrorists and prevention of production of WMD.

In his second term, as alluded from his NSS, Bush Jr. moved towards undertaking policies that will promote friendly relations with other states and worked towards promotion of multilateral engagement. The author underscores that after successfully overthrowing Saddam Hussein and reducing the impact of Taliban in Afghanistan, Bush Jr. decided to ignore the threat posed by Osama bin Laden to concentrate on promoting global economic growth, free market, open door policies, building democratic infrastructure.[46]

3.5 Bush Jr.'s Relationship with the World

Bush Jr.'s relationship with the rest of the world is depicted in both his foreign policies and the approach with which he intended to achieve his goals. Traditionally, a country's interaction with the rest of the world is geared towards achieving the national interest. The elements which constitute the national interest of US may vary from regime to regime but they must end up meeting the three core pillars of US national interest which are: National Security, promotion of American values such as liberal democracy, liberty etc. home and abroad and promotion of economic welfare for its citizens home and abroad.

The interest at stake determines if the US president will seek absolute or partial support of the rest of the world or the president may decide to go it alone. A study of Bush Jr.'s relationship with multilateral organizations in implementation his dominant foreign policies provides a basic understanding about the extent to which his foreign policy orientation was unilaterally or multilaterally influenced.

3.5.1 Approach towards War on Terror

- **The Invasion of Afghanistan and the Creation of Guantanamo Bay Detention Centre**

The invasion of Afghanistan by the US began on October 7, 2001 in response to the 9/11 attacks by terrorist which resulted in the destruction of lives and properties in the US. The war is described as the longest war in US history as narrated by Susa E. Rice, former US National Security Advisor and a Fellow of the Brookings Institute, in the New York Times on March 14, 2018.[47]

The Global Policy Forum, an independent policy watch-dog on the UN, gives accounts of Bush Jr.'s approach to the war in Afghanistan. The paper narrates that the UNSC authorised the US to overthrow the Taliban government, in the later part of 2001, as a punishment for its

connections with the al Qaeda terrorist organization based in the country. The war was led by US and its NATO assisted allies.[48] The Council on Foreign Relations, a US based Think Tank, discloses that Bush Jr. sent a stern warning to the Afghanistan leaders to hand over all al Qaeda authorities hiding in the country or share in their woes.[49]

On September 18, Bush Jr. signed a joint resolution which was approved by Congress authorising the use of US army against those responsible for the attacks. On October 7, 2001, the US backed by United Kingdom (UK) started bombing campaigns against Taliban forces through Operation Enduring Freedom. The gravity of the attacks led to the retreat of the Taliban and al-Qaeda forces and the eventual escape of Osama Bin Laden from Afghanistan to Pakistan on horse-back on December 16 2001.[50]

An event marking the war in Afghanistan was the creation of a military detention center in Guantanamo Bay, a region within the Cuban territory but under US control. The prison camp was set up by Bush Jr. to detained suspected terrorists. Bush claimed that he has power to detain suspected terrorists captured after 9/11 indefinitely. The detention which constitutes a unilateral approach of Bush Jr. was opposed, even by his own lawyers and the US Supreme Court on accounts that the whole procedure is against the habeas corpus principle. The Supreme Court also said the centre breached Detainees Treatment Act (2005) and Military Commission Act (2006).[51] Apart from the Supreme Court, several human rights watch groups such as the Amnesty International condemned the abuses at the centre asked the US to close down the centre.

It is worthy to note that in spite of the fact that the US engaged in a UN supported multilateral WOT in Afghanistan, it did not support the unilaterally created detention camp by Bush Jr. The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navy Pillay, on April 5, 2013

expressed the worries of the UN over the US's refusal to close the facility in spite of the numerous promises from the US that it will close the centre.[52]

- **The Invasion of Iraq**

In an interview with Hon Okudjato Ablakwa, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee in Ghana's Parliament discloses that the war on terror took the centre stage of the foreign policy of Bush Jr. after 9/11. According to the legislator, Bush Jr. declared that his administration will go out and search for terrorists and destroy them before they attack the US. He indicated that the US will wage war on terrorists with the collaboration of allies or do so alone.[53]

US invasion of Iraq is a test case that casts light on the Bush Jr.'s relationship with other countries and the UN before, during and after the war. The relationship indicates how unilateralism or multilateralism impacted US approach in solving international problems.

The war began when Bush Jr. went to deliver his speech to the UN on Iraq. According to New York Times, the president lament over Saddam Hussein's regime over its continuous and unilateral disregard for the provision of the UNSC. The US president accuses the Iraqi leader of possessing WMD, harbouring al Qaida terrorists escaping from Afghanistan, torturing its citizens, etc. Bush Jr. also reveals that Saddam Hussein openly praised the 9/11 terrorist attackers. Bush reiterates that the US will work in with the UN Security Council to meet every challenge posed by Iraq.[54] Bush Jr.'s speech shows his commitment and respect to the UN. His commitment comes at a time when his country is facing attack from terrorists whom he described them as shadows.

Professor David Skidmore identifies five main themes from the 2002 NSS of Bush and indicates that the invasion of Iraq has its genesis from the themes. The NSS identifies

terrorism and the spread of WMD as key threats to US national interest and security. It also requires the US to oppose such growing threat before they are completely formed. The US has the option to act unilaterally when necessary.[55]

Skidmore reveals that Iraq has been a major worry to the US since the country's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. He indicates that the US and allied forces drove into Kuwait through neighbouring Saudi Arabia to successfully free Kuwait. They refuse to overthrow Saddam Hussein. The writer opines that the US and her international partners continue to apply all measure such as economic and political sanctions to contain Iraq to incapacitate it of its aggression. UN inspectors moved all over Iraq to destroy WMD and their sites, however, they withdrew from Iraq due to protest that Iraq authorities impeded their effort.[56]

The writer maintains that throughout this period, voices in the US called for regime change other than containment. Congress passed the Iraq Liberation Act (ILA) as a foreign policy to ensure the removal of leader Saddam Hussein in 1998. Senior officials in the Bush Jr. government called for the removal of Saddam through force and that commenced a serious plan to oust the Iraq leader beginning from 2001 to 2002.

Skidmore maintains that as the US moved towards confronting with Saddam regime, the presidency thought of invading Iraq unilaterally without cooperation with other states through the UN. The writer posits that Colin Powell, Secretary of State to Bush Jr. objected the move and with domestic and international resistance he was able to convince the president to seek approval of the UN. The UN asked the US to give them some time to conduct a fresh nuclear and biological weapon production search in Iraq, the result was that no such weapons were found.

Discovering after careful calculations that they would not secure majority in the UN Security Council, US alongside Great Britain and some smaller coalition members opted for war.

France and Russia had made it clear that they would have vetoed any second UNSC resolution which would require Iraq to disarm within 7 days by the US and the UK.[57]

Skidmore reveals that on March 19, 2003, the US and UK attacked Iraq which led to the overthrow of Saddam Hussein. The US helps in drafting a new constitution in which a fresh democratic election was organized in January 2005 to elect a new leader.[58] Dr Antwi Danso reveals that Bush Jr. desired to make Iraq the hub of democracy in the Middle East. Professor Fredoline Anonubi opines that Bush Jr.'s dislike for Saddam is as a result of the fact that Bush held the belief that Saddam Hussein wanted to kill his father, Bush Sr. The Professor's revelation is supported in a CNN article by John King revealing that Bush Jr. referred to Saddam Hussein as "… the guy who tried to kill my dad" when he was delivering a speech during a fund-raiser, in Houston, for Texas Attorney General John Cornyn, the then Republican nominee for Senate seat.[59]

It can be deduced from the discussion so far that Bush Jr.'s attack on Iraq was purely a unilateral decision simply because it did not have UN backing. The then Secretary General, Mr Kofi Anan, made it clear that the war contravened the Charter of the UN.[60]

3.5.2 US and International Treaties under Bush Jr.

In spite of the role played by the US in the establishment of the UN in 1945 and supported the creation of several multilateral treaties to encourage cooperation among nations on our planet, there has been gradual decline in by US in commitment to the very treaties they have aided to establish.

Barbara Crossette opines that the UN agencies such as the IMF, WTO, IBRD, International Labour Oraganization (ILO), etc. as well their various treaties were established to ensure stability and order in essential areas of life such as migration, human right protection, health and diseases, food and security among others. Crossette added that US's skepticism about

ratifying treaties is grounded on the fact that the leaders are not enthusiastic about entering into an agreement that has a permanent entanglement which their founding fathers like George Washington warned them against.[61]

Bush Jr., who was surrendered by Vice President Dick Cheney and former National Security Advisor and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice whom according to Skidmore had a jaundiced view about multilateral institutions and treaties, is cited by the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) in their March 2005 Treaty Database on US compliance with Global Treaties as particularly reluctant to engage in the international treaty system.[62]

The IATP data base reveals that as of 2005, Bush Jr. had signed only six treaties in his first term and none of the six treaties forwarded to the Senate had been ratified. However, the data shows the president reversed the support of the US from at least six major treaties including but not limited to: Ending U.S participation in the on-going negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change (KPCC), Violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NNT) by manufacturing new nuclear weapons, Withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABMT), Nullifying the commitment of US signature on the International Criminal Court (ICC). The database reveals that Bush Jr. becomes the first president to nullify the US's signature on multilateral treaty and also the first president of a major power to back out on a nuclear treaty after it became binding.[63]

The IATP report discovers that analysts cite the unwillingness of the US to surrender its sovereignty to external authority as the chief reasons behind the country's lack of participation in multilateral based treaties. However, the IATP report found something different upon a critical scrutiny. The report found out that the White House is more than prepared to surrender to multilateral trade treaties its sovereignty. The problem with the US, however, is that it is selective when it comes to when to subordinate. A summary of the IATP

data shows that US government may be less interested in treaties that promote right of people and protect our planet and greatly interested in treaties that projects its control over world resources. IAPT buttress their finding by indicating apart from Somalia which by then had no president, US remains the only country not to have ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). [64]

In a press statement released on October 6, 2004, the author of the analysis, and Director of IATP's Global Cooperation Project, Patricia Jurewicz lamented that for the last 20 years President Bush Jr. became the US president to have signed fewest multilateral treaties. She describes the Bush Jr.'s regime of retreating from international arena.

Antwi Danso reveals that US under Bush Jr. refused to go along with multilateral treaties rather the US "bought" countries through bilateral engagement to achieve their goals.

A report published by Pew Research Centre (PRC) on Global Public Opinion on the Bush Jr. years from 2001-2008 reveals that the image of the US suffered almost everywhere especially among developed countries and the Muslim world. This forced the then president-elect Obama to posit that he will focus on international cooperation in solving world problems.[65]

3.5.3 US Level of Financial Commitment to Multilateral Organizations under Bush Jr.

The major features of a multinational organizations are levels of commitment and cooperation on the part of every actor. Refusing to honour ones financial commitment can be attributed to retreat and lack of commitment. Contribution of Bush Jr.'s administration to formal International Organizations such as UN, NATO, and ad hoc coalition has the ability to determine the extent to which the his foreign policy approach is unilaterally or multilaterally impacted.

Right from his campaign period through to his seven month in office before 9/11, Bush Jr.'s utterances and actions created the impression on the minds of people that he will not show support and preference for international organizations, multilateral agreements and permanent alliances. He saw them as more problem than they were worth. The reasons include his refusal to ratify several multilateral treaties such as the Kyoto protocol among others.

Bush Jr. proved his critics wrong as his administration show a huge commitment to foreign aid and also honoured his financial commitment to these organizations where applicable. His most impressive financial commitment to a multilateral organization is commitment to pay arrears US owed the UN.

Lizzette Alvarez reports in the New York Times on September 25, 2001 that the House voted to approved the release of $850 million to settle dues and arrears owed to UN. The reporter indicates that the bill was passed at a time when the Bush administration opines that multilateral cooperation is required to combat terrorism. As Lizzette alludes, Connecticut Republican Representative, Christopher Shays could not fathom why the US remains the biggest debtor to the UN at a time the US was reaching out to every country in the world to support in the war on terror. He described the situation as unacceptable and an impediment to diplomatic efforts of US.[66] Bush wins the support of Congress in which his $850 Million bill gets approved to settle UN debt which he inherited.

The decision of Bush Jr. to pay off the arrears supports the framework of the study: the Rational Actor Model. Until the advent of the 9/11 leading to the WOT, the Bush Jr. had not made any intention offset the arrears. It was at a point that the president realised that he needed a multilateral backing that they hurriedly went to pay their debt. This does not promote a sound multilateral development.

An October 2008 research report by Stanley R Sloan, a researcher at NATO Research Division, on "How and Why Did NATO Survived Bush Doctrine" reveals that Bush Jr. had a frosty relationship with NATO in his first term of office. His unilateral pre-emptive preventive force after 9/11 was not shared by many NATO members like Germany, Belgium among others who declared that they would not take part in an attack on Iraq even if U.S and Great Britain managed to get UN Security Council approval and this raised uncertainties about NATO security community. The Iraqi war created a division within NATO as most member states refused to accept US argument after 9/11 that the US and its allies were involved in war with radical Islamic extremism.[67] Bush strategy was to build a multistate coalition against terrorism.[68]

Sloan however indicates that the second term of Bush Jr.'s administration raised campaign to win back support and trust of European Union (EU) governments. The researcher indicates that Bush Jr. made effort towards US commitment to international alliance by visiting most EU member states together with his secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. Sloan claims that the financial and economic commitment among NATO members was huge and mutually interdependent that political and security break could jeopardise vital EU US interest.

The research covers a study in 2003 by Joseph P. Quinlin about EU-US mutual economic interest and found out that EU members states had over $860 billion of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in US and the US also has some $700 billion FDI in the EU states indicating that NATO members had a mutual stake in each members welfare and ignoring these gains will be at each other's peril.[69]

A Fox News on November 27, 2006 indicates that the US spends over 3.7 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on NATO which is about 70% of total NATO funds, higher than

any other member state contribution.[70] Bush Jr. is a key architect who called for NATO members to increase their military funding by a threshold of 2% of GDP in 2006.

3.5.4 Economic, Political and Social Development Cooperation under Bush Jr.

In his second term, President Bush Jr. emphasised open market, trade, cooperation, building democratic structures around the world, etc. in his 2006 NSS. As a result the president undertook several faith-based foreign policy initiatives to assist the needy home and abroad. Bush Jr. and his advisers decided to combine soft power -involving the use of aid to achieve their interest and hard power- using military power when required to demand compliance from others.[71]

3.5.4.1 Bush Jr. and Foreign Aid

Carol Lancaster, a member of the Board of Directors at the Centre for Global Development-Washington DC posits in his book: "George Bush's Foreign Aid: Transformation or Chaos?," that president Bush Jr.'s greatly transformed US foreign aid system in terms of volume, purpose, policies and organization since JF Kennedy's administration. Two major foreign aid policies pursued by Bush Jr. were the establishment of Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) and the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Response (PEPFAR).

- **The Millennium Challenge Corporation**

Lancaster opines that the MCC came about at UN conference on financing development at Monterrey, Mexico hosted by his friend and neighbour, Vicente Fox, the then President of Mexico in March 2002. Having decided to attend, the president decided to deliver something attractive and inspiring to the World's largest Organization. He therefore proposed to increase US aid.[72]

Lancaster reveals that the US president was inspired by two things: firstly, European leaders had planned to increase their aid which indirectly required some expectation from the US and the second based on contribution of an American Rock Star, Bono, who was involved in massive aid contribution to Africa and other part of the World. The meeting at Monterrey became a fertile ground based upon rational calculation for President Bush to act. He announces to increase US aid by $5 billion every year until 2006 through a Millennium Challenge Account (MCA).[73]

Lancaster indicates that ordinarily the proposal would have been opposed by media and opposition party, however, given the fact that Congress was Republican dominated and the WOT was beginning, Congress was more than ready to second the president's astronomic increase in aid.

Writing for the Miller Centre on Bush Jr.'s foreign aid, Gary L. Gregg II, professor at University of Louisville, clarifies that the MCA was a centre piece for Bush's strategy for economic development. Gregg II states that for a country to be eligible the country should eschew corruption encourage education and health of its people, enable economic development which is market controlled. In all, Gregg II reveals that $6.7 billion was invested in countries involved.[74] Gregg II posits that Bush Jr. worked with his G8 partners to cancel debt amounting to $34 billion for poor African countries including the removal of many tariffs for African exports.[75] Ghana and Mali signed their compact with the MCC in 2006.[76]

- **President's Emergency Plan For AIDS Relief (PEPFAR)**

The PEPFAR is another major aid based foreign policy initiative of President Bush Jr. to step up global fight against HIV/AIDS. As part of his January 2003 State of Union Address (SOUA), the president made a stunning revelation that he would request form Congress, the

sole controller of the US purse, an amount of $15 billion to be used over five years to augment the already funding federal government HIV/AIDS programme.[77]

The account as given by Lancaster indicates that the President proposed, in June, 2007, a doubling of the funding for PEPFAR from $15 to $30 billion over the following five years. He posits that the mutual understanding between Congress and the President to support the whooping sum are based on these factors: Firstly, Congress and the general public increasingly became aware of the scope of dangers affecting the human race especially in Africa from HIV/AIDS. It was estimated that HIV/AIDS killed more than Malaria with over 2 million people dying in year 2007.[78]

A second reason which Lancaster reveals and Gregg II elaborates coherently is rate of infection in women and girls which was alarming. Gregg II discloses that President Bush at the onset of his presidency committed $200 million to the UN Global Fund (UNGF) to fight HIV/AIDS but realised that the both the programme and the UNGF was no enough to handle the menace. The president therefore announced the International Mother and Child HIV Prevention Initiative (IMCHPI) in June 2002 to combat the pandemic in the women thereby preventing mother to child infection.[79]

It is the IMCHPI which led to the emergence of the PEPFAR in January 2003. Lancaster states that it is as a result of the inability of the affected countries and the international community to provide adequate care and treatment that PEPFAR remained unquestionable.

3.6. Foreign Policy Determinants under President Barack Obama

Foreign policies of US presidents have been either directed or redirected by internal and external actors and situations, national interest and the leadership idiosyncrasies of the president of the day. Internally, the views of Congress, Trade Unions, Lobbyist, Bureaucrats,

and Political Parties have a stake in the foreign policy direction of every president of which Barrack Obama was no exception. In the external arena, International Organizations such as the UN, NATO, etc., and global issues such as terrorism, production of WMD etc., also determine what policies US leaders formulate.

3.6.1 Internal/Domestic Determinant of Barrack Obama Foreign Policy

Congress which is one most powerful determinant of any president's policies was very prominent in the era of Barack Obama. Congress has the constitutional mandate to approve important elements in a president's policies such as approving foreign budget, approving declaration of war based on the War Powers Act (1973).[80]

Stunning record of Barrack Obama's relationship with Congress is provided by Stephen Dinan, a national correspondent of the Washington Times on January 17 2017. Dinan emphasise that President Obama struggled to find his way through Congress whose interaction with the president began from lukewarm and progressed to open hostility. He opines that for all his eight years in office, Obama was able to sign only 1,227 bills into law-even lesser than former presidents Jimmy Carter and George H.W. Bush who served for only four years (one term).[81]

In an attempt to explain the cause of the tension between the Congress and the president, Dina indicates that analyst gave two core reasons: Firstly, Obama had a divide control Congress which hamstrung him for four years. Secondly, others noted that Obama failed to locate his way to coexist with the lawmakers that electors gave him-especially after election 2010. Joshua C. Huder, a senior fellow at the Government Affairs Institute-George Town University, cited by Dinan, opines that Congress put up more road blocks than they did to Obama's predecessors.[82]

Dinan boldly clarifies that 2009 and 2010 were Obama's best years and that was so because Obama's Democrats controlled both chambers. The journalist posits that the 2010 election led to Republicans dominating the House while Democrats maintained their majority in the Senate bringing legislative work into what he termed a tailspin the following four years. The correspondent adds that the Republicans finally gained control of both the House and Senate in 2015 making things still stagnant.[83]

Dinan concludes that while the Democrats blamed the Republicans of frustrating Obama's achievement forcing the president to take unilateral decisions through the use of Executive Orders, the Republicans hit back at Democrats on grounds that they (Democrats) did same during Bush Jr.'s last two years in office when they (Democrats) controlled both houses.[84]

3.6.2 Obama's Personality Attributes

Barrack Obama's attributes such as his beliefs, family background, education, profession, mood, among others, determined his policies and how he envisioned approaching them.

Professor Aubrey Immelman, who conducted a personality study on Bush Jr., did a similar study on Obama. His studies, which was based on the Million Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria (MIDC) and Million Index of Personality Styles (MIPS) manuals synthesizes data from biological and media sources to form Obama's personality profile.

Primary personality make up of Obama the study suggests were: Dominant/asserting and Ambitious/confident while his secondary characteristics were: Conscientious/respectful and Accommodating/cooperative. The psychologist says Obama's traits make him confident conciliator making him benevolent, gracious and considerate. He concludes that leaders with Obama's traits are agreeable, favours compromise and mediation over coercion and force, less driven by power and have stronger urge for affiliation[85]

Hon. Ablakwa describes Obama as "unique" because he emerges as first African-American. He said such a trait must have let him develop deep love towards Africa. He said Obama believes in institutions and consensus building and multilaterally oriented and believes in raising next generation of African leaders.[86]

Bartosz Wiśniewski of the Polish Institute of International Affairs describes Obama as popular person whose popularity served as a backbone to his foreign policy.[87]

Vladimir describes Obama as a liberalist who wanted multilateralist approach, with American leadership, to tackling world problems as against Bush Jr.'s realist unilateral approach to world problem based on American leadership. Reacting to Obama's unilateralist drone strikes in Iraq, Afghanistan and other Middle East Countries, the international relations lecturer posits that the system sometimes force the president to act against his decision. Professor Anunobi in resonance with Vladimir posits that the structures force Obama to send more troops abroad instead of his intent to withdraw them gradually.

3.6.3 External Determinant of Obama's Foreign Policies.

According to Professor Fredoline Anunobi, the factors which shaped the foreign policy of Obama were similar to that of President Bush Jr. The Professor mentions that issues of global fight against terrorism, poverty, climate problems, clash of civilization and dwindling natural resources among others were key events which drove Obama's policies abroad.

Both multilateral institutions such as the UN, NATO, NAFTA, EU etc., together with their various agencies and global challenges such as terrorism, poverty, climate, change, proliferation of WMD determined Obama's policies and his approach in foreign policy.

To restore America's lost image abroad Obama plans to work in collaboration with international organizations in a way that will ensure America's compliance and obedience

with bodies such as the UN. He was worried about the seemingly unilateral stance of Bush Jr. towards the multilateral organizations, especially the UN, and warns during his campaign era that, the US cannot exempt itself from laws that apply to everybody noting that such a conduct amounts to US retreat from the rest of the world other than US leadership.[88]

The war on terror which his predecessor began and the resulting emergence of new terrorist networks such as the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and the Arab Spring which began in Obama's era formed a dominant determinant in the policies of the president. Oblivious of the oncoming Arab Spring, President Obama's campaign message was geared towards ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan until the sudden eruption of the Arab unrest to which Obama directed substantial quantity of US resources leading to the sudden demise of Colonel Muammar Gadhafi of Libya.

Obama's policies were also determined by global socio economic issues such as global climate change, poverty, health and disease, democracy and institutional building. In his policy towards Africa, he emphasised on building strong institutions and not strong men during his speech in the Parliament of the Republic of Ghana. Hon Ablakwa, in an interview, praised Obama for instituting the Young African Leadership Initiative (YALI) to empower African youth for leadership.

3.6.4 National Interest under Barack Obama

Generally, National interest under president Obama centred predominantly on national security, promoting American values and promoting socio economic welfare around the world. Specifically, Obama's national interest bothered on capturing Osama bin Laden who was considered a threat to US national Security together with his al Qaeda network hiding in Iraq and Afghanistan, rebranding the image of US abroad, restoration relationship with Muslim world and ending the WOT and subsequent withdrawal of US troop back home.

He believed that the US can achieve her foreign policy interest through the use of soft power. This involves the use of tools of diplomacy such as engagement, negotiations, building encouraging the building of strong institutions among others. President Obama believed that cooperation should be the choice for the US to engage the rest of the world and not projection of military might.

3.6.5 Overview of US Foreign Policy under Obama

In all the one-on-one interviews conducted by the researcher, respondents opine that Bush Jr. and Barack Obama pursued similar foreign policies but differed on the approaches they employed to administer their policies. Dr Antwi Danso, for instance, indicates that Obama's policy is an offshoot of Bush Jr.'s policies. Professor Anonubi makes it clear Obama's policy is a continuation of Bush Jr.'s policies but with different approaches.

Professor Anonubi discloses that Obama faced the same problems which Bush Jr. faced. The professor mentions issues of GWOT, global poverty, global climate problems, clash of civilizations and dwindling natural resources as major areas Obama's policies centred.

- **Obama's Policy on War on Terror**

Michael Nelson, a Fulmer Professor of Political Science at Rhodes College and a Senior Fellow at the University of Virginia Miller Centre in his "Barack Obama: Foreign Affairs," posits that President Obama inherited two wars: Afghanistan and Iraq; at the commencement of his presidency amidst national economic wreckage arising out of astronomic resources committed to fighting WOT.

Nelson reveals that Obama opposed Bush Jr.'s decision to attack Iraq and promised, during the 2008 elections campaign, to withdraw US troops as early as possible. The Professor says in February 2009, the US Commander-In-Chief declared plans to cut down US troops

involved in the war from 160,000 to 50,000 as of August 2010 and the rest removed latest by end of 2011. Professor Nelson concludes that the president's vision materialised and by 2012 only 150 US troops were in Iraq, a number that remained on for about three years.[89]

The astute Professor posits that President Obama turned his attention to Afghanistan where he was determined to prevent the pro al Qaeda Taliban regime from regaining political power which could make the country a centre for terrorists operations targeted at the US. Professor Nelson writes that the military had requested for additional troops getting to the end of the Bush Jr.'s administration which was not granted, however, Obama who opposed troop surge in Iraq, willingly approved the request to send additional 21,000 troops to Afghanistan, raising US military presence there to 60,000. On December 1, 2009 Barack Obama approved 33000 additional troops, at the request of General Stanley McChrystal, who were to train Afghan forces to defeat Taliban forces on their own based on a new military strategy by Gen. McChrystal.[90]

The president orders a military operation in Pakistan after Intelligence agencies reveal that Osama bin Laden was hiding in al-Qaeda compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan. On May 2, 2011, a team of Navy SEALS killed Osama bin Laden in an Operation Neptune Spear.[91]After killing Bin Laden, withdrawal of troops increases, the president conducts unilateral drone strikes in "secret wars" bombing several terrorist hide outs in Afghanistan.[92]

- **Arab Spring under Obama**

President Obama met a sudden civil unrest within the Arab League popularly called Arab Spring during his first term. The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) writes that the Arab Spring begins when a 26 year old Tunisian man set himself ablaze for economic hardship. The event led to mass civil protest and call for democratic reforms in Tunisia and extended to other countries like Egypt, Libya, Yemen, Syria, etc. Martin S. Indyk et al state that Obama

supported the popular call for democratic reforms and aided in toppling unpopular dictators in Egypt, Libya and Yemen.[93]

Writing on the Libya crisis, Professor Nelson says Obama and his team posited that they were using a new approach to war which involved multilateral other than unilateral approach. This statement came as a response after congress asked the White House to clarify why they involved US Soldiers in Libyan crisis without Congressional approval. The white House also responded that they did not breach the War Powers Act (WPA) because the situation in Libya was not a war. The Presidency joined NATO to enforce a "no fly zone" impose on Libya by the UNSC. The effect of the operation assisted the Libyans to bring the administration of dictator, Muammar El-Qaddafi to a fatal end. Congress had opposed the White House use of US troops in Libya as it breached the War Powers Resolution which requires the presidency to get approval from Congress.

In Syria, both Democrats and Republicans demonstrating war weariness and uninterested in the on-going involvement of US troops in the Middle East called on Obama to withdraw troops. President Obama based on the opposition declared that he will not offer assistance to Syrian rebels against autocratic leadership of President Bashar al-Assad.[94] Nelson indicates that a video aired showing the killing of two US journalists by ISIS also called Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) infuriates the president who in his September 10, 2014 speech to the State promised to annihilate the terrorist group through counterterrorism measures. The writer indicates that Obama's administration launched more than 10,000 air strikes and also called for UN support against the ISIS/ISIL.[95]

3.6.6 The Obama Grand Strategy

Hal Brands makes greater effort to explain three ideologies that constitute the Grand strategy of President Obama. First ideology Professor Brands posits is sustaining American leadership

and primacy. He posits that this ideology is not peculiar to Obama since he reveals it dates back to the 1990s. He posits that this ideology has featured in major strategy documents of the president since 2009. Brands indicate America must build strong military force to ensure global order, maintain alliances and oppose proliferation of WMD.

A second grand strategy is sustaining the American global leadership through smarter, cheaper and prudent way of enforcing the leadership particularly in times of use of force. Brands reveal that the second ideology involves encouraging partners and allies to have a massive share of actions involving military. This ideology is applied in Obama's use of drone strikes as low-cost technique for counterterrorism. It also involves leading from behind.

The third and last grand principle is refocusing American engagement to reflect growing global dynamics of the present times. Professor Brands reiterates that the third principle is framed in a geopolitical context with emphasis on the rise of China which US saw as a greatest challenge in the long term for US foreign policy towards the Asia Pacific. This vision is actualised by US becoming open to Myanmar, stationing Marines in Darwin etc. to rationally have US access and control of the region.[96]

3.6.7 Barack Obama and International Treaties

President Obama during campaign trail focused on bringing change in US foreign policies especially ensuring that US complies with multilateral treaties. He indicates that US cannot exempt itself from laws that apply to everyone. He reverses most of the treaties that the US under Bush Jr. refused to ratify.

Mark Tran writing in the Guardian revealed that Barack Obama actualized his campaign by signing nuclear treaty with Russia under Dmitry Medvedev in Praque- Czech Republic. Tran posits that the treaty requires both countries to reduce its war head by third. The US promised not to use its nuclear weapon on non-nuclear weapon countries.[97]

The Miller Centre at University of Virginia provides a chronological study of the various treaties signed by Barack Obama some of which were a reverse of those rejected by Bush Jr. Those identified are: Signing of Executive Order to close Guantanamo bay (January 2009), Lifting 22 –year old travel Ban to enable people with HIV/AIDS to travel to US, Paris Climate Change (December 2015) etc.[98]

3.6.8 Mending Relationships

President Obama theme of "Change" used in his campaign sought to reinvigorate broken relationships between US and specific group of people or countries occurred before or during Bush Jr.'s era. He wanted to create an atmosphere in which either the US or Muslim world will not see each other as anti-American and anti-Muslim respectfully.

- **Barack Obama and the Muslim World**

The relationship between the Muslim world and the US under Bush Jr. grew worst due to the 9/11 tragic event. Immediately after the attack, people all over the world including Muslims joined in solidarity behind the US. However, the diversion of US energy and military towards the Middle East who are predominantly Muslim invading the territorial integrity of countries such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan etc. which led to loss of thousands of innocent lives through war on terror coupled with a declaration from the president that he will attack both the terrorists and the countries in which they hide, which were predominantly Muslim countries, bred tension between the Muslim world and the US.

President Obama, as part of his campaign promise to correct this wrong impression undertook measure to unite Muslims and the US. Professor Anonubi commenting on Obama's relationship with Muslim world, he posits that, Obama did not want war and used diplomacy and persuasion in his interactions. He said Obama was able to work with all the enemies of

the US in a mutual relationship. The Professor says Obama was the first president to visit Fidel Castro in Cuba to restore diplomatic relations after many years.

Khalil al-Anani, Middle East Expert and Senior Fellow, Al-Ahram Foundation, posits that, in his speech at Cairo, Egypt, Obama tries to unite Muslims, Arabs, Jews, Christian and all other religious sects living in the Middle East to live in peace. He called for a new chapter in the relationship between US and the Muslim world by asking for promotion of rights of women, democratic processes among others.[99] Michael Oren posits that the heart of the president was open to the Muslim world.[100]

Obama's message of open hands to everyone, especially Muslim, world indicates cooperation engendered by multilateralism as against Bush Jr.'s message that the US will not make any difference between the terrorists and those countries which harbour them. This is a message of division championed by unilateralists and not cooperation.

3.6.9 Guantanamo Bay under Obama

Guantanamo Bay was a military based prison set up in January 2002 to detain terrorists captured in the Bush Jr.'s War on Terror. There were several controversies surrounding the creation of the centre; lawyers of President Bush Jr. argued that US laws do not have control over the area. Innocent persons like a Sudanese journalist; Samil al-Haj, were wrongfully captured and detained during his first duty with Al Jazeera.[101]

Connie Bruck, a correspondent for the New Yorker Today clarifies that Obama made it loud and clear during his campaign era that he would close the military prison upon assuming office describing the detention facility as 'dark halls' with sleep deprivations, unwarranted beatings, force-feedings and all other types of torture. Bruck discloses that Obama signed an Executive Order for the facility to be shut down but that will not work due to bipartisan

opposition.[102] Spencer Ackerman reports in the Guardian that Obama left office with more than 40 detainees still at the Bay.[103]

3.6.9 Economic and Development Cooperation under Obama

- **Foreign Aid Under Obama**

In their attempt to compare the foreign economic assistance (aid) between Barrack Obama and Bush Jr. Douglass M Geibler and Steven Miller, assert that Obama's did not constitute any dramatic change and that his foreign policy is a continuation of Bush's bigger aim to promote sustainable development and improve general wellbeing of humans around the world.[104]

One area that Geibler and Miller taut as Obama's most impressive aid connection is his contribution to PEPFAR. The authors posit that Obama continued the emergency program against AIDS by increasing the contribution to $50 billion to support PEPFAR general goals. They include that Obama worked committing more funds to fight diseases like tuberculosis and malaria.[105]

Press Statement from the MCC delivered by Renee Kelly suggests President Obama was committed to working with developing countries in alleviating poverty through the Corporation. The release indicates that the president continuously called for a yearly increase in the fund to developing countries. For example, the release demonstrated that president Obama requested for $1 billion to support the MCC operation in his 2017 fiscal budget which was higher than that of 2016 pegged at $901 million.[106]

3.7 Comparative Analysis of the Study

- **Relationship with congress**

A major defining factor that shapes the foreign policies of the two past presidents during their tenure of leadership was the level of relationship that existed between these leaders and the legislators that served in the US Congress in their times. Both leaders enjoyed some level of support as well as frustration from Congress. It was also discovered that the presidents usually enjoyed massive support when their parties dominated Congress. However, generally, the discussions concerning the level of relationship points to the fact that Bush Jnr enjoyed massive support from the Congress than his counterpart.

On the part of Bush Jnr, his massive support, as the discussion suggests, was partly due to the quest of the Congress to find solution to the devastating terror attack that rocked the US at the beginning pages of his administration. It was Congress which authorized the president to wage war on terror and exert the needed pressure on individuals, organizations and countries involved in the commission of the attack. This empowerment from Congress was exercised, to a larger extent, unilaterally which received criticisms from several multilateral bodies like the UN and other human right advocates around the world. For example, Bush Jnr's attack on Iraq and the setting up of the Guantanamo Bay Rehabilitation Detention Centre were purely unilateral. Bush Jnr's frosty relationship began around 2006, two years to the end of his tenure when Congress was dominated by the Democratic Party which opposed most of his policies. He, however, resorted to Signing Statement which challenged laws passed by Congress.

On the part of Obama, as the records shows elsewhere in the discussion, 2009 and 2010 were the years he enjoyed tremendous support from Congress throughout his administration and this represents a period where the Democratic Party had control over the Senate and House of

Representatives. To a very large extent, Obama enjoyed very limited support from Congress and this almost affected most of his flagship policies negatively. For example his bid to close the Guantanamo Bay Rehabilitation Detention Centre was almost frustrated by Congress who vehemently opposed to keeping the inmates in American prison centres. On record, Obama is believed to be the president to have signed the fewest treaties less than one term presidents: George W. H. Bush Sr. and Jimmy Carter. Obama's woes with Congress comes from the fact that Congress was divided during most part of his administration and also it became difficult to established rapport with the Congress he had worked with. He therefore undertook most of his external treaties through Executive Agreement. In all these, that heart of Obama was geared towards respect for international calls on the US to refrain from certain unilateral actions which did not auger well for world peace. A typical example is the closure of the Guantanamo which housed suspected terrorists who were not trialled and whose identities were not known. Obama's average support from Congress was geared towards fulfilling multilateral wish.

- **Personal idiosyncrasies of the two leaders**

Comparatively, the personal idiosyncrasies of the two leaders also affected their policies and approaches to international issues. The biological make up, up-bringing, exposure, beliefs, profession, conducts and many others impacted on the policy and approaches to multilateral deals. The studies find that the two leaders had opposing characteristics which impacted their actions differently.

On the part of Bush Jr., he was a military officer by profession who prefers quick action without delays. His biological make up, as indicated in the discussion, shows that his personality type does not take interest in long talks and broader consultations which is a key character of multilateral bodies. Also his animosity for Saddam Hussein on the basis that the

Iraqi leader wanted to kill his father, Bush Sr. also gingers his desire to wage war on Saddam, as a pay back, a war which the UN condemn.

On the other hand, as a professional lawyer, Obama succumbed to international laws and treaties to take the lead ahead of capricious whims of any leader. He had no conspicuous ill feeling for any leader and sought to unite the world through his leadership. The discussion indicates that his personality type favours negotiation, cooperation, compromise, mediation, etc. which are key features of multilateral bodies.

In short, to a larger extent, the personality attributes of Bush Jnr embraced unilateral instincts whereas Obama's personality attributes embraced multilateralism.

- **American leadership**

American leadership as a factor influenced the policies and approaches of the two leaders in their foreign dealings. Both leaders believed in the concept of American leadership of the world, however, their approaches toward ensuring this leadership was what raised diversion.

To Bush Jnr, American leadership comprises the use of American military might to compel compliance to bring about world order. This is a leader who witnesses direct attack from terrorists and promises to employ all powers to find those who sought to distract the US. He therefore saw the use of military as a vital asset to bring about compliance. He also did not want to accept that America must be treated on the same level as any other country. He believed that America must be treated with exception and indicates that the norm that applies to everyone cannot be applied to the US. From the horse's own mouth, Bush Jnr makes his unilateralist belief clearer when he indicates that he believes he had been given divine mandate to lead unilaterally. His statement that nobody can dictate for the US on issues of US security showed his love for unilateralism. Although Bush Jnr tried to create a good global

impression of his leadership by resorting to the use of foreign aid and negotiated for the withdrawal of US troops from Iraq, yet he is best remembered for his unilateralist impression created within the first term of office as a president.

Obama, like his counterpart, believes in American leadership. As indicated in his grand strategy, unlike the use of coercive military might, by Bush Jnr, American leadership should be based on smart power. This implies effective use of military resources, economic aid and diplomatic means to bring about international obedience. Obama also indicates, just like Bush Jr. that, he believes in American exceptionalism. However, contrary to the position of Bush Jnr, Obama underscores that America cannot be exempted from laws that apply to everyone. He makes it clear that exceptionalism is not exclusive to only America but that every country sees itself as being exceptional.

It is obvious from the analysis that Bush Jnr's concept of American leadership is geared towards a unilateralist agenda whereas Obama's American leadership is calculated towards promoting global multilateral values and norms.

- **National interest**

Every country pursues foreign policy with the aim of promoting their national interest. Both leaders do not hide their commitment to US national interest. As pointed out in the study, US national interest basically centres around three cardinal domains: national security, economic prosperity of citizens and promotion of democratic values home and abroad.

Comparatively, Bush Jr. resorts to the use of unilateral means by depending on US military and economic might to promote the national interest of the US. After the 9/11 attack, Bush Jr. is seen marshalling all US war arsenals to wage war on individuals, groups and nations suspected to be behind the attack at the opposition of UN, in the case of Iraq, as well as

unlawful detention of suspected terrorists without trial. Economically, Bush Jnr pulled out of many international treaties on the basis that they did not help US economic interest, a typical example is the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change. Bush Jnr also wanted to make democracy the dominant form of government in the Middle East through the use of military might by overthrowing Saddam Hussein's autocratic regime unilaterally. It can be inferred that in ensuring national security for its citizens at home and abroad, the US under Bush Jnr created disaffection and incurred the displeasure of many states especially the Muslim world and the international community at large by disregarding multilateral norms.

Obama on the other hand pursued the same US national interest but in a different point of view. What he considered as a major national interest included ending the WOT and subsequent withdrawal of US troops from Iraq as well as putting in place measures to counter home grown terrorists. He restores hope in US national security by capturing and killing Osama Bin Laden who was regarded a serious threat to the US. He sees the WOT as an international multilateral business and not a battle for the US alone. He improved the image of US around the word by overcoming the frosty relationship that existed between US and the Muslim world and subsequent closure of the Guantanamo Bay.

It can also be realized that although both leaders worked towards the national interest, Bush Jnr's approach was conducted through a unilateralist pattern whereas Obama's approach sought to satisfy a multilateral international wish.

- **War On Terror (WOT)**

War on terror happened to be the most prominent determinant which shapes the foreign policies of both presidents. It is clear from the discussion that both leaders had different experiences regarding terror attack on the US. Thus, whereas the US was attacked during Bush Jnr's administration, Obama on the other hand came about eight years after the attack.

The war on terror which begins during Bush Jr.'s administration is inherited by the Obama administration.

Bush Jr. begins the war on terror as a result of his attempt to find those behind the commission of the terror attack which collapsed the WTC among other things. The UN authorized the US to wage war on the Afghanistan's Taliban regime for supporting and funding the al-Qaida terrorist network who claimed responsibility for the terror attack on the US. The Bush Jr. administration overthrows the Taliban regime which saw the eventual escape of Osama bin Laden to Pakistan. After failing to capture Osama, Bush Jr. turns his WOT to Iraq on the basis that the Saddam Hussein regime is in possession of WMD and have also been funding terrorists. After flouting warnings from the UN, that the war on Iraq will be illegal and a breach of multilateral norm and rejecting the advice of his security aid, Bush Jr. attacks and overthrows the Saddam regime unilaterally, with his British allies, which later turns out to be a mistake. His capturing of suspected terrorists without trial was all against international norms.

On the part of president Obama, his contribution to the WOT was to discontinue the involvement of US troops in Iraq and the subsequent search for Osama who had gone hiding in Pakistan. Obama's major contribution to the war on terror was the killing of Osama Bin Laden and the weakening of the al-Qaida network through bombing of their hidden places. Obama during his campaign period, as the discussion shows, was opposed to Bush Jr.'s attack on Iraq and promised to withdraw US troops should he win power. Obama succeeds in withdrawing the troops from Iraq. However, he increased troops to Afghanistan to prevent pro al-Qaida Taliban forces from regaining political power.

Generally, Bush Jr.'s expansive wars on terror beyond the borders of the US to search and attack suspected terrorist groups was not only unilaterally oriented, but also, economically

expensive, created several enemies for the US and her allies, and involved loss of lives of several US soldiers which led to the call on the president from statesmen and opposition to end the war and withdraw troops from Iraq. Meanwhile, Obama's withdrawal of troops as a campaign promise, although the agreement to withdraw troops had been negotiated between Bush Jr. and the Iraqis, was fulfilled as a significant commitment to the demand form international bodies like the UN which had declared the war null and void.

- **National Security Strategy**

Although Bush Jr.'s NSS emphasized on issues like free trade , cooperation with allies among others, it is obvious from the study that pre-emptive strikes (chasing the enemy where they are), regime change, destruction of WMD, in his WOT, took the centre stage of his NSS. This therefore projects his NSS as war oriented and use of fear to scare off possible enemies and was conducted in a unilateral way.

However, Obama's NSS was seen as a diversion from that of Bush. It represents a massive change just as he campaigned before assuming office. The NSS of Obama's administration predominantly centers on cooperation, especially with the enemies of the US created as a result of Bush Jr.'s WOT. His NSS was based on diplomatic relations with the rest of the world other than war and violence which characterized that of his predecessor. Thus, whereas Bush Jr.'s NSS, to a larger extent, anchored on unilateralism and war, Obama's NSS, to a larger extent, emphasized on diplomacy and cooperation which promote multilateralism.

- **Commitment to international protocols and treaties**

A leader's commitment to multilateral agreement shows his desire for multilateralism or not.

It has been shown by the study so far that Bush Jr.'s commitment to international multilateral protocols and treaties was poor as a result of his intended unilateralist agenda from the onset

of his leadership especially after the 9/11 compared to his successor. This is seen from the fact that, he did not want to be tied by group norms that may prevent him from undertaking any action he so wished in his fight against terror.

He refuses to ratify the KPCC to point to the fact that he was not committed to issues which the international community considered paramount. Bush Jr.'s also pulled out the US from the ICC. All these showed a decline in US commitment to internationally agreed protocols under his reign.

Obama, on the other hand, with the aim to promote US leadership by example, ensures that the US followed the norms set out by multilateral international bodies like the UN. He reverses most decisions taken by his predecessor to promote friendly international world: lifting the 22- year ban to enable people with HIV/AIDS to travel to the US, signing on to the Paris Accord on Climate change, closure of the Guantanamo Bay, among others. In effect, Bush Jr.'s reaction towards international treaties and protocol was based on unilateralist agenda whereas Obama's policies promoted multilateralism.

- **Foreign aid**

Foreign aid is one area that was positively promoted by both leaders. Support for the Global Fund by the Bush administration which was continued by Obama is a sign of promoting multilateralism. Both leaders contribute significantly towards fight against diseases such as HIV/AIDS and Malaria. Significant to both leaders aid contribution is the setting up of the MCA by the Bush Jr. administration which provided about $5 billion dollars to selected nations whose governments exercised just and democratic rule as well as building the capacity of their people. This policy was in a good direction since the economic aid seeking to empower people has the potency to reduce crime and violence hence reduction in

terrorism. The Obama administration maintains the MCA and further introduces initiatives on global agriculture and food security through his Feed the Future Initiative, etc.

Continuity and change

It can be inferred from the analysis that, although the leaders are examined based on specific determinants, yet the policies employed by these had some few similarities and vast differences these may account for the differences in their approaches.

For example, Obama's withdrawal of troops from Iraq on the agreed date proposed by Bush Jr.; his commitment to PEPFAR and the MC, etc. serves as a continuity. However, agenda of change was epitomised in majority of policies and approaches which made Obama distinct from Bush Jr. For instance, the shift from Bush's Jr. grand strategy which was centred on war to his diplomacy, ratifying of several multilateral treaties opposed to Bush Jr.'s withdrawal tactics all indicate that there was some few continuity as against very vast change.

3.8 Conclusion

The foreign policies of presidents Bush Jr. and Barack Obama were determined by factors such as relationship with Congress, War on Terror, National Interest, Leadership Idiosyncrasies, American Leadership, Climate Change, and Diseases etc. Although the policies adopted by the two leaders had some continuity, yet they differed significantly. It is obvious that both leaders encountered Congress differently. While Bush Jr. got massive support, Obama experience a sour relationship with the legislators leading to his inability to officially close the Guantanamo Bay detention facility before his administration ended although he had wished to do so.

Bush Jr.'s policies seems to have planted some discord between the US and the Muslim world as well as the blatant disregard for multilateral norms by withdrawing US from international treaties. Obama reverses most of the decisions of his predecessor which could tarnish the image of the US

The foreign policies of Bush Jr. and Barack Obama are significantly different and this explains Obama's campaign agenda for change. In terms of the approach adopted for their policies, it is obvious that Bush Jr. makes it loud and clear, both in speech and action that, he favours unilateralism whereas Obama is seen to favour multilateralism. It is hard to locate any clear cut unilateralist intent of Obama through-out the study, unlike Bush Jr.

Endnote

[1] Yao Gebe, "Ghana's Foreign Policy at Independence and Implication for the 1966 Coup D' état." The Journal of Pan African Studies Vol. 2 No. 3, March 2008. Pp. 160-164
[2]Transcribed interview with Ambassador K. Baah-Duodu of Legon Centre for International Affairs and Diplomacy on Tuesday, July 3, 2018
[3] Interview with Dr Vladimir Antwi Danso of the Ghana Armed Forces Staff and Command College
[4] Meiers F-J. "The Return of the Imperial Presidency? The President, congress, and US Foreign Policy after 11 September 2001 American Studies Vol. 55, No. 2 (2010) p. 260
[5] Fortier C. John and Ornstein J. N "Congress and the Bush Presidency: An Early Assessment" American Enterprise Institute April 11, 2003. A paper delivered at Princeton University. Retrieved from https://www.princeton.edu>fortierpaper, Accessed on Tuesday July 3, 2018.

[6] Dean W. J "The Bush administration's Adversarial Relationship with Congress" US Supreme Court Centre, Friday, July 14, 2006. Retrieved from https://supreme.findlaw.com/legal-commentary/the-bush-administrations-adverserial-relationship-with-congress.html
[7] Yao Gebe p.163
[8] Swansbrough H. R. "A Kohuntan Analysis of President Bush's Personality and Style in the Persian Gulf Crisis. Political Psychology, Vol. 15 No. 2 (June 1994) p.235
[9] Immelman, A. "The Political Personality of U.S president George W. Bush. In L. O. Valenty & O.Feldman (Eds.), political leadership for the new century: Personality and behaviour among American leaders (pp. 81-103), 2002. Westport, CT: Praeger. Retrieved from Digital Commons website: http://digitalcommons.Csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs/52/ on Saturday, July 28, 2018.
[10] Ibid p.13
[11] Ibdi p.13
[12]Taylor,P. "Iraq War: The Greatest intelligence Failure in Living memory", 18 March, 2018 Retrieved from: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/Iraq/9937516/Iraq-war-the-greatest-intelligence-failure-in-living-memory.html on Saturday, July 28, 2018
[13] Pfiffner, JP, " George W. Bush, Policy, Politics and Personality :New Challenges for the American presidency," 2004- pfiffner.gmu.edu
[14] Ibid p. 163
[15] Interview with Ambassador Kwadwo Baah-Duodu at the Legon Cemtre for International Affairs and Diplomacy (LECIAD) on Tuesday July 3, 2018
[16] Interview with Professor Fredoline Anonubi of Georgia State University (USA) at the American Corner-University of Ghana on Thursday July 5, 2018
[17] Daalder H. I & Lindsay J.M "The Bush Revolution: The remaking of America's Foreign Policy, p.3
[18] 9/11 Commision Report p.289, The Brookings Institution, May 2003
[19] Sam W, "A Jihadi Scorned: Was Osama bin Laden's Real Reasons for Masterminding the September 11 Terror Attacks because He Blamed America for Breakdown of His Marriage?" Retrieved from https://www.thesun.co.uk>news. On Monday July 30, 2018
[20] Yao G. " The United Sates, International Relations and World Leadership In the Twenty-First Century" p.58
[21] Text of President Bush Jr.'s address on Tuesday Night after terrorists attack on New York and Washington Retrieved from https://www.edition.cnn.com/2001/US/11/bush.speech.text/ On Monday July 30, 2018
[22] Research Interview with Honourable S. O. Ablakwa, MP North Tongu in his office at Parliament House Job 600 Building on Wednesday July 11, 2018.
[23] Interview with Dr Vladimir Antwi-Danso, Dean of Academic Affairs at the Ghana Armed Forces Command and Staff College on Tuesday, July 3, 2018
[24] Yao Gebe p.164
[25] Vladimir Antwi-Danso interview brief
[2626] Daalder and Linsay p.7
[27] Ibid pp. 1 & 45
[28] Leffler P. M. "9/11 In Retrospect: George W. Bush's Grand strategy, Reconsidered Foreign Affairs, Vol. 9. No. 5 (September/October 2011), pp.33-36, 37-40, 41-44
[29] George W. Bush – Key Events; Miller Center-University of Virginia Retrieved from https://www.millercnter.org/president/george-w-bush/key-events
[3030] Ibid p. 35

[31] Bush Jr. : Kyoto Treaty would have hurt economy; A Speech delivered by president Bush Jr. in a Denish TV interview at Copenhagen, Denmark. Retrieved from https://www.nbcnews.com/id/8422343/ns/politics//t/bush-kyoto-treaty-would-have-hurt-economy/
[32] Daalder and Linsay p.1
[33] Summary of thematic areas of Bush Jr Administrattion's Foreign policy, contained in the National security Strategy under Bush Jr.'s Aministration September 20, 2002; Department of State. Retrieved from https://www.state.gov>organization
[34] Content analysis of Bush Jr.'s Foreign Policy Pillars in his Second Term National Security Strategy, March 2006 Retrieved from https://www.state.gov>organization On Monday July 30, 2018
[35] Leffler p. 35
[36] Analysis of March 2006 National Security Strategy of Bush Jr. pp. 1 & 8
[37] Gordon F. "Exactly what is Presidential Doctrine? APRIL 13, 2017 Opinion Columns & Blogs; Ledger-Enquirer Retrieved from www.ledger-enquire.com
[38] Beaumont, P. " Now For the Bush Doctrine" The Guardian; Sun. Sep. 2002 Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/sep/22/1raq.usa Retrieved on Thursday, August 1, 2018
[39] Interview with Dr. Vladimir Antwi Danso Dean of academic Affairs at Ghana Armed Forces Command and Staff College in Accra On Tuesday July 3, 2018
[40] Skidmore D. " Case Studies in US Grand Strategy: The War Against Terrorism and the Invasion of Iraq", in pp. 215-225 in David skidmore (ed.), Paradoxes of Power: US Foreign Policy in a Changing World, Routlegde, 2007
[41] Seongjong pg.250
[42] Clarke M and Ricketts A. "Did Obama have grand strategy?. Journal of Strategic Studies 40:1-2, pp. 295-324, 2017.
[43] Ibid p. 297
[44] Skidmore p. 219
[45] Leffler p.33
[46] Ibid p.43
[47] Rice E. S. " Tell the Truth About Our Longest War" The New York Times Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/14/opinion/afghanistan-longest-war.html Accessed on Monday, August 13, 2018
[48] "UN Involvement in Afghanistan" document retrieved from https://www.globalpolicy.org/security-council/index-of-countries-on-the-security-council-agenda/afghanistan.html Accessed on Monday August 13, 2018
[49] "The US War In Afghanistan" Council on Foreign Relations publication Retrieved from https://www.cfr.org/timeline/us-war-afghanistan accessed on Monday, August 13, 2018
[50] ibid
[51] Buncombe A. "Guantanamo Bay: Why Was It Set Up, What Are the Controversies, And Why Does Obama Want To Close It?" Tuesday February 23, 2016 Retrieved from https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/guantanamo-bay-why-was-it-set-up-what-are-the-and-why-is-obama-looking-to-close-the-a6891516.html Accessed on Mondy 13, 2018
[52] "Human right chief urges US to close Guantanamo Detention Centre" UN News, April 5, 2013, Retrieved from https://www.nes.un.org/en/story/2013/04/436302 Accessed on Monday August 13, 2018
[53]Research Interview with Honourable Samuel Okudzeto Ablakwa in Parliament House.
[54] Analysis of Content of President Bush's Speech to UN on Iraq by the New York times Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/12/politics/text-bushs-speech-to-un-on-iraq.html
[55] Skidmore D. " Case Studies in US Grand Strategy: The War Against Terrorism and the Invasion of Iraq", in pp. 215-225 in David skidmore (ed.), Paradoxes of Power: US Foreign Policy in a Changing World, Routlegde, 2007

[56] Ibid
[57] BBC NEWS; Timeline: Iraq War retrieved from https://www.bbc.com>news on Thursday August 2, 2018yug
[58] Skidmore p.22
[59] King J. " Bush calls saddam 'the guy who tried to kill my dad', Friday September 27, 2002. A CNN report retrieved from www.cnn.com>bush.war.talk
[60] MacAskill E. and Borger J. " Iraq War was Illegal and Breached UN charter, Says Annan", the Guardian, Thursday 16 September, 2004 Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/sep/16/iraq.iraq
[61] Crossette B. " Alone or together: the US and the World" Great Decisions, eat Decisions (2003) pp.5-16, Publisher: Foreign Policy Association

[62] Data Base on US Compliance with Global Treaties published by Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) March 2005 Retrieved from https://www.iatp.org>site>default

[63] Ibid
[64] ibid
[65] Global Public Opinion in the Bush Years (2001-2008) Published by Pew Research Centre Retrieved from www.pewglobal.org/2008/12/global-public-opinion-in-the-bush-years-2001-2008/
[66] Alvarez, L. "House Approves $582 Million for Back Dues Owed to UN.". September 25, 2001.New York Times Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com>2001/09/25>world
[67] Sloan R. S. "How and why did NATO Survived Bush Doctrine?" 2008, NATO Research Division
[68] Ibid p.3
[6969] Ibid p.8-9
[70] Fox News: " Bush to Press NATO Allies for More Defence Spending at NATO Summit" November 2006 Retrieved from www.foxnews.com>story>2006>11>27
[71] Lancaster C. "George Bush's Foreign Aid: Transformation or Chaos?" 2008, Centre for Global Development, Massachusetts, Washington DC. P.13
[72] Ibid p. 18
[73] Ibid p.17
[74] Gregg II, L. G. "George W. Bush: Foreign Affairs" 2018, Miller Centre University of Virginia Retrieved from https://www.millercentre.org/president/gwbush/foreign-affairs on Saturday, August 4 2018
[75] Ibid
[76] Lancaster p. 21
[77] Ibid p. 22
[78] Ibid. p22-23
[79] Lancaster, ibid
[80] Article on "War Powers Act" written by editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/topic/War-Powers-Act on Sunday August 5, 2018
[81] Dinan S. "Obama Scores the Worst Legislative Record in History: Signed Fewer Bills into Law than One-term Carter" Tuesday January 17, 2017, The Washington Times. Retrieved from https://www.google.com.gh/amp/s/amp.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/president-obama-scores-poorly-working-congress-leg/
[82] Ibid
[83] ibid
[84] ibid
[85] Immelman A. "The Political personality of US President Barack Obama" July, 2008 Paper presented at the 33rd Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, San Francisco, July 7-10, 2010. Retrieved from Digital Commons website: http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs/25/
[86] Interview With Honourable Samuel Okudjeto Ablakwa
[87] Wiśniewski B. "United State Foreign Policy Under Obama: What Could a Second Term Bring?" PIIA Policy Paper No. 12, Novenber 2012
[88] Seogjong S, " American Exceptionalism at Cross Roads" p.253
[89] Nelson M. "Barrack Obama: Foreign Affairs" Retrieved from https://www.millercenter.org/president/obama/foreign-affairs
[90] Ibid
[91] The Operation that Killed Bin Laden Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/news-information/featured-storyarchives/the-operation-that-killed-bin-ladin-htlm&-GH on Sunday August 5, 2018
[92] Nelson M. ibid
[93] Indyk S. M. et al "Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to Bend History" Foreign Affairs Vol. 19 No. 3 (May/Junes 2003), pp. 37
[94] Nelson M, ibid
[95] ibid
[96] Brands H. "Breaking Down Obama's Grand Strategy" The National Interest, June 23, 2014 Retrieved from http://nationalinterest.org/feature/breaking-down-obamas-grand-strategy
[97] Tran M. "Barrack Obama Signs Nuclear Treaty With Russia" The Guardian, April 8, 2010. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com
[98] Barack Obama key events retrieved Retrieved from https://www.miller.org/president/barack-obama/key-events Accessed on Monday august 6, 2018

[99] Khalil al-Anani "Obama's Egypt Speech: What He said to the Muslim World" Project On US Relations With the Islamic World Thurday June 4, 2009 Retrieved from http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/obamas-egypt-speech-what-he-said-to-the-muslim-world/

[100] Oren M. "How Obama opened His Heart to the 'Muslim World'" June 19, 2015 retrieved from https://www.foreignpolicy.com/2015/06/19/barack-obama-muslim-world-outreach-consequencies-israel-ambassador-michael-oren/ On Tuesday August 7, 2018

[101] Buncombe A. "Guantanamo Bay: Why Was It Set Up, What Are The Controversies, And Why Does Obama Want To close It?" Tuesday February 23, 2016 Retrieved from https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/guantanamo-bay-why-was-it-set-up-what-are-the-and-why-is-obama-looking-to-close-the-a6891516.html Accessed on Wednesday August 8, 2018

[102] Bruck C. " Why Obama Has Failed To Close Guantanamo" The New Yorker, A Reporter At Large August 1, 2016 Issue Retrieved from https://www.thenewyorker.com/magazine/2016/08/01/why-obama-has-failed-to-close-guantanamo Wednesday August 8, 2018

[103] Ackerman S. " Obama To Leave Office With More Than 40 Detainees still In Guantanamo Bay" the Guardian Wednesday January 2017 Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com.co/us-news/2017/jan/18/guantanamo-bay-detainess-obama-final-transfers Wednesday August 8, 2018

[104] Geibler M. D and Miller V. S. "Comparing the Foreign Aid Policies of Presidents Bush and Obama" Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 93, No.5, Special Issue: Social, Economic and Political Transition in America: Retrospective on the "Era of Obama" (December 2012) pp. 1202-1217

[105] Ibid p. 1206

[106] Kelly R "President Obama Requests $1 Billion for Millenium Challenge Corporation's Fight Against Poverty" Press Release February 9, 2016, Millenium challenge Corporation, Washington DC

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter marks the conclusion of the comparative study of US foreign policy approaches during the administrations of the two past presidents under consideration. It seeks to summarise the findings discovered in the discussions from interviews and argument put forward by scholars as discussed in the previous chapters.

4.2 Summary of Findings

The aim of the research is to find out about the foreign policy approaches adopted by Bush Jr. and Barack Obama in the administration of their policies abroad. The effectiveness of a policy does not only depend on its composition, rather the approach with which it is administered. This makes the concepts of unilateralism and multilateralism very relevant in foreign policy administration. Multilateralism indicates whether a country is having the support of multilateral organizations to undertake a course in the international system alone or does so with active involvement of other states. Unilateralism on the other hand involves undertaking a course of action in the international system without the approval of UN which is the head of all multilateral bodies

Both the foreign policies and approaches adopted by US leaders are very significant and continue to attract the attention and views of policy analysts within and outside the US. While some tend to present an agreeable view from some point others present a reverse version. The US represents a system where the president, constitutionally, is the preeminent actor in

responding to all issues of foreign affairs and as such their ways and actions remain vital for study.

These findings have been found as per the discussion on this basis:

Foreign Policy Determinants

Congress remains a major determinant in the policy approach of both presidents. The study shows that Congress gave more support to Bush Jr. in his policy approach than Barack Obama although both leaders had tough time with Congress. However, this support on the part of Bush Jr. mainly fulfilled unilateralist policies such as withdrawal from International treaties and attacking Iraq which was not sanctioned by the UN. Obama on the other hand, the study indicates, had a frosty relationship with Congress to the extent that when he had wanted to close the Guantanamo Bay detention centre, to demonstrate his commitment to UN calls on the US to close the centre, Congress passed several laws to prevent the move by Obama. For example, Congress opposed the idea of keeping the inmates in American prisons.

National Interest

National interest played a key role in the policies of both leaders but from different approaches. Bush Jr. believed in the promotion of American values (democracy and democratic practices) through a combination of American military might and foreign aid. He relied on the use of force to bring about compliance in instituting democracy. This created more enmity for the US, especially among the Middle East countries who saw the approach as an imposition and hostile. Obama on the other hand resorted to the use of diplomacy and aid. It was as a result of national interest that Obama called for the removal of autocratic leaders like Hussein Mubarak of Egypt and Muammar Qaddafi during the Arab spring although he had a cordial relationship with both leaders. Obama called for institutional

development to promote democracy which is a major advocate of the US. Both leaders worked towards achieving the national interest.

Leadership Idiosyncrasies

The biological make up as well as the environmental impact of these two leaders also affected their foreign policy orientation. The study clearly indicates that Bush Jr. was not much interested in long talks, which often characterise multilateral bodies, coupled with his aids such as his Vice President and Secretary of State (Condoleezza Rice) who had jaundiced view about multilateral bodies. On the other hand, Obama's traits, as the study depicts, demonstrate cooperation, negotiation, etc. As an astute lawyer, he preferred to follow rules set by multilateral bodies than openly flout the rules. He is never seen directly undertaking actions against the UN which incurred international roar compared to Bush Jr.

War on Terror

War on terror formed a major factor of the policies of both leaders. They all faced the same issues but at different period. While Bush viewed involvement of the UN as an impediment to America's approach towards the War on Terror, Obama saw it as a transnational canker which required the involvement of all. Even though Bush Jr. would not reject a multilateral support, he knew his pre-emptive preventive unilateral approach would be derailed by multilateral engagements. Obama's approach to the WOT was directly opposite to that of Bush Jr. He fought for the withdrawal of US troops from Iraq and Afghanistan and also began to develop cordial relationship with countries which were hurt by the US as a result of war decisions by Bush Jr., and strengthened relationships with enemies of the US.

American Leadership

American leadership was a key principle in the foreign policy administration of these two leaders. A thorough study of the research indicates that both leaders believed in the need to project American leadership in solving world problems, but the approaches were in different ways. To Bush Jr. America should create the path, thus, America should lead for all others to follow as well as being exempted from certain norms. Thus, multilateral organizations cannot dictate the course of the US and that the US should lead for all other bodies to follow. To Obama, America can lead from behind. America can lead still by following and respecting the norms of multilateral organizations.

Signing of Treaties

Multilateral bodies are characterised by treaty signings to ensure their commitment. Bush Jr.'s attitude to multilateral agreements was worrying that the IATP lamented openly that the president was retreating from the international setting. Obama did the reverse to the admiration of the world. He ratified most of the treaties Bush Jr. refused to ratify. Bush became the first US president to nullify the ABMT between Russia and the US.

Foreign Aid

The study found out that both leaders did exceptionally well in connection with the UN in the fight against HIV/AID. They committed a substantial amount of dollars into the eradication of diseases. It was found out that Bush Jr.'s PEPFER and MCC which Obama came to continue are among the best so far in terms of any US foreign policy on aid. They mark a positive sign for both leaders.

Generally the study also found that:

In terms of their policies both leaders engaged in different policy ideas extensively although there were some few continuity, example is Obama's continuation of the HIV/AIDS policy (PEPFAR), carrying out of the withdrawal of US troops which Bush Jr. had completed negotiations, etc. The approach used by each leader differed significantly to reflect that stance. Bush Jr.'s policies served as the foundation upon which Obama built. Among the numerous policies pursued by both leaders, their policies towards War on Terror created the attention and attracted the most energy.

The researcher found that US presidents are rated high and well received based on their level of multilateral engagement. That is, the US has come to embrace the need for multilateralism ahead of unilateralism and leaders who indicate likeness for multilateralism are seen as humanitarian.

Moreover, it is transparent that the foreign policy orientation of Bush Jr. and Barack Obama were based largely on unilateralism and multilateralism respectively.

It was found that regardless of the intensions of the presidents, the US political system, making up of several factors such as parents, congress, executive, legislature, media, etc., can speak to a particular direction which the president have nothing to do than to follow. This proves that although the US president is regarded as the most powerful on earth, he is also constrained by several factors.

The US takes interest in multilateral seriously if it involved their security and more so when the cost of war looks huge.

Lastly, most analysts who serve in the various administrations seek to argue in favour of their preferred leaders. However, most of the analysts the researcher came across skewed Bush Jr. towards unilateralism and Obama towards multilateralism.

4.3 Conclusion

A look at the research in terms of the build up from chapter one to chapter four with regards to the research questions, objectives, theoretical framework and the methodology gives ample understanding about the foreign policies and approaches adopted by these two leaders. In totality, the foreign policy approaches of these two leaders have been affected by several factors both at domestic and international levels. Both leaders came at a point where the US was facing a massive threat in its national security structure. Bush Jr.'s policies served as a foundation for Obama, although working under common determinants, the policies and the approaches adopted by these two leaders to deal with issues were largely different.

They happened to serve in a country which has a track record in both unilateral and multilateral foreign policy approaches and the rate at which the country will engage with the rest of the world is shaped by severally mentioned factors which the president is the chief architect.

The rate at which the foreign policy views of these two leaders were affected, based on the study, is obvious and the conduct and attitude of the leaders within their terms of office speak to the findings.

On the whole, the study confirms that, both leaders used multilateralism and unilateralism in their approach towards solving world problems, however, the facts is clear that in terms of the extent to which these leaders engaged and disengage the world, President Barrack Obama leaned more towards multilateral bodies in resolving world problems while President George Bush Jr. mostly preferred unilateralist approach which confirms the hypothesis of the study.

4.4 Recommendations

The researcher recommends the following for presidents, leaders, students, organizations who are involved in foreign policy interactions with the US.

1. In spite of the National Interest, the US as the world's multilateral leader, might consider showing maximum commitment to international multilateral norms. This suggestion is based on the fact that every country seeks to advance its national interest in the international system, however, total commitment to national interest at the expense of multilateral interest by countries around the world would not augur well for coexistence in the international system.
2. Bipartisanship within congress, thus, between the Republicans and the Democrats as well as between the Senate and the Representative and bipartisanship between congress and the presidency should be encouraged to promote policies and programmes of international interest.
3. Succeeding presidents should be encouraged to follow multilateral protocols and agreements duly ratified and signed by their predecessors to foster continuity in government.
4. The Executive and the Congress are also encouraged to devote considerable amount of time to examine the policies and actions to be taken by the US in its foreign relations to see the expected consequences during critical moments since hasty and ill-examined policies and actions can be detrimental both to the US and the rest of the world. This recommendation comes from the fact that President Bush Jr. in the latter part of his administration admits that his attack on Iraq after the 9/11 terrorist attack on the US admitted that his action and accusations were made out of false information.

5. In spite of her military might and influence in the international system, the US might consider continuous reliance on diplomatic tools such as negotiation, compromise, dialogue, discussions, etc., to bring about compliance from other nations other than the use of force and coercion to foster international cooperation. For example, in her quest to spread democratic values, the US needs the absolute compromise and friendly engagements with the states concerned since any attempt to use force might lead to chaos.
6. The US might also consider increasing aid to economically deprived and marginalized countries where terrorists can easily emerge. This is due to the fact that terror/violence, in part, is associated with economic hardship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

Allison, Graham T. "Essence of Decision." 1971. Boston: Little Brown, 536

Tulasi, R. Kafle: Making a Difference: Allison's Three Models of Foreign Policy analysis, (2011), university of Nicosia, Cyprus. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/592889/making_a_Difference_Allisons_Three_models_of_Foreign_Policy_Analysis Accessed on June 9, 2018

Nye, J. S. Jr., : America can't go it alone: Unilateralism vs multilateralism. 2002 New York Times. New York, International Herald Tribune.

Modelski, G. "A Theory of Foreign Policy", London: Pall Mall Press, 1962, pp.6-7.

Holsti J.K. 1995. International Politics: A Framework for Analysis. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall Inc 7th Edition

Ikenberry, J. After Victory: Institutions, Strategic restraint, And the Rebuilding of Order after Major War, 2000, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Northedge, F.S (ed.), "The Foreign Policies," London; Faber and Faber, 1968, pp. 6-7.

Hugh G., "The Road of Foreign Policy", New York: Doubleday, 1944, p. 9.

Cox, M. and Stokes, D., "US Foreign policy" (Second Edition.), Oxford University Press 2012.

Frankel J., "National Interest," London: Pall Mall Press Ltd, 1970, pp. 15 – 18

Morgenthau, H.J. and Thompson K.W. "Politics Among Nations: Framework for Understanding" 1985, New York: Alfred A Knopf Inc, P. 117

Madsen, D. Lea "American Exceptionalism." 1998. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, p. 196

Immelman, A. "The Political Personality of U.S president George W. Bush. In L. O. Valenty & O.Feldman (Eds.), political leadership for the new century: Personality and behaviour among American leaders (pp. 81-103), 2002. Westport, CT: Praeger. Retrieved from Digital Commons website: http://digitalcommons.Csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs/52/ on Saturday, July 28, 2018.

B. Journal Articles

Farer J. Tom: Beyond the Charter Frame: Unilateralism or Condominium? American Journal of International Law. Vol. 96 No.2, (2017) pp.359-364, Cambridge university Press. Brands, H.W.: Presidential Doctrines: An Introduction; Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 36 No. 1, (March 2006), pp. 1-4

Lindsay, M., J: George W. Bush, Barack Obama and the Future of US Global Leadership; International Affairs, Volume 87, Issue 4, July 1, 2001.

Seonjgong. S.: American Exceptionalism at Crossroads; The Korean Journal of

International Studies, Volume 13, No. 1, pp. 239-262 retrieved from
Skidmore, David. "The Obama Presidency and US foreign Policy: Where Is the Multilateralism? "International Studies Perspectives, Volume 13, Issue 1,(2012) pp.43-64

Yao Gebe, "Ghana's Foreign Policy at Independence and Implication for the 1966 Coup D' état." The Journal of Pan African Studies Vol. 2 No. 3, March 2008. Pp. 160-164
Meiers F-J. "The Return of the Imperial Presidency? The President, congress, and US Foreign Policy after 11 September 2001 American Studies Vol. 55, No. 2 (2010) p. 260

C. Documents

9/11 Commission Report (Sources and Detailed Information-Flight 93 National Memorial)

President Barack Obama's UN Ganeral Assembly Address in September 2009

Text of President Bush Jr.'s address on Tuesday Night after terrorists attack on New York and Washington
The UN Charter

The Constitution of the US

D. Internet Sources

Lyman J,: Obama's Multilateralism; International Policy Digest, March, 2011. Retrieved from www.intpolicydigest.org/2011/03/27/obama-s-multilateralism/
Vercruyssen, V.: American Foreign Policy: The Bush and Obama Doctrine, 2012,

Pfiffner, JP, "George W. Bush, Policy, Politics and Personality: New Challenges for the American presidency," 2004- pfiffner.gmu.edu

Interviews

Interview with Ambassador Kwabena Baah-Duodu, Diplomat-in- Residence at the Legon Center for International Affairs and Diplomacy (LECIAD).

Interview with Dr Vladimir Antwi-Danso, Dean of Academic Affairs at the Ghana Armed Forces Staff and Command College (GAFCSC).

Interview with Professor Fredoline Anonubi, (a visiting Professor from the US to Ghana), Dean of International Education- Georgia State University, USA.

Interview with Honourable Samuel Okudzeto Ablakwa, Member of Parliament for the North Tongu and Ranking Member Committee on Foreign Affairs.

APPENDIX 1

INETRVIEW GUIDE FOR INTERVIEWEES

RESEARCH INTERVIEW GUIDE QUESTIONS

Research Question 1

1. What factors underpinned the foreign policy of Bush Jr. after 9/11

Specific questions for Interviewee

a. To what extent did the 9/11 attack transform the foreign policy of Bush Jr.?
b. How did Congress contribute to the role Bush Jr. played in responding to the 9/11 attack?

Research Question 2

2. To what extent did unilateralism or multilateralism affect the foreign policy orientation of Bush Jr.?

Specific questions for Interviewee

a. How did the personality of bush contribute to his foreign policy approach
b. To what extent did he engage the rest of the world in solving international problems of his time, using his interaction with the UN, NATO, etc. as example?
c. What motivated his decision to engage or disengage the rest of the world?

Research question 3

3. What factors determined foreign policies of Obama?

Specific questions for interviewee

a. What in your opinion are the factors which underpinned Obama's foreign policies?
b. Are the factors the same as his predecessor?
c. If they are different, can you throw some light on the difference?

Research question 4

4. To what extent did unilateralism or multilateralism affect the foreign policy of Obama?

Specific question for interviewee

a. How did the personality traits of Obama determine his foreign policy?
b. Was Obama's mode of engagement with the rest of the world a continuation of his predecessor or there were existence of change?
c. Can you give an instance where the two leaders individually collaborated to execute programmes to tackle world problems with the UN during their administrations?
d. Kindly give your general comment on the extent to which the style of the two leaders in their foreign policy approaches engaged or disengaged multinational institutions.