



Article

An Appraisal of United States' Foreign Policy of Democracy Promotion

Nnamdi Azikiwe Journal of
Political Science (NAJOPS).
2014, Vol. 4(2)
ISSN: 2992-5924
©NAJOPS 2014
Reprints and permissions:
www.najops.org.ng

Raphael C. EZE
Department of Political Science,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka,
Anambra State, Nigeria.

Abstract

The article was an effort to assess the extent of United States benevolence, consistency, and objectivity in the execution of her professed policy of promoting democracy abroad. We adopted the theory of political realism, secondary sources of information gathering, as well as content analysis. Using Iraq, Libya, Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Bahrain as cases. The paper revealed that contrary to many peoples' views of the U.S. as a benevolent exporter of democracy, the U.S. has actually been using her foreign policy of democracy promotion as a stratagem for achieving her politico-economic cum geo-strategic interests. The paper also ascertained that in a bid to achieve the said national interests, the U.S. has greatly been selective and, hence, inconsistent in promoting democracy abroad. Given the prevailing power politics where might makes right, the paper recommends (a) That non-democratic cum authoritarian states, should immediately embark on a selfless home-grown transition to representative government (with its inherent human rights) so as to eliminate the 'excuse' for U.S. (and her allies) national interest-oriented political engineering in other countries, and (b) That leaders of non-democratic states (especially in the Third World) should, as a matter of urgency, endeavour to acquire high techno-economic cum military power capabilities with which to ward off selfish foreign intervention, especially by the global Leviathan (the U.S.) in their domestic affairs. These shall no doubt help to realise genuine global democratisation as well as Article 2(4) and Article 2(7) of the U.N. Charter bordering on sovereignty, equality of states, and non-interventionism.

Keywords

Foreign policy, Democracy promotion, American-ization, Political monism, Washington consensus.

Introduction

From George Washington to Barack Obama, the United States foreign policy has metamorphosed from Isolationism, through Internationalism, to the contemporary era of Globalism. Throughout these epochs. Americans think of their country as "The goddess of liberty, holding high the torch of freedom as a beacon light to all the peoples of the world" (Palmer and Perkins, 1996:640).

With the disintegration of the former Soviet Union and the eclipse of the Cold War, the United States emerged as sole super-power in the new unipolar world order. Consequently, American foreign policy focus shifted from 'Containment of Communism' to aggressive globalisation of liberal democracy. In this regard, Lynn-Jones (2008:12) aptly states thus "after the cold war ended, promoting the international spread of democracy seemed poised to replace containment as the guiding principle of the United States foreign policy. Similarly, Epstein, et al (2007:69), notes that, "Democracy Promotion has been a long-standing element of U.S. foreign policy. In recent years, however, it has become a primary component". In a bid to achieve this, the U.S. has been employing the 'carrot' and 'stick' strategy of rendering foreign aid (financial and otherwise), imposing various sanctions, anti-regime propaganda, support for pro-democracy rebels, direct regime-change military interventions, etc. around the world.

Corresponding Author:

Raphael C. EZE, PhD, Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Observers of international politics are worried over the alarming rate of direct and indirect involvement of the global Leviathan (the U.S.) in the internal political process of other lands in furtherance of her democratisation foreign policy agenda. Using United States actions and inactions in Iraq, Libya, Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Bahrain as cases in point, this paper aims at assessing the extent of United States' 'benevolence', 'consistency' and 'objectivity' in the execution of her professed foreign policy of democracy promotion as well as to proffer necessary panacea where necessary. To this end, there is employment of the theory of political realism (power politics model', secondary sources of information Catherine as well as content analysis.

Theoretical Framework

Many theories have been advocated by different scholars concerning the best approach to analyse, understand, explain and even predict the nature and dynamics of international relations. These theories may be broadly classified into the Traditional or Classical school, the Behavioural or Scientific School and the Marxist School of International Relations. Within the Traditional or Classical School, we have in the main, the theory of 'Political Realism', commonly referred to as the 'Power Politics' model. The Behavioural or Scientific School is pregnant with such theories like Decision-Making Theory, Systems Theory, Structural Functionalism; Communication Theory, etc. A major aspect of the Marxist School is the 'Dependency theory of International Relations' which is interchangeably termed 'Centre-Periphery' or 'Satellite-Metropole' theory.

Though there is no generally accepted theory of international relations among scholars, the theoretical perspective adopted for this paper is that of the Theory of Political Realism' which is synonymously referred to as 'Power Politics' model. Its major exponent is Hans J. Morgenthau Politics Among Nations. The crux of the theory of Political Realism according to Morgenthau (in Goldstein and Pevehouse. 2010:44) is that "international politics is governed by objective, universal laws based on national interests defined in terms of power'.

In a nutshell therefore, the theory of Political Realism postulates that the pursuit or struggle for national interest which it also as power is the motivational force to all international political actions. Political Realism sees 'power' as the capacity of a nation to use its tangible and intangible resources in such a way as to control the behaviour of other nations. National interest' to the Political Realists connotes whatever socio-economic cum political values a nation wants to achieve in the global arena. Political Realists (like Hans J. Morgenthau, Nicollo Machiavelli, etc) also believe that 'the end justifies the means'. Consequently, political realism posits that moral principles which apply to local or domestic political life cannot be considered in international political actions-that if an action increases national power, it is moralistic, if not, it is amoral and unethical. Thus, Ejiolor (1981:138) notes that the theory postulates that "the state have no right to let its moral disapprobation get in the way of successful political action, because the state must be inspired by the moral principle of national survival" It is therefore in line with the foregoing 'national interest-oriented' theoretical perspective of Political Realism that this paper endeavours to x-ray the actions and inactions of the U.S. in her foreign policy of democracy promotion. It is the candid belief of the researcher that with this theory of Political Realism, the fallacy of the widely held 'Idealist' view of the U.S. as 'benevolent exporter' of democracy shall be exposed as there is 'no free lunch in the predatory terrain of international politics whose trade mark according to Political Realism, is the 'struggle for national interest'.

Conceptual Clarification

Sandford and Robert (1976:30) aver that “words mean what you define them to mean”. Consequently, we hereby present the operational or contextual connotations of certain concepts used in this paper. "Foreign Policy" here refers to a set of principles and rules that guides a country in her relations with other countries. It acts as a compass in directing state actors towards taking appropriate decisions and actions for the realization of national interests in the international arena. "Democracy Promotion" on the other hand connotes the various ways by which the United States acts as catalyst in gingering the emergence and maintenance of representative government with its inherent human rights and rule of law in other countries. Some of the ways include financial assistance. Propaganda such as via VOA. CNN, sanctions against authoritarian regimes. Direct and Indirect regime-change military intervention, etc.

As regards "Americanization", we mean the rapid world-wide spread of America's socio-economic cum political values across the globe. The term is pregnant with United States promotion of her liberal democracy abroad as well as the acculturation in others about how Americans speak, dress, walk, etc. In this work, "Political Monism" refers to power concentration or monopolization by an individual or group in a state with the attendant tyranny or despotism on the part of the rulers over the ruled. The term is diametrically opposed to 'political pluralism' that bothers on power decentralization.

Finally, "Washington Consensus" in this paper, refers to the prevailing international system whereby advanced capitalist countries (like Britain, France, Japan, etc) as well as their neo-colonial or dependent countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Caribbean always align themselves with whatever decision, action and inaction taken by the sole super-power (the U.S.) in world politics. Anti-thesis to this condition is the emerging counter-solidarity alignment viewed as Sino (China) Moscow (Russia) Consensus' in the contemporary international political system.

Actions and Inactions in United States Democracy Promotion Abroad

We hereby point our searchlight to some countries to ascertain the extent of benevolent motive as well as consistency or otherwise of America's execution of her foreign policy of democracy promotion.

1. Iraq: Prior to 1990 when late Saddam Hussein invaded and annexed pro-US Kuwait, the U.S that greatly needed Iraq's oil did not bother about Iraq's non-democratic credentials. Between 1980 and 1988, the catastrophic Iraq-Iran war, for example, the U.S. supported Saddam Hussein's Iraq while the then Soviet Union backed revolutionary Ayatollah Khomeini's Iran. Worthy to note is that the same U.S. was darling of non-democratic Iran's Shah regime prior to its overthrow by revolutionary anti-US Khomeini. In this regard. Chandra (1999:255) avers:

Until the Revolution of 1978-79 under the leadership of Ayatollah Khomeini, who unleashed a new wave of nationalism in Iran over throw of Shah's regime, Iran was treated as the linchpin of American strategy in the Gulf region. She was one of the pillars of the Central Treaty Organization.

After the liberation of Kuwait (from Saddam Iraqi's annexation by U.S.-led Allied forces, the U.S., for her geo-economic and strategic interest, rushed for a regime change against 'recalcitrant' Saddam based on initial allegation of Iraq possessing weapons of mass destruction (and not over democracy. As the investigators from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) could not find an iota of truth in U.S. allegation. The U.S. later adopted 'Democracy building' (and its associated human rights) as reason for

her 2003 non-UN mandated G. W. Bush's military invasion and pro-U.S. regime change in Iraq. In this regard, Epstein, et al (2007:69) notes that "under the George W. Bush administration, efforts to spread freedom to Iraq and around the world have been viewed as a tool to end tyranny".

However, the issue of spreading freedom to Iraqi people as the major reason for the U.S. bypass of the UN and engagement in unilateral military invasion of Saddam's Iraq faces big question mark. The fact that the U.S. maintained cordial relations with undemocratic Iraq until her invasion and annexation of pro-U.S. oil-rich Kuwait shows that what matters to the U.S. is her national interests and not promotion of democracy per se. As hitherto preferred ally of America during the Iraq war with anti-U.S. revolutionary Iran under Khomeini, the U.S. ignored Iraq's use of prohibited chemical weapon against Iran. The U.S. led allied liberation of oil-rich Kuwait from Iraqi annexation and the later U.S. regime-change invasion of Saddam's Iraq should not be viewed as promotion of America's democratic values but a matter of the struggle for national interest (oil) on the part of the U.S. Thus, Chinweizu (1978:481) rightly avers that:

It ought to be plain that the fundamental conflict between the West and the rest of us is not over ideology-Democracy. Communism, Marxism, or any of the many bogeys the West brandishes to keep our eyes away from the real issues..., the conflict has been over the control and use of the resources of the non-western peoples. Consider what would happen to the prosperity of the West, and hence to their military, economic and political dominance, if the Copper of Zambia and Chile were no longer available to them, if the diamonds of Africa and South America, Zaire's Uranium... were no longer as cheaply available to the West as now, if there were no cheap Oil from the Middle East and Venezuela to fuel their planes, cars, tanks, B-52 bombers and to lubricate their rifles and big guns. The consequent diminution of their prosperity is what they will not tolerate.

In Iraq therefore, the U.S. closed her eyes and show protectionism over the then undemocratic Saddam's Iraq for years but only remembered her politics of democracy promotion after Saddam occupied Kuwait which tantamount to controlling Kuwaiti oil wells hitherto under the domination of U.S. multinational oil companies. So, what matters to the U.S. is not all about democracy but having regimes (whether tyrannical, monarchical, elected or not) in power that are ready to cooperate and protect U.S. economic and geo- strategic interests.

2. *Libya*: Here, we focus on Muammar Ghaddafi's regime and United States foreign policy of democracy promotion. After seizing power in 1969 via military coup. Col. Ghaddafi maintained no nonsense, nationalistic and anti-imperialistic and anti-Israel stance contrary to United States interests. However, Libya's enormous oil resources which are highly needed by the U.S. remained the major ligament connecting her and the U.S. Prior to 2011 Arab spring, the strained relations with the U.S. was not over democratisation but over the allegation of Libya's engagement in state sponsored terrorism including the 1988 bombing of U.S. Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie. Scotland.

However, the 2011 Arab Democracy uprising provided the U.S. (and her Western allies) the much-needed opportunity to effect a pro-U.S. regime change in Libya. Thus, *ab initio*, the U.S. (via VOA, CNN. etc support for the anti-Ghaddafi pro-Democracy demonstrators. Later the U.S and her arch Washington Consensus allies (such as Britain and France) backed the anti-Ghaddafi rebels with arms supply for Ghaddafi's removal from power. Through her permanent representative to the United Nations

(Susan Rice), the U.S. secured a U.N. resolution for 'Protection of Civilians' from the war between Ghaddafi forces and anti-Ghaddafi rebels. Thereafter, President Obama who according to Farced Zakaria (Time, April 4, 2011: 23) has 'repeatedly' been stating a regime-change goal in Libya quickly mobilized the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Forces and sided the rebels. Contrary to the UN mandate of protecting the civilians, the U.S. led NATO forces in conjunction with the anti-Ghaddafi rebels, ensured an overwhelming aerial bombardment and decapitation of Ghaddafi forces, with eventual elimination of Ghaddafi and his regime and subsequent enthronement of pro- U.S. elected regime via U.S. engineered political process.

Worthy to observe in the foregoing, is that while the U.S. (for purposes of pro-U.S. regime-change) supported (militarily and otherwise) the democracy activists against anti-U.S. nationalistic Ghaddafi, such gesture was in no way extended to the other Arab Spring pro-democracy activist being violently cracked down by pro-U.S. undemocratic, authoritarian, Saudi Arabia and Bahrain monarchies. This is tantamount to self-oriented selectivity and policy inconsistency in U.S. foreign policy of democracy promotion.

3. *Egypt*: This also provides a good test ground for America's professed foreign policy of democracy promotion. There is abandonment of United States' foreign policy of democracy promotion as far as the regime in power protects American interests such as "countering terrorism, and increasing security in the Sinai Peninsula, the Suez Canal and the Gaza strip" ([http://www.phantomreport.com/us-hegemony-America-secretly-approves \\$1.3-billion-worth-of-military-and-to-Egypt](http://www.phantomreport.com/us-hegemony-America-secretly-approves-$1.3-billion-worth-of-military-and-to-Egypt)). Thus, for her national interest, the U.S. supported decades of undemocratic and military-oriented regimes of Anwar Sadat and Hosni Mubarak as well as the military backed government that emerged after the July 3, 2013 military overthrow of the first democratically elected President Mohammed Morsi and bloody crackdown and imprisonment of his Moslem Brotherhood supporters.

After the 1973 Arab-Israeli war. Egyptian foreign policy began to shift due to the changes in Egypt's leadership from the pro-Soviet Union fiery Gamal Abdel Nasser to the much more moderate (and pro-U.S.) Anwar Sadat who signed Peace Treaty (Camp David Accord) with Israel (a staunch U.S. ally). Egypt's non-possession of Democracy credentials notwithstanding, it is on record that between 1979 and 2003, the U.S. has provided Egypt with about \$19 billion in military aid, making Egypt the second largest non-NATO recipient of U.S. military aid after Israel. Besides, Egypt received about \$30 billion in economic aid within the same time frame. In 2009, the U.S. provided a military assistance of U.S. \$1.3 billion and an economic assistance of US \$250 million (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egypt-UnitedStates-Relations>).

The United States openly deviated from her professed democracy promotion by her continuation of military and economic aid to Egypt's undemocratic military-backed government after General Abdel El-Sisi's military overthrow of Egypt's first democratically elected President Mohammed Morsi in July 3, 2013. In accordance with political realism's emphasis on national interest, the U.S. did not push for reinstatement of president Morsi who she (the US) feared would not pursue pro-US policies, since he (Morsi) is a member of the radical Moslem Brotherhood Sect (which metamorphosed into Justice and Peace Party) as well as an ally of Iran and Hamas (arch U.S. enemies). In this regard, Trumpet (June 10, 2013) recorded that President Barack Obama in a September 2012 interview with American Spanish-language TV network Telemundo stated that under Mohammed Morsi Egypt is no longer a U.S. ally.

Associated Press (August 17, 2013) on the other hand notes that the US position has stirred up anti-American sentiment in Egypt, with Morsi supporters accusing the U.S. of failing to live up to its own democratic values by allowing an elected leader to be pushed aside.

In response to the military overthrow of president Morsi and subsequent massacre of pro-Morsi demonstrators by the Egyptian security forces. *The Nation* (August 16, 2013:58) notes that President Obama only "cancelled her planned US-Egypt military exercise". Unfortunately, despite the fact that the only legal way to remove an elected president is via impeachment or the ballot box (election), "the White House refused to declare Mohammed Morsi's removal from power 'a coup', a step that would require Obama to suspend \$ 1.3 billion in annual military aid to Egypt" (<http://www.wggb.com/2Q13/08/17/egypt-challenges-obama-s-arab-spring-philosophy>).

Worthy to note is that U.S. military assistance to Egypt was considered part of America's strategy to maintaining continued availability of Persian Gulf energy resources and to secure the Suez Canal, which serves both as an important international oil route and as critical route for U.S. warships transiting between the Mediterranean and either the Indian Ocean or the Persian Gulf (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egypt-United_States_relations). In Egypt therefore, over the years, the United States, in line with the theory of Political Realism, has been 'sacrificing' her foreign policy of democracy promotion on "the altar" of undemocratic regimes protection of her politico-economic cum geo-strategic interests.

4. *Syria*: Hitherto, Syria was an integral part of the Ottoman Empire until 1920 when it came under the World War I mandate of France. Though proclaimed independence in 1941, France (the Colonist) left it in 1946. Chandra (1999:254) notes inter-alia that:

It was in Syria where Arab nationalism first became a political reality.... The creation of Israel in 1948 was unacceptable to Syrians who regarded Syria, including Palestine, Transjordan and Lebanon as a single Arab political entity.

Syria was a major participant in the 1948/49, 1967 and 1973 Arab-Israeli wars. She had a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with the defunct Soviet Union. With the expulsion of Egypt from the Arab League in 1979 consequent upon President Anwar Sadat's Camp David Accord with Israel. Syria became the 'beating heart of Arabism' and hence, a rallying ground for anti-Israel (and her U.S. led Western supporters). Till date, the United States regard Syria as one of what she (the U.S.) calls 'Axis of Evil'.

In the 2011 Arab Spring, while President Obama was merely using 'oral condemnation' against her excessive violent crackdown of pro-democracy peaceful demonstrators in Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and Egypt, the same mere oral condemnation was not extended to Syria. This is a clear case of U.S. application of double standard policy in her democracy promotion abroad. President Obama, in line with U.S. age-long quest for regime-change in Syria, quickly accused President Assad of using excessive force against pro-democracy demonstrators, placed sanctions on Assad's Syria and mobilized her (US) allies for material and weapon supply to the anti-Assad Rebel-turned pro-democracy activists. While pro-US Egypt's Mubarak was given soft landing by the Pentagon backed Egyptian military political engineering, Syria's anti-U.S. West Assad has been engaged in a protracted civil war with U.S. (and her allies > backed rebels (The Free Syria Army).

In highlighting this U.S. subjectivity and double standard, the Associated Press (<http://www.wggb.com/2013/08/17/Egypt-challenges-Obama's-Arab-Spring-philosophy>) notes inter-alia that;

For 30 years, the U.S. propped up Egyptian autocrat Hosni Mubarak in part to ensure that he maintained Egypt's peace treaty with Israel while in Syria, the U.S. has levied economic sanctions and approved light weaponry for rebels fighting President Bashar Assad's government.

As of the time of writing this article, President Obama (with her Washington Consensus members) has been mobilizing for direct military intervention against Assad's regime under the allegation that Assad forces was responsible for use of chemical weapon that killed many civilians in a rebel held area outside Damascus. However, President Putin of Russia (as well as his Chinese and Iranian counterparts) is vehemently opposed to any U.S. military action in Syria. He (Putin) maintains that any unilateral military action against Syria contravenes international law as the U.N. Charter only allows for use of force on the ground of either 'self-defence' or 'unanimous resolution or mandate by the UN Security Council'. Besides, the actual culprit responsible for the use of the chemical weapon must be ascertained beyond any reasonable doubt by independent investigators prior to use of any force. President Putin also contended that the U.S. backed rebels (rather than Assad's forces) must have used the chemical weapon in order to provoke U.S. and her allies' military intervention to tilt the balance of power in the battle front in their favour against Assad's forces. Even though President Assad has accepted Russia's proposal of handing over Syria's chemical weapons for destruction under international supervision, the U.S. who could not get UN Security Council mandate for use of force, has already assembled her warships in Eastern Mediterranean Sea and is still threatening Syria with unilateral use of force as 'Might makes right' (and 'justice is the advantage of the stronger') in international politics.

In fact, the delay in U.S. regime-change military intervention in Syria has been attributed to lack of credible U.S. ally (to take over government) among the disunited rebel factions (including Al Qaeda) on the battle field. Thus, Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff (Tell, September 2, 2013:56) informed the U.S. Congress that "while the Pentagon could forcefully intervene in Syria, there were no moderate rebel groups ready to fill a power vacuum".

The above speaks volume about U.S. intention in Syria which is not to enthrone democracy (with its inherent human rights) per se, but 'planting pro-U.S. puppet regime' for the attainment of America's geo-strategic and economic interests.

5. *Saudi Arabia*: The oil-rich Kingdom of Saudi Arabia represents a classical example of United States deviation from her professed foreign policy of democracy promotion. Since its founding, the Kingdom has been under a conservative monarch} whereby the descendants of its founder (King Abdul Aziz Ibn-Saud) such as its present King Abdullah runs the monarchy as a family affair. Though it supported the Arab forces in 1967 and 1973 wars against Israel, it has, to a great extent been pro-U.S. and as Chandra (1999:258) notes;

Saudi Arabia has come to play a central role in American calculations and in regional politics, especially after the downfall of Shah of Iran. Saudi Arabia is also linked to the U.S. through Arabian-American Oil Company.

The 2011 wind of democracy uprising in the Middle East also blew across Saudi Arabia but King Abdullah utilized his security forces to ensure brutal crackdown and imprisonment of the pro-democracy peaceful demonstrators. Since the existing status quo (King Abdullah's monarchical regime) has been serving U.S. interests in the Middle East and globally, the White House kept mute unlike her reactions against Assad and Ghaddafi crackdown on pro-democracy activists in Syria and Libya respectively. Hamzawy (2007:19) thus avers that;

Saudi Arabia remains a clear case of authoritarian stability and therefore represents a serious challenge to the declared objective of the United States to promote democratic transition and human rights in the Middle East.

However, because of the cooperation the U.S. is enjoying from King Abdullah's ruling royal family especially in the war on terror, ensuring steady availability of oil at reasonable price, harbouring U.S. military base and curtailing the regional influence of Anti-America Islamic republic of Iran, etc, the U.S. back-pedalled in democracy promotion in Saudi Arabia.

Worthy to note too is the covert cooperation between King Abdullah and President Obama in welcoming military overthrow of Egypt's elected non-moderate (radical) President Morsi which gave room for enthroning U.S./Saudi foreign aid backed military-oriented government that is a reincarnation of the pro-U.S. Mubarak era. In this regard, Diana states that:

The Saudis were shocked when Obama abandoned Mubarak, a close Saudi ally, in 2011. They saw a dangerous precedent for their own future. Since then, the Kingdom has been the leader of the counter revolution in the Arab world, backing up regimes in Bahrain, Yemen and Jordan. The Saudis were early supporters of the coup in Cairo and have rallied their Gulf allies. Kuwait and the UAE, to promise \$12 billion in aid to the-military government that has ousted the Muslim Brotherhood (<http://www.dianaswednesday.com/2013/08/egypt-in-2011-2013>).

Unlike Assad's Syria and Ghaddafi's Libya, the foregoing reveals how King Abdullah's Saudi Arabia is enjoying United States 'Sacred Cow' status in exchange for serving U.S. interest which tantamount to 'selectivity' and inconsistency in America's foreign policy of democracy promotion.

6. Bahrain: This is one of the Gulf Kingdoms in the Middle East that possesses oil and large natural gas reserves. Though majority of the population is the 'Shiite' Muslim, the country has been under the dictatorship of the minority 'Sunni' ruling Al-Khalifa family in power since 1783.

In 2011, following the Arab Spring, the monarchical regime witnessed massive demonstration by citizens demanding representative government and human rights. The monarchical regime, with the support of Saudi Arabia Air Force, used excessive force and ensured bloody crackdown of the pro-democracy demonstrators. Till date, the crackdown, torture and imprisonment of pro-democracy activists continue (like in Saudi Arabia) while the United States kept quiet (and forgot her democracy promotion) due to her economic and geo-strategic interest which Bahrain monarchy (like that of Saudi Arabia) serves.

Pierre (2013) avers that U.S. military and strategic interests in Bahrain overshadow Human Rights and oppression. Bahrain's strategic value to the United States is the result of geography. It is a naval compliment to the Qatar peninsular, up to the midsection of the Persian Gulf, across from Iran, providing

quick access to the gulf sea lanes and protecting the disgoring oil pipelines of Iraq. Kuwait. Saudi Arabia, and further south, the United Arab Emirates and Oman. Thus. Pierre (<http://middleeast.about.com/od/bahrain/a/American-interests-in-Bahrain>) notes that:

The 20-some ships of the U.S. Navy's 5th Fleet—a fleet representing tens of billions of dollars are based there, with responsibility for 7.5 million square miles of seas from the Arabian Gulf to the Red Sea to the Gulf of Oman. Some 2,300 American personnel are stationed on the Fifth Fleet headquarters' 100-acre base, and thousands of the fleet's 15,000 sailors land in Bahrain on and off throughout the year.

Remarkably, unlike some Arab nations, Bahrain allowed the Pentagon to fly combat missions from its territory during the 1991 U.S.-led liberation of Kuwait from Iraqi annexation and United States invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on the U.S. So, in line with the theory of Political Realism, the U.S. sees non-democratic monarchical Bahrain as ally and has been satisfying her geo-strategic national interests at the expense or opportunity cost of her professed foreign policy of democracy promotion. This is in tandem with the theory of political realism, for as Ejiófor (1981:137-138) avers:

The state has no right to let its moral disapprobation gets in the way of successful political action, because the state must be inspired by the moral principle of national survival.... All nations try to clothe their own aspirations and actions in the moral purpose of the universe. We must look upon all nations as basically pursuing their own interests.

So, like in Saudi Arabia, the U.S. has in Bahrain been sacrificing her foreign policy of democracy promotion at the altar of her national interest satisfaction.

Summary of Findings and Conclusion

In the foregoing, we made an appraisal of United States' implementation of her foreign policy of democracy promotion. Having x-rayed America's actions and inactions in Iraq, Libya, Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Bahrain as cases in study, we ascertained that the global Leviathan (the U.S.), has, in line with the theory of Political Realism, been national interest-oriented, selective. and hence inconsistent in her democracy promotion abroad. She (the U.S.) is therefore, 'not engaged in any benevolent democratisation' exercise abroad, as there is 'no free lunch' in the predatory terrain of international politics.

In non-democratic but pro-U.S. countries (such as Saudi Arabia. Bahrain, and Egypt under Anwar Saddat, Hosni Mubarak and post-Mohammed Morsi military backed autocratic regime), the United States abandoned her professed foreign policy of democracy promotion in exchange for those countries' continued 'cooperation' and protection of America's politico-economic cum geo-strategic interests. On the other hand, we also established, that in non-democratic and nationalistic anti-America states (such as Saddam's Iraq, Ghaddafi's Libya, and Assad's Syria), the U.S. vigorously pushed for enthronement of pro-U.S. regimes under the smokescreen stratagem of democracy promotion. Ascertained too was United States conspicuous deviation from her professed foreign policy of. democracy promotion as it concerns military overthrow of democratically elected Egypt's President Mohammed Morsi. In this case, President Obama, believing that Morsi would not serve U.S. interests (as Morsi is a member of the radical Moslem Brotherhood Sect and ally of anti-U.S. Iran and Hamas), refused to call Morsi's overthrow 'a coup' contrary to United States claim of champion of democracy promotion. Besides, the White House

continued to provide the \$1.3 billion U.S. yearly aid to the imposed Military-backed government, which like the Mubarak era, will guarantee U.S. politico-economic and geo-strategic interests in the Middle East region. All these tantamount to sacrificing democracy promotion at the altar of U.S. national interests.

In conclusion therefore, given the observed selective, inconsistent and self-oriented America's promotion of (neo-colonial) democracy abroad (especially in the Third World), this paper recommends as follows: (a) That present leaders of non-democratic states (especially in the Third World) should, as a matter of urgency embark on home-grown democratisation so as to eliminate the major 'excuse' given by foreign predators (like the U.S. and her allies) masquerading as benevolent exporter of democracy; and (b) Third World countries (that are always targeted by the powerful U.S.) must strive to acquire high techno-economic and military power capabilities and form progressive alliances, so as not to remain as 'pawns' in the 'chessboard' of the predatory terrain of international politics where. 'Might Makes Right'. It is the candid belief of the researcher that these panaceas, if effected, shall go a long way towards ensuring genuine global democratisation as well as egalitarian enjoyment of Article 2(4) and Article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter bothering on the principles of Sovereignty, equality of States and non-interventionism.

References

- Associated Press, August 17, "Egypt Challenges Obama's Arab Spring Philosophy", (<http://www.wggb.com/2013/08/17/egypt-challenges-obama-arab-spring-philosophy>). retrieved on 21/08/2013 at 4:40pm.
- Chandra, P. (1999), *International Relations*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House PVT, Ltd.
- Chinweizu (1978), *The West and the Rest of Us*, Lagos: NOK Publishers.
- Ejiofor, L. U. (1981), *Africa in World Politics*, Onitsha: Africana Educational Publishers Ltd.
- Epstein, S. B., Nina, M. S. and Miko, F. T. (2007), *Democracy Promotion: Cornerstone of U.S. Foreign Policy*, Washington D.C.: Penn, Schoen and Berland Associates.
- Fareed Zakaria, "What if He Doesn't Go? The War against Ghadaffi", *Time*, April 4, 2011:23.
- Goldstein, J. S. and Pevehouse, J. C. (2010), *International Relations*, Ninth Edition, New York: Longman.
- Hamzawy, A., 'Promoting Democracy and Human Rights in the Middle East: The Case of Saudi Arabia', being testimony before the U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Sub-Committee on International Organizations, human rights and oversights on June 14, 2007.
- Jeremy Kinsman, "How the West failed Egypt's Democracy", (<http://www.dianaswednesday.com/2013/Q8/egypt-in-2Q-12-2013/Wednesday-right>).
- Lynn-Jones, S. M. (2008), *Debating the Democratic Peace*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Martin Dempsey, Chairman of U. S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Address to U.S. Congress, in *Tell*, "Massacre Stirs World Conscience", September 2, 2013.
- The Nation, "Obama Denounces Egypt Massacre". August 16, 2013.
- Palmer, A. N. and Perkins, C. (1996), *International Relations*, Third Edition, New Delhi: CBS Publishers.
- Pierre, T., (2013), "American Interests in Bahrain", (<http://middleeast.about.c6.m/od/Bahrain/a/American-interests-in-Bahrain>); retrieved on 21/08/2013 by 4.48pm.
- Samford, L. and Robert, H. (1976), *Introduction to Social Research*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Trumpet, "U.S. Hegemony: America Secretly Approves \$1.3 Billion Worth of Military Aid to Egypt" (<http://www.phantomreport.com/u-s-hegemony-america-secretly-approves-1.3-billion-worth-of-military-aid-to-egypt>); retrieved on 21/08/2013 by 4:33pm.
- Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, "Egypt-United States Relations", (Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.), retrieved on 21/08/2013 at 7:31pm.

Author's Biography

Raphael C. EZE, Ph.D. is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, NIGERIA. His area of specialization is International Relations.