



Crisis of Liberal Hegemony and the US

Aqeel Abbas KAZMÎ¹

Zeeshan FİDA²

ABSTRACT

In the contemporary complex world, strain on the world order led by liberal hegemonic state of the United States seems obvious. In the Post-Cold war era, being swayed by the demise of the Soviet empire and the American exceptionalism, the United States pursued ideals of progressive liberalism which favored promotion of democracy, free market capitalism, international institutions and protection of human rights around the globe. Progressive liberal values were upheld and propagated by the United States in the unipolar world. The US policy makers desired that their domestic political and economic ideals should be emulated by the entire world. Because progressive liberals believed that compatibility between the US domestic political and economic structures and international system will lead towards sustainable peace in the world. Thus, in the absence of peer competitors, the US pursued the policy of global domination being favored by progressive liberals. However, the US policy of global domination backfired when the US used force unilaterally during its campaign on War on Terror and had little appreciation of the use of force in Afghanistan and Iraq. Moreover, the unilateral policy initiatives of the US President Donald Trump such as withdrawal from the Paris Climate agreement, Iran Nuclear deal and the Trump Peace plan for the Middle East have also undermined liberal world order based on the global norm of multilateralism. On the other hand, the rise of China as a great power and the Russian resurrection pose severe challenges to the US dominance in world affairs.

Keywords: Liberalism, United States, Hegemony, Global Politics, World Order

Liberal Hegemony Krizi ve A.B.D.

ÖZ

Çağdaş karmaşık dünyada, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nin liberal hegemonik devletinin önderlik ettiği dünya düzeni üzerindeki baskı bariz görünüyor. Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde, Sovyet imparatorluğunun çöküşü ve Amerikan istisnacılığının etkisinde kalan Amerika Birleşik Devletleri, dünya çapında demokrasi, serbest piyasa kapitalizmi, uluslararası kurumlar ve insan haklarının korunmasını destekleyen ilerici liberalizm ideallerini takip etti. İlerici liberal değerler, tek kutuplu dünyada Birleşik Devletler tarafından desteklendi ve yayıldı. ABD'li politika yapımcılar, kendi iç siyasi ve ekonomik ideallerinin tüm dünya tarafından örnek alınmasını istediler. Çünkü ilerici liberaller, ABD'nin iç siyasi ve ekonomik yapıları ile uluslararası sistem arasındaki uyumluluğun dünyada sürdürülebilir barışa yol açacağına inanıyorlardı. Böylece, emsal rakiplerinin yokluğunda ABD, ilerici liberaller tarafından tercih edilen küresel egemenlik politikasını izledi. Bununla birlikte, ABD Teröre Karşı Savaş kampanyası sırasında tek taraflı olarak güç kullandığında ve Afganistan ve Irak'ta güç kullanımını çok az takdir ettiğinde, ABD'nin küresel egemenlik politikası geri tepti. Ayrıca ABD Başkanı Donald Trump'ın Paris İklim Anlaşması'ndan çekilmesi, İran Nükleer Anlaşması ve Trump'ın Ortadoğu için Barış Planı gibi tek taraflı politika girişimleri de küresel çok taraflılık normuna dayalı liberal dünya düzenini baltaladı. Öte yandan, Çin'in büyük bir güç olarak yükselişi ve Rusya'nın yeniden dirilişi, ABD'nin dünya meselelerindeki egemenliğine ciddi meydan okumalar getiriyor.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Liberalizm, A.B.D, Hegemonya, Küresel Politika

¹ Aqeel Abbas Kazmi ,Lecturer Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University ,School of Foreign Languages, ORCID 0000-0002-5044-4182 (Sorumlu Yazar)

² Zeeshan Fida , Lecturer Fatima Jinnah University Rawalpindi , Pakistan , Department of International Relations, ORCID 0000-0001-2345-6789

Modus Vivendi Liberalism

The first part of the paper deals with the ideas of classical liberalism. Classical liberalism as an ideology is individualistic at its core. It gives priority to individual rights over collective rights. Classical liberal thinkers such as John Locke, Adam Smith and Fredrick Hayek were champions of individual rights.

Modus vivendi liberals reject the classical realist views about human nature. Thomas Hobbes in the Leviathan argued that humans are fallible creatures and by nature unruly, aggressive, and violent. In the Hobbesian state of nature, there is an absence of higher authority, rules and regulations; egoistic and narcissist individuals are competing over limited resources and everyone is free to do anything to protect one's life. Such a state of affairs results in a war of all against all in which life of a man is short, nasty, and brutish (Hobbes, 1996). John Locke rejected these postulates and argued that man by nature is 'Casa Blanca'. He is neither good nor bad. It is his social institutions which nurture his personality. Furthermore, he opined that man is a rational actor and reasonable creature (Locke, 1988).

Lockean conception of state of nature is quite different from the Hobbesian one. According to John Locke, state of nature is that condition that exists prior to the creation of government or political society. However, in the Lockean state of nature, there is abundance of resources. Human beings are engaged in commerce and trade and there is no fierce rivalry among people. But in the state of nature, there are certain inconveniences because of which humans need to create an impartial authority, a state. The question is what are those inconveniences? Locke answered that in a state of nature, one is one's own judge and executive. And in a state of nature, everyone is free and equal and possesses inalienable rights. These inalienable rights are life, liberty and property. All these natural rights are there even in a state of nature. These fundamental rights cannot be transferred. Thus, in a state of nature, everyone is one's own judge and holds executive power as well. But problems arise in a state of nature, when individuals cannot reach universal agreement over the first principles (which means what constitutes a good life?) and when judicial and executive power is abused which can lead towards a cycle of revenge and retaliation. For example, in the 'Thirty Year War' (1618-1648), Catholics and Protestant fought against each other over the first principle. Both held that their views represent truth and reality. This led to chaos and caused bloodshed in the Western Europe in the Seventeenth century. Hence, to create rapprochement over the first principle and to overcome inconveniences of state of nature, Locke and other enlightenment philosophers suggested solutions for these problems.

Liberal Solution to the Problems of State of Nature

Political liberalism has two variants: modus vivendi liberalism and progressive liberalism. They share a common view of human nature and stress the importance of inalienable rights (rights that cannot be taken away or voluntarily given up), tolerance, and the need for a state to maintain public order (Mearsheimer, 2018, p.45) (Learn Liberty, 2011).

First, they talk about norms of tolerance (Mearsheimer, 2018). They all agree that agreement over the first principle is not possible, thus, humans need to tolerate each other's views over the first principle. It is almost impossible to resolve differences between Catholic and Protestants. As in the contemporary world, it is difficult to end differences between Shia and Sunni Muslims. Thus,

individuals need to tolerate each other's views even if they do not agree with the views of others. French liberal intellectual Voltaire stated “I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it”. Hence, classical liberal thinkers propagated for individual rights, norms of tolerance and freedom of expression.

Second, John Locke favored a social contract for the creation of a political agency, a state. He argued that human beings need to create an impartial authority by their mutual consent. People could choose a few among themselves as their representatives and these representatives as trustees of people then in return protect fundamental rights of people (World Library Foundation, 2020). Liberal scholars favored a limited form of government, a minimalistic state (Locke, 1988) (Learn Liberty, 2011).

The Nature of Liberal Social Contract

John Locke is a quintessential Modus Vivendi liberal, as are Adam Smith and Friedrich Hayek. Modus Vivendi liberals argued that the state should not be involved in social engineering rather state should provide just a friendly environment to people to engage in trade and commerce. (Mearsheimer, 2018, p. 45). And if any problem arises then the state should intervene and solve that problem (Mearsheimer, 2018, p. 55-56).

Adam Smith was the champion of free market mechanism and in favor of the limited role of the state in the market affairs. He argued that market mechanisms (invisible hands of market) allocate scarce resources in a more effective and efficient manner. He argued that in the long run, market forces lead towards progress and peace (Smith, 1776).

Liberal thinkers favored separation of power among state institutions. French thinker Montesquieu favored separation of power between legislature, executive and judiciary (Montesquieu, 1989). However, earlier Locke also favored separation of power among state institutions (World Library Foundation, 2020). Classical liberals talk about rule of law (Learn Liberty, 2011). No one can be superior before law. And law should express the General Will of the people (Rousseau). Law should promote maximum happiness for the maximum number of people (Mill, 1863). The government policies and laws should increase individual liberties and promote peace and prosperity (Learn Liberty, 2011).

Immanuel Kant argued that if states are republican in nature and are constitutional in character then such free liberal republican states can promote peace and prosperity. He believed that people should elect their representatives who in turn protect fundamental rights of people and promote peace and prosperity (Kant, 1970). Moreover, liberal republican states should engage in friendly relations among each other and exchange goods and services among themselves. This would increase prosperity among liberal states (Mingst, Arreguin-Toft, 2018, p.84). Thus, Kant in his essay, ‘Perpetual Peace’ favored a loose coalition of liberal republican states who favor friendly relations among each other and exchange goods and services. Hence, in today's parlance, he favored democracy, trade, and international organisations. Furthermore, he argued that free trade, international organisations and democracy promote peace and prosperity in the world.

Locke and Rousseau argued for popular sovereignty and that if a state does not protect interests of people then people can resist against the existing state. These ideas shaped the entire history of Western Europe. Thus, ordinary people revolted against their monarchs and demanded their fundamental rights. Two revolutions ushered in the eighteenth century— the American Revolution (1773–1785) against British rule and the French Revolution (1789) against absolutist rule. Both revolutions were the product of Enlightenment thinking as well as social-contract theory.

Enlightenment thinkers saw individuals as rational, capable of understanding the laws governing them and capable of working to improve their condition in society (Mingst, Arreguin-Toft, 2018, p.26).

What is Liberal Hegemony?

The second part of the paper discusses the idea of liberal hegemony. The genesis of liberal hegemony arises from individualism and alienable rights when these individual natural rights become universal rights (Mearsheimer, 2018). When liberals argue that fundamental individual rights are not confined to a particular state rather these individual rights should be promoted and protected in the entire world then liberalism becomes a very imperialist ideology. When states are not only concerned with their own national interests rather become champions of individual rights in the world then liberalism becomes liberal hegemony, when states try to impose their values and ideals on other states.

By the beginning of the last decade of the twentieth century, Wilsonianism seemed triumphant. President Bush proclaimed his hope for a new world order in classically Wilsonian terms: “We have a vision of a new partnership of nations that transcends the Cold War. A partnership based on consultation, cooperation, and collective action, especially through international and regional organizations. A partnership united by principles and the rule of law and supported by an equitable sharing of both cost and commitment. A partnership whose goals are to increase democracy, increase prosperity, increase peace, and reduce arms (Bush, 1990, p.152).

Bush’s Democratic successor, President Bill Clinton, expressed America’s goals in very similar terms, expounding on the theme of “enlarging democracy”: In a new era of peril and opportunity, our overriding purpose must be to expand and strengthen the world’s community of market-based democracies. During the Cold War, we sought to contain a threat to survival of free institutions. Now we seek to enlarge the circle of nations that live under those free institutions, for our dream is of a day when the opinions and energies of every person in the world will be given full expression in a world of thriving democracies that cooperate with each other and live in peace (Clinton, 1993, p.650).

Since the outbreak of riots in Hong Kong, the US is defending and speaking in favor of individual rights of the people of Hong Kong. Even the US House of Representative passed H.Res.543-116th Congress (2019-2020): “Recognizing Hong Kong's bilateral relationship with the United States, condemning the People's Republic of China for violating their obligations to the people of Hong Kong, and supporting the people of Hong Kong's right to freedom of assembly and peaceful protest.”

Moreover, the United States has powerful incentives to make Taiwan an important player in its anti-China balancing coalition. First, as noted, Taiwan has significant economic and military resources and it is effectively a giant aircraft carrier that can be used to help control the waters close to China’s all-important eastern coast. The United States will surely want Taiwan’s assets on its side of the strategic balance, not on China’s side. Second, America’s commitment to Taiwan is inextricably bound up with U.S. credibility in the region, which matters greatly to policy makers in Washington (Mearsheimer, 2014, p. 35-36).

Furthermore, the US casus belli for intervention in Iraq is emancipation of Iraqi nation from the authoritarian regime of Saddam Hussein, promotion of democracy and universal fundamental rights in Iraq (Mearsheimer, 2011). Similarly, during the Obama administration, the US alongside NATO led coalitions intervened in Libya in March 2011 under the UNSC Resolution of 1973. It was proclaimed that the US is going to protect the Libyans from the ethnic cleansing and genocide of Muammar Gaddafi (Daladier, 2012). In addition, during the Trump administration, the US airstrikes in Syria in April 2017 also highlighted these same arguments that the US is going to protect the Syrian

from the brutal regime of Bashar al Assad. And it was alleged that Syrian government is using chemical weapons against its own people. Thus, to protect the innocent people, the US conducted a military operation in Syria.

In the Eastern Europe, the United States sponsored and instigated a revolt against the Ukrainian government of Viktor Yanukovich in 2013-2014. When the Ukrainian government said no to the European Union and the NATO deal, widespread protests started in November 2013. In response to demonstrations, Russian forces intervened in Ukraine and annexed Crimea in between February and March 2014 and started separatist movement in the Eastern Ukraine (Mearsheimer, 2014). The West's final tool for peeling Kiev away from Moscow has been its efforts to spread Western values and promote democracy in Ukraine and other Post-Soviet states, a plan that often entails funding pro-Western individuals and organizations. Victoria Nuland, the U.S. assistant secretary of state for European and Eurasian affairs, estimated in December 2013 that the United States had invested more than \$5 billion since 1991 to help Ukraine achieve "the future it deserves" (Mearsheimer, 2014, p. 3-4). Thus, these are a few illustrations of how the US became champion of progressive liberal ideals of individual universal rights, promotion of democracy and free international institutions.

The second development that led towards liberal hegemony is the triumph of progressive liberals over classical liberals at domestic level in the US during the interwar years and at international level during the Post-Cold War era. In the Pre-Second World War era, the liberal US government got involved in social engineering. Under the Franklin Roosevelt administration, the state expanded its power and provided more services to people. State led public expenditures grew rapidly and created job opportunities for the Americans (Mearsheimer, 2018, p.69-74). Moreover, progressive liberals succeeded because of the rise of popular democracy and the mass media; the government assumed the role of welfare state. Secondly, ideas of John Maynard Keynes got priority over classical economic theorists. Keynes idea of state market intervention substituted ideas of Adam Smith. Hence, the government began to intervene in market affairs to regulate it and increased public spending to avoid economic depression. However, in the Post WWII era, progressive liberal ideas ambivalently remained confined at domestic level in the US. These liberal hegemonic ideals could not be translated at international level because of bipolar order (Mearsheimer, 2018, p.130). But their opportunity to pursue these hegemonic ideas would come later on, when the Soviet empire disintegrated in late 1980s.

Why the US pursued Liberal hegemony in the Post-Cold War Era

The third part of the paper addresses the question of why the US pursued liberal hegemony. This section deals with calibrating the US policy of global domination in the Post-Cold war era. First, global power configuration changed in the international system. The world became a unipolar world led by the United States (Mearsheimer, 1990). In the first two decades of the Millennium, there was absence of peer competitors that could confront US primacy (Nye, 1992). The Soviet empire crumbled and became embroiled in internal conflicts. China was still an emerging power. Besides, Japan was not a military power and it allied with the United States after WWII. Hence, the unipolar world order provided the United States opportunity to ignore the balance of power politics, *raison d'être* and pursue a liberal foreign policy. Thus, the US in the unipolar world favored global domination instead of off-shore balancing, containment policy or isolationism (Mearsheimer, 2011).

American foreign policy was guided by the two bigger ideas of the early 1990s. First idea was endorsed by Francis Fukayama. He argued in his book, "The End of History and Last Man", about the triumph of liberal democracy and capitalism. Moreover, he stated that Nazism and fascism had

been defeated in the First half of the Twentieth century whereas communism has been defeated in the Second half of the Twentieth century (Fukuyama, 1989). Thus, there is no other alternative ideology which could compete with liberalism. Hence, it is the end of history in terms of ideological rivalries. Every state with the passage of time would adopt democracy and capitalism as their political and economic form of systems.

Another idea that would shape the US foreign policy would be ideas presented by Charles Krauthammer. He argued in his seminal article, “Unipolar Moment”, that the US is not only just a strong economic power in the globe but also the strongest military power in the world (Krauthammer, 1990). Thus, the US should promote its ideas and interests in the entire world even with the use of force. Besides, ideas of Francis Fukayama and Krauthammer would be wedded together and these ideas would then shape US foreign policy in the Post-Cold war era. Be it Liberal Democrat or Neo-Conservative Republican, both major political parties of the US would pursue liberal hegemony in their foreign policy. Hence, in the Post-Cold war era, the US would dominate the entire globe and sponsor human rights, democracy, capitalism and international organizations as their ideals to promote progress and peace in the world.

Goals of Liberal Hegemony

The fourth section of the paper deals with goals of liberal hegemony. In the Post-Cold war era, the US attempted to remake the world in its own image (Mearsheimer, 2018, p.120). The US desired other countries to adopt liberal ideas. Thus, in order to pursue such goals, the US executed a three pronged strategy (Mearsheimer, 2018, p. 130).

First, the US promoted liberal democratic values in the entire world. After the demise of the Soviet empire, the US would help the Eastern European states to adopt democracy as their political form of government. Moreover, the US used force in Iraq in 2003 and justified their unilateral intervention by arguing that the US wanted to liberate Iraq from the authoritarian regime of Saddam Hussain and bring a democratically elected government in Iraq (Mingst and Arreguin-Toft, 2018, p.76). Similarly, under the Obama administration, the US intervened in Libya in 2011 and justified their intervention on the basis of humanitarian intervention (Daladier, Stavridis, 2012, p.2-3). The American officials contended that purpose of military intervention is to protect the Libyan from genocide and the protection of the Libyans human rights and establishment of democratically elected government in Libya (Jacobs, 2015, p.2-4, 5). A 42-page report released recently by China’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs singled out the National Endowment for Democracy, the congressionally funded organization founded in 1983 to support the spread of democracy and human rights around the world, accusing it of underwriting a revolution in Hong Kong (Myers, 2020).

Second, the US desired states to integrate with international institutions. The liberal logic behind such an approach is that international organisations promote peace and stability. Peeve House and Bruce Russet claim that international organisations promote peace and stability through multilateralism. International organisations settle disputes particularly those organisations that are of homogenous nature. Moreover, international organisations provide a platform for negotiations to overcome trust deficit among states and mitigate fear of cheating (Pevehouse, Russet 2006, p.969-1000). Furthermore, international organisations ensure states comply with rules and regulations of the international system, reduce transaction cost of exchange, and socialize states to cooperate with each other at international level (Ruggie, 1992). Thus, the US pursued such an approach in the immediate aftermath of the Cold war. Various Eastern European states integrated into the NATO and European Union. And this wave of NATO and EU expansion from Central Europe to the Eastern Europe

continued without interruption (Mearsheimer, 2011). However, finally, these expansions stopped when Russian President Putin drew red lines over Ukraine and Georgia. The Putin administration communicated to the US that Russia would wreck Ukraine but would not let it become part of NATO and European Union and this eastward expansion of these two organisations led towards Ukrainian crisis (Mearsheimer, 2014). Moreover, the US maneuvered international organizations to pursue its vested interests in the world. For example, in the Gulf War of 1991, the US through the platform of the United Nations Security Council got an endorsement to intervene in Kuwait to liberate her from Iraqi occupation. Similarly, the US intervention in Yugoslavia and Somalia also came under the banner of the UNSC and NATO. US intervention in Afghanistan also came while utilizing the UNSC forum. Under the UNSC Resolution 1386 (2001) American invaded Afghanistan. Moreover, the norm of multilateralism was exploited by the US, when the US intervened in Libya. Thus, to wind up the argument, the US wanted more states to become part of a global network of international organizations (Kissinger, 1994, p.805).

The third goal of liberal hegemony is to promote global capitalism (Mearsheimer, 2018). The US as a leader of the capitalist world promoted free trade, multinational corporations, and forces of globalization (Kissinger, 2014, p. 364,368,369) (Kissinger, 1994, p.804, 805). The driving forces of globalization are trade, finance, technology, and communication. According to Liberal economists, the end product of these forces of globalization is prosperity and peace in the world. Global capitalism favors forces of globalisation. As a result, there is more interconnectedness among states. Global trade has increased many folds. Moreover, because of the availability of finance, more states are relying on global financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Furthermore, due to technology, economic institutions have been transformed. Now, states as well as non-state actors can easily interact with one another. Time and space have been shrunk and squeezed (Baylis, 2020). As a result of all these processes, the world has become a global village. Globalization promotes complex interdependence among states and which eventually reduces likelihood of wars among states. Thus, the US pursued liberal ideas of global capitalism and wanted more and more countries to embed with global economic institutions in order to promote prosperity and peace in the world.

The assumed benefits of pursuing liberal hegemony were to eliminate human rights violations in the entire globe. However, the US justification for intervention in Somalia, Iraq, Libya, Syria and Ukraine to protect universal human rights was liberal delusion rather the US intervention in these states created a power vacuum that resulted in intense rivalries among various factions which ensued in bloodshed and anarchy (Hamasaed, Nada, 2020, p.1) (Boke, 2016).

The second purpose to pursue liberal hegemony was to ensure peace in the international system, to halt proliferation of nuclear weapons and to eliminate terrorism. The US and the international community, to some extent, have been successful in checking the spread of nuclear weapons and ensuring compliance to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime. But the menace of terrorism has become a major global security problem. The Middle Eastern region is engulfed in the scourge of terrorism (Mearsheimer, 2014). And the World has become far more dangerous be it the Middle East, the Eastern Europe and Southeast Asia.

The hegemonic Bush doctrine has led towards catastrophe in the already tumultuous West Asian region. After the war in Afghanistan, the Bush administration invaded Iraq in 2003 (Mingst and Arreguin-Toft, 2018, p.74). Without the United Nations Security Council Resolution, the US intervened in Iraq. The purpose behind the Iraq war was to change the government of Saddam Hussain. And regime change policy was pursued through unilateralism and preemptive strikes were conducted to destroy the Weapons of Mass Destruction which were not found in Iraq. In 2004, the

UN Secretary General at the time, Kofi Annan, said the invasion was illegal. Bush doctrine of regime change destroyed Iraq (Hirsch, 2010). The US illegal intervention and flawed policies in Iraq led towards creation of the IS in Iraq which brought havoc in the Middle East (Al Jazeera English, 2015). Moreover, the US invasion of Libya has destroyed its entire landscape. Two separate governments are controlling the Eastern and Western parts of Libya. The Libyan National Army of Khalifa Haftar and the United Nations recognized Government of the National Accord is competing for power. Libya is in chaos and the US is very much responsible for the mess it left in Libya. Despite several other factors that triggered the Syrian Civil War in 2011, US policy of regime change in Syria aggravated the Syrian crisis. Thus, liberal hegemonic designs in the Middle East have destroyed the entire region.

Moreover, the US liberal dream to bring Ukraine into NATO and the European Union has brought havoc in Ukraine. The Eastern Ukrainians have launched the Eastern separatist movement. Moreover, Russia has annexed Crimea. Hence, again the indispensable nation has been unable to achieve her end goals in Ukraine and humiliated by the Russians (Nuruzzaman, 2014).

Furthermore, the Sino-US rapprochement seems to be withering away. However, it was the US that accommodated China to become part of global institutions (Mearsheimer, 2018). And it was assessed by the US administrations that Chinese assimilation into global institutions would promote US interests. However, such US liberal delusion has short lived. With the rise of China, her behaviour has become more assertive and aggressive. China claims sovereign rights over the entire South China Sea. Moreover, Chinese are becoming more aggressive in their relations with the other Southeast Asian Nations over their territorial claims in the South China Sea (Vox. 2017) (Al Jazeera English, 2020). Recently, China is also creating various man made artificial islands in the South China Sea to assert her territorial claims in the water which is a violation of international law of seas (Vox.2017) (Al Jazeera English. 2020). The US policy of liberal hegemony has resulted in shattering the aura of the US invincibility (Nasr. 2014).

Why Liberal Hegemony in a Crisis Phase

The last section of the paper deals with why liberal hegemony is in a crisis phase (Mearsheimer, 2018). First, if there is a competition between nationalism and liberalism, nationalism would always win. Almost all states are nation states but a very few states are liberal states which show the power of nationalism. In international relations, nationalism precedes liberalism. States choose nationalism over liberalism. States are concerned about their sovereignty and national interests. State sovereignty means that nation states do not allow other states to interfere in their internal matters. In the Post-Cold war era, the US pursued liberal hegemony and underestimated the power of nationalism which resulted in retreat of the US foreign policy. As a consequence, liberal hegemony is in a crisis phase.

Second, in the anarchic world, states are primarily concerned about their survival (Waltz 1990). To ensure their survival, states are engaged in power competition. Each state tries to maximize its power. While competing for power, states do not trust the intentions of other states. Thus, states rely on self-help mechanisms. In order to attain security, states possess some kind of offensive/defensive military capabilities. However, when states interests are at stake, they use force to protect her interests (Mearsheimer, 2007, p. 73-75). Nonetheless, these realists' assumptions were not well understood by the liberal American administrations. When Putin used force in Ukraine, the US officials' paints were down and they could not understand what was happening in Ukraine. Thus, Ukrainian crisis shows why US liberal foreign policy is in a crisis phase and the power of realism.

Third, the overselling of individual rights also led towards failure of US foreign policy. To emphasize, in international relations, states are more concerned about their national interests, individual rights

take a back seat when it comes to state survival and security consideration. The Russian behavior in Ukraine, the Syrian regime policies in the Syrian civil war, and the Chinese government behaviour in Hong Kong illustrate this point.

Moreover, the coming of Donald Trump into power as anti-liberal President further pushed liberal ideas into the abyss. Donald Trump fought against the rhetoric of globalisation. He is a nationalist President who favored America First Approach which means American nation comes first rather than the liberal idea of cosmopolitanism. He is against free trade principles. He opposed free trade agreements vis-a-vis China and started a trade war against China by imposing tariffs on Chinese goods. He renegotiated the North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico. He withdrew from the Paris Climate Change agreement. He is against multilateral institutions like the World Bank, NATO, and International Criminal Court. He said NATO is an obsolete organisation. He stated that the WTO is against the US interests. He threatened the ICC prosecutors if they initiated cases against the US war crimes in Afghanistan and Iraq. He unilaterally favored Israel's claim over the West Bank, recognized the East Jerusalem as the undivided capital of Israel and shifted the US embassy, recognised Israel claims over the Golan Heights of Syria. Even President Trump allowed the killing of Iranian General Qasim Sulemani in the drone strikes in Iraq. Furthermore, he turned blind eye towards authoritarian regimes. He backed Saudi Arabia and their campaign in Yemen. He is against migration and announced construction of a boundary wall between US-Mexico. Thus, he is against liberal ideas and such US foreign policy behavior has led towards a crisis in liberal hegemony. To conclude, the rise of China and resurrection of Russian power on the one hand, decline in the US power on the other hand, has resulted in power diffusion in the global power configuration which has resulted in the Post-American World.

References

- Al Jazeera English. (26-10-2015). Enemy of Enemies: The Rise of ISIL. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4yX6pK0d19Q>
- Al Jazeera English. (22-11-2020). what's behind the South China Sea dispute? <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f00V9MOBhg8>.
- Baylis, J. (2010). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press.
- Daalder, I. H., & James G. S. (2012). NATO's victory in Libya: the right way to run an intervention. *Foreign Affairs*, 2-7.
- Daladier, I. H., & Stavridis, J. G. (2012). NATO's victory in Libya: the right way to run an intervention. *Foreign Affairs*, 2-7.
- De Montesquieu, C. (1989). *Montesquieu: The spirit of the laws*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (1989). The end of history? *The National Interest*, 16, 3-18.
- Hamasaeed Sarhang, Nada Garrett. (2020). *United States Institute of Peace*. <https://www.usip.org/iraq-timeline-2003-war#textonly>

- Hirsch Afua. (2010). 'Iraq invasion violated international law, Dutch inquiry finds'. *The Guardian*. 12-01-2010. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/jan/12/iraq-invasion-violated-interational-law-dutch-inquiry-finds>. (Accessed: 05-05-2021)
- Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan*. (Ed. R. Tuck) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- H.Res.543-116th Congress (2019-2020):Recognizing Hong Kong's bilateral relationship with the United States, condemning the People's Republic of China for violating their obligations to the people of Hong Kong, and supporting the people of Hong Kong's right to freedom of assembly and peaceful protest. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-resolution/543>.
- Jacobs, R. T. (2015). A History of Conflict and International Intervention in Libya. *Global Security Studies*, 6(1).
- Jordan S. (2020). World Library Foundation. "Two Treatises of Government by John Locke. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IVYBRhqT3Qs&t=1s>.
- Kant, I. (1970). *Perpetual peace: A philosophical sketch*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kissinger, H. (2014). *World order*. Penguin Books.
- (1994). *Diplomacy*. Simon and Schuster.
- Krauthammer, C. (1990). The unipolar moment. *Foreign Affairs*. 70, 23.
- Locke, J. (1988). *Two treatises on government*. (ed. P. Laslett). Cambridge University Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (1990). Why we will soon miss the Cold war. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 266(2), 35-50.
- (2011). Imperial by design. *The National Interest*, 11, 16-34.
- (2014). America unhinged. *The National Interest*, 129, 9-30.
- (2014). Why the Ukraine crisis is the West's fault: The liberal delusions that provoked Putin. *Foreign Affairs*, 93, 77.
- (2018). *Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities*. Yale University Press.
- (2007). Structural realism. *International relations theories: Discipline and diversity*, 83, 77-94. https://www.comackschools.org/Downloads/8_mearsheimer-structural_realism.pdf
- (2014). Why the Ukraine crisis is the West's fault: the liberal delusions that provoked Putin. *Foreign Affairs*. 93, 77. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/fora93&div=111&id=&page=>
- (2014). Taiwan's dire straits. *The National Interest*, (130), 29-39.
- (2018). *The great delusion: Liberal dreams and international realities*. Yale University Press.

- Mill, J.S. (2008). *Utilitarianism* in J. Gray (ed.) *On Liberty and other essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [ISBN 9780199535736].
- Mingst, K. A., McKibben, H. E., & Arreguin-Toft, I. M. (2018). *Essentials of international relations*. (7th Edition). WW Norton & Company.
- Myers Lee Steven. (2020). 'In Hong Kong Protests, China Angrily Connects Dots Back to U.S.'. *The New York Times*. 30-11-2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/05/world/asia/china-hong-kong-protests.html>. (Accessed: 04-05-2021)
- Nuruzzaman, M. (2014). The dispensable nation: American foreign policy in retreat. *Global Change, Peace & Security*, 26(3), 337-339.
- Nigel Ashford. Learn Liberty. (2011). "What is Classical Liberalism?" https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iU-8Uz_nMaQ.
- Nye, J. S. (1992). What new world order? *Foreign Affairs*, 71(2), 83-96.
- Pevehouse, J., & Russett, B. (2006). Democratic international governmental organizations promote peace. *International organization*, 969-1000.
- President George Bush, "The U.N: World Parliament of Peace," address to the U.N, General Assembly, New York, and October 1, 1990.
- President Bill Clinton, "Confronting the Challenges of a Broader World," address to the U.N. General Assembly, New York, September 27, 1993.
- Rousseau, J. (n.d.). *Discourse and the Social Contract*, in Cahn, S. M. (2010). *Political Philosophy: The Essential Texts* (2nd ed). Oxford University Press. [ISBN 9780195396614].
- Ruggie, J. G. (1992). Multilateralism: The Anatomy of an Institution. *International organization*, 46 (3), 561-598.
- Smith, A. (1937). *The wealth of nations* [1776].
- Vox. (17-02-2017). Why China is building islands in the South China Sea. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=luTPMHC7zHY>.
- Waltz, K. N. (1990). Realist thought and neorealist theory. *Journal of International Affairs*, 44(1), 21-37.