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Abstract

United States of America enjoys an ideal isolated strategic location enriched with natural and human resources. At that moment of history, United States pursued the Policy of Isolation to utilize these resources for its own economic, military and political development. After emerging as a nuclear power US shifted its policy towards capitalism promotion and containment of communism, Cold war era, a period of major powers. After US emergence as a hegemonic power the policy of overwhelming interference in worlds affair was adopted by its policy makers. Americans always expect sustainable peace, fearless environment and guarantee of human right particularly for themselves and generally for humanity as out come of government policies. Bush aggressive policies fulfilled this requirement or led to deterioration. This needs to be accounted. American policies over Afghanistan and Iraq particularly posed serious challenges to President Obama during his early years of White House.
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I. Introduction

Science, technology and their inventions has shrunk the world and converted it to global village. In this age of globalization no country bigger or smaller can claim to survive without others. Economic Political and cultural interests, traditions and values are exposed to each other for change. Globalization, democratization, liberalization, privatization (even defense industry) and interdependent nature in all sphere of life made security issues complex and complicated. Education and knowledge is crossing the frontiers of states and no one has power, capacity or ability to limit it in its boundaries. Modern education accelerated the process of political awareness, political socialization, and political recruitment even in primitive societies. This phenomenon also initiated the will and desire among individuals, groups and nations for economic, political and cultural equality at domestic as well as international level. In field of science and technology nations are acquiring knowledge and introducing technologies to facilitate their people. On the other hand states acquired technologies to fortify their defense. Resultantly, despite the international efforts of disarmament, number of nuclear club is increasing, although slowly. Since, countries evaluate this device the best instrument of deterrence
and economic development. Moreover, increasing inequality at national as well as international level and double standard of justice for developed and under developed, for powerful and powerless countries are aggravating tensions in international scenario. Increasing mistrust, social tension and devastating capacity of various countries exposed the humanity to many dangers.

In this global village US emerged as single hegemonic supper power having capacity, capability and resources to adjust, regulate and shift world order/paradigm according to its desire. It also has potential to interfere and change the regimes and systems of nations by hampering the concept of sovereignty of state particularly in developing world. US launched from the policy of isolation and reached up to the level single super power having enormous power and potentials. This superiority put a great responsibility on shoulder of US policy makers. Presently, world politics is shifty, crafty, thrifty and demanding. Whereas, Bush adopted aggressive policy and was more inclined to use the hard power, even, in some cases he did not bother to by pass the UN. His aggressive policy style was widely under criticism at home and abroad and by allied and others. That is why the foreign policy remained the major issue during election campaign. Consequently, Barack Husain Obama and his party indicated and promised to modify the US policy accordingly. These internal and external pressures placed the Barak Obama Husain at the cross road of paradigm shift. This article is to review the US foreign policy and options before contemporary leadership and policy makers of US.

II. Policy of Isolation
United States of America enjoys an ideal strategic location as it is surrounded by deep seas, vast area, balanced population and rich in natural and human resources. This location guarantees its defense and security, while richness in resources bestows maximum opportunity of self reliance. By considering this state of affairs the policy makers decided to adopt the policy of isolation at international front and they concentrated more on domestic development of newly emerging state. Later on they expanded it up to Continent of America. The policy of isolation provided opportunity to US, to strengthen its economic, political and cultural position at domestic as well as external front. Conceivably, the era of isolationism began in 1789, with the nation’s independence and probably ended in 1945. However, this policy formally appeared in President Washington’s 1796 Farewell Address, when he admonished his country to “avoid entangling alliances.” Washington advocated isolationism because he had witnessed first hand the polarizing effects that foreign entanglements could have on American Domestic politics and domestic stability. Isolationism was codified in the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, when Secretary of State John Quincy Adams called for the Old World and the New to remain separate spheres. During its heyday, isolationism had a powerful pull on Americans because they lived in a country whose location and size made isolationism both attractive and feasible. Isolationism’s grip on the United States was especially strong in the first half of the twentieth century, and especially in the era between the two world wars. People of US were so committed to this policy that in the immediate aftermath of World War I, Wilson’s campaign to join the League of Nations considered against isolationist opposition. In 1941, on the eve of America’s entry into war, while Hitler was subjugating Europe and Japan was rampaging in East Asia, The Selective Service Act (the draft) passed in the House of Representatives by only a single vote. Roosevelt feared the return of isolationism so much after World War II that he devised the United Nations partly to sell internationalism to the American people. In the
late 1940s, the Truman administration so feared the resurgence of isolationist sentiment that it felt compelled to exaggerate the Communist threat in order to mobilize public backing for its containment policy. Even after the United States embraced containment in 1947, isolationism’s hold was so powerful that a substantial segment of the American public continued to adhere to it throughout the entire Cold War era. For example, when asked “do you think it would be best for the future of the country if we take an active part in world affairs or if we stay out of world affairs,” “25 to 30 percent of the American public during this period regularly answered that the United States should “stay out”. (Schneider, 1992: 40)

In that era international paradigm was branded with balance of power and international politics and operations could be portrayed as: (i) World was divided in major powers (ii) Major actors were in Europe (iii) Major powers were wrangling for power to bring more and more area under their colonial influence (iv) There battlefields were by and large outside Europe. Under the circumstances United States went for policy of isolation. It does not mean that US was completely unconcerned and unresponsive to international arena during this paradigm. So, they remained cautious about world power configuration. Thus, along with others the most important objective before US policy makers was that any single country should not emerge with the status of single continental power. Probably, it was perceived by policy makers that single continental power would have potential and inclination to attack other continents, particularly, North America. The continental power can also put embargo by hindering the world trade rout. Consequently, whenever like situation cropped up the US jumped in other continents and took preventive measure to contain emerging power and to uphold balance of power. Following this policy US intervened in world war first and second. This policy provided opportunity to Americans to ensure internal political stability and economic development. Americans enjoyed fearless environment at home and abroad. They were most respected outside US in absence of any potential enemy.

III. Containment of Communism and Cold War

US policy witnessed a paradigm shift in the fourth decade of nineteenth century. Actually, The World War II gave a new turn to world politics. US actively and effectively participated in the war but this participation was so sophisticated that US was kept saved from the dreadful effects of war. While others conquerors as well as conquered, all were shattered, damaged and devastated. It is interesting that during war period US land remained sacred. The attack on Pearl Harbor by Japanese forces on December 7, 1941 propelled America into World War II. At the beginning, the objective of the United States was merely to defeat Japan and, after Hitler declared war on the United States a few days later, to defeat Germany. The actual consequences of the war went beyond this, to the establishment of the American spheres of influence over Western Europe and Northeast Asia. This became an American Empire of liberal democracy and free markets on a truly half-world or “free world” scale. Indeed this energized expansionist impulse then advanced beyond the two end regions of the Eurasian landmass and extended into the crucial region that lay between them. This was the Middle East, whose oil was essential for the well being of the American allies in Western Europe and North East Asia. Simultaneously, according to agreements concluded at the conclusion of World War II, confronting forces were supposed to withdraw from conquered areas and respective countries would adopt political system according to the will of their people. Conversely, the Red armies showed reluctance to withdraw from the parts of Europe.
This behaviour was taken as threat by other powers. Moreover, in consequence of war Europe’s economy was devastated. Roy C. Macridus (1979) indicated that the economy of Germany was so horrified that the price of one packet cigarette was equal to one month salary. French steel industry was ruined. UK who was conqueror and so big empire at that time that Sun never set in its area, was measured economically sinking country. In a nut shell whole Europe was confronting worst kind of economic disaster. War trodden countries were facing acute shortage of capital. The composition of major powers was changed drastically. Ideological clash emerged as main issue at international front. Colonialism took its last breath. New states emerged at the map of world carrying with many problems and issues at domestic as well as at international fronts. (I) domestically political and economic systems were undecided. There were push and pull between various ideologies. (II) Facing worst kind of economic problems. (III) Strangulated by intra state economic, political, cultural, ethnic and linguistic clash. In a nut shell the whole world was at the cross road of change and looking for some reliever. In the circumstances two powers had a potential to play the role of reliever the US and USSR. The US having strong military power, economic resources, enjoying ideal geographical condition, possessing stable political system etc was boasted as great power. USSR also emerged as big power containing the biggest area, emerging and expanding ideology, strong and tested military power, atomic power and having ambitions to carry out proletariat revolution all over the world. The USSR was already driving for Proletariat world revolution and eager to provide economic, political cultural including military support if needed to revolutionary forces. The distressed Europe was in search of reconstruction. USSR was prepared to provide economic aid for reconstruction to those nations who were ready to join its ideology. Moreover USSR demonstrated reluctance to withdraw red armies from its occupied areas.

This changing politico-economic situation pushed the US leadership to redesign the US foreign policy. A group was of the opinion that US should go back to its policy of isolation, while the other was of the view that US should play the role of leadership in the world politics and operations. In this state of affairs intellectual community and think tanks contributed articles by indicating the threat of USSR and communist expansionism. They formed the public opinion, prepared American people psychologically, gave a direction to policy makers and paved the way to introduce major shift in US foreign policy. This can be confirmed by the statement of President Johnson, who helplessly explained “we did not choose to be the guardians at the gate” (Johnson, 1965).

British evaluated USSR expansionism and Communist revolution policy as a potential threat to democracy as well as other national interests. In February 1949 British foreign minister visited US and realized US leadership that the British played the role of leader of democracy in world, but, in present circumstances it would not be in position to play the same role. US has potential to elevate as leader of democracy. So, it should come up to look after democracy and contain communism in length and width of world. Under the circumstances US foreign policy took a major shift by adopting True-Man doctrine. This triggered cold war between US and USSR. The USSR declared that the US was aggressor while she was challenger on the other US declared USSR was aggressor while she was challenger. However this enigma is yet to be resolved who was aggressor and who was challenger. At this moment of the American history, Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles even asserted that military cooperation could provide greater security than nuclear deterrence and since military alliances were the cornerstone of the security for the
free nations (Dulles, 1954:355-57). During this era, under the operational mechanism multi dimensional strategies were adopted including (i) military alliances all over the world (ii) economic development programmes for allied and for those countries who were inclined to choose democracy as political system, (Marshall Plan) (iii) Cultural diffusion and etc. In case of Europe and Japan it helped to reconstruct and rehabilitated economies on permanent bases by providing economic as well as technical aid under Marshall Plan and other programmes. These rehabilitated, strong and prosperous nations are allied of US in all international activities. In case of developing nations US and its allied came up with economic aid but this aid was not to put their economies on strong footing. This aid was temporary arrangements to seek their support to contain communism or for other defense purpose. Resultantly, the aid was limited to provide meal and defense arms if required by situation. During this era Ideological war was at its peak. Countries included in communist block were treated as enemy. Conversely, countries in democratic block were treated as enemy by USSR. Despite the fact that two blocks were under a constant horror of war but thanks to the balance of power and in presence of nuclear Deterrence both blocks avoided from overhead collision. However, Suez and Quebec missile issues aggravated the situation at the level that political analyst perceived that the Cold War could be converted to direct war, but, both powers evaluated the consequences and accommodated each other to avoid from war. During this period US normally adopted the policy of soft power or at the maximum policy of proxy war in some cases.

IV. Policy of Peaceful-Co-Existence

President Nixon was exceptionally intellectual, logical and rational to evaluate the situation and courageous enough to implement his findings. He wisely evaluated the then existing balance of power which was shifted in favour of Communist block with the emergence of Socialist republic of China under the strong leadership of Mao as ideological partner of USSR. However, this state of affairs remained for short time. China wanted relations within and out of Communist world on equal bases as big nation. It refused to accept intra “Communist world” hegemony of USSR. Consequently, within a short span of time conflicts approached between USSR and China. During this period China remained under pressure from US alliance as well, because, they considered it a member of Communist block. US supported India in 1963 just to contain china (at cost of its tested allied Pakistan). This support was not to defend any allied or friend this was just to contain the Socialist Republic of China. President Nixon and his team calculated Sino-Soviet worsening relations and announced the policy of peaceful co-existence against the wishes of hardliners. This policy shifted balance of power in favour of US in Cold War. Nixon was praised by American people at home for opening the door to China and trying to bring the Vietnam War to an end. He was paid of in his second-term presidential win by a huge margin. Until he was disgraced to resign as president over his role in the “Watergate Scandal” he remained successful Republican president. This was the era that Nixon did not only use policy of peaceful coexistence politically but also his secretary of defence Robert McNamara adopted the Policy of Flexible response in which Washington emphasized on the use of diplomatic and peaceful methods to resolve disputes with other states and Nuclear weapon would be a last option. On the other hand, Mao re-launched himself on the international stage. China offered a permanent Security Council seat at UN with veto power. It was fixed during behind the scene meeting between Kissinger and Zhou. The US made a huge commitment to pull all forces out of Indochina and Korea (Subedi, 2007). It is also pertinent to mention that Pakistan played the role of
bridge in these relations. One can calculate that this policy opened new avenues of success for US. This enabled US to withdraw forces from Indochina and Korea. This shifted balance of power in Favour of US. In mid 1970's USSR sent its military to Afghanistan to reach to hot water and to occupy the most important strategic places of world. The US contained USSR in mountains of Afghanistan with the support of its allied. Pakistan played role of frontline state. The man power was made available from various countries on the name of religion and religious fight (jihad). Pakistan badly suffered from consequences of war. The US provided arms and other required support. With minimum expenditure and without bearing the loss of human causality US was able to win the War in Afghanistan. Eventually, Cold War ended and US emerged as single supper power at the map of world.

During the Cold War period Muslim world, by and large remained on side of US. Due to balance of power US refrained to intervene in other countries un-necessarily. The leadership of various countries was contended that US refrained to intervene and to use hard power even against those countries that were non allied and were not in US camp, while, they were used to perceive some kind of threat from USSR. It could be calculated that key to success for US was policy of Peaceful-co-Existence. These were days when people of America and her allied were enjoying more secured and peaceful life at home and abroad.

V. Post Cold War/Excessive Unilateralism

In the last decade of 20th century the Cold War took its last breath. One of the major actors of the bipolar system confronted with worst kind of intra state political, economic and ideological crises, which led it to disintegration. Consequently, USSR disengaged itself from role of leadership of communism, from the role of champion of world proletariat revolution and from the role of challenger power in world politics. This is other discussion that these decisions were for how much time. However, this surrender created a vacuum in the composition of international power politics. Balance of power shifted in favour of US and it got the status of “Unilateral Power” at the map of world. Neither from allied nor from other world was in position to resist a bit aggressive behaviour and policies of US policy makers. As a matter of fact the hegemony of US was established at the end of Afghan war (Jihad). According to some observers, the USA is currently enjoying an unprecedented “Unipolar moment”, with the potential “to last for many decades”(Wohforth, 1999: 37)

Emerging international power structure and politico-economic environment entrusted US with opportunity to lay down the foundation of new paradigm apparently. There were two options before the then leadership of US

(i) Firstly, to sustain already attained hegemonic status, this was by and large recognized silently by whole world. (a) This could have been done by using the technique of soft power. (b) Enhancing role of UN as regulatory body (c) by gearing up international bodies toward democratic norms (d) by taking steps to ensure social justice at inter state and intra state level (e) to take steps for confidence building measure at international level

(ii) Secondly, to establish its role as neo-colonial power by controlling global village directly, (a) for the purpose to ensure direct presence of its military in some strategically important areas (b) exercise of hard power if needed (c) strategy of pre-emptive war if needed.
It seems that the Bush administration preferred second option. Resultantly, Bush took hasty decisions. Obama’s (2009) decisions were taken on the bases of fear rather than farsightedness. Consequently, the troops were sent to change regime and for pre-emptive action etc. in various countries and regions by violating their sovereignty, bypassing the UN, ignoring the reservations of allied, overlooking the suspicions of non allied and neglecting the sentiments of people of relevant countries, communities and religions. This policy can be evaluated by following. In February 1992, Paul Wolfowitz, as undersecretary for defense policy and Zalmay Khalilzad of NSC staff, completed a project initiated by Defense Secretary Cheney, on America’s defense and foreign policy for the Post Cold War world, called Defense Policy Guidance (DPG) which was leaked to the New York Times in March that year. By the New York Times account, the policy paper asserted that: ‘America’s mission was to ensure that no rival superpower emerged any part of the world. The United States, ‘must maintain the mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role’. It described Russia and China as potential threat (Fitzgerald, 2002: 80-86).

The authors of the document (DPG), therefore, recommended that: ‘the Pentagon should take measures – including the use of force, if necessary to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in such countries as North Korea, Iraq and some of the former Soviet republics. America’s impulses toward excessive ambition and excessive unilateralism were also fuelled by the fact that the United States was so powerful. It was all too tempting for the United States, like every powerful state of the past, to believe that it could impose its will on others and could succeed where others before have failed. However, a group illustrated their reservations about aggressiveness. Richard Haass, head of policy planning in the George W. Bush administration’s State Department, put the point well: “There’s very little we can do in the world unilaterally. There’s almost nothing we can do better unilaterally.” (Lloyd, 2002). There can be occasions when the United States will have to act unilaterally, either because others oppose it but the need for action is urgent, or because only the United States has the power to act. As Joseph Nye has observed, there will be occasions when the United States should act unilaterally: when multilateral action would lead to inaction; when unilateral action would advance multilateral interests; or when unilateral action would facilitate multilateral compromises that could lead to multilateral action later. ( Nye, Jr. 2002: 154-163).

VI. Pre-emptive Strikes

Bush administration developed a new unilateral security doctrine based on pre-emptive strikes against perceived enemies in general and towards Iran and North Korea in particular. The term “pre-emption” is not an accurate description of the Bush administration’s doctrine. It implies taking action against a nation or group that is about to strike. What the Bush administration did in Iraq was “prevention,” which implies taking action even before the decision to strike has been taken by a potentially hostile power, and perhaps well before. This is the harder case from a traditional international legal point of view⁵. Such act of violation of UN Charter shows that any powerful state may engage in, wars of Conquest, preventive wars against an adversary, wars against rogue states- states that disregard international order, system and international law, wars against foreign regimes to change regime. Many analysts fear that this has gravely damaged the credibility of the UN and the whole concept of Collective Security. Even
Bush himself proclaimed, “when it comes to our security, we really don’t need anybody’s permission.” (Balz, 2003:A1).

**VII. Implications of Bush Doctrine**

Americans would have been expecting secure and fearless environment after end of Cold War, Because, US appeared as un-matching power, with the status of unilateral leadership in absence of any potential challenger in global village. But the situation worsened. It can be perceived that there is some policy flaw which led the following condition:

i. **Americans feel insecure:** During policy of isolation even during Cold War Americans were enjoying high respect, secured and fearless environment all over the world. They were moving every where in all the countries in all the camps (Communist, Democratic, Islamic etc.) without any fear. It is astonished to write that presently America is more powerful, more influential but American feel more insecure at home as well as at abroad. Above all fear is dancing everywhere. This state of affairs is not tolerable to peace loving people of US.

ii. **Economy is confronting with worst kind of financial crises:** USA shifted its policy from soft power to hard power in post Cold War era. This compelled to enhance defense expenditure. Moreover, other factors also contributed. Consequently, US is confronting with worst kind of financial as well as economic crisis of its history. Resultantly American Congress passed “Bail out Package” of $ 7 billion for its economic sustainability.

iii. **Allied are not satisfied with these actions:** It is also pertinent to mention here that allied are not satisfied with this aggressive policy. Indeed, Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder of Germany and President Jacques Chirac of France called for a cohesive European front against unilateral U.S. military action against Baghdad at that point (Cracknell and Rufford, 2002).

iv. **Opposition:** A United States war and victory in Iraq and Afghanistan would enlarge American Empire. It would also energize and enlarge the opposition to the empire, both within America and within other countries.

v. **Image of US:** People of US are secular peace loving, tolerant and accommodative by nature. It seems that Bush’s aggressive policy harmed the image of US.

- **Image about UN:** Many Europeans and some Americans profess themselves shocked that the US would announce its intention to seek “regime change” in despotic governments, and if necessary at the expense of international law and the UN Charter. The United States has many times toppled tyrannical regimes with less provocation, and less obvious justification. American unilateralism on Iraq has clearly conveyed the message that the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, is useful as an instrument for imposing and managing international order only when it does Washington’s bidding. When it resists U.S. designs, it is either berated or bypassed or both. This logic was foreshadowed by the rhetoric surrounding the US led NATO intervention in Kosovo in 1999 without the authorization of the Security Council. Even in recent attack on Iraq, U.S. acted outside the U.N. but one thing is very clear from the present experience that it could win wars without the U.N., it could not build peace without it. (Anderson, 2004: 41)
• There are feelings that Jews community has a lot of potential to influence US internal as well as external policies. Some time they are successful to use US influence in favour of their community interest at cost of others. East Israel received (from emergence to present) unbridled support from US in case of Middle. Even, some time at cost of international principles. It is a hard fact that violation of human rights by Israeli army in Palestinian areas could not attract the US policy makers to take some appropriate measures to stop or condemn atrocities committed by Israeli forces.

vi. **Double standard:** the second alarming thing about the image of US that it observes double standard in its policies. Its principles vary from place to place and country to country. In 1998 Richard Haass observed that "discrimination is at the heart of the entire non-proliferation regime in that it treats five countries “(the United States, Russia, China, Great Britain and France) differently from everyone else.” Hass went on to note that the reasons for this were obvious: The reality is that not all proliferation is equally bad. We have long held that nuclear weapons in responsible hands such as our own can be stabilizing, a deterrent to the use of conventional, chemical, biological or nuclear weapons by others… We also long viewed India, as well as Pakistan and Israel, as in different category than Iran, Iraq, Libya and North Korea. Iraq particularly suffered a decade of sanctions and blockade were bombed on the pretext of WMD while Israel has such weapons and regularly fails to comply with UN resolution is still a beloved child of US. Double standards and triple standards if need be are what a realistic and successful foreign policy is all about. US want to act in an authoritarian manner in the new unipolar world by walking out from the Kyoto climate change protocol, withdrawing from the ABM treaty with Russia and killed negotiations aimed at strengthening the biological weapons convention. Because America knows that it is the strongest member of the international community.

vii. **War against Terrorism:** 9/11 incident changed the shape of world politics completely. America; Champion of democracy, guarantor of world peace and security was attacked by some invisible power. US blamed Al Qaeda and Taliban for this and started war against terrorism not only to secure itself but the world at large. US launched attack on Afghanistan; producer of Taliban and then on Iraq, safe heaven for Al-Qaida and lastly on South Waziristan( Pakistan); a safe passage of Taliban. Resultantly global wave of sympathy after 9/11 has changed in the hatred of American arrogance and militarism. Now the war against terrorism is very complicated and complex. This is boundary less war. At same time involved countries are allied as well as enemy.

viii. **Less Powerful countries (LPC):** America, by using power created a sense of inequality, powerlessness and impotence for the less powerful countries in international system. Even the front line state in the war against terrorism has to sacrifice its territorial integrity and US air attacks flagrantly violated the air space territory of Pakistan and it did not create political instability but also economic devastation in Pakistan and Pakistan has to pay price in waging war in Swat which created almost 3 million IDPs without food, shelter and even clean drinking water.
ix. Case of Afghanistan: In case of Afghanistan American presence is strongly resisted by Afghans’. Resultantly, despite all resources America could not get required results up to now. Many causes could be mentioned about this failure. One can perceive that if US would have to repose complete trust in Pakistan which is playing the role of frontline state. The Pakistani forces equipped with US arms and other required support would have been able to tackle the situation more effectively with less expenditure and less human loss. They are familiar with the Scio-political, economic and strategic situation of Afghanistan more than others. It seems that there is trust deficit between two allied. India’s presence in Afghanistan contributed to this trust deficit. Because, Pakistan and India have lot of reservations about each other, so, India’s extensive presence alongside the Pakistan and Afghanistan border raised many questions in minds of Pakistanis and other neutral strategic experts. Sophisticated arms used by Talban in Pakistan also raising questions that who is providing them these arms and training.

VIII. Barack H. Obama

Barack H. Obama, 47th president of US attracted increasing intention at home and abroad on foreign policy. During election campaign the foreign policy and economic policy of the US remained the main agenda of major political parties. People voted for Barack Obama, since they believed that he is young, have political will, intentions and potentials to introduce paradigm shift in US foreign policy to guarantee the security to Americans and to restore and rebuild the positive image of US. Presently, the following could be considered big challenges for Obama and his administration: American should feel secure at home and abroad, ensure fearless environment for Americans. To restore and rebuild image of US in allied and other friends, image about UN, image as human right lover and image towards Muslims, image that its policy is not overwhelmingly influenced by any specific group, particularly Jews lobby. Among other major challenges are current economic crises at home, failure of Bush policies in Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, and Cuba crises. In the neighborhood, relations with Venezuela have soured. Venezuela under Chavez is being viewed as America’s greatest foreign policy challenge in the region. North Korea, which, Washington believes is keen on producing nuclear weapons, is yet another challenge for the Obama administration. Russia cannot be lumped together with these countries but it remains a fact that Washington’s ties with Moscow under the clout of president-turned-prime Minister Vladimir Putin by no means can be taken for granted. Obama is an energetic young man having cosmic vision about present and future realities. He gave indications that he would depart from his predecessor’s policies. In his inaugural speech, Obama recalled “earlier generations faced down fascism and communism not just with missiles and tanks, but with sturdy alliances and enduring conventions” (Kharel, 2009). Certainly, to shrink the gap between Bush’s aggressive policies and Americans expectations is a gigantic challenge for Obama and his party. He collected a good team; consulted relevant interest groups to visualize the situation and to put in practice his conclusion and findings. He took initiative to improve ties with a number of countries since long treated as Washington’s enemy. In a short span of time he closed down infamous Guantanamo prison camp and decided to withdraw forces from Iraq. He visited Middle East and met the Americans most trusted friend King of Saudi Arabia and other Middle East leaders to give a new beginning to US and Muslim world relations. He categorically mentioned in his speech that US wants to establish endurable peace in ME. He indicated to settle Iran and North Korean issues by dialog. On June 4,
2009 Obama delivered a speech on ties with Muslim world as opening a “new age” and even some arch-US foes said that they saw sign of change by the world supper power. European Union foreign policy chief Solana (2009) viewed “It was remarkable speech, a speech that without any doubt is going to open a new page in the relations with the Arab-Muslim world and I hope in the problems we have in so many theaters in the region” iii All this indicates that Obama has agenda to introduce paradigm shift in US policy to achieve mentioned targets.

IX. Conclusion

In past, particularly, during Cold War US normally used soft power and strengthened UN and other institutions to ensure peace in World. In most cases US operated through economic and military assistance to various countries and created frontline states to confront the enemy. This policy ensured success of US with bearing minimum human loss and investment. The case of “Afghan Jihad” could be considered best example of it. Pakistan played role of frontline state, Afghan and other Mujahidin all over the world sacrificed their lives and defeated intervening power which was calculated potential threat to world power fabric by US and it’s allied. As ultimate result of this indirect war US was conqueror and emerge as unilateral power in global village. Conversely, wherever US directly involved its forces, used hard power the net result was not beneficial for US, except, “Kuwait War” which was quite different war in its nature and objective. Presently, the case of Afghanistan and Iraq could be considered best example of it. A careful calculation indicates that as repercussion of these wars along with other issues the economy of US is shivering and Image of US is confused in world. 

It is suggested that US should adopt the policy of international democracy, international social justice, strengthening of international institution, to take steps to overcome social, political and economic exclusion at national as well as international level and to introduce confidence building measures among nations, regions, countries and people of divergent interest. Shun from use of direct military action and use of hard power. Avoid from concept of clash of civilization because this concept is breeding mistrust among different religions and nations. It is also pertinent to mention that capitalism is confronting with serious kind of weaknesses. It must be mended according to need of time, in favour of down trodden people to ensure eternal peace in global village.
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