

Assessing the Impact of United States Hegemony on the Global South: Balancing Positive Contributions and Negative Consequences

Omar Abdi Mohamed Qasaye

Senior Independent Researcher

Email: [omarkasaye\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:omarkasaye[at]gmail.com)

Abstract: *The United States has been the dominant power in the global south for centuries. This hegemony has had both positive and negative effects on the region. On view of academic scholar and other politician believe that there is positive side, the United States has provided economic assistance, military support, and technical expertise to many countries in the global south. This has helped to improve living standards, promote democracy, and combat poverty. For example, the United States has provided billions of dollars in aid to Africa to help fight HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases. The United States has also helped to promote democracy in many countries in the global south, such as Haiti, Liberia, and the Philippines. Others believe that there is negative side, US hegemony has also been associated with exploitation, intervention, and militarization. For example, the United States has supported authoritarian regimes in the global south that have abused human rights. The United States has also intervened militarily in many countries in the global south, often for its own strategic interests. For example, the United States invaded Iraq in 2003, to remove Saddam Hussein from power, but many believe that the real reason for the invasion was to control Iraq's oil reserves.*

Keywords: United States hegemony, global south, positive effects, negative effects, economic assistance, military support, technical expertise, living standards, democracy, poverty, HIV/AIDS, malaria, disease eradication, authoritarian regimes, human rights, militarization, intervention, strategic interests, Iraq invasion, oil reserves.

1. Introduction

Since becoming the world's most powerful country after the two world wars and the Cold War, the United States has acted more boldly to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, pursue, maintain and exploitation hegemony, advance subversion and infiltration, and willfully wage wars, bringing harm to the international community. The United States has developed a hegemonic playground to stage "color revolutions," The color revolutions were a series of popular protests that occurred in the post - Soviet states (particularly Ukraine, Georgia, and Kyrgyzstan) and Serbia during the early 21st century. Largely inspired by democratic sentiment, opposition to election results widely viewed as falsified, and anti - corruption, the color revolutions were marked by the usage of the internet as a method of communication, as well as the strong role of non - governmental organizations in the protests. This instigates regional disputes, and even directly open wars under the pretext of promoting democracy, regime change, freedom and human rights. Sticking to the Cold War mentality, the United States has erected up bloc politics and adds fuel to conflict and confrontation. It has overstretched the concept of national security, maltreated export controls and forced unilateral sanctions upon others countries. It has taken a selective approach to international law and rules, utilizing or discarding them as it sees fit, and has sought to impose rules that serve its own interests in the name of upholding a "rules - based international order." To this paper is presenting the relevant facts, seeks to picture out the U. S. ill - treatment of hegemony in the political, military, economic, financial, technological and cultural fields, and to draw greater international attention to the threats of the U. S. practices to world peace and stability and the well - being of all peoples.

1.1 Background

"Global hegemony" might be defined as a situation in which one nation - state plays a predominant role in organizing, regulating, and stabilizing the world political economy, during the transition from the 19th to the 20th century; the United States became one of the most powerful nations in the world. Following the end of WWII at mid - century, the U. S. emerged victorious and was militarily and economically dominant over every other nation on the earth (Modelski 218). The use of armed force has always been an inseparable part of hegemony, but military power depends upon the economic resources at the disposal of the state. Since becoming the world's most powerful country after the two world wars and the Cold War, the United States has acted more confidently to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, pursue, maintain and abuse hegemony, advance treason and infiltration, and willfully wage wars, bringing harm to the international community. The interesting question that both Modelski and Kennedy raise, and what remains to be seen, is who will be the challenger to the United States? What nation will be able to overcome the gains that the U. S. has made and obtain a legitimate position of dominance recognized by the other great powers? Numerous scholars predict China will be the next hegemon, and many books are written about "China's Rise." (Rajah and Leng 2022). Some see Russia as a resurgent power. Still others predict that India will grow to become the world leader, while some believe that the European Union will be able to overtake the U. S. The objective of this paper is to investigate the threats of US hegemony to the global south, looking positive and negative effects and the relevant fact of the U. S. hegemony in the political, military, economic, financial, technological and cultural fields, and to draw greater international attention to the threat of the U. S.

Volume 12 Issue 8, August 2023

www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

practices to world peace and stability and the well - being of all peoples, (Arrighi 2005). The United States has developed a hegemonic playbook to stage "color revolutions," instigate regional disputes, and even directly launch wars under the guise of promoting democracy, freedom and human rights. Clinging to the Cold War mentality, the United States has ramped up bloc politics and stoked conflict and confrontation. It has overstretched the concept of national security, abused export controls and forced unilateral sanctions upon others. It has taken a selective approach to international law and rules, utilizing or discarding them as it sees fit, and has sought to impose rules that serve its own interests in the name of upholding a "rules - based international order." "For instance Decades of lawless interventions in the Middle East, Asia, Africa, and Latin America have left nations of the Global South deeply and rightly skeptical of the United States as a champion of international law. Younger Americans increasingly reject U. S. exceptionalism and global military dominance as well, (Wallerstein 2003: 13 - 30). A United States that faces more and greater challenges to its power will likely turn to increasingly coercive means to defend that power, rendering its "liberal" guise increasingly worn - out as the Iraq war was most a painful failure for the United States, nevertheless the Iraq disaster creates an opportunity to reconsider global geopolitical changes.

1.2 Statement

The fall of the Soviet Union ended a period of bipolarity and created an "ideological vacuum" in the absence of socialist alliance. U. S. United States is the only superpower with unchallenged supremacy in every domain of power, economic, military, diplomatic, ideological, technological, and cultural. " (Huntington (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003) ". Intervention against Soviet aggression in Europe was no longer necessary. Thus, the significance of future U. S. hegemony came into question. The world witnessed a vast shift in the polarity of geopolitics after the Cold War. The United States became the world's greatest hegemon with an unequalled ability to globally project cultural, political, economic, and military power in a manner not seen since the days of the Roman Empire. The United States is increasingly forced to act unilaterally as a result of both foreign and domestic dislike to U. S. dominance and the rise of liberal internationalism. The United States has been the world's leading superpower for decades, and its hegemony has had a significant impact on the global south. Some of the potential threats of US hegemony to the global south includes economic exploitation, The US has often used its economic power to exploit developing countries. This can take the form of unfair trade practices, debt traps, and the extraction of natural resources. Political interference, The US has a long history of interfering in the internal affairs of developing countries. This can include supporting coups, installing puppet governments, and suppressing opposition as well as Military intervention, (Beckley 2018: 62 - 97). The US has a large and powerful military, and it has used it to intervene in conflicts in the global south on numerous occasions. This can lead to civilian casualties, displacement, refugees and instability. These are just some of the potential threats of US hegemony to the global south. It is important to note that not all countries in the global south are equally

affected by US hegemony. Some countries have been able to benefit from US economic and military power, while others have been more adversely affected. The impact of US hegemony also varies depending on the specific policies and actions of the US government.

1.3 The objective

The main objective of this study is to investigate the threats of US hegemony to the global south, looking positive and negative effects In addition, the study will also examine the consequence and how to How to alleviate US threats on global south

1.4 Research question

What are the threats of US hegemony to the global south, looking at positive and negative effect, and how can alleviate US threats to the global south?

2. Literature Review

2.1 The international system after the cold war

With the collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and disintegration of the Soviet Union, the bipolar international system dominating the Cold War period disappeared, leaving its place to basically a unipolar system under the leadership of the United States, speaking especially from a military/political point of view. The former rivals of the United States, especially the Soviet Union and China, have either collapsed or jettisoned the central features of their ideologies that were hostile to the United States. Other countries have turned to American military protection. The "American Empire" may best be seen operating in the Persian Gulf, Iraq, and the Middle East, in general, where the armed forces of the United States have established a semi - permanent position and thousands of soldiers deployed at bases keep a watch on Iran, Syria, and other "potential enemies". Moreover, American military power serves as an organizer of military coalition, both permanent (such as NATO) and ad hoc (such as peacekeeping missions). American military participation is often necessary to the command and control of coalition operations. When the Americans are willing to lead, other countries often follow, even if reluctantly. However, these are certainly not to argue that American interventions occur in every large conflict around the world. But it means that almost any country embarking on the use of force beyond its borders has to think about possible reactions of the United States (See, Sanders, 2008). The post - Cold War world faces several other threats, most notably, ethnically - driven conflicts, religious militancy and terrorism, supported by some revisionist powers. These are particularly challenging threats as they are beyond the full control of nation - states, calling for international cooperation if they are to be effectively dealt with. Thus, the future of the world will depend on whether major powers, in particular, and the international community, in general, are able to show the will to cooperate on these serious problems. The United States certainly a great economic power, but it is not the only power. There are other power centers, most notably, the European Union, the Organization of Asia - Pacific

Economic Cooperation, as well as many nation - states outside of these integrations or organizations (See, Harrison, 2004). As a matter of fact, when the United States exercised military operations to “stable” the world in Kuwait, Afghanistan, Iraq and elsewhere, it insisted on sharing the costs of the operations with other major powers or relevant countries. Thus, the international system of the post - Cold War era actually reflects a mixture of both unipolar and multipolar system in which at least five major powers, the United States, Europe, China, Japan, and Russia, dominate international affairs.

2.2 The threat of US Hegemony on global south

The Global South is a term broadly used to refer to countries in Africa, Latin America, and Asia. These countries are often characterized by lower levels of development and income than countries in the Global North, which is typically used to refer to Europe, North America, and Australia. The United States has a long history of involvement in the Global South, dating back to the early days of colonialism. The threat of US hegemony on the Global South is always very clear. In some cases, US military intervention, such as the overthrow of working regimes for reason to promote democracy. And the other US slogan is helping to improve infrastructure, education, and healthcare, promoting democracy, good governance and human rights. On the other hand, the US has also been accused of using its influence to promote its own interests at the expense of those of the Global South. For example, the US has been criticized for supporting authoritarian regimes in the region, and for using its economic power to pressure countries to adopt policies that benefit US businesses. US have a history of intervening militarily in countries in the Global South, often without the consent of the UN or the local government. This can destabilize the region and lead to violence and human rights abuses. In recent decades, the US has maintained its dominance in the region through a variety of means, including military intervention, economic aid, and political pressure. The authors believe that the threats of US hegemony to the Global South are real and should not be overlooked today. Threats to the Global South from US hegemony can be evident in a variety of ways, including (1) US Economic dominance is characterised by an unequal share of global economic power, giving it a major edge in trade discussions with countries in the Global South. This can result in unjust trade accords that benefit US corporations at the expense of developing - country businesses. (2) US Military intervention stands witness to the past of military engaging in countries of the Global South, frequently without the consent of the UN or local governments. This has the potential to destabilise the region and lead to violence and human rights violations. (3) The US has used its political strength to put pressure on countries in the Global South to favorable interest that benefit the US. Policies that undermine democracy or human rights are examples of this.

2.3 Insurgencies in global politics after the cold war against Western hegemony.

This article investigates the main challenges that have emerged to the American - led Western geopolitical bloc

after the Cold War. While the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 was thought to bring about a unipolar world of American dominance and a convergence around liberal democracy and free market economies, the post - Cold War order soon produced new challenges to Western hegemony. Primary among these “insurgents” are a rising China and a resurgent Russia, both of which explicitly aim to create a multipolar world, work to create alternative international institutions and economic infrastructure, challenge Western influence in their neighborhoods, and are trying to exploit the rise of illiberalism in Western societies on both the left and the right. More so than Russia, China in fact claims to have an alternative social order that is supposed to bring it to the same level of economic and technological development as the West (or possibly surpass it), and it has decades of very high growth rates to back up those claims. Another key challenge has come from a global Islamist movement that has many faces, including state actors like Iran and the former Islamic State, as well as a wide range of non - state actors, of which Al - Qaeda, Alshabab, Boko Haram is undoubtedly the most in famous. Finally, there is North Korea – a curious remnant of a by - gone Stalinist civilization that has nevertheless claimed a place in global politics by developing a nuclear arsenal. The paper investigate these various “insurgencies” against Western dominance by looking at their ideologies, (geo) political strategies, and their proposed alternative political, social, and economic models. Along each of these factors, the Authors will assess their successes and failures in challenging the American - led Western powers and creating alternative value systems, institutions, and international regimes to those created and circulate by the Western powers. Key questions to be discussed are: What is the nature of the American - led Western bloc (is it an empire, liberal international order, world after the end of World War II in 1945, when the United States became the world's dominant economic ? What are the sources and dimensions of the West's global power? Is the multipolar world a reality or a Chinese and Russian fantasy? Is the West truly in decline? Can China replace the United States as the leading power or are we perhaps heading towards another bipolar world? Is Russia a resurgent power or a declining one that is lashing out with its last strength? Is Islamism a real threat to the West? What is the significance of North Korea's nuclear arsenal and Iran's attempts to acquire one? What is the role of political ideology in shaping the geopolitics of the post - Cold War order? Is geopolitical increasingly conflict taking place along cultural civilizational lines? By analyzing these questions, Authors believe that we will gain a better understanding of our current geopolitical moment and how it profoundly shapes the world that we live in.

2.4 The emerging global new world order (BRICS).

The end of the Cold War changed the global architecture in ways that are proving global structure. The dissolution of the USSR left the United States as the undisputed hegemon. However, the emerging global order also created a place for players that hitherto were on the fringes of shaping global politics. Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa seem to be the most prominent of emerging regional powers (Nkomo - Mashabane, 2009; Li and Zhang 2018). With the passage of time, these powers of the global South have

augmented their influence in their respective regions, and their participation in groups such as the G20 and BRICS suggests that they predict themselves as emerging global leaders. In fact, in the case of China and India, Mthembu (2018) has argued that they have since challenged the 'emerging power' mark and have asserted themselves as 'southern powers.' This will have an impact on theorizing international relations because the global South has unique experiences and conditions which inevitably shapes its outlook on international relations. Furthermore, the BRICS countries have a number of things in common that could make them a powerful force in the global order. They are all emerging markets with large populations and growing economies. They are also all developing countries that are seeking a greater say in the global order. Additionally, they all have a shared interest in challenging the dominance of the United States and the European Union. The BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) are emerging as a new global power bloc that could challenge the dominance of the United States and the European Union. These countries are all large, populous, and have rapidly growing economies. They are also increasingly declared their interests on the world stage, particularly in the areas of trade, finance, and security. Adding to the above authors believe that the BRICS countries are also working together to promote their own interests on the world stage. For example, they have called for a reform of the UN Security Council to give them more representation. They have also worked together to block US - led interventions in countries like Syria and Venezuela. The BRICS countries are still a relatively new bloc, and it is unclear how they will ultimately shape the global order. However, they are clearly emerging as a force to be supposed with. They have the potential to challenge the dominance of the United States and the European Union, and they are likely to play an increasingly important role in the global economy and politics in the years to come. The author believes that it is still too early to say what the ultimate impact of the BRICS rise will be on the global order. However, it is clear that they are emerging as a significant force that could reshape the world in the years to come.

2.5 Potential consequences of the end of US hegemony

Author, consider to my experience, suggested that it is important to note that there are some of the potential consequences of the end of US hegemony. There would be a variety of consequence if US hegemony ended, the actual consequences will depend on a variety of factors, possibly could have a number of potential consequences for the global order. Some of these consequences could be positive, while others could be negative. The question is as such how the rise of other powers is managed, how the US responds to this shift in power, and how countries around the world cooperate to address common challenges. In addition possibly to increase competition and conflict between major powers: As the US becomes less dominant; other countries will be more likely to compete for power and influence. Moreover this could lead to increased tensions and conflict between major powers. A more unstable and unpredictable world order, the end of US hegemony could lead to a more unstable and unpredictable world order. This could make it more difficult to address global challenges, such as

international system, climate change and terrorism. Many academics predict that if US hegemony ends, the world would become increasingly divided, with many nations and regions creating their own alliances. This can make it more challenging to work together on international systems. The end of US hegemony is a complex and uncertain issue. Authors think it is critical to be watchful of the possible effects of this change in power and to act to make sure that the new multipolarity world order it is important to assume and predict at the end of US hegemony could have a number of potential consequences for the global order possibly positive or negative consequence.

Positive consequences (author hypothesis):

- 1) The end of US hegemony could lead to a more multipolar world order, with a greater role for other major powers, such as China, Russia, and the European Union. This could lead to a more balanced and less conflict - prone world.
- 2) The end of US hegemony could lead to a more equitable distribution of wealth and resources in the world. This could be achieved through a number of mechanisms, such as increased trade and investment between developing and developed countries, and the transfer of technology from developed to developing countries.
- 3) The end of US hegemony could lead to a more sustainable development model for the world. This could be achieved through a number of mechanisms, such as increased cooperation on climate change, and the development of new technologies that promote more efficient use of resources.

Negative consequences (Author Hypothesis)

- 1) The end of US hegemony could lead to increased conflict and instability in the world. This could be caused by a number of factors, such as competition for resources, power struggles between major powers, and the rise of new security threats, such as terrorism and cyberwarfare.
- 2) The end of US hegemony could lead to a decline in global cooperation. This could be caused by a number of factors, such as the rise of protectionism, the fragmentation of international institutions, and the increasing polarization of global politics.
- 3) The end of US hegemony could lead to a loss of global leadership. This could have a number of negative consequences, anarchy such as a decline in the rule of law, a rise in human rights abuses, and a failure to address global challenges, such as climate change and nuclear proliferation.
- 4) Increased competition for resources - With no single country able to dominate the global economy, there would be more competition for resources such as oil and natural gas. This could lead to higher prices and increased tensions between countries.
- 5) Increased risk of nuclear proliferation - With no single country able to guarantee security, countries may be more likely to develop their own nuclear weapons. This could increase the risk of nuclear war.

2.6 Academic debate over the veracity of global hegemony

The future of political hegemony is uncertain. Some analysts believe that the rise of new powers, such as BRICS (China), will lead to a more multipolar world order. Others believe that the United States will continue to be the world's leading hegemonic power for the foreseeable future. Only time will tell how political hegemony will change in the years to come. Overall, the end of US hegemony would have a mixed basket of consequences. It is possible that the world would be a more peaceful and prosperous place without a single dominant power. However, it is also possible that the world would be more unstable and dangerous. The actual consequences would depend on a number of factors, including how countries choose to interact with each other in the absence of US leadership. It is important to note that the end of US hegemony is not inevitable. The United States could continue to maintain its dominant position in the world for many years to come. However, the factors that have contributed to US hegemony, such as its economic and military power, are changing rapidly. It is possible that these changes will lead to a more multipolar world in the future. The academic debate over global hegemony is likely to continue for many years to come. It is a complex issue with no easy answers. However, it is an important issue to understand, as it has a significant impact on the global order. There is a long - standing academic debate over the veracity of global hegemony. Some scholars argue that the United States has been the hegemonic power in the world since the end of World War II, while others argue that the world is becoming increasingly multipolar and that the United States is no longer the sole hegemon.

3. Recommendation (How to alleviate US threats on global south)

It is important to note that there is no single solution to the problem of US threats to the Global South. The best approach will vary depending on the specific circumstances of each country. However, the strategies outlined above can all play a role in alleviating these threats and promoting a more equitable and just world order. Author believes that there some ways to alleviate US threats on the Global South. Here are some ways to alleviate US threats on the Global South:

- 1) Countries in the Global South can engage in diplomacy and dialogue with the US in an effort to resolve their differences and to find common ground. This can help to reduce tensions and to build a more cooperative relationship between the two sides.
- 2) Strengthen regional cooperation - the countries in the Global South can work together to reduce their dependence on the US and to promote their own interests on the global stage. For example, the BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) have formed a number of cooperation agreements in recent years, aimed at reducing their reliance on the US and promoting their own economic and political interests.
- 3) Promote economic diversification - Countries in the Global South can diversify their economies and reduce their reliance on exports to the US. This will make them

less vulnerable to US economic sanctions and other forms of pressure. For example, many countries in Africa are increasingly turning to China as a source of investment and trade, in an effort to reduce their dependence on the US.

- 4) Countries in the Global South can build strong democratic institutions that are resistant to US interference. This will help to protect their sovereignty and their right to self - determination. For example, many countries in Latin America have made significant progress in recent years in strengthening their democratic institutions, in part as a way to resist US pressure to adopt policies that are not in their best interests.
- 5) Form alliances with other countries - Countries in the Global South can form alliances with other countries that are also opposed to US hegemony. This can help to increase their bargaining power and to resist US pressure. For example, many countries in the Global South have joined the Non - Aligned Movement, an organization of countries that are not aligned with any major power bloc.

4. Conclusion

The United States has been the hegemonic power in the world since the end of World War II. This hegemony has been based on a number of factors, including the United States' economic, military, and cultural power. The rise of China as a major economic and military power is one of the most significant challenges to US hegemony. China is now the world's second largest economy, and it is rapidly expanding its military capabilities. China is also increasingly asserting its interests on the world stage, and it is challenging US leadership in a number of areas. The emergence of the BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) is another challenge to US hegemony. The BRICS countries are all large, populous, and have rapidly growing economies. They are also increasingly asserting their interests on the world stage, and they are working together to promote their own interests. However, Author argues that the world is becoming increasingly multipolar, and the United States is no longer the sole hegemon. The hegemonic, dominant, and bullying practices of using strength to intimidate the weak, taking from others by force and deception, and playing zero - sum games are exerting grave harm. The historical trends of peace, development, cooperation, and mutual benefit are unstoppable. The United States has been overriding truth with its power and stamping on justice to serve self - interest. These unilateral, egoistic and regressive hegemonic practices have drawn growing, intense criticism and opposition from the international community. Countries need to respect each other and treat each other as equals. Big countries should behave in a manner befitting their status and take the lead in pursuing a new model of state - to - state relations featuring dialogue and partnership, not confrontation or alliance. China opposes all forms of hegemonism and power politics, and rejects interference in other countries' internal affairs. The United States must conduct serious soul - searching. It must critically examine what it has done, let go of its arrogance and prejudice, and quit its hegemonic, dominating and bullying practices.

Since the US played a major role in promoting free trade and globalization, which have helped millions of people escape poverty in developing countries, some academic researchers and scholars worry that the end of US hegemony could result in increased economic inequality between nations. Economic disparity might rise, though, if the US is unable to continue filling this role.

References

- [1] Cox, Robert W. *Production, Power and World Order. Social Forces in the Making of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
- [2] Gilpin, Robert. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- [3] DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511664267
- [4] Gilpin, Robert. *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- [5] Keohane, Robert O. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- [6] Reference
- [7] Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003), 316.
- [8] For a good summary see Anna Khakee, "Plus ça Change... Civilizations, Political Systems and Power Politics: A Critique of Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations,'" in *The 'Clash of Civilizations' 25 Years On: A Multidisciplinary Appraisal*, ed. Davide Orsi (Bristol, England: E - International Relations Publishing, 2018), 87 - 88.
- [9] Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991); Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: The Free Press, 1992).
- [10] See Raymond Sontag, "The End of Sovereign Democracy in Russia," Center on Global Interests, July 3, 2013, <http://globalinterests.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/The-End-of-Sovereign-Democracy-in-Russia.pdf>.
- [11] See Daniel Philpott, *Revolutions in Sovereignty: How Ideas Shaped Modern International Relations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 87, 261 - 262.
- [12] Hedley Bull, *the Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), 13, 16.
- [13] Philpott, *Revolutions*, 39 - 43.
- [14] Joelle Tanguy, "Redefining Sovereignty and Intervention," *Ethics and International Affairs* 17.1 (2003): 143. The United Nations' World Summit in 2005 formalized the principle of "the Responsibility to Protect" as one of the attributes of sovereignty.
- [15] Bull, *Anarchical Society*, 85, 317; David Lumsdaine, "Moral Rationality and Particularity: A Response to John Hare," in *Sovereignty at the Crossroads? Morality and International Politics in the Post - Cold War Era*, ed. Luis E. Lugo (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1996), 97, 99.
- [16] Huntington, "Why International Primacy Matters," *International Security* 17.4 (1993): 83, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539022>; Huntington, *Clash*, 302; Huntington, "If Not Civilization, What? Paradigms of the Post - Cold War World," *Foreign Affairs* 72.5 (1993): 189, 193. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20045880>.
- [17] Huntington, *Clash*, 310, 313, 316.
- [18] *Ibid.*, 33 - 34, 135. On the importance of ideas in foreign policy, see Philpott, *Revolutions*, 8 - 9, and Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization* 51.4 (1997): 546 - 547.
- [19] Arno J. Mayer, *Wilson vs. Lenin: Political Origins of the New Diplomacy, 1917 - 1918* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959); Anton Fedyashin, "How Lenin and Wilson Changed the World," *The National Interest*, Mar.25, 2017, <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/howlenin-wilson-changed-the-world-19900>.
- [20] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol.5 (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1955), 40.
- [21] "X" [George F. Kennan], "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs*, 25.4 (1947): 566 - 582.
- [22] Mikhail Gorbachev, "From the Address to the 43rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly," in *The Road We Traveled the Challenges We Face: Speeches, Articles, Interviews* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Ves Mir, 2006), 26 - 45, http://www.gorby.ru/userfiles/file/gorbachev_book_speeches_en.pdf.
- [23] For the evangelical connection with Russia, see Perry Glanzer, *The Quest for Russia's Soul: Evangelicals and Moral Education in Post - Communist Russia* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2002).
- [24] Stephen F. Cohen, *Soviet Fates and Lost Alternatives: From Stalinism to the New Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 171 - 187.
- [25] David Mayers, *The Ambassadors and America's Soviet Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 248.
- [26] P. Edward Haley, *Strategies of Dominance: The Misdirection of U. S. Foreign Policy* (Washington, D. C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2006), 72 - 80.
- [27] *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President of the United States, 2002), 1, 6, <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>.
- [28] William Zimmerman, *Ruling Russia: Authoritarianism from the Revolution to Putin* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 2 - 7 and 308 - 310.
- [29] "Russians name Brezhnev Best 20th - century Leader, Gorbachev Worst," *Russia Today* May, 2013, <http://rt.com/politics/brezhnev-stalin-gorbachev-soviet-638/>; Sam Greene and Graeme Robertson, "Explaining Putin's Popularity: Rallying Round the Russian Flag," *Washington Post*, Sept.9, 2014.
- [30] Paul Goble, "Moscow Seeing the Ukraine Conflict as a Spiritual Struggle," *East - West Church & Ministry Report* 22.4 (2014): 5. (Reprinted from Paul Goble, "Moscow Draws a Religious Line in the Sand in Ukraine," *Eurasia Daily Monitor* 11.104 (2014).
- [31] Kristina Stoeckl, "The Russian Orthodox Church as Moral Norm Entrepreneur," *Religion, State and*

- Society* 44 (2016): 139, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09637494.2016.1194010>.
- [32] Geraldine Fagan, "Russia: Building Places of Worship in Moscow Still a Struggle," *Forum 18 News Service*, Dec.3, 2007, http://www.forum18.org/archive.php?article_id=1056.
- [33] [Http://www.rusdoctrina.ru/](http://www.rusdoctrina.ru/). Using translate. google.com, select "Theses of the RD" and scroll down to section IV, paragraph 7.
- [34] "Integration of Post - Soviet Space an Alternative to Uncontrolled Migration," *Russia Today*, Jan.23, 2012, <https://on.rt.com/e3ntmg>; Vladimir Putin, "Presidential Address to the Federal Assembly" (Moscow, December 12, 2013), President of Russia. <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/19825>. Search the document for "hegemony."
- [35] Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, *The Mortal Danger: How Misconceptions about Russia Imperil America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1981); Solzhenitsyn, "Harvard Address," *The Solzhenitsyn Reader: New and Essential Writings 1947 - 2005* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2006), 573.
- [36] Stephen F. Cohen, *Soviet Fates*, 188, citing Kennan, *American Diplomacy* (New York: Signet Books, 1952), 112. Cohen, *Rethinking the Soviet Experience: Politics and History Since 1917* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 157, and *Soviet Fates*, ch.7.
- [37] Charlie Laderman, "Conservative Internationalism: An Overview," *Orbis* 62.1 (2018): 15, citing Henry A. Kissinger, *A World Restored: Metternich, Castlereagh and the Problems of Peace, 1812 - 1822* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1957), 206.
- [38] Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously," 525.
- [39] Henry R. Nau, "Why 'Conservative,' not Liberal, Internationalism?" *Orbis* 62.1 (2018): 22 - 29.
- [40] See Laderman, "Conservative Internationalism," 17 - 18, and Henry A. Nau, "Trump's Conservative Internationalism," *National Review*, Aug.24, 2017, 33 - 36.
- [41] Mark Amstutz, "The Renewal of Global Order," *Providence: A Journal of Christianity and Foreign Policy* 5 (2016): 22 - 32.
- [42] Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment Revisited," *The National Interest*, Winter 2002/03, 5.
- [43] See Robert O. Work, "Winning the Race: A Naval Fleet Platform Architecture for Enduring Maritime Supremacy" (Washington, D. C.: Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, 2005), p.16.
- [44] Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment Revisited," *The National Interest*, Winter 2002/03, 5.
- [45] Spyros Sakellariopoulos and Panagiotis Sotiris, "American Foreign Policy as Modern Imperialism: From Armed Humanitarianism to Preemptive War," *Science & Society* 72, no.2 (2008): 222.
- [46] Beeson, Mark and Richard Higgott. "Hegemony, Institutionalism and US Foreign Policy: theory and practice in comparative historical perspective." *Third World Quarterly* Vol.26, No.7 (2005): 1173 - 1188.
- [47] Camroux, David and Nuria Okfen. "9/11 and US-Asian relations: towards a new 'New World Order'?" *The Pacific Review*, Vol.17 No.2 (2004): 163-177.
- [48] Catley, Bob. "Hegemonic America: The Arrogance of Power." *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International & Strategic Affairs* vol.21 no.2 (1999): 157.
- [49] Catley, Bob. "Hegemonic America: The Arrogance of Power." *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International & Strategic Affairs* vol.21 no.2 (1999): 157.
- [50] Chomsky, Noam. *Rogue states: the rule of force in world affairs*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2000.
- [51] Huntington, Samuel. "Culture, Power and Democracy." Plattner, Marc and Aleksander Smolar. *Globalization, Power and Democracy*. London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.3 - 13.
- [52] Sakellariopoulos, Spyros and Panagiotis Sotiris. "American Foreign Policy as Modern Imperialism: From Armed Humanitarianism to Preemptive War." *Science and Society* Vol.72, No.2 (2008): 208-235.
- [53] Black, Jeremy. *Great Powers and the Quest for Hegemony: The World Order since 1500*. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- [54] Gill, Graeme. *The Nature and Development of the Modern State*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Print.
- [55] Little, Richard. *The balance of power in international relations: metaphors, myths and models*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print.
- [56] Rose, Gideon. "U. S. Hegemony and International Organizations." *foreignaffairs*, 2003. Web.
- [57] Sharp, Paul. For *Diplomacy: Representation and the Study of International Relation*. *International Studies Review*, Vol.1, No.1, 1999), pp.33 - 57.
- [58] IvyPanda. (2020, July 22). *Was US Hegemony in the 20th Century Inevitable?* <https://ivypanda.com/essays/was-us-hegemony-in-the-20th-century-inevitable/>
- [59] Chapman, T & Reiter, D 2004, 'The United Nations Security Council and the 'rally round the flag effect'', *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol.48, no.6, pp.886 - 909.
- [60] Cox, R 1981, 'Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations', *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, vol.10, no.2, pp.126 - 155.
- [61] Cox, R 1983, 'Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: An essay in method', *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, vol.12, no.2, pp.162 - 175.
- [62] Gill, S2003, *Power and resistance in the new world order*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- [63] Lynn, R & Vanhanen, T 2002, *IQ and the wealth of nations*. Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport, Conn.
- [64] Ohmae, K 2005, *Next global stage: Challenges and opportunities in our borderless world*, Wharton School Publishing, Upper Saddle River.
- [65] Rupert, M 1995, *Producing hegemony: The politics of mass production and American global power*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- [66] Rupert, M 2003, 'Globalizing common sense: A Marxian - Gramscian (re) vision of the politics of governance/resistance', *Review of International Studies*, vol.29, no.5, pp.195 - 196.
- [67] Strange, S 1988, *State and markets*, Printer Publishers, London,

- [68] Fabbri, S., & Yossef, A. (2015). Obama's wavering: US foreign policy on the Egyptian crisis, 2011–13. *Contemporary Arab Affairs*, 8 (1), 65 - 80.
- [69] Cox, Robert W. *Production, Power and World Order. Social Forces in the Making of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987. Gilpin, Robert. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511664267
- [70] Gilpin, Robert. *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- [71] Keohane, Robert O. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- [72] Amin, Samir. *Beyond U. S. Hegemony? Assessing the Prospects for a Multipolar World*. New York: Zed Books Ltd., 2006
- [73] Annan, Kofi. "Farewell Address. " The United Nations. Truman Presidential Library & Museum, Independence, MO. 11 Dec. 2006. 23 Mar. 2008
- [74] Barber, Benjamin R. "Jihad Vs. McWorld. " *The Atlantic Monthly* Mar. 1992. 4 Apr. 2008. Bajoria, Jayshree. "Inequalities in Asia's Giants. " *Backgrounder* (2007). 22 Mar. 2008.
- [75] Betts, Richard K. "A Disciplined Defense: How to Regain Strategic Solvency. " *Foreign Affairs* (2007). 30 Feb. 2008.
- [76] Blasko, Dennis J. "Rumsfeld's Take on the Chinese Military: a Dissenting View. " *Current History* 105 (2006): 263 - 269.
- [77] Browne, Anthony. "Why China is the Real Master of the Universe. " *Daily Mail* 11 Apr. 2008. 11 Apr. 2008 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/worldnews.html?in_article_id=559133&in_page_id=1811>
- [78] Brzezinski, Zbigniew, and John J. Mearsheimer. "Clash of the Titans. " *Foreign Policy* (2005). 20 Mar. 2008.
- [79] <https://ivypanda.com/essays/the-us-global-hegemony/>
- [80] <https://monthlyreview.org/2003/12/01/us-hegemony-continuing-decline-enduring-danger/>
- [81] https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/wjbxw/202302/t20230220_11027664.html
- [82] https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/wjbxw/202302/t20230220_11027664.html
- [83] https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/wjbxw/202302/t20230220_11027664.html

Author Profile



Omar Abdi Mohamed Qasaye –Senior Independent Researcher.

PhD Candidate - International Relations & Diplomacy
did in MAILHR - Master International law and Human rights and MAIRD - Master international relations & Diplomacy.

1. Email: [omarkasaye\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:omarkasaye[at]gmail.com)
2. Cell phone: 252 615036843