



BIPOLAR CONFRONTATION IN GLOBAL POLITICS: HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY AND CHALLENGES: AS WITNESSED ABOVE AND BEYOND SEPTEMBER 11th 2001 ATTACKS ON THE US AND TYPIFIED IN THE CURRENT BOKO HARAM SAGA IN NIGERIA

Ugwu, Ude¹ --- Moko, Finian^{2†}

¹*Institute of Public Policy and Administration, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria*

²*Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria*

ABSTRACT

The current study is a contribution to existing literatures in search of international peace and global stability. The study adopts a new estimation methodology adopted every non-empirical, philosophical and theoretical researches. The study originates a new formula showing a deepening concern over US' over-activated denial of genuine sovereignty to nations of the Arab Spring in our Post-September 11, 2011 Global Response to Sept. 11th 2011 Attacks on the US by Osama-Led Al-Qaida Groups. The study is therefore one of the few studies which have investigated into the rights of 'underdog nations', such as Iraq and Nigeria, under the current bipolar confrontation between the US and a seeming Arab Hegemony. The paper is a contribution to the first logical analysis of the history, the philosophy, and the challenges of the realists power-drunk approach to international politics around which the present bipolar politics between the US and an emerging Arab Hegemony seems to have been built. The main finding of the paper is its discovery that the power-based realists philosophy of bipolarity is to be rejected if the international community must move beyond the Sept. 11, 2011 event. The research documents and sources are materials which include books, internet articles, paper publications and input from journals.

Keywords: History, Philosophy, Challenges, Bipolar confrontations, Global politics, Post-Sept. Attacks on the US, Boko Haram Saga in Nigeria, Oppression of the Arab Spring, Rights of underdog nations in global politics.

Received: 26 September 2014/ **Revised:** 11 November 2014/ **Accepted:** 15 November 2014/ **Published:** 23 November 2014

Contribution/ Originality

The study contributes to research by raising a new question, not about the merits or demerits of bipolar politics as in existing literature, but a new question about the philosophy behind the politics, namely, realists emphasis on domination, highlighted in the philosophy, history, and challenges of bipolar politics

1. BACKGROUND CONSIDERATION AND GENERAL OVERVIEWED

The history, the philosophy and the challenges of the theory of bipolar confrontation, especially, its humanitarian challenges, namely, the continuous abuse of the rights, of underdog nations' in the international system, etc is one subject which truly calls for reflection and possible reforms to achieve a better international community. In particular, this anti-minoritarian theory of bipolar confrontation as it is reflected in variety of historic events such as the bipolar scramble for the resources of Ukraine and C₂choslovakia by US and Soviet Union during the cold war, etc, was a wound that took time to heal. The bipolar conflict or Arab revolt by Bin Ladin's Al-Qaeda Group against US is believed by most people to be is a contemporary indictment of the much celebrated glories of the theory of bipolar politics, which is largely due to US unfair treatment of the Middle East. These events here under consideration, namely, Sept. 11th 2001 attacks on the US by some Talibanese representing the Al-Qaeda Network; as well as, the bipolar conflict as typified in the *Boko Haram* insurgency in Nigeria between Christian West South and Muslim North in Nigeria, both tend to expose [raised] in recent times, one of the most controversial humanitarian questions of the rights [sovereignty] of 'underdog nations' in the international political system. This right [sovereignty] of underdog nations appears to this research as a contemporary question which leaders of states and scholars in the classroom, both in the Social Sciences and in the Humanities, must arise and address. The heat which seems to have made this minoritarian question a central question in global politics or in the Politics of Bipolarity, is as [Montairo Numo \(2012\)](#) thinks it through, namely, the point that polarity of any kind in global politics, whether under circumstances of unipolar, bipolar of multipolar confrontation, among states reveals that it is clearly against international law itself to subjugate the rights of weaker nations in the international system under the ampits of world powers. This, in the thinking of this paper and in the thinking of Montairo, is wrong, especially, under the current circumstances where the denial of the sovereignty of relatively weaker nations of the world under pretence of balance of power, is being achieved against the spirit of international law. Even when it is done with a good aim to ensuring a balance of power system in global politics, this is only achieved in favour of the already rich, strong, and power-drunk nations of and world and in favour of World Powers, namely, The US and the G8.

Bipolar confrontation aims at achieving a balance of power in international relations. Yet, there are strong doubts whether this noble aim is being pursued with honesty? In terms of its meaning and definition, [Wohlforth \(1999\)](#) describes this concept as administration of

international political community by two antagonistic equals or semi-equal super nations. Such International administration or lordship of one nation over others not by a rule of 'consent' but by exhibition or avalanche of 'force'. It is, therefore not surprising that bipolar confrontation, has largely been linked with the classical realists works such as those of [Morgenthau \(1948\)](#) who in one of his seminar papers, "*Politics of Nations*", ([William et al., 1993](#)) viewed international relations as nothing other than a scramble for political domination. Morgenthau does not see international politics as a move by nations to harmony. In Law and Philosophy, such realists' scramble for power rather than the harmony of states, has been highlighted by the Legal Positivists such as Bentham and Austin, particularly, in Austin's command theory. And in History, Political Philosophy and in the Social Sciences this theory of bipolar confrontation or the balance of power in global politics has come through the Machiavellian conception of power as a game of selfish interest. All of these, both the realist stand of Machiavelli, the theory of Bipolar confrontation and the balance of power, have historically, manifested both in the cold war and in Sept 11th 2001 attacks on the US, and by extension, in the current Boko Haram Insurgency in Nigeria.

Any leaders of states is likely to agree with social theories in Law, History, Political Science, Philosophy, Policy Study and Literary Works, including the literary sketches of the Shakespearian standing, that bipolar confrontation and its philosophy of political balance of power, etc, all build upon the realists' conception of how power should be distributed in the international community. Therefore, with a realists' emphasis on power rather than 'harmony', it is not surprising that the political international expression of bipolar confrontation, continues to justify both the subjugation of Bosnia and Cuba under the US the during the cold war era and the current subjugation of the Arab Spring by US Middle East, which most people believe gave birth to Sept 11th 2001 attacks on the US in contemporary times is not to be left out in naming the numerous flaws of the theory.. Abuse of minority rights of the Arab Spring in international politics, has also been seen in the Boko Haram insurgency in present day Nigeria. [Obi Emeka \(2006\)](#) explains that other theories of international relations also exist. They include theories such as the Game Theory, The Dependency Theory, The Communications Theory, The System's Theory and The Idealists Theory, etc to mention only but these. Yet, a majority view rates this so-called 'bipolar confrontation' (balance of power theory), second, in turns of result-orientedness only second to the systems theory of Emile Dawkins, the reasons for this laudable ovations enjoyed by political bipolarity or balance of power theory is as [Montairo Numo \(2012\)](#) sees it. According to Montairo, this is because of the relative merits of being able to ensure peace by embarking upon threats of *Mutuality Assure Destruction* of states in an event of conflict. But, despite this relative advantage of bipolar confrontation over other theories of international politics, historic events, such as the *Post-Sept 11th rise or increase in Islamic terrorism globally*, has tended to deflate this laudable ovation which bipolar confrontation or the balance of power theory, has always enjoyed, thereby, resurrecting his demerits of or total subjugation of the rights

of weaker nations. Nigeria may not be a weak nation in the sense in which Ukraine was during the Cold War, yet, the interests of Democratic West and Arab East in Nigeria's Oil have rendered Nigeria an underdog nation for purposes of Boko Haram Insurgency and other weapons in global politics ensuring the perpetual servitude of some nations and the endless squabbles whose solutions are possible through a reformed UN Security Council as pointed out by Wohlforth account in this paper. In other words, while we learn from the cold war history that under the bipolar politics, there could be no full scale war because of threats of mutual Assured Destruction but only verbal confrontation, most people now believe that any replay of the Cold War Episode in international politics, even in its current form as a Post-Sept 11th tussle between US as the current World Power and an emerging Arab Spring. If this is anything to be justified, even on grounds of suppressing terrorism, Sept. 11th attacks on the US did no less than resurrected the ghost of the cold war. In this setting where Arab's terrorism as lunched against the Capital West and its ideology of democracy brings back memories of Soviet Union and its communists' attack on Democratic West, it seems most likely that it is the Soviet Union which has now been, replaced by the Arab Hegemony and its philosophy of terrorism. This new form of Cold War, (this time, between the US and the Arab nation, no longer between US and Soviet Union, has done no less than opened fresh doors for the scrambles over the resources of some "underdog nations" in Africa, such as Libya, Egypt and Nigeria, between the Ally West and the rising Arab Hegemony in the Middle East. What now stands out is the humanitarian question of the 'the rights of such nations such as Egypt, Libya Nigeria and Iraq, under the current bipolar structure? Although the question of the rights of 'underdog' states under the international system is as old as the world itself, there seems to be a worsening scenario after Post-Sept 11th attacks on the US. To the value of this position, Daniel (1996) has in his online response in (Cisac.stanford.edu/publication/new...) held thus as here stated;

The period since 1989 (which ended the cold war) has witnessed a marked divergence between strengthening minority rights' standards at the level of international politics and worsening conflicts and growing repression in many states of the world.

These states of the world have not failed to include countries of the Middle East and African, and such a growing disrespect for the rights of 'underdog nations' or exchange of their rights for political power by super nations has of late become a viable ground for power lobbying between US and France. In present day Egypt, US and Italy duly contested in the ousting of Mubarak, and in Lybia, it was between US and France, yet, between France and Britain in Nigeria's Bakassi Peninsula, Russia and the US have been fighting over North Korea and Christian South and Muslim West have been fighting the *Boko Haram* insurgency in present day Nigeria. To state the case quite clearly, it is to say that instances of this gross abuse of rights and sovereignty of African Nations and those of the Middle East by the Super Nations who now see Africa and the Middle East as underdog states in international politics are clearly inexhaustible, yet, have been

listed with so much pain, being in reality that the UN which could have long intervened to defend the rights of weaker states is under the circumstances a partial judge and an ardent supporter of Western Policies towards other nations whether good or badly intended by the West

2. MAJOR ARGUMENTS OF THE RESEARCH

This research paper, *“Bipolar Confrontations in Global Politics; History, Challenges and Philosophy as Witnessed Above and Beyond Sept 11th 2001 Attacks on the US and Typified in the Current Boko Haram Saga in Nigeria”*, is centered around the following arguments;

- i. The research is built around an adoption of [Montairo Numo \(2012\)](#) assertion that *“Polarity of any kind” in global politics, infringes on the rights of weaker nations’*. The paper adds that Nigeria, Syria, Egypt and Iraq are no less victims of this (but not North Korea being a non underdog nation), which, despite its pro-nuclear weapon policy, cannot be victimized, even by the United States as a World Power.
- ii. Emphasis of the paper is that the end of the cold war in 1989 seems to have put an end to bipolar politics and its abuse of the rights of *“underdog nations”*. But contrary to this belief we now have a worsening situation and a more deadly bipolarity or power tussle and underdog victimization between US West and the Arab Hegemony’ emphasis in this paper is that this “neo cold war” humanitarian question originated in Sept 11th, 2001 following Al Qaeda attacks on the US Bin Laden’s men who claim to be by an Arab Extremist Group.
- iii. In the end, the paper recommends fundamental reforms of the UN Security Council to enable it ensure the future of society irrespective of any existing polarity. The ultimate submission of the paper is that, although, Bipolar politics cannot be stopped since the quest for domination is natural to man. But its effects can, in the view of this paper be overcome through UN reforms. This is Montairo’s position adopted in this research paper, and the study intends to render it explicit in the course of its discussions

3. DEFINITION OF SOME RELEVANT TERMS

a. History, Philosophy, Challenges and Politics of Bipolar Confrontation Since World War II

A first century philosopher, historian, politician, lawyer, statesman and public analysts, ([Marcus Tullius Cicero \(ADI\)](#)) once founded the relation between the philosophy, the politics, the challenges and the tussle which exists between nations as founded on greed and intolerance where he proceeded to define history *par se as ‘man’s teacher’* (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cicero). Two thousand years after Cicero described history as *‘man’s teachers’*, a common definition now exists which sees history as a *record* and *an analysis* of events (dictionary.net). This research, while considering the philosophy, the challenges, the history and the politics of bipolar confrontation

since World War II, adopts both the Cicerian position and our everyday conception by spotlighting both the *records* and the *learnings* from such changes in time since World War II. Some of those learning that have come as events of history would include such as the creation of the Berlin wall after world war II. The rise and collapse of bipolar politics during the cold war, the Sept 11th 2001 attacks on the US, and the recreation of a new kind of bipolar squabble between a Christian South and Muslim North in the current Boko Haram Saga in Nigeria, are some salient examples since World War II. Perhaps the biggest challenge after the Cold War, which the international community had to confront since World War II, is the current attempt by the US to completely bite into submission, those eye-points of the Arab Nations that have formally been called “the Arab Spring”. This is where bipolarity has proved to be the right attitude for contemporary society because the repercussion is the continuous emergence of terrorists groups as a philosophy for containing abuse of rights under a bipolar setting

b. Post-Sept 11th 2001 Attacks Bipolar Politics Globally (Between US West and Arab Hegemony)

The specific event which most people now see as marking a historical confrontation of terrorism as a contemporary philosophy for containing abuse of rights under a bipolar setting remain that of Sept 11th 2001 attacks on the US. Though, attacks took place on Sept 11th, it was not until that historic broadcast by Osama Bin Laden on Sept 16th (5 days later) where Osama Bin Laden accepted responsibility for the attacks on Al Jazeera news, sources were merely speculating (www.britainica.com/). Although Osama Bin Laden was already on the FBI list, the US state never really suspected that such a magnitude of destruction and the political under tone of the attacks would have come from Bin Laden (Ibid). But consider this that the said attacks has further one word stirred up a chain of reprisal attacks by the US on every nation of the world reasonably suspected to be loyal to Bin Laden’s course. These suspected nations unfortunately, constitute nation, of the Arab Spring; Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Afghanistan and then, Libya. According to [Moises Saman \(2011\)](#) the current Post-Sept 11th squabble between the US West and the Arab Spring commenced in Egypt. In particular, it was in February and in an 18-day revolt suspected to have been manipulated by the US to aust Mubarak out of power. The revolt eventually ousted Mubarak out of three decades of power. This, as has been reported came one month after a similar revolt in Tunisia ousted Zine El Abinadina Ben Ali out of power. As soon as Egypt’s flag was lowered indicating the exist of Mubarak, the US flag was found flying in a definite direction against Syria, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Yemen. The US has continued to attack these Nations of the Arab Spring as if Arabs were the only nations running autocratic governments within the global system. This, in the thinking of any rational mind, is not likely to keep the Arab nations out of protest. Hence, the current post-Sept 11th 2001 bipolar tussle between the US West and the emerging Arab Hegemony, holds no good promise for society even where US believes that violence was the only way to entrench democracy among the Arab nations.

c. Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria as Typifying the Challenges of Bipolar Politics

It was the BBC News of May 14th 2012 which adequately described the Boko Haram extremists in Nigeria within the context of this paper. It referred to the group as one which is fighting the government of President Goodluck Jonathan because the said religious sect believe that Jonathan's government is sponsoring ideas which are of Western origin (www.bbc.co.uk/./world-africa-13809501). This Boko Haram-Government struggle is not new in the sense that each time a Muslim gets into power in Nigeria, the Christian population also complain. Therefore, Bipolar politics in Nigeria is only being reiterated through the current Boko Haram insurgency where in the deeper sense the Arab Spring is by virtue of Boko Haram, into a celebrated cold war sort of confrontation with the Capitalist West and its Ideology of Political Democracy. Although this has never been Nigeria's desire, it is to be added that this undesired bipolarity raises a deeper question of why internal and external sponsors of Boko Haram should so intent to swallow the Nigerian state and its rights of existence as a nation? This possibly explains why (*The Punch (Daily Publication) Newspaper Nigeria Ltd*) explains that this simple idea, "Kill, then, get a direct flight to Al Jonah (Heaven)" is the staying philosophy and power of Boko Haram ([www.punchng.com](http://www.punchng.com/home/opinion/letters)> home> opinion> letters). Another version holds that Islam promises twelve (12) virgins in Al Jona to any of its faithful who undertakes a terrorist act in the name of Allah. We must be careful to distinguish here that in Nigeria the case with Boko Haram is the Westernization of values rather than promises of reward. But the fight seems to be more political than real because even when the sect kick against Western Education, all the leaders are educated both in Arab and in Western Education. Thus who is fooling who?

4. BIPOLAR CONFRONTATIONS IN THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Theoretically, three sets of theories have been advanced in attempt at explaining the developmental philosophy the challenges and politics of bipolarity since pre-cold war ear to the post-Sept 11th 2001 era in which we live. These theories summarized as follows:

1. The Bipolar Theory: This first theory which believes that there must be exactly two world powers to ensure global peace, argues that global stability is only possible through a bipolar politics or balance of power between two world power. The theory has been championed in war circumstances by NATO, SETO and the Warsaw fact. Meanwhile within the academic circle, it has been promoted by Keneth Waltz, William Dartmouth and Nuno Montairo. *Waltz Kennedy (1964)* for instance has in *Waltz Kennedy (1964)* seen bipolar confrontation as a workable theory which confers dignity to international politics since it operates among judicial equals what he means by judicial equals is the government of two world powers. Waltz's argument has been supported by the later works of *Javis Robert (2009)* who has argued to prove the strength of bipolar theory by pointing out the weaknesses of the other two theories. He argues that its contrary, a tripolar politics, creates conflict of interests while the other theory, a unipolar system, introduces the idea of an empire hence it operates by method of divide and rule.

A real case has been made in favour of bipolar politics where [Montairo Numo \(2012\)](#) argues that while unipolarity and multipolarity only expanded the pathway to global instability, the balance of power concept in bipolar politics allows for stability through threat of mutual assured destruction of states in an event of conflict. Montairo like most other literatures adopts bipolar politics with a criticism that, this notwithstanding, despite the glories of bipolarity, polarity of every kind is problematic. All scholars on the subject seem to agree on this one point that bipolar politics infringes on the rights of underdog states (Ibid). This is why it has remained a concern for us in this paper.

2. Unipolar Theory: This second theory argues that global stability in international politics is only possible in a *unipolar system* synonymous with the political Leviathan in Hobbes'. [William Dartmouth \(2010\)](#) on this, explains that (2010:17) if unipolar politics be possible we need not even think of a bipolar system. This for him is because, just like all multipolar systems, bipolar confrontation encourages global instability through competition and rivalry in favour of prestige and power. Therefore, to cure this rivalry and mutual tussle for power, [Wohlforth \(1999\)](#) explains that a unipolar structure (synonymous with the "big-brother" idea of Hobbes) must emerge in a promise of lasting stability in the international system. Taken as a whole unipolar politics has not been able to ensure peace. This at least is the weakness of the system even from Hobbes' Leviathan. For instance, when bipolar politics fizzled out in 1989 following the end of the cold war and in 1991 consequent upon the collapse of soviet unions, it left the world with a unipolar structure in which the US had the hegemonic advantages of being the only world power. All that we saw that the US continued to pull its weight as the only world power everywhere in search of oil money in Iraq Kuwait, Kazastan and Iran. This means that if a unipolar politics can ensure stability, then the Sept 11th 2001 attacks on the US would not have taken place. It was this same failure of a unipolar. US structure that gave birth to Sept 11th attacks and has subsequently plunged the world into the current global instability.

3. Multipolar (UN Reformed) Theory: This third set of theories argues for a multipolar system which builds the future of the global community on a reformed UN that expects cooperation from states. When such cooperation is not given, generates a multipolar structure cooperation from within and applies it to keep the international community politically stable. The theory has been canvassed for by [Leonids \(1996\)](#) and adopted by the majority of viewers even as Kistersky argues as follows;

- i. Leonid Kistersky argues for an expansion of the UN security council to about 22 members with two consequent implications, first, the seats in the UN Security Council to become rotational rather than permanent and second, their votes to become votive rather than veto.
- ii. Leonid further explains how this would mean carving out a neutral geographical area between Eastern Europe and Asia as UN territory to guarantee bipolar cooperation being a region most prone to bipolar confrontations.

- iii. Under the theory, peacekeeping operations and military intervention are no longer to be arbitrary but properly resolved through a democratic vote at the UN security council as the former has hitherto thus day, encouraged the abuse of underdog states by super powers within present and past systems of polar politics.

Of the three theories of polarity or tussle for power in international politics, here presented, one can correctly conclude from the forgoing that Leonid Kistersky's multipolar UN reformed theory of global stability holds a better future for contemporary international politics.

5. BRIEF REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

It is strite fact that bipolar politics has its strongest point us canvassing for a balance of power theory in international politics. However, the Wikipedia article "*Cold War and the Formation of A Bipolar World*"(*History Doctor (Online)*) reveals that this relative advantage of bipolarity and balance of power philosophy was acted out officially in the sharing of post-world war II Germany into East and West Germany. . West Germany was to be administered by Ally West and East Germany by Soviet East. Montairo Numo who has in his article, "*Polarity and Power: US Hegemony and China's Challenges*" (2012:9) clarified issues by holding that where a *polar power* differs from an *empire* is that the concept of empire always involves conquest in contradistinction to a *polar power* which only stops at domination. For *Junction* (2009) in "*Online Support Testimonies*" (www.mdjunction.com/), people with bipolar disorder and a balance of power intents always see the world as a disorderly universe in which they and no one else must intervene to establish order. The theory of bipolar confrontation is always seeing something wrong in others. More than this, it believes that it alone and no other can rectify the faults in others. Yet, it is Kroynak (2012) who has in his works "*Diffusing Conflicts with the "I" Statements*", explained that in terms of operation, bipolar politics and the balance power ethics, are rooted in first person pronoun believing thus that while I am OK others are not OK. For the online article, "*Confrontation and Anxiety*" (www.bph.com/) bipolar confrontation does not happen in a blues; it only occurs when change of moods occur in international politics and individuals (nations), loose their self-control. What Keenie Jeneth thinks is that bipolar confrontation is so endemic and so available that in her article, "*I Hate Confrontations; Why Does Is Bother Me More Than others?*" (www.bph.com/.../117) she argues that even nations and countries avoid bipolar confrontations at a very high cost. One of the consequences of bipolar politics according to "*A New Scope of Social Books*" (gulnaruybet.com/...), there is a rapid growth of books on security policies in Europe and America courtesy of bipolar politics and a search for balances of power in international politics . Yet, "*Bipolar Disorder; Effects on the Family*", (www.heretohelp.bc.ca/) argues that within the family, bipolar politics leads to increased differences and arguments. his position tends to that has nip things in the boards. The whole message is were contained, namely, that, aside from politics, bipolarity cuts across every gamut and facet of life. It cuts across all human past, present and future societies, even generations yet unborn.

5.1. Cold War Era and the Formation of a Bipolar Universe in Global Politics

The continent of Europe has always sought to globalize any idea which it finds useful. This tendency in such a traditionally “Capitalist-Oriented” Europe, to globalize its belief in democratic values, historically, met its stiffest resistance in communist-sponsored Soviet Union and in the historic era of power-tussle which has here been called the “Cold war”. The cold war was the height of bipolar confrontation Elements of it can be traced to the post world war I era of the 1920(s). Commenting on the formation of the cold war and its conflict of bipolar confrontation the following has been said ([History Doctor \(Online\)](#)).

These ideological differences between the Capitalist West as represented by the US and the Communist East represented by Soviet Union, reached a boiling point after world war II in a historic encounter which has been described by all scholars as the cold war.

It was during this time in world history that interactional politics first adopted the term ‘*super powers*’. With time, this so-called Cold War or the capitalist-communists ideology which split the world into two was a time in which the publication of Karl Marx’ Communist Manifesto (quoted in [Abiola \(2006\)](#), truly became global. “Two things”, as this author puts it, the emergence of NATO and its parallel formation of the Warsaw Pact by communist Soviet Union, created this global tussle between US West and Soviet East called the cold war. This, according to ([historydoctor.net](#)) is how the cold war was fought, the US quickly developed a “*policy of containment*” and advanced it into the Soviet territory to stop communism within its existing borders’. Soviet union did same against the Capitalist West so much so that, the Berlin wall of 1945 which split the world into east and west Germany of which soviet union administered east Germany and the Allied West controlled west Germany became the searchlight upon which the cold war was taught. Yet the war was actually fought by NATO in the West and the Warsaw Pact, was the true weapon with which the communist East fought the Cold War.

5.2. Challenges to Bipolar Politics

By every indication, neither the US nor the soviet union was sure of the future. The two super nations under the cold war philosophy were not even sure of the outcome of the war. Yet ([historydoctor.com](#)) reveals that it was obvious to viewers even from the onset that none of the two nations would win the war. Hence, the Warsaw Pact keenly contested that when soviet union in 1966 became the first nation to enter space through its space-pilot, Eurigagarine, the US in 1971 fought to become the first nation to enter the moon. This was done to balance its space science against that of Russia. The *Modus operandi* of the cold war as [Abiola \(2006\)](#) observes, was that there were merely hi-fi seberating confrontations and *mutual threats* that could not really result in an open war. To sustain the war, Abiola Adeniji observed that each of these nations adopted a “*domino*” *policy*. Hence, to remain powerful, US dominated the West while Soviet Union held sway on eastern Europe and Asia. Each of these, built around itself, nations within and beyond its control region whom it either dominated or could not dominate but promised military

support in times of external attacks. The Wikipedia story on this (en.wikipedia.org/cold-war) Singled out France in the West which threw itself as a challenge by refusing itself to be encapsulated in the cold war Saga. In the East, the challenges to Russia's advancement came from China which withdraw its support in the 1950(s) when Soviet Union threatened to lecture China on how to construct a social society (Ibid).

5.3. Characteristics of Bipolar Politics as Typified in the Cold War

It is needless to say that every age and its philosophy of life creates characteristics which can be described in words or ink. Those of bipolar confrontation as seen in the light of global politics seemed to have been typified in the nature of bipolar confrontations as captured in "*Bipolar Confrontation Chapter 38* (higheredu.mcgraw-hill.com/.../chapter38). According to this extract;

- i. Bipolar politics survives on mutual threats of armed race
- ii. It emphasizes the formation of military alliances as NATO SETO
- iii. it adopts aggressiveness and seberating rather than an open war
- iv. It is usually tied to a philosophy or the works of a philosopher. The cold war wasted to Hobbes Leviathan and Marxism
- v. It operates as a philosophy of juridical equals among unequal terrain right

5.4. Collapse of NATO and the Warsaw Pact and the Creation of New Dimensions to Bipolar Politics

To borrow the words of Leonids (1996) in "New Dimensions of International Security System after the Collapse of NATO and the Warsaw Pact (did no less than) left West and East a security vacuum. Regional Organizations such as Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (and Asia), important as they were, were beginning to feel this security vacuum and they become (whether rightly or wrongly) Effective Security Structure for Europe and the Asian World in the absence of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Even from the onsect, it was not news that the progress of the cold war era (1946-1989) was in itself an indication of the collapse of NATO and the Warsaw pact. These unprepared collapse of NATO and the Warsaw Pact did not only leave a security vacuum but occasioned certain abnormalities that weakened the sustenance of the Cold War. These unexpected collapsed as soon as they were effected, fortune, followed the failure of each of these world powers towards commencing the welfare and rights of its weaker numbers. Abiola (2006) therefore, explains that while Soviet Union was great in Scientific and Military Strength; US had the economic power. It was through its Economic powers that US extended aids to Russian territory under a weakening agenda of its Warsaw Pact. Hence, countries like C₃choslovakia and Ukraine subsequently became a scrambled territory within a weakening agenda of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The new question which arose from this was truly the question of the rights of underdog nations to self-existence? This question, old as it has been, has not been solved. It has, instead, resurfaced in the Post-Sept. 11th reprisal attacks on the Arab

Spring by the US. It is now rearing its ugly face again in Nigeria, Africa and the Caribbean. If the weakening collapse of NATO and the Warsaw Pact had addressed the issue, it could have been gone with the cold war. But not so are things. But we have a second chance in the view of this research to address the question of minoritarian rights in international politics. This in the view of this paper lies in reforming in UN to achieve same.

5.5. Sept 11th 2001 Attacks On the Us: Begging the Question of Minoritarian Rights in International Politics

When, eventually the cold war ended in 1989, the cause of it was attributed to subversive politics by certain “*underdog nations*” among the Communist Minority Block, such as Afghanistan, Serbia, Albania and Syria, upon the collapse of the cold war vis-a-vis NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Instant air of relief was felt within the international community unaware that the same Afghanistan was going to turn its guns against the West only Ten Years from the 1991 date of eventual disintegration of Soviet Union. Such a temporal sigh of relief as duly explained, Abiola Adeniji (ibid), meant that the atrocity of the cold war, which led Albert Einstein to predict the coming of a Third World War, (having been laid to rest with the disintegration of soviet union by ‘underdog nations’) the road to another world war also terminated unaware that only Ten Years down the live Sept 11th was going to reopen such unfortunate roads. Only Ten Years (10yrs) after the collapse of soviet union in 1991, a set of Afghan-Trained Talibans, carried out Sept 11th 2001 attacks on the US, thereby, establishing a new form of bipolar tussle which have in recent past began another round of victimization of states such as Syria, Egypt, Lydia etc suspected to be members of the Arab Spring North Korea has been spared, not being an ‘underdog state’. Therefore, putting one and two together, Sept 11th which seemed to the Arab Spring, a move towards correcting the ills of the past, may under their current subjugation to their superior US opponents as a self-inflicted injury which they must be ready to bear for a while until the world finds ways to liberate them from their present dilemma. The thing which this paper sees is that the current balance of power in international politics could not have given birth to this sporadic rise in Arab terrorism. Nor would the US have remained benable. The real problem is that we have a weak UN that must be reformed.

5.6. Bipolar Politics in Post Sept 11th 2001 Era and World Politics in Perspective

a. Russia-Untied States Relations After Sept, 11th 2001: Russia relations is one which never supports the US even in the aftermath of Sept 11th 2001. The words of its online article, “Russia United States Relations” (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rus...) are quite instructive for that purpose of clarification, though the workings of the text seem complex.

Relations between the US and Russia have long been strained. But in recent years both countries have tried to reset this frosty relationship with an intent to establish an new partnership. However it is Sept 11th, 2001 which has duly offered both countries (the requisite)

opportunity to effect this partnership. When seen against the backdrop of UN's recent efforts to disarm North Korea of its biological weapons project and when seen from the series of open confrontation between president Obama and Vladimir Putin, the point is clear, US-Russia foreign relations is not to be seen as anything which has moved beyond the cold war. On the contrary, having just ended a forty-three year period of serrated confrontations, one would ordinarily expect that improvements are bound to be gradual.

b. United States-Afghanistan Relations After Sept 11th 2001: The online article, "*Foreign Relations of Afghanistan*" (2014 online) declares that having been names in connection with Sept 11th 2001 attacks on the US, Afghanistan is not likely to have a *friction free* relationship with the US. With the present disharmony between the two nations, the best description is perhaps, to point out how power suddenly turns former friends into arch enemies. History makes us to understand that Afghanistan was in the cold war era, a country which hosted the US against communist Russia. Today, the need to prove political equality with the US hegemony through its nuclear civilization as reflected in Sept 11th 2001 scenario duly defines the current US-Afghanistan relation as one in which Afghanistan is all too quick to replace Soviet Union as Arab Nation seek to equal the US as a world power in world politics.

c. The Nigerian Misfortunes Above and Beyond Sept 11th 2001 Attacks on the US:

In Nigeria, the Post-Sept 11th 2001 impact on the Christian West and Muslim East Boko Haram insurgency may be described as a tripartite situation in which two elephants are fighting on the first floor and terrible blocks of sand continues to Drop the Nigerian "bowl of 'garri" (cassava flour). Nigeria is now soaked in intolerable sand. In particular, there have been many arguments indicting Nigerian politicians, but while the West and for various reasons keeps sponsoring the sales of arms, the Arab spring now sees through the eyes of Boko Haram sect, a bipolar opportunity to "contain" US and Britain within its borders by revolting against Western Education (Western Democracy). From the etymology of Boko Haram which means 'against western civilization' the view which some Nigerians have expressed is that such misfortunes as the killing of thousands through acts of terror on Nigeria would likely not have happened if Sept 11th 2001 did not occur. Arab Nuclear Civilization can certainly not last if the UN is reformed.

d. The Situation in Central Africa After Sept 11th 2001: The situation in central Africa as Grey Sand tells US, "*A Clash of Civilizations in the Central Africa Republic*" ([Foreign policyblogs.com/2014/05/28/a..](http://Foreignpolicyblogs.com/2014/05/28/a..)), is one which is currently promoting a clash between western democracy and Nuclear civilization attributed to the Arab nations. In the main, the conflict in central Africa always arisen from the quest for resource control in which multinational cooperation owned by Super nations now doing mining in the region, despite official licenses, still purchase (illegal diamond and other) items from rebels to keep their arms funded.

e. Bipolar Politics in the Horn of Africa: Unlike Central Africa and Nigeria, the bipolar conflict in the "Horn of Africa" has not digressed from either the containment of western

civilization or from the control of mineral resources. But only that the resources causing the squabbles is the waters of the Nile. The situation as expressed in the article, "*The Horn of Africa in Bipolar War; the Cold War as the Origin of it*" (www.kor.org/urc/vio...) is that Egypt and Sudan are not only backed by the Arab world. They claim to have been given absolute right over the waters of the Nile in the *Entebbe Agreement* of 1959. Consequently, when Ethiopia began to construct hydro dams, Egypt and Sudan demanded its suspension of project thereby inviting attention from US and Britain in favour of Ethiopia. Although this could have been resolved among the parties but the Crisis is one in which existing world powers seem to be fighting themselves.

6. SUMMARY OF WORK, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

By now it must have become clear that there exist in contemporary international politics a contemporary theory of bipolar confrontation synonymous in form and style with the realists balance of power theory. The theory is as practiced by leaders of states and taught both in the humanities and in the social sciences. The one point which the paper makes with total emphasis is that though bipolar confrontation has a relative merit of ensuring peace through threats of mutually assured destruction of states in an event of conflict polarity of every kind must be, re-evaluated because post Sept 11th 2001 events such as the Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria have clearly underscored bipolar confrontation as a viable international political theory. The reality of either Sept 11th or Boko Haram Insurgency in Nigeria, has proved more than anything else that polarity must be replaced by something better if the future of planet earth must be sustained. It is against this backdrop that this research paper has adopted William Wohlforth's recommendation of a reformed United Nations which shall be adequately equipped to receive cooperation from states, and if not given, shall be capable of generating it from within, not by fiat or force but through processes which shall be sufficiently democratic.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Contributors/Acknowledgement: All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.

REFERENCES

- Abiola, A., 2006. Transformation in international relations since 1945. Lagos; A-Triad Associates. "NATO", BY Knuid Bartel, Available from: www.nato.int. [Accessed June 22nd, 2014].
- Daniel, F.J., 1996. Emergence and selective enforcement of international minority rights protection policy in Europe after the cold war. Available from Cisac.stanford.edu/publications/news [Accessed June 20th 2014].
- History Doctor (Online), Cold war and the formation of A bipolar world. A free online article by an internet site designated simply as 'History Doctor', and has been made. Available from www.historydoctor.net/advanced%2520 [Accessed 24th 2014].

- History Doctor (Online), Cold war and the formation of a bipolar world. Available from hisroerydoctornet/advanced%2520 [Accessed June 24th 2014].
- Javis Robert, 2009. Unpolarity; a structural perspective. Journal of World Politics, 1(61): 188-231,190. Available from 101353/wp.0.0031 [Accessed June 24th 2014].
- Junction, M.D., 2009. Online support group testimonies. Available from www.mdjunction.com/dreams/starting.t [Accessed June 24th 2014].
- Kroynak, T., 2012. Diffusing conflicts with “I” statements. Available from blogpsychocentral.com/bipolar/2012 [Accessed June 2014].
- Leonids, K., 1996. New dimensions in international system after cold war, an online article of an FSI standford foundation for international security and cooperation. Available from cisac.fsi.stanford.edu/publications [Accessed June 20th, 2014].
- Marcus Tullies Cicero (ADI), Cicero, the wikipedia, free encyclopedia online. Available from en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cicero “History Dictionary” (online dictionary.com) [Accessed 21st June 2014].
- Moises Saman, 2011. Post Sept 11th attacks on the US” in “The New York times” (Online). Available from www.Newyorktimes.com/ [Accessed June 21st, 2014].
- Montairo Numo, 2012. Polarity and power. US hegemony and China’s challenges. Published in International Security, 10(36): 9-40. DOI 101162/ISEC-900064.
- Morgenthau, H.J., 1948. The politics of nations. In William H, Wright M. and Evans T. (Eds) (1993). A reader in international relations and political theory. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Obi Emeka, A., 2006. Basic concepts and theories of international relations. Onitsha: Book Point Press.
- The Punch (Daily Publication) Newspaper Nigeria Ltd, Boko Haram Insurgency, Febuary 29th, 2012 (Online). Available from www.punchng.com>home>opinion>letters, [Accessed June 23rd, 2014].
- Waltz Kennedy, 1964. The stability of bipolar world. Published in The Daedalus (2002); A Journal of Science, Technology and Organizational Researches (JSTOR), Published June 2002; (p.887), 20026863, 3(93): 881-909.
- William Dartmouth, 2010. In the wikipedia article, bipolar confrontation and the formation of the cold war. Available from historydoctor.net [Accessed June 24th 2014].
- William, H., M. Wright and T. Evans, 1993. Reading in international relations and political theories. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Wohlforth, W., 1999. The stability of unipolar world. Published in International Security, 1(24): 5-41, 23. DOI 101162/016228899560031.

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), Humanities and Social Sciences Letters shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/ arising out of the use of the content.