

American National Security and Impeachment of Presidents: Westfailure in the 'Temple of Democracy'

Onyemaechi Augustine Eke Ph.D

Department of International Relations, Gregory University, Uturu, PMB 1012, Amaokwe, Uturu, Abia State

ABSTRACT : The Democrats-Republican political contestation over articles of impeachment of U.S. Executive President Donald John Trump was seemingly drifting from crisis to Westfailure of Westphalia. Under the Westphalia, America sees itself with the responsibility to protect Western-style democracy. Americans see the United States as the 'temple of democracy' and a 'city on the hills', which every one observes as a model. Situating the contestations between Democrats and Republicans on the debate and vote on impeachment of President Donald John Trump, 18 December 2019, based on two articles: abuse of power and obstruction of congressional investigation side-by-side with two impeachment bouts of 1868 and 1974 in the U.S., leads one to thinking that democracy poses internal threat to American security and thus justifies the study of the United States as a global model of democracy.

Keywords : America, Westphalia, democracy, impeachment, national security.

1. INTRODUCTION

The impeachment debates for the removal of Executive President of the United States, President Donald John Trump, which began on Wednesday 18 December 2019 was third in American history, after Andrew Johnson and Richard M. Nixon as well as another - the 'first close call' on President Bill Clinton, respectively in 1868, 1974 and 1998. Congressional impeachments are seemingly drifting from crises to Westfailure of Westphalia. Under the Westphalia and Western 'liberal internationalism' reinforced by 'American exceptionalism', America "sees itself as promoting Western-style democracy and human rights, which are taken to be universally desired. In promoting these goals the U.S. is simply acting in the global interest" (Brown and Ainley, 2005, p. 13). Although Members of the House of Representatives (MHRs) were enjoined by President Trump to observe the doctrine of 'quid-pro-quo', they rather observed the impeachment process as a sad moment in American democracy. Congressional power of impeachment is a constitutional provision to strengthen the doctrine of separation of powers, checks and balances, rule of law, accountability, etc., as underpinnings of American democracy. Observing these templates, imposes on America the image of temple of democracy, "a 'city on the hill' and an example to the rest of the world" (Brown and Ainley, 2005, p. 13). Americans swore, at independence, to defend and promote democracy across the globe. In 1941, Times magazine announced the arrival of the 'American Century' and insisted: "A world dominated for centuries by European great powers would now see its future shaped by the U.S" which has accepted to 'take up the white man's burden' (Brown and Ainley, 2005, 232 and p. 249).

This chapter is divided into eight sections: 1) Introduction; 2) United States as Global Template of Democracy; 3) Democracy and Impeachment of United States' Presidents; 4) Congressional Impeachment of U.S. Presidents; 5) House Impeachment of President Trump; 6) Senate Trial in Trump's Impeachment; 7) Effects of Presidential Impeachments of Presidents on United States' Security; and 8) Concluding Remarks.

2. UNITED STATES AS GLOBAL TEMPLE OF DEMOCRACY

The U.S. emerged as the only surviving military power with the goal of compelling the United Nations and its agencies which emerged in the 'American Century' to follow U.S. ideological and strategic agenda (Brown and Ainley, 2005, p. 232) to further the U.S. global interests (Basu, 2004, 405). In the fashion of 'American exceptionalism' under 'liberal internationalism' nurtured and sustained by America, the U.S. perceives itself as a 'city on a hill'. Thus, "America protects its interests in the world, but it also sees itself as promoting Western-style democracy and human rights, which are taken to be universally desired" (Brown and Ainley, 2005, p. 13). In fact, it is argued that "the existing structure of international institutions is indeed a product of Western/American hegemony and reflects Western values" (Huntington, 1993; 1996).

Based on American goal to promote and support democracy across the globe, the U.S. and Poland founded Community of Democracies (CDs) as the first intergovernmental organisation of established democracies and democratising countries. The CDs worked in promoting, deepening and defending democracy across countries of the world. A ten-member Convening Group (CG) of the CDs, including U.S. and Poland, drafted a statement of Democratic Principles and Practices that became the "Warsaw Declaration" on open elections to multiple parties, independent judiciary, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, etc. (Eke, 2017, p. 133).

Three pillars that shape European/American and African relationship as carefully crafted in Europe's Marshall Plan with Africa are the desire to spread western values, ideologies and ideas such as democracy, human right and rule of law; promote peace and security; and improve economic activity, trade and employment (Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development, 2000, p. 12).

Against this background, it is argued that the existing structures and institutions of international system are defined by globalisation which, according to Thomas Friedman, "shrinks the world from a size medium to a size small" (Speth, 2003, p. 15). More so, at the inaugural meeting of the CDs, founded and sponsored by the U.S. in collaboration with Poland to promote, deepen and defend democracy across countries of the world, United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan averred: "The principle of democracy is now universally recognised" (Eke, 2017, p. 132).

Nonetheless, the United States President George Bush also averred that the policy of the United States [is] to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture" (Axelrod, 2005). Thus, America conceived democracy as non-exclusive and non-rival global public good (Stern, 1968; Kaul et al, 1999; Veradzia, 2016) against 'global' challenges of the 21st century and was ready to defend democracy by stealth under the veil of humanitarian intervention.

Democracy promotion by America and Europe has been stretched too far under the guise of humanitarian intervention in sovereign states such as in Iraq, Kosovo as well as the French in Mali. The American policies and actions in this regard lead to understanding and interpretation as self-serving and imperialistic by those States the U.S. curiously tag 'rogue states', 'axis of evil' or, in Reagan's parlance, "evil empire" such as "when U.S. President Reagan directed American naval and air forces to return to [Libya] in 1986 to bombard civilian targets, guided by the goal of contributing to an international environment of peace, freedom, and progress within which our democracy – and other free nations – can flourish" (Chomsky, 2000, p. 21).

Judging democracy from the Westphalian principle of peace through freedom vis-à-vis the new trend to defend democracy movements by stealth, International Society theorists argue that the Westphalian system has failed and can only work should states recognise the doctrine of states' sovereignty in their relations

(Brown and Ainley, 2005, p. 222). Understanding U.S. as a global temple of democracy starts from sound understanding of the link between factors responsible for corrosion of American democracy and her national security.

3. DEMOCRACY AND IMPEACHMENT OF UNITED STATES' PRESIDENTS

History of impeachment of United States' presidents dates back to one-and-half century (1868-2019), with three incidences only two were logically concluded, prior to the impeachment of President Donald John Trump in December 2019. Constitutionally, by democratic principle of separation of powers, checks and balances, impeachment process in the United States begins with the lower House [House of Representative] which is charged with the responsibilities to draft charges or articles for impeachment based on crimes alleged to have been committed by civil officer of government for trial and disposal action by the upper House [Senate]. Congressional impeachments of U.S. presidents are discussed seriatim.

Impeachment of President Andrew Johnson (1868)

Andrew Johnson's impeachment was the outcome of political crisis and the rupture of ideologies in the aftermath of the American Civil War. It began from uncompromised beliefs and a contest for power in a post-war America struggling with reunification. President Johnson was intent to carry out the liberal and reconstruction plans of Abraham Lincoln before the latter was assassinated in 1865. Connectedly, Johnson's impeachment proceedings began when the president breached the Tenure of Office Act by removing Edwin Stanton, Secretary of War, from the cabinet against the provision of the Act that "a president could not dismiss appointed officials without the consent of Congress."

On 27 January 1868, Mr Spalding moved a suspension of the rules, which allowed him raise the motion: "...That Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, be impeached of high crimes and misdemeanors in office." Spalding's motion was supported by overwhelming 128 'Yeas' vote, against 47 'nays' votes to become the Resolution of the House for impeachment process against President Johnson. Thus, President Johnson's impeachment process was broadly anchored on allegations of "high crimes and misdemeanors" encapsulated in 11 articles or charges (United States House of Representatives, 24 February 1868) by the "Radical Republicans" of 40th House of Representatives (1867-1869). The 11 articles of impeachments were:

- Articles 1, that the order for Stanton removal was with the intent to violate the Tenure of Office Act;
- Articles 2, 3 and 8 alleged that the appointment of General Lorenzo Thomas (26 October 1804 – 2 March 1875), to replace Stanton, without the advice and consent of the Senate was a further violation of the Constitution;
- Articles 4 and 7 accused Johnson of conspiring with Thomas to remove Stanton, citing such conspiracy as a "high crime in office," thus illegally depriving Stanton of his rightful possessions;
- Article 9 accused Johnson of diverting orders and instructions related to military operations through the general of the army, bypassing secretary Stanton;
- Article 10 charged Johnson with making speeches "with a loud voice, certain intemperate, inflammatory, and scandalous harangues" with the intent to disgrace Congress; and
- Article 11 accused Johnson of declaring the 39th Congress unconstitutional, since it was a Congress of only part of the states, and therefore did not have legislative powers to propose constitutional amendments – a misdemeanor against his presidential oath requiring him to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed" (United States Senate, n.d.)

The House of Representatives impeached President Johnson on 24 February 1868 by 126 to 47 votes on grounds to protect the office of the president and preserve the constitutional balance of powers as it were. Eight of the articles of impeachment dealt with alleged violation of the Tenure of Office Act by President Johnson.

On 16 May 1868, the Senate voted 35 in favour and 19 against on article 11, one vote short of the mandatory two-thirds majority to impeach American president (U.S. Department of Interior, 14 August 2017). Ten days later, the Senate trial failed to convict President Johnson on article 2 and 3 by the same margin, after which the Senators voted to adjourn the trial. Despite the vote-verdict on the articles of impeachments, the remote causes of his travail were that Johnson was a Southerner from hitherto seceding Tennessee State, a Democrat, and 'too soft' on the South.

Impeachment Process against President Richard M. Nixon (1973-1974)

On 30 October 1973, the U.S. House of Representatives commenced impeachment process on the 37th U.S. President Richard M. Nixon (Republican) following series of events that took place on the evening of Saturday 20 October 1973 which were connected to the "Watergate scandal." In these events, President Nixon, among others, ordered Attorney-General Elliot Richardson to fire independent special prosecutor Archibald Cox, which led to the refusal and immediate resignation of Richardson from office.

Consequently, Nixon ordered Deputy Attorney-General William Ruckelshaus to fire Cox but also, Ruckelshaus refused and resigned. Nixon, unrelenting, ordered the third-most senior official after Ruckelshaus, Judge Robert Bork to fire Cox and Bork reluctantly obeyed the presidential directive.

The dismissal of Cox led to public outcry within ten days of which U.S. Congress received more than 300,000 telegrams, most calling for President Nixon's resignation. These whole events prompted the impeachment process of President Nixon, as it were, ten days later on 30 October 1973. A special counsel was appointed on 1 November 1973 and on 14 November 1973, a court ruled that the dismissal of Cox was illegal (Noble, 26 July 1987, p. 23). The impeachment process was, therefore, anchored on three articles:

- obstruction of congressional investigation of the "Watergate" burglary inquiry'
- misuse of law-enforcement; and
- refusal to comply with the Judiciary Committee's subpoenas.

With the release of 'smoking gun tape' on 5 August 1974, which made clear Nixon's complicity in the Watergate scandal, bipartisan leaders in the House were certain that President Nixon would be impeached by a substantial majority in the full House with great possibility of his conviction in the Senate trial.

Given the murky situation in which Republican congressional leaders had told President Nixon that both his impeachment and his conviction were certainties, Nixon, in a State of the Union address on 30 January 1974, asserted that he had no "intention whatsoever" of resigning, but he did indeed, resign before the House could vote on the articles of impeachment and thus became the only U.S. president who left office till 2019 based on impeachment process (Silverstein, 19 November 2019; Superville, 2 February 2019).

Impeachment of President Bill Clinton (1998)

The case against President Bill Clinton was that he had a scandalous love affair with one-time White House intern, Monica S. Lewinski. Linda R. Tripp had leaked the secret love affair to independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's office insisting that she had secret tapes of her friend Lewinsky, to testify that Clinton lied to grand jury. When the report of the case on sexual abuse of Lewinski, filed against President Bill Clinton by Paula Jones, leaked in September 1998, impeachment process was initiated on 8 October 1998. The grounds of charges were "high crimes and misdemeanors" which border specifically on lying under oath and obstruction of justice".

Based on quadruple-barrel articles of impeachment, the House voted on the first article (grand jury) by 228 to 206; on the second article (perjury), it voted 205 to 229; and on third article (obstruction of justice), it voted 221 to 212; and on the fourth article (abuse of power), the House voted 148 to 284, for and against, thus

rejected the vote. By vote-voice and decision, Clinton became the second American president to be impeached.

The Senate conducted a three-stage trial process (pre-trial, testimony, and verdict) in January 1999 with presiding Chief Justice William Rehnquist. On the final day, the Senate as authorised in its Order Paper (Proceedings and Debates) 106 , No. 26, Vol, 145 of Friday , February 12, 1999 12 acquitted Bill Clinton of the charges which failed to receive mandatory two-thirds majority vote of senators present for the conviction and removal from office of the U.S. Presidents. Peter Baker and Helen Dewar reported:

The United States acquitted William Jefferson Clinton yesterday on charges that he committed perjury and obstruction of justice to hide sexual indiscretions with a onetime White House intern, permitting the 42nd president to complete the remaining 708 days of his term. After a tumultuous year of scandal that tested the Constitution and tried the nation's patience, neither of the two articles of impeachment brought by the House garnered a simple majority, much less the two-thirds necessary to convict Clinton of high crimes and misdemeanors. Article I alleging perjury was defeated on a 45 to 55 vote at 12:21 p.m. Just 18 minutes later, Article II charging obstruction failed on a 50 to 50 tie. Five Republicans joined all 45 Democrats in supporting full acquittal (Baker and Dewar, 13 February 1999, p. A1).

President Clinton on acquittal stated that that he was profoundly sorry for his actions which had brought great burden on "the Congress and on the American people" and pleaded to rededicate Americans to the work of serving the country and building the American future together. He added: "This can be and this must be a time of reconciliation and renewal for America" (Baker and Dewar, 13 February 1999, p. A1).

4. HOUSE IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT TRUMP

The grouse of the Democrats-promoters of impeachment of President Trump, led by Representative Nancy Pelosi, Speaker, U.S. House of representatives, was anchored on two-horned articles: abuse of power and obstruction of congress. On "abuse of power"; the Democrats relied on claims of a whistle-blower to front the allegation that President Trump delayed release of payment of \$400, approved by the Congress for military aid package to President Volodymyr Zelensky of Ukraine, to achieve quid pro quo cooperation to institute a public inquiry against Democratic Party presidential primary candidate Joe Biden and his son, Hunter Biden. Democrats also alleged that Russia interfered in the U.S.'s 2016 elections. The Democrats also alleged that a number of contacts were established between the White House and the government of Ukraine leading to a 25 July 2019 phone call between Trump and Zelensky (Baker and Sullivan, 3 October 2019; Mizette and Benner, 30 September 2019; Miller et al, 2 October 2019; Savage, 4 October 2019).

On the other horn, was allegation of obstruction of congress, whereby the Democrats pointedly argued that President Trump obstructed and continued to obstruct congressional investigation into Ukraine's intervention in America's electoral matters.

Democrat Sheila Jackson Lee (Arizona) in a support-vote for the two-horned articles of impeachment persuasively tried to link the allegations against Trump to abuse of constitution and threat to America's national security. In the same vein, Democrat Jamie Raskin (Maryland) pushed forward the viewpoint that "democracy is the meaning of America" and urged MHRs, "for democracy, for the constitution, for our country...let us do the right thing and impeach President Trump. The democrats relied their constructed thesis that the impeachment was a choice to either defend President Trump or defame the American Constitution. Democrat Joe Neguse (Colorado) defended Democrats' impeachment articles, stating that President Trump undermined the "sentry of free and fair elections."

The Democrats unrelentingly canvassed the view that President Trump by the articles of impeachment acted in desecration of the U.S. Constitution and the image of America as the temple of democracy as well as become a threat to America's national security.

Republicans reacted that Democrats' argument for the impeachment of 'POTUS' was a 'bunch-bug' orchestrated and weaponised in the articles of impeachment and delivered albeit subverting the will of democracy within U.S. presidential election timeline. The Republicans argued that Democrats and their cohorts had rehearsed plans to damage the political institutions of American government. The Republicans proffered that their position was to defend POTUS and the American Constitution. The party accused rival Democrats of being worse than Pontus Pilate who despite his mindset to subject Jesus Christ to death nevertheless afforded Jesus opportunity to face his accusers. Republicans bemoaned denial of same opportunity to President Trump to prove his innocence, insisting that Democrats were pursuing whacky constitutional theory because President Trump was not Democrats choice 'President' Clinton. They lashed Democrats for demonstrating bipartisanship instead of cooperation to put America first. They concluded that the process was 'politically-motivated, sham and shame' in American political history.

At the Senate, Republican Mitch McConnell, Senate Majority Leader maintained that the Democrats allowed partisan rage they harboured against Trump to becloud their responsibility to due process in the impeachment of President Trump. Senator McConnell noted that the process was a "predetermined end of partisan crusade" which was to find a 'get-out-the-vote' gift to the Democrats. Accordingly, McConnell revealed that several times, the Democrats tried to impeach President Trump based on extra-constitutional reasons, including:

- (i) for being impolite to press;
- (ii) for being mean to professionalism;
- (iii) for changing Obama policies.

At the end of stages of setting the rule of impeachment and debate on the articles of impeachment of Trump in the HRs, voting exercise was conducted based on the House composition and Democrats majority with 232 member, Republican minority with 197 member, Independent with (one) 1member, and vacant seats for 5 members. The House Representatives are by Apportionment Act of 1911, as amended in The Reapportionment Act of 1929 (a combination of census and apportionment bill) passed on 18 June 1929, limited the number of seats in the House to a maximum of 435 voting members and 6 non-voting members. The minimum number for voting-majority in the House is 218.

Thus, by the voting pattern of the Democrats-majority House of Representatives, President Trump was impeached by 230 votes in favour to 197 votes against on the first article of impeachment, with only two Democrats: Jeff Van Drew (New Jersey), who pledged "undying support" to President Trump and was switching to the Republicans (Edmondson and Haberman. 19 December 2019) and Collin Peterson (Minnesota) opposition; and on the second article 229-198, with Democrat Jared Golden (Maine) who joined the first two to make the number three.

Democrat presidential candidate Tulsi Gabbard voted "present" on both charges (The Guardian, 20 December 2019, p. 31). It is interesting to note that Democrat presidential candidate Gabbard's vote represented neither sympathy for President Trump nor opposition against his position of the Democrats but a tactical non-entanglement to safeguard his political chances, the Democrats' chances and curry support beyond his Democrats' supporters but from the Republicans' in the upcoming U.S. presidential election.

The impeachment votes showed a hyper-partisanship in U.S. House of Representatives, divided into almost 100 per cent Democrats' "Yes" votes, 100 per cent Republicans' "No" votes, and less than 1 per cent Independent's "ambivalent" votes.

At the conclusion of the impeachment votes, House Speaker Pelosi led the Representatives to the Senate Chamber and announced suspension to transmit the two articles of impeachment to the Senate, on condition that the key witnesses to the Trump-Zelensky affair be brought to make additional submissions for fair hearing. Reacting, the Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, in typical tone of impasse, observed that the

articles of impeachment fall within 'executive privileges' of the president and thus lashed heavily at the Democrats for not allowing the American justice to run its course. McConnell accused Democrats of partisan impatience which led them to tie their demands to a "political timetable" rather than act in fairness. The Senate Leader argued more persuasively that the articles of impeachment were "incompatible" with the Constitution and the process constitutes the "thinnest and weakest" in U.S. history. He submitted that impeachment is not only a legal question but also requires political judgment... A political faction in the House of Representatives has acquiesced to partisan rage...Senate should protect America from the "momentary hysteria" of a 12-week "rushed and rigged" inquiry which sets the bar of impeachment very low in a 230-year tradition.

On Wednesday 15 January 2020, the House of Representatives voted 228 in favour and 193 against (Daily Independence, 17 January 2020, p. 20) and submitted the articles of impeachment to Senate for the trial of Trump. The House appointed Democrats' 7-man impeachment prosecution managers (Adam Schiff, 59; Jerry Nadler, 72; Zoe Lofgren, 72; Hakeem Jeffries, 49; Val Demings, 62; Jaason Crow, 40; and Sylvia Garcia, 40). Mrs Pelosi, at a press conference, before signing and subsequent submission of the articles of impeachment to the Senate, said:

Today, we will make history. When the managers walk down the hall, we will cross a threshold in history – delivering articles of impeachment against the president of the United States for abuse of power and obstruction of the House (BBC News, 15 January 2020)

The Democrats' prosecution managers were chaired by Adam Schiff (California), Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee who worked with the presiding Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts and the 100-member Senate of Congress as jurors.

5. SENATE TRIAL IN TRUMP'S IMPEACHMENT

The United States' 116th Senate of Congress is composed of 100 senators, two from each of the 50 states. In the Senate, the Representatives commands slim majority of 53 senators over the Democrats' 47 senators and Independent's 2 senators.

Constitutionally, to convict the president or any other accused by the U.S. Senate requires the concurrent of two-thirds of the [Senators] present for at least one article or charge. Where there is no single article on which a "guilty" vote is cast from two-thirds of the senators present, the defendant is acquitted without any punishment whatsoever.

Relying on the above provisions regarding the House motion for additional evidence to be heard in the Senate impeachment trial, the Senate first course of action was to deliberate and vote on the bi-partisan contentious motion. Arguing against House articles during the impeachment trial, former Harvard Law School Professor Alan Dershowitz, a member of Trump's legal counsel corroborated McConnells' view that House did not reach the bar of impeachment and removal of President Trump because the charges were "Purely non-criminal conduct, including abuse of power and obstruction of congress". Dershowitz premised his disapproval on a legal tripod:

- (i) "The president of the United States should have the power to grant reprieve and pardons for offences against the United States, except in case of Impeachment.
- (ii) The trial of all crimes except in case of impeachment shall be by jury.
- (iii) Impeachment trial, in the express word of the constitution requires acquittal or a conviction, a judgment generally rendered only in the trial of crimes.

The Senate, on the 31st January 2020, after a 4-hour debate on witnesses, the Republicans, in a 'razor-thin' majority, voted down a Democratic proposal to admit additional witness and documents on Trump's impeachment trial by 51 votes against and 49 votes in favour (Wilkie and Dahanova, 31 January 2020). Out of

the Republican's 53 senators, two (Susan Collins of Maine and Mitt Romney of Utah) broke with their party [Republican] to join the Democrats' 45 senators and the Independent's 2 senators which lead to the 51-49 Republican-Democratic vote-alignments before the Senate adjourned and went for recess to continue ongoing negotiations between the White House, the Republican senators, and perhaps marginally, the Democrat senators over the next step of the trial.

On resumption from recess, on Wednesday 5 February 2020, senate voted 52 against and 48 in favour on the first article of impeachment (abuse of power), with Utah senator Mitt Romney who broke his Republican rank and voted against Trump. On the second article (obstruction of congress), all 53 Republican senators, including Romney voted against and all 47 Democrat senators voted in favour. The Democrat-Republican vote-alignments fell below the mandatory two-thirds of the total 100 senators (at least 67 senators) required to impeach any American president.

Frustrated by Democrats failure in the Senate trial, House Speaker Pelosi responded:

Trump remains an ongoing threat to American democracy with his insistence that he is above the law and that he can corrupt the elections if he wants to...Today, the president and Senate Republicans have normalised lawlessness and rejected the system of checks and balances of our Constitution (Agence France-Presse, 6 February 2020).

In the coming days, months and years, the simmering effects on national security of America of hyper-partisanship and acrid division created by Trump's impeachment saga is no doubt beyond contemplation.

6. EFFECTS OF IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENTS ON UNITED STATES' SECURITY

The impeachment of President Trump, just as any other exercise before it, by the U.S. House of Representatives revealed more clearly evidence of democracy obsession as a driver of internal conflict and by extension, threat to U.S. national security. U.S.' national security goals are anchored on 'principled realism': power, peace, prosperity and principle which verges into American 'exceptional internationalism' in the formulation, spread and defence of templates of democracy across the world. The Trump administration stated:

An American First National Strategy is based on American principles, a clear-eyed assessment of U.S. interests, and a determination to tackle the challenges that we face. It is a strategy of principled realism that is guided by outcomes, not ideology. It is based upon the view that peace, security, and prosperity depend on strong, sovereign nations that respect their citizens at home and cooperate to advance peace, and it is grounded in the realisation that American principles are a lasting force for good in the world (White House, 2017: 1).

American power-projection serves as instrument to ensure peace for 'sustained cooperation', to advance prosperity through economic incentive or aid, and to strengthen and broaden American principles, values and ideas such as democracy across the world. For example, among the issues that shape American-African relationship is the desire to spread western values, ideologies and ideas such as democracy, human right and rule of law in order to open up trade and security relations. The force-stature behind American democracy promotion around the globe has attracted criticisms. For example, Amy Chua (2000; 2003) opined that globalisation and democratisation waves lead to ethnic hatred and violence in countries with market-dominated minority as well as "does robustly increase ethnic violence in countries without market-dominant minorities" (Bezemer and Jong-A-Pin, 2008, p. 14).

Nonetheless, from the American worldview, countries that are critical and non-cooperative to Western democratisation constitute 'rogue states' on the axis of evil for sanctions under the guise of 'humanitarian'

terrorism. The development marks American democracy obsession which has reached a point at which democracy is seen as an end rather than means for human rights, rule of law and inclusive progress.

The above logic promoted support for Executive-Congress cooperation for national stability and development rather than bipartisan incompatibility, by the Republicans, few Democrats and Trump's allies, supporters and sympathisers in the U.S. and across the globe. For instance, Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair being fielded questions on Brexit by his host, Christiane Maria Amanpour at Cable News Network (CNN) programme, 'Amanpour' in the UK, was asked his feelings about the Democrats-Republicans impeachment drama on U.S. President Trump. With reservation to U.S. 'internal' political affairs, Blair stated that if he were in the shoes of the Democrats, the major issues would be how to secure better future for the Americans. By implication Blair was asking the Democrats to join hands with the Republicans and Trump to make America greater.

The Russian President Vladimir Putin was no less critical of U.S. Congressional impeachment of Trump. President Putin, entertaining questions on Climate Change, when asked his views on the impeachment of President Trump by majority-Democrats of the House of Representatives, criticised Democrats for impeaching Trump based on "made-up reasons."

It is instructive to note that America is a country of immigrants from countries and continents across the world. At the centre of the Congressional impeachment moves against Trump were the immigrants from Asia (e.g., India, China), Africa (Ghana, Kenya), South America (Brazil, Cuba), etc., who were critical of Trump's 'high-handedness' against the rule of law and who also empathise with their home-states that are under threats for resisting U.S. hegemonic power, influence and values. The composition of American immigrant population and the interest they represent can only be moderated along party lines but cannot be divorced from the hyper-bipartisanship that surrounded Congressional impeachment of Trump, just as part of the impeachment of Johnson was because he was a Southerner and sympathetic to the Southern cause.

Based on the foregoing, the evident facts in the constitutional logjam orchestrated by bipartisan politics of impeachment of President Trump are:

- (i) Regional politics;
- (ii) Executive-Congress incompatibility;
- (iii) hyper-bipartisanship;
- (iv) Political instability;
- (v) Switching of or decamping from parties for political interests; and
- (vi) Emphasis on partisan politics rather than development politics.

From Congressional impeachment hindsight, President Trump miffed and scorned at the Democrats: "This doesn't feel like impeachment...A cheap in the word 'impeachment'; it should never happen to any other president. You have never witnessed zero negative votes by the Republican." "I am beating everybody by a lot, and I think that's where we're going" (Baker et al, 19 December 2019).

At Trump's State of the Union Address delivered on Tuesday 4 February 2020 in the chamber of the U.S. House of Representatives at the Capitol in Washington D. C, a day before Senate vote to conclude the five-month impeachment saga, Democrats-Republican "acid atmosphere of partisanship" characterised their reactions. In BBC Telecast of President Trump's "pro-growth, pro-family, pro-American" agenda, Trump stated, inter alia:

Jobs are booming, incomes are soaring, poverty is plummeting, crime is falling, confidence is surging and our country is thriving and highly respected again... the sun is still rising, that grace is still shining, and my fellow Americans, the best is still to come.

Speaker Pelosi, who had extended hand to greet Trump while the president turned away to give his speech, later stood up with Republicans who were clapping for President Trump but instead tore her copy of the speech in disapproval, which she referred to as “manifesto of mistruths”.

Gretchen Esther Whitmer, 49th governor of Michigan who delivered Democratic Party’s response acknowledged dangerous: “division of the last few years...Congressional Democrats have presented proposals to keep us moving forward...But president Trump and Republicans in the Senate...Bullying people on Twitter doesn’t fix bridges..”. Democratic criticised Trump’s announcement of his achievement titled ‘Great American Comeback’ as lacking content of climate change and a call for re-election vote. Though Trump reminded Americans that “...the sun is still rising, grace is still shining, and the best is still to come”, Kevin Liptak painted the scenario in Democrat perspective:

With the Senate on the verge of an impeachment vote... President Donald Trump used a theatrical State of the Union Address Tuesday to implore Americans to do the same. Salted with dramatic surprises and heavy on reelection themes, Trump hoped the address would prove vindicating in the very same House chamber where he was impeached late last year [2019]. But the acrid atmosphere of partisanship was impossible to avoid... (Liptak, 5 February 2020).

Previous impeachment processes showed that despite congressional ‘rule-of-law’ vote-verdict of bipartisan House of Representatives on the articles of impeachments of Presidents Johnson and Nixon, were immediate causes but the remote causes of Johnson’s impeachment were that he was seen, against his citizenship rights, as a Southerner from hitherto seceding Tennessee State, a Democrat, and ‘too soft’ on the South. President Bill Clinton was impeached by the House of Representatives of perjury and obstruction of justice to hide sexual indiscretions with a one-time White House intern but was acquitted by the Senate bipartisan majority vote-verdict.

It can, therefore, be poignantly argued that the impeachment of President Johnson and President Clinton by the Republicans-majority as well as President Nixon and President Trump by the Democrats-majority in the House of Representatives make no novelty of the traditional bipartisanship guiding Congressional impeachment process of U.S. presidents. Although the Senate had always acquitted the embattled presidents, except Nixon, who resigned before the voting process could commence, impeachment process of U.S. presidents has built up hyper-partisanship in the Congress, government and the state, created cleavages, a sense of political instability and stultifies development policies and programmes based on bipartisanship.

In comparative term, U.S. Senate acquittal of Clinton was not more convincing than Trump’s. it must be recalled that Clinton after the acquittal apologised for the trouble he put the Congress and things were quickly patched up for the U.S. to return to greatness and winning ways in the comity of nations. That Democrats-Republicans post-impeachment understanding and cooperation suddenly became lacking in the Trump’s case. It is un-American for Congress that was enviably, politically united in strengthening presidential power during the 2018 Trump-Kim Denuclearisation of the Korean Peninsula to have degenerated into such hyper-partisanship, notorious, politically disunited class against presidential power to the level of denigrating the power as a wimp factor and reason the president of America cannot successfully authorize Indian government to lift ban on hydroxyl-chloroquin to supply to the U.S. in the fight against COVID-19. At no time in the history of U.S. Superpower status, not even the Clinton impeachment saga that could bring U.S. power so close to precipice as witnessed in the Trump post-impeachment hyper-bipartisan politics of COVID-19 and other U.S. policies, programmes and projects.

Analysts are wont to accept Putin’s “made-up reasons” perspective in the impeachment of Trump, given that the allegation of Trump-Zelensky quid-pro-quo was a classical case of arm-twisting for investigation of the Bidens. It is truism that aid-giving and withdrawal fall within the traditional presidential prerogatives although

the Congress can approve the ceiling. It was no wonder Trump, on 20 December 2017, in pursuit of U.S. national security interests declared: "All of these nations that take our money and then they vote against us at the Security Council or they vote against us ... at the Assembly ... Well, we're watching those votes. Let them vote against us; we'll save a lot" (Landler, 2017).

Analysing the articles for the impeachment of U.S. presidents, Jason Silverstein, argued that they deliberately skewed on familiar reasons of "lie", "obstruction", "abusing power", and "defying congress" to fall within Congress' meaning of "High Crimes and Misdemeanors" within the constitutional ambit of "Treason, Bribery and other High Crimes and Misdemeanors" for impeaching presidents and other federal officials in the United States (Silverstein, 19 November 2019).

The seemingly 100 percentile votes by Democrats and Republicans who are sharply divided on the articles of democratic impeachment of President Trump illustrated how Americans are ideologically deeply fragmented along iron-curtain party and petty lines which is sustained by hyper-partisanship and by extension, constitutes internal threat to political elections, policy and national security in the U.S. the present political crisis recreates the view canvassed by Susan Strange in her book, *The Westfailure System*, published posthumously in 1999, contending that "'Westphalia' is 'Westfailure'" (Strange, 1999, p.). The legacy of peace of Westphalia, among others, was the entrenchment of democratic system in the political order in the world via Europe (Hoeksma, 3 January 2014).

7. Concluding Remarks

The study of America as the temple of Western democracy in relation to U.S. national security goals through globalisation and its structures and institutions has ripped open the deep sore of "political" cleavages which divide political parties into voting blocs of advocates and adversaries, or supporters and opponents. This sore political development has provided more opportunities for external interferences, however subtle. The discovery of deep-seated anger and rage which characterised the hyper-bipartisan impeachment processes explains how Americans' connection to political party trumps other social identifiers like gender, race, religion, language and ethnicity (Martinovich, 31 August 2017).

The U.S. model of democracy presents a nervy obsession for self-destruction. These events demonstrate that the U.S. is not immune to internal threats to national security but indeed is at the threshold of 'tipping point' of Westfailure.

8. References

1. Axelrod, R. (2005) "Promoting Democracy through International Organisations", Revised Paper from Ernesto Zedillo ed., *Reforming the United Nations for Peace and Security*. New Haven: Yale Centre for the Study of Globalisation, pp. 19-38.
2. Agence France-Presse (6 February 2020) "Donald Trump Remains a 'Threat to American Democracy': Nancy Pelosi", Agence France-Presse.
3. Baker, P. and E. Sullivan (3 October 2019) "Trump Publicly Urges China to Investigate the Bidens," *The New York Times*. Available online at: <https://www.nytimes.com>.
4. Baker, P. and Helen Dewar (13 February 1999) "The Senate Acquits President Clinton", *The Washington Post*.
5. Baker, P.; M. Haberman, J. W. Peters and E. Plott (19 December 2019) "After Impeachment, an Angry Trump Looks to Voters for Vindication," *The New York Times*. Available online at: <https://www.nytimes.com>.
6. Bezemer, D. J. and R. Jong-A-Pin (2008) "World on Fire? Democracy and Ethnic Violence", Munich Personal RePEc Archive (MPRA), Paper No. 7027. Available online at: <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/7027/>
7. Brown, C. and K. Ainley (2005) *Understanding International Relations*, 3rd Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.
8. Chomsky, N. (2000) *Rogue States: The Rule of Force in World Affairs*. London: Pluto Press.

9. Chua, A. (2000) "The Paradox of Free Market Democracy: Rethinking Development Policy", *Harvard International Law Journal*, Vol. 41, pp. 287-379.
10. Chua, A. (2003) *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability*. New York: Anchor Books.
11. Daily Independence (17 January 2020) "White House broke Law by withholding Ukraine Aid – Agency", *Daily Independence*. Independent Newspapers Limited.
12. Edmondson, C. and M. Haberman (19 December 2019) "Jeff Van Drew Switches Parties, Pledging 'Undying Support' for Trump," *The New York Times*. Available online at: <https://www.nytimes.com>.
13. Eke, O. A. (2017) "Democracy and Development in Africa: The Governance Connexion" in A. M. Okolie and V. C. Onah eds, *Politics of Development and Underdevelopment*. Abakaliki: WillyRose & Appleseed Publishing Coy, pp. 129-162.
14. Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (2000) *Africa and Europe: A New Partnership for Development, Peace and Better Future*. United Kingdom; London School of Economics.
15. Hoeksma, J. (3 January 2013) "Beyond the Westphalian Paradigm", Peace Palace Library, <https://www.peacepalacelibrary.nl>.
16. Huntington, S. (1993) "The Clash of Civilisations", *Foreign Affairs* 72, pp. 22-49.
17. Huntington, S. (1996) *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
18. Kaul, I; I. Grunberg and M. A. Stem (1999) *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*. New York: OUP.
19. Landler, Mark (2017). "Trump Threatens to End American Aid: 'We're watching Those Votes at the UN'", *The New York Times*, December 20, 2017 @ <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/20/trump-threatens-to-end-american-aid-were-watching-those-votes-at-the-un.htm>
20. Liptak, K. (5 February 2020) "trump's Theatrical State of the Union Prompts Partisan Outrage." *CNN*, <https://edition.cnn.com>
21. Martinovich, M. (31 August 2017) "American Partisan Identities are Stronger than Race and Ethnicity, Stanford Scholar Finds", *Stanford News*. Available online at: <https://news.stanford.edu>
22. Mazetti, M. and K. Benner (30 September 2019) "Trump Passed Australian Leader to Help Barr Investigate Mueller Inquiry's Origins," *The New York Times*. Available online at: <https://en.m.wikipedia.org>. Retrieved 22 December 2019.
23. Miller, G.; G. Jaffe and A. Parker (2 October 2019) "Trump Involved Pence in Efforts to Pressure Ukraine's Leader, Though Aides Say Vice President was Unaware of Pursuit of Dirt on Bidens," *The Washington Post*. Available online at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com>.
24. Noble, K. B. (26 July 1987) "New Views Emerge of Bork's Role in Watergate Dismissal", *The New York Times*. Available online at: <https://www.nytimes.com>.
25. Savage, C. (4 October 2019) "Read the Text Messages Between U.S. and Ukrainian Officials," *The New York Times*. Available online at: <https://en.m.wikipedia.org>.
26. Silverstein, J. (19 November 2019) "What have Presidents been Impeached for? The Articles of Impeachment for Andrew Johnson, Richard Nixon, Bill Clinton and Donald Trump", *CBS News*. Available online at: <https://www.cbsnews.com>.
27. Speth, J. G. ed. (2003) *Worlds Apart: Globalisation and the Environment*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
28. Stern, P. (1968) "Design Principles for Global Commons: Natural Resources and Emerging Technologies", *Science, New Series*, Vol. 162(3859), pp. 1243-1248.
29. Strange, S. (1999) "The Westfailure System", *Review of International Studies* 25(3), pp. 345-354
30. Superville, D. (2 February 2019) "Trump is Latest to Give State of Union at Time of Tumult", News Channel 9. Available online at: <https://newschannel9.com>.
31. The Guardian (20 December 2019) "U.S.'s Trump to Face Senate Trial Amid Impeachment", *The Guardian*. Lagos: The Guardian Group.
32. The White House (2017) "National Security Strategy of the United States" Washington, D.C.: The White House.
33. U.S. Department of Interior (14 August 2017) "Why Was Andrew Johnson Impeached?" Washington, D.C.: National Park Service. Available online at: <https://www.nps.gov>.

34. United States House of Representatives (24 February 1868) "the Impeachment of President Andrew Johnson", Washington, D.c.: History, Art & Archives. Available online at: <https://history.house.gov>.
35. United States Senate (n.d.) "The Impeachment of Andrew Johnson (1868) President of the United States." Available online at: <https://www.senate.gov>.
36. Veradzia, F. (2016) "global Public Goods and Integration", Paper presented at International Conference on European Integration, Ostrava, Czech Republic, pp. 1052-1059.
37. Wilkie, C. and Y. Dahanova (31 January 2020) "Senate Votes against Calling New Witnesses in trump's Impeachment Trial", *CNBC*.
38. BBC News (15 January 2020), "Trump Impeachment: House Sends Historic Case to Senate", *BBC News*.

INFO:-

Corresponding Author: *Onyemaechi Augustine Eke, Department of International Relations, Gregory University, Uturu, Abia State, Nigeria.*

How to cite this article: *Onyemaechi Augustine Eke, American National Security and Impeachment of Presidents: Westfailure in the 'Temple of Democracy', Asian. Jour. Social. Scie. Mgmt. Tech. 2(3): 40-52, 2020.*