

**POPULAR AND DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA**  
**MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**  
**MENTOURI UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANTINE**  
**FACULTY OF ARTS**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**

**THE SEPTEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup> ATTACKS, THE BUSH DOCTRINE AND THE  
NEOCONSERVATIVE AGENDA.  
STUDY CASE: THE INVASION OF IRAQ 2003.**

**RESEARCH PROJECT**  
**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF**  
**THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF**  
**MASTER OF ARTS**  
**IN**  
**AMERICAN STUDIES.**

**Candidate:**

**NEMOUCHI Adel**

**Supervisor:**

**Mrs. SEHILI Assia.**

**Examiner:**

**Mrs. ZINE Djamila**

**June 2010.**

## **Acknowledgement:**

All my gratitude is to Allah the almighty.

I want to thank all the people who have helped in writing this dissertation with a special  
thanks to:

My supervisor Mrs SEHILI Assia for her help and support.

My teachers Mrs.Bahri,Mrs.Athmani,Mis.Hamadouche for their support and encouragements.

My teachers Pr Harouni,Dr Maghrebi,Mr.Boughenot,Mr.Yachir and Mr.Azil for their  
encouragements and help.

To all my family for their help and support during all my years of studies.

My friends and colleagues especially: Samira, Merriam and Samira.

My friends and colleague especially: Ahmed, Salah and Amine

My friends: Kamel ,Reda ,Hamza,Nanou,Mehdi and the others.

My friends: Adlene, Soussen,Senfour and the others.

All my students who have encouraged me especially khalil.

All my teachers from the primary school to the university.

To all these people I am grateful and thankful.

## **Dedication**

I want sincerely to dedicate this research project to:

The memory of my loving mother HADJIRA called “Chahmouni”

My father BELKACEM called “Guessoum”

The memory of my brother LAZHAR.

My brothers DRISS, BRAHIM et HAMZA.

My sisters AMEL, FARIDA, YAMINA et SAMIA.

My nieces SAFSOUFA, DJOUWAIRYA and CHAIMA.

My nephews RACIM and DJOULAIBIB.

To all the people I love.

**ABSTRACT:**

This work is about the analysis of U.S. foreign policy in the last decade. The history of U.S. foreign policy is one of the most debatable topics in the field of international relations and conflicts. In this dissertation I have focused on the making of U.S. foreign policy under Bush Administration.

During the Bush presidency the U.S has known two major wars in its modern history. The attacks of 9/11 were the most shocking events in the modern history of the U.S. My research concern is the invasion of Iraq as a study case of the new tendencies of U.S foreign policy after the attacks. The use of force abroad is a new way of shaping U.S. foreign policy. The Bush Doctrine is a new instrument of U.S. foreign policy after deterrence and containment.

The Bush Doctrine, its historical background, its definition and legitimacy, is the main concern of the first chapter.

The second chapter main focus is the role of the lobbies and interest groups in the making of U.S foreign policy. The Neoconservative being the most influential interest group is the making of U.S foreign policy in Bush Administration is the basic question in this chapter. I have put a great attention on their ideology and their agenda which led to the invasion of Iraq.

**KEY WORDS:**

*The September 11<sup>th</sup> Attacks, the Bush Doctrine, Preemptive War, U.S Foreign Policy, Neoconservatives.*

## **RESUME:**

Ce mémoire de master consiste à analyser la politique étrangère des Etats Unies d'Amérique Durant la dernière décennie .Le sujet de la politique étrangère des Etats Unies est l'un des sujets qui ont fais coulé beaucoup d'encre et qui ont inspiré des débats entre les politiciens les critiques. Dans ce mémoire je me suis basé sur l'analyse et l'étude de la politique étrangère des Etats Unies dans l'Administration Bush.

Durant l'administration de G.W.Bush ,les Etas Unies a connu deux guerres les plus fameux dans l'histoire modern je parle bien sur la guerre en Afghanistan et en Iraq. Les attaques du 11 Septembre sont les événements les plus choquants dans l'histoire modern des états unies. Ma recherche se base sur l'invasion de l'Iraq en 2003 comme un cas d'étude de la nouvelle tendance de la politique étrangère après les attaques du 11 Septembre.

L'utilisation de la force comme un instrument dans la politique étrangère des Etats Unies. La doctrine de Bush, sa définition, son historique et sa légitimité sont les points les plus importants du premier chapitre.

Le deuxième chapitre traite le sujet du rôle des lobbies et les groups de pression dans la politique étrangère des Etats Unies. Les Néoconservateurs comme étant le lobby le lus puissant sur le plan de la politique étrangère durant l'administration Bush. j'ai mis un grande attention sur leur historique, leurs idéologie ainsi que leur agenda pour l'invasion de l'Iraq.

## **MOTS CLES:**

*Les attaques du 11 Septembre, la doctrine de Bush, les guerres préventives, politique étrangère des états unies d'Amérique. Neoconservateurs.The invasion of Iraq.*

## ملخص

إن الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو تحليل السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية في العشرية الأخيرة.

إن موضوع السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية أسأل الكثير من الحبر و آثار الكثير من النقاشات و الحوارات. في هذه المذكرة ركزت على السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية أثناء فترة حكم جورج ولكر بوش. في فترة حكم بوش الابن عرفت الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية هجمات الحادي عشر سبتمبر التي ألقّت بضلالها على صناعة القرار في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية حيث دفعت بالولايات المتحدة الأمريكية إلى استعمال القوة فيما عرف ب "فلسفة بوش".

الفصل الأول يركز على هذه الفلسفة من حيث تعريفها و أهدافها و شرعيتها.

أما الفصل الثاني من الدراسة فيركز على موضوع اللوبيات وجماعات الضغط كطرف مهم في معادلة صناعة القرار في السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية. المحافظون الجدد يعتبرون من الجماعات الضاغطة الأكثر فاعلية في صناعة القرار. كما سأطرق إلى أجندة المحافظين الجدد و أثرها على قرار غزو العراق.

كلمات مفتاحيه

السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية. الحروب الاستباقية. الإرهاب. غزو العراق, المحافظون الجدد. أحداث الحادي عشر من سبتمبر.

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS:**

CBRN: [chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons](#)

CIA: Central Intelligence Agency

DoD: Department of Defense

IMF: INTERNATIONAL MONEY FUND

ICC: INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

MFN: MOST FAVOURED NATIONS

NSA: National Security Agency

NSS: NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

NSC: National Security Council

PNAC: PROJECT OF NEW AMERICAN CENTURY

RAD: REBUILDING AMERICAN DEFENSE

UBL: Usama Bin Ladin

U N: UNITED NATIONS

UNSC: UNITED NATION SECURITY COUNCIL

WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction

WTC: World Trade Center

WTO: WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

WWII: World War II

GWOT: WAR ON TERRORISM

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Acknowledgement.....I

Dedication.....I

Abstract.....III

List of Abbreviations .....VI

Table of Contents.....VII

General Introduction.....1

CHAPTER I: THE IMPACTS OF 9/11 ATTACKS ON U.S FOREIGN POLICY AND THE BUSH DOCTRINE..... 3

INTRODUCTION..... 3

I-1. I.1 A comparative analysis between the 9/11 and Pearl Harbor attacks.....4

I.2American Grand Strategy and the War on Terror: From Hegemony to Empire.....7

1.3 National security strategy of 2002.....9

I.4 Historical Emergence of the Doctrine.....11

I.5 The Doctrine of Preemptive-Preventive War after the 9/11.....12

I.6 The Department of Defense Definition and Response to the Bush Doctrine.....13

I.7.the UN Charter and the Preemptive Actions .....14

CONCLUSION.....17





## **General Introduction:**

This research project belongs to the field of American studies. It explores and analyzes George.W.Bush foreign policy towards the Middle East and especially in Iraq. During his two term of presidency, George Bush's foreign policy in this region created and is still creating serious and hot debates among scholars, historians and politicians. The purpose of this dissertation is to prove that George Bush's presidency has brought a revolution in U.S. foreign policy toward the Middle East and particularly towards Iraq. This research will try to focus on the philosophy followed by George Bush to trace a new way for the making and the shaping of U.S. foreign policy.

This research tries to demonstrate the true nature of the relations between the United States and Iraq under the Bush Administration. It investigates how the president of the United States, George Bush, was able to put into practice a doctrine of preemption that proved that the main concern of U.S foreign policy was and is still homeland security and empire building. Furthermore the main aim of this dissertation is to analyze the relation between the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks, the Bush Doctrine and the Neoconservatives Agenda. The main question of the research project is:

How did the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks influence the making of U.S foreign policy and what is the real relation between the Neoconservative Agenda and the invasion of Iraq in 2003?

The research strategy and methodology is based on data collected and acquired mainly from primary sources such as addresses, speeches and charts, and some other secondary sources like books, articles from magazines and journals, and reports. All the data collected is analyzed in a detailed way by using two different approaches: descriptive and analytical.

The first chapter of the dissertation will examine the impacts of the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks on U.S. foreign policy and the analysis of the Bush Doctrine as a response to these attacks.

The main concern of the chapter is to show whether or not the attacks of the September 11<sup>th</sup> brought a revolution to U.S foreign policy and also the legitimacy of the Bush Doctrine.

The second chapter explores the role of lobbies and interest groups in the making of U.S foreign policy which is a critical issue that characterized and still characterizes the making of U.S foreign policy. The main concern of this chapter is whether or not lobbies and interest groups have an influence and an impact on the making of U.S. foreign policy.

## **The Impacts of September 11<sup>th</sup> Attacks on U.S Foreign Policy and the Bush Doctrine**

### **Introduction:**

Immediately after the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks, some people compared that attacks to the Japanese surprising attack on Pearl Harbor on 12/7/1941. It now seems that the comparisons might be more appropriate than anyone could have imagined.

Prior to Pearl Harbor, the Roosevelt administration ignored increasing signs that a surprise attack somewhere in the Pacific was imminent. And we found, 8 months after the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration did the same thing.

Yet, in fairness to the president Bush, the most that could be said of officials in his administration was that they were guilty of negligence.

There is considerable evidence that Roosevelt, on the other hand, was guilty of a much more serious offense because Roosevelt has an eager desire to involve the United States into World War II (WW II) despite his public assurances to the contrary and given his continuous efforts to squeeze the German and Japanese military into making the first attack on U.S. forces.

## **I.1 A Comparative Analysis Between 9/11 and Pearl Harbor Attacks:**

The attacks of 9/11 were widely referred to as a new Pearl Harbor. President Bush himself reportedly wrote in his diary on the night of 9/11: “The Pearl Harbor of the 21<sup>st</sup> century took place today.”<sup>1</sup> directly after the attacks, many people, from Robert Kagan to Henry Kissinger, said that America should respond to the attacks of 9/11 in the same way it had responded to the attack on Pearl Harbor.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, just as the attack on Pearl Harbor gave the United States the opportunity to enter WW II, which in turn allowed it to replace Great Britain as the leading imperial power, the attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup> were widely regarded as an opportunity to reign over the world. Donald Rumsfeld stated that 9/11 created “the kind of opportunities that WWII offered, to refashion the world.”<sup>3</sup> Condoleezza Rice, National Security Adviser, reportedly told senior members of the National Security Council to “think about how do you capitalize on these opportunities to fundamentally change American doctrine, and the shape of the world, in the wake of September 11<sup>th</sup>.”<sup>4</sup> In a public address, she said that “if the collapse of the Soviet Union and September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks bookened a major shift in international politics, then this is a period not just of grave danger, but of enormous opportunity.”<sup>5</sup> According to Bob Woodward, the president himself said that the attacks provided “a great opportunity.”<sup>6</sup> Only

---

1. “Statement by the President in His Diaries,” October, 2001 quoted in the Washington post, available at([www.washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com))

2. Robert Kagan, “We Must Fight This War,” *Washington Post*, September 12, 2001; Henry Kissinger, “Destroy the Network,” *Washington Post*, September 11, 2001 (<http://washingtonpost.com>)

3. “Secretary Rumsfeld Interview with the New York Times,” *New York Times*, October 12, 2001.

4. Nicholas Lemann, “The Next World Order: The Bush Administration May Have a Brand-New Doctrine of Power,” *New Yorker*, April 1, 2002 ([http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/articles/020401fa\\_FACT1](http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/articles/020401fa_FACT1)).

5. “Remarks by National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice on Terrorism and Foreign Policy,” April 29, 2002, available at ([www.whitehouse.gov](http://www.whitehouse.gov)).

6. Bob Woodward, *Bush at War* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002), 32.

two days after September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks, in fact, George Bush said in a telephone conversation with Governor George Pataki of New York: “[T]hrough the tears of sadness I see an opportunity.” The next day, he reportedly used exactly the same words while talking to the press.<sup>7</sup>

Nicholas Lemann, a journalist of the New Yorker dealing with this response to September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks as an opportunity, reported that he was told by a senior official of the Bush Administration that “the reason September 11th appears to have been a transformative moment is not so much that it revealed the existence of a threat of which officials had previously been unaware as that it drastically reduced the American public's usual resistance to American military involvement overseas.”<sup>8</sup>

The attacks of 9/11 also reduced Congressional resistance to provide increased funding for Pentagon programs. On the evening of September 11<sup>th</sup> itself, Rumsfeld held a news briefing on the Pentagon attack. At this briefing, Senator Carl Levin, the chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, was asked: “Senator Levin, you and other Democrats in Congress have voiced fear that you simply don’t have enough money for the large increase in defense that the Pentagon is seeking, especially for missile defense. . . . Does this sort of thing convince you that an emergency exists in this country to increase defense spending?”<sup>9</sup> This was an example of the debate among American policymakers on the issue of funding and supporting financially the military operations abroad.

---

<sup>7</sup> “September 11, 2001: Attack on America: Remarks by the President in Telephone Conversation with New York Governor Pataki 11:00 A.M. EDT; September 13, 2001,” available at [http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept\\_11/president\\_009.html](http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept_11/president_009.html).

<sup>8</sup> Nicholas Lemann, “The Next World Order.”

<sup>9</sup> Department of Defense News Briefing on Pentagon Attack, 6:42 PM, September 11, 2001 (available at [http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept\\_11/dod\\_brief02.htm](http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept_11/dod_brief02.htm)).

The September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks, moreover, helped those who favoured a transformation of the military along RMA lines (Revolution in Military Affairs). In the weeks before September 11<sup>th</sup>, Bacevich argued that the decision of the president G.W.Bush to declare Global War On Terrorism (GWT) which will cost a lot was an appearing sign of the change of the role played by the U.S. President from a war theory maker to war architect .the president was supported by some influential men like Ramsfield and Wolfowitz<sup>11</sup>.

These ideas for achieving military dominance became official policy with the publication, one year after 9/11, of the Bush-Cheney Administration's National Security Strategy of the United States of America (NSS 2002), which said: "We must build and maintain our defences beyond challenge" so that we can "dissuade future military competition."<sup>10</sup>

The conviction that the attacks provided an opportunity was also reflected in NSS 2002, which said: "The events of September 11, 2001 . . . opened vast, new opportunities."<sup>11</sup> One of the things for which it most clearly provided an opportunity was the Doctrine of Preemptive and Preventive War.

---

<sup>10</sup> The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002, henceforth NSS 2002 ([www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html)), 29-30.

<sup>11</sup> NSS 2002, cover letter.

## **I.2 American Grand Strategy and the War on Terror: From Hegemony to Empire**

This important part of the work explains and analyzes the way G.W. Bush Administration responded to attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup>. The scope of American policy change was difficult to measure partly because policy making was an unfolding process whose aims cannot be easily summed up. In addition to that, policy was partly the outcome of a struggle between different voices within the Bush Administration. Despite these problems of understanding, the broad contours of American grand strategy were clear. In particular, it was characterized by two dramatic shifts away from the means by which the United States established and maintained its hegemony during the cold war.

Before moving to next section there is a necessity to identify key concept in U.S. foreign policy.

The first concept is Unilateralism, which is any doctrine or policy that supports one-sided action. Such action may be in disregard for other parties, or as an expression of a commitment toward a direction which other parties may find agreeable.

The second concept is multilateralism, which, in international relations, refers to multiple countries working in concert on a given issue. So the act is not made by a single country but it includes the participation of many countries.

Some great nations or states often act unilaterally, while the smaller ones may have little direct power at all in international affairs aside from participation in the United Nations (UN). Moreover, multilateralism involves all nations acting together as in the UN and does not involve regional or military alliances, pacts, or groupings.



The first departure which was remarked after the 9/11 attacks was from multilateralism to unilateralism. The difference between the two is a matter of degree rather than kind, but there was no question that the United States no longer regarded itself as bound by the three cardinal principles of multilateral arrangements in the areas of security or the management of the global security. The principles are nondiscrimination, indivisibility and diffuse reciprocity. Non-discrimination means that states should carry out their treaty obligations without any contingencies or exceptions based on alliances, or on the idiosyncrasies of the circumstances at hand. The most often cited example of such nondiscrimination is the obligation of states to extend Most Favored Nations (MFN) status to all other states in the trading regime governed by the World Trade Organization. Next comes the principle of indivisibility. In the context of military cooperation, for example, states are required to meet their commitments to all other states in a collective security institution, such as the United Nations. Finally, the principle of diffuse reciprocity means that continuity in the application of the principles of nondiscrimination and indivisibility is an essential ingredient of multilateral arrangements.

Multilateralism, then, is a particular way of bringing together international actors to support cooperation, incorporating principles of non-discrimination, diffuse reciprocity, and generalized institutional structures.<sup>12</sup>

In this step an important question should be asked; where did the Bush Administration stand on this variety between unilateralism and multilateralism? Despite all the talk about coalition building in the wake of September 11<sup>th</sup>, the attacks have been seen by the

---

<sup>12</sup> Bob Woodward, *Bush at War* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002), 39.

Administration as an attack on the United States, and the Administration reserved the right to respond as it saw fit. Consequently, the United States has, among other things, attempted to act unilaterally.

The second shift in American foreign policy is away from the idea of Deterrence\* toward a policy of Coercive Diplomacy\* against countries that the Administration defines as 'Rogue States'\*, such as Iraq, Iran and North Korea or "the Axis of Evil"\*. The phrase 'coercive diplomacy' is preferable to that of 'preemption'. Coercive diplomacy, which is the credible threat to use force to shape another state's behavior, is not limited to the traditional definition of preemption - striking an enemy as it prepares an attack - but also includes prevention - striking an enemy even in the absence of specific evidence of a coming attack. The idea principally appears to be directed at terrorist groups as well as "rogue states."

### **1.3 National Security Strategy of 2002:**

The West Point speech provided a first statement of this new doctrine. It was in NSS 2002, published in September, which the new doctrine was laid out at some length. The covering letter, signed by the president, says that with regard to "our enemies' efforts to acquire dangerous technologies," America will, in self-defense, "act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed." The document itself, saying that "our best defense is a good offense," also stated:

Given the goals of rogue states and terrorists, the United States can no longer rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past. The inability to deter a potential attacker, the immediacy of today's threats, and the magnitude of potential harm that could be caused by our adversaries'

choice of weapons, do not permit that option. We cannot let our enemies strike first.<sup>13</sup>

To justify this doctrine, NSS 2002 argues that the United States must “adapt” the traditional Doctrine of Preemption, long recognized as a right, to the new situation, thereby turning it into a right of anticipatory preemption:

For centuries, international law recognized that nations need not suffer an attack before they can lawfully take action to defend themselves against forces that present an imminent danger of attack. . . . We must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today’s adversaries. . . . The United States has long maintained the option of preemptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to our national security. The greater the threat, . . . the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves, even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy’s attack. To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively.<sup>14</sup>

The authors of NSS 2002 tried to suggest that since this doctrine of anticipatory preemption simply involved adapting a traditionally recognized right to a new situation, it involves no great change. According to the traditional doctrine, one needed certain evidence that the other country was going to launch an immediate attack. According to the Bush Doctrine, by contrast, the United States can attack another country even if uncertainty

---

<sup>13</sup> NSS 2002, 6, 15.

<sup>14</sup> NSS 2002,16

remained and even, more flagrantly, if the United States knew that the threat from the other country was not yet fully formed.

The originality here, to be sure, involved a doctrine, a theory more than a practice. The United States has in practice attacked several countries that presented no imminent military threat. But it always portrayed these attacks in such a way that they could appear to comport with international law. The attack on North Vietnam after the alleged incident in the Tonkin Gulf provides an example. But “[n]ever before,” point out Halper and Clarke, “had any president set out a formal national strategy doctrine that included [preventive] preemption.”<sup>15</sup> This was a step of great significance, because it involved an explicit statement by the United States that the basic principle of international law, as embodied in the United Nations Charter, did not apply to its own behaviour.

#### **I.4 Historical Emergence of the Doctrine:**

This doctrine of preemptive and preventive war had been advocated by Neoconservatives long before September 11<sup>th</sup>. It was contained already in the Cheney-Wolfowitz Defense Planning Guidance of 1992, which said that the United States should use force to “preempt” and “preclude threats.”<sup>16</sup>

In 1996, Richard Perle and other Neocons prepared a strategy paper entitled “A Clean Break” for Benjamin Netanyahu, who had recently been elected prime minister of Israel. This paper recommended that Israel, in making a Clean Break from previous strategies, establish

---

<sup>15</sup> Halper and Clarke, *America Alone*, 142

<sup>16</sup> Barton Gellman, “Keeping the U.S. First: Pentagon Would Preclude a Rival Superpower”; cited in Halper and Clarke, *America Alone*, 141.

“the principle of preemption.”<sup>17</sup> In 1997, the Project of the New American Century (PNAC) “Statement of Principles” argued that to exert “global leadership,” America needs to “challenge regimes hostile to our interests and values.”<sup>2</sup> In 1998, a letter from PNAC, signed by Perle, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, and other members, urged President Clinton to “undertake military action” to eliminate “the possibility that Iraq will be able to use or threaten to use weapons of mass destruction.”<sup>18</sup>

### **I.5 The Doctrine of Preemptive-Preventive War after 9/11:**

Although these Neoconservatives were anxious to have their doctrine of preemptive preventive war accepted as national policy, this did not occur during the Clinton presidency or even during the first eight months of the Bush-Cheney administration. After the September 11<sup>th</sup>, however, it did. “The events of 9/11,” provided the opportunity to break free of the chains restricting the exercise of American power.

The idea of preemptive preventive war, which came to be known as the “Bush Doctrine,” was first clearly expressed in the president’s address at West Point in June 2002 when the administration started preparing the American people psychologically for the attack on Iraq. Having stated that, in relation to the “new threats,” deterrence “meant nothing” and containment was “not possible,” Bush even took aim at the traditional understanding of preemption, saying: “If we wait for threats to fully materialize, we will have waited too long.”

<sup>19</sup> Then, using the language of anticipation while really meaning preemptive prevention, he

---

<sup>17</sup> Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm,” June 1996 ,available at (<http://www.israeleconomy.org/strat1.htm>).

<sup>18</sup> PNAC, Letter to President Clinton on Iraq, January 26, 1998 (<http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqclintonletter.htm>). PNAC, Letter to Gingrich and Lott on Iraq, May 29, 1998 (<http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqletter1998.htm>).

19. NSS 2002, 19.

said that America's security "will require all Americans . . . to be ready for pre-emptive action."<sup>20</sup>

### **1.6 Department of Defense Definition of Preemptive War:**

According the U.S Department of Defense, a preemptive war is "an attack initiated on the basis of incontrovertible evidence that an enemy attack is imminent." In contrast, a preventive war is "a war initiated in the belief that military conflict, while not imminent, is inevitable, and that to delay would involve greater risk."<sup>20</sup> International relation scholars generally agree on the definition of preemptive war, but their definition of preventive war is broader and includes not just an attack in anticipation of an eventual conflict, but also attacks to prevent an unfavorable shift in the balance of power. Scholars of international law often use the term "anticipatory self-defense" in place of preemption, even though the plain language interpretation of anticipatory self-defense would also seem to include at least some preventive wars.<sup>21</sup>

A major difference between preemptive and preventive wars is in the timing or imminence of the threat a preemptive or preventive attack is supposed to address. A preemptive is against an immediate threat whereas a preventive war is against a longer-term threat.

---

20. Ibid, 23.

<sup>20</sup> DoD online dictionary at: <<http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/doddict/data/p/index.html>>

<sup>21</sup> Copeland, Dale C., *The Origins of Major War* ( NY: Cornell University Press, 2000)

### **1.7. The Preemptive Attacks and the UN Charter:**

The framers of the U.N Charter sought to establish a normative order that would severely restrict the resort to force. Under Article 2(4) of the Charter, states were to “refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.” In the Charter, there were only two explicit exceptions to this prohibition: force authorized by the Security Council and force in self-defense. Under Article 39, the council is empowered to determine if there is a “threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression.” If the Security Council so determined, it can authorize the use of force against the offending state under Article 42.

The critical provision relating to the other exception, self-defense is Article 51, which provides in part:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> UN Charter, preamble. Available At : <[www.onucom/unchart.html](http://www.onucom/unchart.html)>

Although the basic contours of Article 51 seem straightforward, its effect on the customary right of anticipatory self-defense is unclear. If one reviews the scholarly literature on this provision, writers seem to be divided into two camps. On one hand, some international jurists claimed that the intent of Article 51 was explicitly to limit the use of force in self-defense to those circumstances in which an armed attack has actually occurred. Under this logic, it would be unlawful to engage in any kind of preemptive actions. Even though Article 51 refers to an “inherent right” of self-defense, they would argue that, under the UN Charter, that natural right could now be exercised only following a clear, armed attack.

Other scholars, however, rejected this interpretation. They claimed that the intent of the Charter was not to restrict the preexisting customary right of anticipatory self-defense.

The occurrence of an “armed attack” was just one circumstance that empowered the aggrieved state to act in self-defense. As the U.S. judge on the International Court of Justice (ICJ), Stephen Schwebel, noted in his dissent in *Nicaragua v. U.S.*, Article 51 does not say “if, and only if, an armed attack occurs.”<sup>23</sup> It does not explicitly limit the exercise of self-defense to only the circumstance in which an armed attack has occurred.

Unfortunately, neither the ICJ nor the UN Security Council has authoritatively determined the precise meaning of Article 51. Indeed, in the *Nicaragua* case, the ICJ made a point of noting that, because “the issue of the lawfulness of a response to the imminent threat of armed attack has not been raised ... the Court expresses no view on the issue.” As a consequence, the language of the charter clearly admits of two interpretations about the permissibility of preemptive force. Given this state of affairs, it is logical to explore the practice of states in the period after the charter was adopted to determine if recent customary international law has either helped supply meaning to the ambiguous language of Article 51

---

<sup>23</sup> *Case Concerning Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. U.S.)*, Merits, International Court of Justice (judgment of June 27, 1986)



or given rise to a new rule of customary international law in its own right that would allow for preemptive action.

## **Conclusion**

President Bush argued that a preemptive policy was the best course of action to follow given the coming on of the terrorist threat in the post-9/11 world. American fears that Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein would pass weapons of mass destruction to al Qaeda, the terrorist group responsible for the 9/11 attacks, justified a preemptive US invasion of that country in the name of self-defense.

The Bush administration also realized that preemptive war might not appear to the US public as self-defense. Rather, Americans would believe the United States had departed from its Cold War policy of deterrence and containment and assumed the offensive. Establishing the morality of a preemptive attack was therefore of paramount importance for it provided a direct tie to America's notion of using force only in self-defense. To do this, the administration asserted a belief in the righteousness of its cause as a means to blunt further terrorist attacks on the United States.

Another thing to say is that, there was a debate among scholars and international jurists on the legitimacy and the lawfulness of the preemptive actions. Some thought it was legitimate under international law but others believed that it was a violation of the UN Charter which proved to be unequipped and unqualified to deal with a number of current issues.

The previous chapter has examined and analyzed the response of the united states under the bush administration towards the attacks of 9/11.th following chapter will examine and explore the relation between the neoconservative agenda and the invasion of Iraq.

## **I.8. End Notes of Chapter I:**

### **WMD:**

A weapon of mass destruction (WMD) is a weapon that can kill large numbers of humans and other life forms or cause great damage to man-made structures (e.g. buildings), natural structures or the biosphere in general. The scope and application of the term has evolved and been disputed, often signifying more politically than technically. Coined in reference to aerial bombing with chemical explosives, it has come to distinguish large-scale weaponry of other technologies, such as chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear. This differentiates the term from more technical ones such as chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons (CBRN).

### **Al Qaeda:**

Al-Qaeda, alternatively spelled al-Qaida and sometimes al-Qa'ida, is a militant Islamist group founded between August 1988 and late 1989. It operates as a network comprising both a multinational, stateless arm and a fundamentalist Sunni movement calling for global Jihad. It is widely considered a terrorist organization.

Al-Qaeda has attacked targets, civilian and military, in various countries, most notably, the September 11 attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C. in 2001. The U.S. government responded by launching the War on Terror.

Characteristic techniques include suicide attacks and simultaneous bombings of different targets.

**Deterrence:**

Deterrence theory is a military strategy developed during the Cold War. It is especially relevant with regard to the use of nuclear weapons, and figures prominently in current United States foreign policy regarding the development of nuclear technology in Iraq, North Korea and Iran

The term is also used more casually to suspect a party in any field of potential conflict of being prepared to inflict unacceptable damage on an aggressor, and making sure the potential aggressor is aware of the risk so that they may refrain from aggression. Establishing a credible and known deterrence is at the opposite end of the spectrum from a policy of appeasement.

**Coercive Diplomacy:**

Coercive diplomacy is the diplomacy of threats. Rather than relying on negotiation, diplomats will sometimes threaten adverse consequences if a demand is not met. Sometimes this works; at other times, it does not. Factors that influence the success of coercive diplomacy are similar to the factors that influence the success of other types of threats: the threat must be credible; the adverse consequence must be severe enough that the potential recipient really wants to avoid that outcome, and the demand must be clear and possible to meet. Even when these factors are present however, coercive diplomacy is risky. As with other threats, it tends further damage relationships and lead to a potential backlash against the threat and/or the threatening country later on. Backlash can, at times, be limited if the threat is combined with more integrative or exchange-based approaches. If rewards for compliance are offered in addition to the threat for non-compliance, the chances of success may be greater; also if the threat is seen to be legitimate, the chances of success may also rise.

**Rogue State:**

Rogue state is a controversial term applied by some international theorists to states they consider threatening to the world's peace. This means meeting certain criteria, such as being ruled by authoritarian regimes that severely restrict human rights, sponsor terrorism, and seek to proliferate weapons of mass destruction. The term is used most by the United States, though it has been applied by other countries.

## **Chapter II: the Neoconservative Agenda and the Invasion of Iraq in 2003:**

### **Introduction:**

There is a unique and only way to measure the impacts of the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks on U.S foreign policy which analyzing the consequences of the attacks on the making of U.S foreign policy and especially that the attacks permitted to the agenda developed by the Neoconservatives during the 1990 to be implemented and to be put into practice.

The first question that raised that time was the nature of the agenda. So what was the truth behind the neoconservative agenda?

The Neoconservative Agenda in its roots was that the United States should use its military superiority in order to build an American empire that includes the whole world under the dominance of the United States of America.

One of the major means and instruments used to accomplish this aim was to make U.S military supremacy over other nations, all the nations including enemies and allies, greater and stronger in order to be out of reach and beyond all the challenges and rivalries.

This goal was accomplished by increasing the money devoted to military aims and goals; after that the use of this money to complete the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA).

The second major instrument was to achieve the American global supremacy and superiority was to declare and launch preemptive attacks .This doctrine of preemption was used mainly for regime change and democracy promotion in some countries which were seen to be hostile and represented a threat to American values and principles.

The third instrument was to control all the sources of energy, mainly oil, all around the globe and particularly in the Middle East and immediately that of Iraq.

The purpose of this chapter is to show that the invasion of Iraq was not done randomly, but it was planned years before, and this invasion was a part of an agenda called the Neoconservative Agenda.

## **II.1. the Neoconservative Ideology and the American Empire:**

Over the last decade, there was a hot debate among scholars and analysts concerning the truth behind Neoconservatism and the Neoconservatives. The prefix “neo” does not mean any radical change in the term conservatives but it indicates a change in the appearance.

The godfather of Neoconservatism is William Kristol who has defined the Neoconservatism as realistic Liberalism. This was the main characteristics of the second generation of the Neoconservatives; the Neoconservatives of the late 1980’s and the 1990’s.

What was really observed was that the Neoconservatism is not a progressive movement. According to Gary Dorrien, the Neoconservatism is in any case, a term used to describe and show strictly an ideology held by Neoconservatives and not a biography of those people who held this ideology.<sup>24</sup>

The majority of the Neoconservatives are of Jewish religion, but it is not a necessary condition to the Neoconservatives. Because many significant members of the neoconservative movement are not Jews like Francis Fukuyama, Zalmay Khalilzad, William Bennet and other Neoconservatives.

---

<sup>24</sup> Gary Dorrien, *Imperial Designs: Neoconservatism and the New Pax Americana* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 16.

The fact of saying that Jewishness is not a necessity to join the Neoconservatives does not in any case deny the reality that most influential and prominent Neoconservative leaders are Jews or pro Israelis.<sup>25</sup>

The debate about the relation between Neoconservatism and Jewish religion of the Neoconservatives is of a primary importance especially concerning some prominent leaders such as Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney. If the Neoconservatism was not seen to be a matter of ideology not a matter of ethnicity; Jewishness, then there will not be a large number of the Neoconservatives who are Jewish and they are all working for the interest of Israel before the interests of America.

This can be seen in a statement by Michael Lind, a former Neoconservative, saying that “Neoconservatism is an ideology like any other ideology and Cheney and Rumsfeld are Neocons even if they are not Jews.”<sup>26</sup>

In the last decade, and especially after the September 11 attacks, the Neoconservatism was included in the American political, social, and economic life, but it was mostly seen in the political life, and especially in the making and the shaping of U.S foreign policy.

The Neoconservative foreign policy was first and originally oriented and directed around the opposition to Communism. But the fall and the collapse of the Soviet Union by the end of the Cold War created and produced a kind of crisis for the Neoconservatives. In 1990 and

---

<sup>25</sup> Stephen M , John J. Mearsheimer and Walt,. *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. London: Harvard University Press, 2006.

<sup>26</sup> Michael Lind, “A Tragedy of Errors,” *The Nation*, February 23, 2004, quoted in Justin Raimondo, “A Real Hijacking: The Neoconservative Fifth Column and the War in Iraq,” in O’Hualachain and Sharpe, eds., *Neoconned Again*, 112-24, at 123.



after the fall of the Berlin Wall, a Neoconservative leader Norman Podhoretz wondered the future of the Neoconservatism as an ideology because there was no purpose for America with the end of the Communist threat and the end of the Soviet menace. These events pushed Podhoretz to publish a book in which he declared the death of the Neoconservatism.<sup>27</sup>

## **II.2.The Second Neoconservative Generation and the Project of the New American Century:**

In the early 1990's and with the collapse of the Soviet Union, new tendencies emerged in the movement of the Neoconservatism. These tendencies were the use of force abroad to ensure American supremacy. This was quite clear because the U.S cannot survive without enemies.

After the end of the Cold War there was the emergence of a new imperial language concerning the new world order. As Zalmay Khalilzad, who was a member of Bush the father administration in 1991, has expressed it in his book entitled: from containment to global leadership, the idea of the preventing, even with the use of military force if necessary, the rise of any rival power.<sup>28</sup>

The U.S showed an ability to use force to preserve its supremacy in a way which indicated a new era; the era of the American empire. This idea was supported by Robert Kagan, one of the most famous and influential Neoconservative foreign policy analysts, who argued that the

---

<sup>27</sup> Norman Podhoretz, "After the Cold War," *Commentary* 92 (July 1991), and "Neoconservatism: A Eulogy," *Commentary* 101 (March 1996); both cited in Andrew J. Bacevich, *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 80.

<sup>28</sup> Zalmay Khalilzad, *From Containment to Global Leadership? America and the World after the Cold War* (Rand Corporation, 1995).

U.S was obliged to use its military force to establish a new world order which supported the American hegemony.<sup>29</sup>

During the Clinton Administration, the neoconservatives were active and created an opposition to the Clinton way of dealing with international conflicts and some other foreign policy issues. They, the Neoconservatives, have created some means and instruments to put the pressure on the Clinton administration. The Weekly Standard Magazine was among the main organs that supported neoconservative tendencies; it was founded by famous Neoconservatives: William Kristol and Robert Kagan.

In January 2001 and during the electoral campaign, Robert Kagan criticized president Clinton and his administration of being half imperialist.<sup>30</sup> This statement and other declarations concerning the Clinton administration way of dealing with some issues of the U.S foreign policy represented the idea of the revival of the American Empire in the minds of the foreign policy makers.

It is clear that understanding the development of the neoconservative ideology lead us to say that after the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks, the making of U.S foreign policy was transformed into an implementation of the Neoconservative Agenda.

This was the general mood in the international scene. The majority of the analysts and politicians were pushed to say that to understand the new directions and orientations of U.S

---

<sup>29</sup> Robert Kagan, "American Power: A Guide for the Perplexed," Commentary 101 (April 1996).

<sup>30</sup> Robert Kagan, "The Clinton Legacy Abroad," Weekly Standard, January 15, 2001; quoted in Bacevich, The New American Militarism, 85

foreign policy during the early years of the twenty first century, one should read with a big attention what the neoconservative intellectuals have written ten years or more before.<sup>31</sup>

Most of the foreign policy decisions made during the Bush administration, especially those concerned with the Middle East, can be considered as a logical consequences and results of the imperial tendency developed during the second neoconservative generation.

The most marking and important development within the neoconservative movement in the late 1990's was the foundation of the PNAC (project of the new American century) in 1997.

The PNAC was closely and deeply linked to the American Enterprise Institute both physically and financially, with a slight difference in the main concern because the PNAC main concern was U.S foreign policy.<sup>32</sup>

In the statement of principles of the PNAC, there was a call for American global leadership and hegemony. It claimed that the U.S has to resolve to shape new world order favorable to American principles, values and interest.<sup>33</sup> Most of the members of the PNAC were neoconservatives, and above all, they were foreign policy makers. That is why the presence of the ideologies of this Think Tank in the making of U S foreign policy can be observed.

In the dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and just few months after the Bush administration took office, the PNAC published a 76 pages document called the RAD (Rebuilding American Defense). The R.A.D announced that the U.S was facing no global rival but its grand strategy should aim to preserve and extend the advantageous position of the U.S in the post Cold War

---

<sup>31</sup>Stefan Halper and Jonathan Clarke, *America Alone: The Neo-Conservatives and the Global Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004),

<sup>32</sup> Garry Dorrien, *Imperial Designs*, 68, 130

<sup>33</sup> PNAC, "Statement of Principles," 1997 (<http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>)

era, when to preserve American peace, which meant increasing the size of the American Empire.

The R.A.D was considered as a milestone in the new tendencies of U.S foreign policy. It can also be associated and linked to the Defense Planning Guideline (DPG) of 1992 which was drafted by Cheney and Wolfowitz. The R.A.D stated that the basic creed and assumptions made in the D.P.G in early 1990 remained correct and workable. So there was a kind of continuity between the two documents and this was not surprising because Cheney and Wolfowitz were listed as participants in the writing of the 2000 document and they were among the drafters of the DPG.<sup>34</sup>

What was openly expressed in the PNAC's document was highly important and significant. Because many of the PNAC's early members, including Elliot Abrams, Zalmay Khalilzad and Richard Perle and most significantly Cheney and Ramsfield, became after less than a decade prominent figures in the Bush Administration. Most of the PNAC's members took key positions in the white house and the pentagon and the department of defense. This was not because that most PNAC's members were part of the Bush Administration but because Cheney and Ramsfield who led the vice presidency and the pentagon.

### **II.3.The 9/11 Attacks and the Revival of the American Empire:**

When Bush Administration took office, neoconservative's analysts and commentators such as Krauthammer became more explicit when talking about the use of America's power for imperial ends. As an example, they mocked at President Clinton for being "a good international citizen" because they saw and thought that he was too much idealistic and

---

<sup>34</sup> Project for the New American Century (PNAC), *Rebuilding America's Defense: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century*, September 2000 available at ([www.newamericancentury.org](http://www.newamericancentury.org)).

moralistic when dealing with international conflicts such as his attitude towards the War in the Balkans.

The Clinton years were one of the most peaceful eras in the modern history of the United States of America that is why they criticized and mocked at him.

When talking about the Clinton years, Krauthammer said:” America is no more international citizen; it is the dominant power in the world, more dominant than any nation since Rome. So America is in a position of force and in a position to reshape the norms to create new realities.”<sup>35</sup>

It was not until the 9/11 Attacks but after the devastating assault on Afghanistan in 2001, that the neoconservatives efforts to convince the Americans to accept an imperial self-definition started showing widespread success.

The imperial language was mainly among some Neoconservatives intellectual was remarkable and they were working to tell the Americans that they were the undisputed masters of the world.

By doing so, there was a general mood in the Americans scene, for both foreign policy makers and citizens, that America was the new and the only superpower in the globe.

The first steps for realizing the new American empire was the invasion of Afghanistan which was considered as “rogue state” and was among the countries which were accused by the Bush Administration of harboring the terrorists who committed the 9/11 attacks.

By invading Afghanistan, which was first a unilateral act, the U.S began a new challenge which was the war on terror and after that the global war on terror.

---

<sup>35</sup> Krauthammer, “The Bush Doctrine,” Time, March 5, 2001 available at (<http://edition.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/time/2001/03/05/doctrine.html>).

During the war on Afghanistan and even after the invasion, most neoconservative scholars, analysts and decision makers showed a total will to push the U.S to use its power unilaterally to manage the world order. There was an opposition to this new way of conducting U.S foreign policy by both the United Nations and the international community which were considered by the neoconservatives as hurdles and barriers standing against the will of the Americans to build their empire.<sup>36</sup>

The 9/11 attacks and the wars that followed it resulted serious talks and debates about the building of the American empire, but this time not only in the scope of the neoconservatives.

During the Bush administration, the will of the American empire become true and the dream was realized to the extent that pushed some politicians, like Paul Kennedy, to declare that there was no empire that existed in the past which can be compared to the American empire.<sup>37</sup>

During the years that followed the war on Afghanistan raised a serious question which was the transformation of the U.S into an imperial power. Noting that the main question that was asked was not whether America was an empire but what where the means to achieve this goal. This was stated clearly in Andrew Bacevich, in his book, American Empire, when he said that “the question before the Americans was not whether the U.S has become an Empire but only what sort of empire they wanted it to be.”<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Robert Kaplan, “Supremacy by Stealth: Ten Rules for Managing the World,” Atlantic Monthly, July/August, 2003.

<sup>37</sup> Paul Kennedy. The Rise and Fall of Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000 . (New York: Vintage Books, 2000)78

<sup>38</sup> Andrew J Bacevich,. American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002)87

The new American empire was present in the Neoconservative agenda. But the Neoconservatives did not find a suitable way to put it in practice until the Bush Administration. It was the 9/11 attacks that allowed the agenda to be implemented. The historic facts can be an argument to debate over the reality behind the 9/11 attacks. So the attacks were beneficial for the implementation of the agenda and also the will of the American empire to be true and accomplished.<sup>39</sup>

#### **II.4.The Invasion of Iraq and the Implementation of the Neoconservative Agenda:**

A big number of the neoconservatives, including some who became central and important members of the Bush Administration, had been planning to bring about a regime change in Iraq ever since Saddam Hussein occupation of Iraq in 1990. Among these neoconservatives we can talk about Cheney and Wolfowitz who occupied the position of secretary and under secretary of defense, and also Richard Perle who chaired the Committee for Peace and Security in the Gulf. The idea of removing Saddam was opposed by both the president G.Bush and also by the two generals Collin Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf.

With this serious and strong opposition, the plan of removing Saddam was not carried out. They were looking for the best opportunity to remove Saddam Hussein and they were ready to do it in the first opportunity.

By a small flash back, in 1992, an ancient Neoconservative expressed his frustration that nothing was done about a dictator sitting on the world's second largest pool of the low-cost oil and ambitious to dominate the Gulf. This inspired Perle and Wolfowitz and other Neoconservatives.

---

<sup>39</sup> Claes Ryn, "The Ideology of American Empire," quoted in O'Huallachain and Sharpe, eds., *Neoconned Again*, 63-79, at 65.

Then in 1996, a document called the “Clean Break” was written by Perle to propose for Israel to remove the entire hostile president who were surrounding Israel and considered as enemies to the United States. The list contained a number of presidents and at the top of the list was Saddam Hussein.<sup>40</sup>

When analyzing the document and its aim, we can make a connection between the document and what happened in the world scene later we can find that document provided strategic ideas for the Operation Iraqi Freedom seven years later.<sup>41</sup>

A year after, and in one of their writings, Wolfowitz and Khalilzad expressed their deep willing to remove Saddam Hussein. Wolfowitz stated: “Saddam must go.”<sup>42</sup>

This statement and others represented proofs that the removal of Saddam Hussein was not newly born idea but it was deeply rooted in the minds of the Neoconservatives.

Saddam did not represent a real threat for America, but it represented a serious and dangerous threat to Israel. That is why there was a kind of a conspiracy to remove Saddam.

The second element which can be picked out from the document was an immense regret among some Neoconservative for the fact of letting Saddam in power especially Wolfowitz who told the National Security Council that it was a big mistake to leave Saddam in power in 1991.

---

<sup>40</sup> Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm,” June 1996 (<http://www.israeleconomy.org/strat1.htm>).

<sup>41</sup> O’Neill is quoted to this effect in Ron Susskind, *The Price of Loyalty: George W. Bush, the White House, and the Education of Paul O’Neill* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004).

<sup>42</sup> Paul Wolfowitz and Zalmay Khalilzad “Saddam must go” the Washington post, 2002.



According to Wolfowitz, Saddam presence in Iraq represented a threat to American interests in the region and his removal was the only outcome that can satisfy the vital American interests and also can guarantee the stability I the region of the Gulf.<sup>43</sup>

To continue the chronology of the implementation of the Neoconservatives agenda, the most obvious example we can give is an article written by Kristol and Kagan in 1998. In this article entitled: “bombing Iraq is not enough.” But the most interesting thing in the article can be found was the call for finishing the job left undone in 1991.

When analyzing this article, it is clear that there was a real will of removing Saddam Hussein and occupying Iraq.

When investigating the history of the pre-Iraq invasion there was a very important document which explicitly expressed the will of regime change in Iraq. This document is a letter to President Clinton from the PNAC. This letter was signed by Cheney, Kristol and other neoconservatives. They urged Clinton to take the necessary steps, including military actions to remove Saddam from power. But they did not receive any agreement from Clinton, that is why they sent copies to senate and the parliament.<sup>44</sup>

In 2000, the PNAC and RAD pointed out that America has to play a great role in the Gulf region. It added that there was a vital need to establish military bases in the region to control Saddam Hussein.

---

<sup>43</sup> That Wolfowitz made this comment in a statement to the Commission was reported by Commissioner Jamie Gorelick. *Washington Post*, March 23, 2004 (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A17798-2004Mar23.html>).

<sup>44</sup> PNAC, Letter to President Clinton on Iraq, January 26, 1998 (<http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqclintonletter.htm>).

This statement can be considered among the final steps before the regime change in Iraq. Because when talking about the military presence, there was a reference to an imminent attack. But the problem was that there were no reasons or even pretext to invade Iraq.

The question of removing Saddam Hussein occupied the mind of several neoconservatives especially few months after the inauguration of Bush as the 43 president of the United States.

The question that raised that time was not why to remove Saddam Hussein but how to remove him. There was a total absence of logical reasons to invade Iraq that time; that is way the removal of Saddam Hussein was impossible. But there was a general feeling among the Bush Administration's members that the invasion of Iraq was among the first steps when talking about the implementation of the Neoconservative agenda.

By 2001, the U.S knew one of the most shocking events in its modern history. Knowing that until the 9/11 attacks no one could find a way to remove Saddam and invade Iraq. One of the most important aftermaths of the attacks was the new window through which the U.S could go after Saddam Hussein.<sup>45</sup>

When analyzing the historical facts, the 9/11 attacks themselves were not sufficient basis for getting the American people support for attacking Iraq. Even though Ramsfield said in a note to General Richard Myers that it was better to fight both Ussama Bin Laden and Saddam Hussein at the same time.<sup>46</sup>

The foreign policy decision makers insisted on the removal and the fighting of Saddam Hussein, because he was put at the top of list of the principal targets of the first round in the war on terrorism.

---

<sup>45</sup> Reported by CBS News, September 4, 2002. This note, written by Rumsfeld's top aide, Stephen Cambone (who participated in PNAC's project to produce Rebuilding America's Defenses)

<sup>46</sup> Stephen J. Sniegowski, "Neoconservatives, Israel, and 9/11," 108-09.

The American people for other countries would support an attack on Afghanistan but not on Iraq, because there was no evidence about the relation between Saddam and the 9/11 attacks.

The U.S could not fight in two critical regions at the same time. That is why G.Bush refused to wage a war on Iraq until finishing the assault on Afghanistan. Another thing to mention is that G.Bush thought that after a successful campaign on Afghanistan, a war on Iraq would become more feasible.

In doing so, G. Bush refused to use the 9/11 attacks to justify an attack on Iraq. So the implementation of the neoconservative agenda was not possible.<sup>47</sup>

The attack on Iraq could not be launched immediately because the Americans were not psychologically prepared for a new war in Iraq. So there was a need to a mediatic war and propaganda to prepare the Americans for the invasion of Iraq.

The propaganda involved convincing the majority of the American people of the absolute truth of two major claims; the first one is that Saddam harbored the terrorist groups that committed the 9/11 attack and the second one is that Saddam possessed weapons of mass destruction.

The point which needs to be clarified is the emphasis in this story was that the propaganda depended on the attacks of 9/11. That is why the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks were considered the provider of a political context in which the thinking of the neoconservatives could be turned into operational foreign policy.

---

<sup>47</sup> Glenn Kessler, "U.S. Decision on Iraq Has Puzzling Past," Washington Post, January 12, 2003 (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A43909-2003Jan11.html>)

In August 2002, Cheney declared that there was no doubt that Saddam now has weapons of mass destruction and he can use them against the U.S.<sup>48</sup>

The Bush Administration was greatly helped in this propaganda by Neoconservatives outside the government, represented in Think Tanks, who linked the 9/11 attacks to Saddam Hussein. By doing so, the invasion of Iraq was considered as a part of the global war on terror.

The offensive agenda was at some extent successful. Shortly before the launching of the attacks on Iraq, the majority of the American population supported the war.

These events led to the fact that the neoconservatives were able to build an environment surrounding the terrorist attacks of 9/11 into a wide normal platform from which they launched the preemptive war against Iraq.

---

<sup>48</sup> Quoted in Gustave Gilbert, *Nuremberg Diary* (New York: Farrar, Straus, & Co, 1947), 278.

**Conclusion:**

As a conclusion for this chapter, I can say that the making and the shaping of U.S foreign policy was not and is not done only by the president. There are many lobbies and interest groups who are influencing the making of U.S foreign policy.

I have focused on the Neoconservatism as an ideology, its history and development. I have also focused on the Neoconservatives as the most influential lobby in the white house and the pentagon in the last decade. I have also investigated the agenda behind the invasion of Iraq in 2003 and how this agenda was implemented.

The War on Terror, The WMD, The 9/11 attacks were considered as the ground that the U.S used to launch an offensive on Iraq in 2003.

## **End Notes of the Second Chapter:**

### **PNAC:**

A project made by some American intellectuals and policy makers, most of them are neoconservatives and Jewish, to put in practice the American supremacy and hegemony.

### **AXIS OF EVIL:**

"Axis of evil" is a term initially used by the former United States President George W. Bush in his State of the Union Address on January 29, 2002 and often repeated throughout his presidency, describing governments that he accused of helping terrorism and seeking weapons of mass destruction. Bush labeled Iran, Iraq and North Korea as the axis of evil.

### **THINK THANK:**

A **think tank** is an organization or individual that conducts research and engages in advocacy in areas such as social policy, political strategy, economy, science or technology issues, industrial or business policies, or military advice. Many think tanks are non-profit organizations, which some countries such as the United States and Canada provide with tax exempt status. Other think tanks are funded by governments, advocacy groups, or businesses, or derive revenue from consulting or research work related to their projects

According to the National Institute for Research Advancement, think tanks are "one of the main policy actors in democratic societies ..., assuring a pluralistic, open and accountable process of policy analysis, research, decision-making and evaluation".

## **General Conclusion:**

When talking making a research in international relations, there is a kind of need to talk about U.S foreign policy because since the end of the Cold War, it emerges as the only super power on the globe.

The U.S foreign policy has known many changes during the last decade. The use of force abroad and military intervention in a unilateral way was the most appearing practice especially after the 9/11. The September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks have brought about a revolution in U.S foreign policy since they permitted to the U.S to use, for the first time in its modern history, of force in a direct way.

When facing and challenging terrorism, The U.S ancient policies such as deterrence and containment which were used during the cold war were no longer applicable. Then appeared a new instrument and tool in U.S foreign policy which was the preemptive actions which were also known as the Bush Doctrine.

The Bush Doctrine created hot talks and debates among scholars and international jurists especially concerning its legitimacy and lawfulness. The conclusion was that the Preemptive actions were not wise but they were legal. The case of the invasion of Iraq 2003 has proved again that the U.N is no longer a multilateral international organization but a means in the hands of the U.S to establish its hegemony. The U.N Charter also proved its handicap to face this kind of cases because it was ambiguous and it has permitted to the U.S to go further in its hegemony.

The question of lobbies and their influence on the making of U.S foreign policy is also among many debatable and inspiring topics when dealing with the U.S foreign policy.

In this research project, the Neoconservative influence on the shaping of U.S foreign policy under bush administration was one of the central questions. The presence of some prominent neoconservatives figures in the circles of policy making, the white house and the pentagon, permitted to those people to pass and to put in practice some agendas they have planned years ago.

In the case of the neoconservative lobby which was the most influential interest group that played a great role in the foreign policy making in the U.S during the Bush Administration. The deep and serious analysis of the ideology of the neoconservatives and their writings during the 1990's permit to say that the invasion of Iraq in 2003 was a part of a plan which was drafted years before. The invasion of Iraq was an implementation of the neoconservative agenda.

The war on terrorism, democracy promotion and preserving human rights were the pretext to invade Iraq. The real causes and motive were the security of Israel, oil and the control of the strategic region that Iraq occupied.



## **Bibliography:**

### **Primary Sources:**

Bush, George Walker. "Address to the Nation," September 11, 2001 available at:

<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html>>

—. "Graduation Speech at West Point," June 1, 2002 available at:

<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html>>

Rice, Condoleezza. "Remarks by National Security Adviser on Terrorism and Foreign Policy,"

April 29, 2002, available at <[www.whitehouse.gov](http://www.whitehouse.gov)>

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002, available at:

<[www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html)>

The United Nation Chart, available at: <[www.onucom/unchart.html](http://www.onucom/unchart.html)>

### **Books:**

Bacevich, Andrew J. American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy .

Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

—. The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2005.

Chamsky, Noam. Hegemony or Survival: America Quest for Global Dominance. New York:

Routledge, 2006.

Clarke, Richard. Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror. New York: Free

Press, 2004.

Clarke, Stefan Halper and Jonathan. America Alone: The Neo-Conservatives and the Global Order. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

chamsky, noam. Hegemony or Survival: America Quest for Global Dominance. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Copeland, Dale C. The Origins of Major War . New York: Cornell University Press, 2000.

David Ray, Griffin. The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions. Northampton : Olive Branch, 2005.

David Ray Griffin, John B. Cobb, Jr., Richard Falk, and Catherine Keller. The American Empire and the Commonwealth of God. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

Dorrien, Gary. Imperial Designs: Neoconservatism and the New Pax Americana. New York: Routledge, 2004.

—. The Neoconservative Mind: Politics, Culture, and the War of Ideology . Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993.

Johnson, Chalmers. The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004.

Kennedy, Paul. The Rise and Fall of Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000 . New York: Vintage Books, 2000.

Lemann, Nicholas. The Next World Order: The Bush Administration May Have a Brand-New Doctrine of Power. New York: New York University press, 2002.

Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed. The War on Freedom: How and Why America was Attacked September 11, 2001 . California.: Tree of Life, 2006.

Sharpe, D. L. O'Huallachain and J. Forrest. Neoconned Again: Hypocrisy, Lawlessness, and the Rape of Iraq. Vienna: IHS Press, 2005.

Sniegoski, Stephen J. "Neoconservatives, Israel, and 9/11: The Origins of the U.S. War on Iraq." . yale university press, 2006.

Walt, John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy. London: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Woodward, Bob. Bush at War . New York : Simon & Schuster , 2002.

Zalmay Khalilzad. From Containment to Global Leadership: America and the World after the Cold War. Rand Corporation, 1995.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives . New York: Basic Books, 1997.

### **Articles from Magazines and Journals:**

Ashton Carter, John Deutch, and Philip Zelikow. «Catastrophic Terrorism: Tackling the New Danger.» Foreign Affairs November/December 1998: 80-94.

Barton Gellman. «Aim of Defense Plan Supported by Bush.» Washington Post (March 12, 1992): 9.

Beichman, Arnold. «How the Divide over Iraq Strategies Began.» Washington Times (November 27, 2002).

Boot, Max. «Think Again: Neocons.» Foreign Policy January/February 2004.

Borchgrave, Arnaud de. «All in the Family.» Washington Times (September 13, 2004 ).

Kagan, Robert. «We Must Fight This War.» Washington Post (September 12, 2001): 12.

Kagan, William Kristol and Robert. «Bombing Iraq Isn't Enough.» New York Times (January 30, 1998).

—. «Time for an Investigation.» Weekly Standard ( May 27, 2002): 9-10.

Kaplan , Robert. «Supremacy by Stealth: Ten Rules for Managing the World.» Atlantic Monthly July/August 2005: 78.

Kessler, Glenn. «U.S. Decision on Iraq Has Puzzling Past.» Washington Post (January 12,

Khalilzad, Paul D. Wolfowitz and Zalmay M. «Saddam Must Go.» Weekly Standard (December 1997): 31.

Kissinger, Henry. «Destroy Network.» Washington Post (September 11, 2001): 17.

Krauthammer, Charles. «Universal Dominion: Toward a Unipolar World.» National Interest Winter 1989: 47-49.

—. «The Bush Doctrine.» Time (2001): 5.

Lind, Michael. «A Tragedy of Errors.» The Nation (February 23, 2004): 8.

Podhoretz, Norman. «The Reagan Road to Détente.» Foreign Affairs (1984): 452.

Rumsfeld, Donald. «Interview with the New York Times.» New York Times, (October 12, 2001).

Tyler, Patrick E. «U.S. Strategy Plan Calls for Insuring No Rivals Develop: A One Superpower World.» New York Times (March 8, 1992): 16.

Wohlstetter, Albert. «Help Iraqi Dissidents Oust Saddam.» Wall Street Journal ( August 25, 1992).

“September 11, 2001: Attack on America: Remarks by the President in Telephone Conversation with New York Mayor Giuliani and New York Governor Pataki;September 13, 2001,” available at [http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept\\_11/president\\_009.htm](http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept_11/president_009.htm)

Department of Defense News Briefing on Pentagon Attack, 6:42 PM, September 11, 2001 (available at [http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept\\_11/dod\\_brief02.htm](http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept_11/dod_brief02.htm)).

### **Organizations and Institutes:**

DoD online dictionary at: <<http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/doddict/data/p/index.html>>

Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm,” June 1996 (<http://www.israeleconomy.org/strat1.htm>).

Project for the New American Century (PNAC) , Rebuilding America’s Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century, September 2000 ([www.newamericancentury.org](http://www.newamericancentury.org)).

—., “Statement of Principles,” June 3, 1997

(<http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>).

—., Letter to President Clinton on Iraq, January 26, 1998

(<http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqclintonletter.htm>).