

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Second World War, the United States has played a leading role as both initiator and reactor, for several significant incidents. The United States abrogates a linchpin of foreign policy so called “Isolationism” and become a dominating player in the international community. On the contrary, the Soviet Union inspired the Communist world as a counter to the U.S. power, which ultimately led the international community to exist in a bi-polar system or the Cold War. During a conflictual situation between the two super powers, the U.S. utilized a strategy of “Containment Policy” in order to enclose an expansion of communist power. It could be concluded that the U.S. utterly abandoned the Idealism perspective by pursuing the Realism concept in an attempt to cultivate military alliances as well as the use of economic power to subsidize economic development of under-developed countries in exchange for non-alignment with the communist. After the cold war, it seemed that the U.S. neglected its standpoint of promoting democracy, and replaced it with an agenda to firmly establish its own influence and hegemony in the world.

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the Cold War or the bi-polar system came to an end. Subsequently, an emergence of the New World Order replaced the old system. The New World Order is a monopolar or uni-polar system due to the fact that the U.S. has been placed in a position of the most powerful country in terms of military capability and economic development. Moreover, an outbreak of globalization has increased the U.S. power by accelerating a role of globalizer in terms of a dispersion of the American ways or expansion of the U.S. power. For instance, as a position of superiority, the U.S. imposes rules and enforcements in many aspects within the United Nations and the World Trade Organization for the benefit of its interests. Evidently, the U.S. violated the UN Resolution by insisting upon attacking Iraq in 2003. The U.S. claimed that it was a legal action of pre-emptive war by acting unilaterally and neglecting the rule of law.

Beyond domestic affairs, the U.S. intervenes in diplomatic, politic, economic and social issues of the other countries. According to the Department of Defense publication, the U.S. has troops in 135 countries.¹ This means that U.S. has troop stations around 70 percent of countries around the world. The U.S. mandates their troops differently in terms of combat assignments or non-combat specialties due to realities of ad hoc situations.

From the points mentioned above, it is possible to assume that the U.S. foreign policy's formulations towards other countries depend on the U.S. perception of whether those countries would threaten its national interest or national security. Evidently, September 11 was a calamitous incident in the U.S.'s point of view. To deal with such incident, the U.S. has launched war against terrorism, pledging to act by all means to devastate terrorists including anyone who harbors them. It indicates that the U.S.'s national interest play a prominent role in the foreign policy decision-making process. One decisive policy utilizes several factors and inevitably relies on the benefit of the country. Moreover, it also needs to consider positive and negative results along with weighting a possibility of such alternatives for seeking the most possible outcome.² At this stage, it indicates that the U.S. foreign policy makers attempt to increase the U.S. power in order to oppress their enemies. This U.S. foreign policy is guided by neoconservative ideology, particularly for response to September 11. Presently, the neoconservatives is pre-eminent driver of the U.S. foreign and security policy. Due to an increasing of public concern over war in Iraq, it is interesting to explore how neoconservatives influence the U.S. foreign policy in deciding to attack Iraq.

¹ *Department of Defense publication*, "Active Duty Military Personnel Strengths by Regional Area and by Country," retrieved February 8, 2007, from <http://siadapp.dior.whs.mil/personnel/M05/hst0309.pdf>. (see Appendix I).

² Christopher Layne, "From Preponderance to Offshore Balancing: America's Future Grand Strategy," *International Security* 22, no. 1 (1997): 87-92.

Significance of issue

After September 11, 2001, concerns over brutal violence from terrorist attack have been increasing and spreading all over the world. September 11 has been variously interpreted as a shrewd movement undertaken by those who knew where to hit the hegemony or the opening of a new Third World War between a radicalized Islam and the modern West. Interestingly, the attack on the World Trade Center on the September 11 was not the first time. In fact, a similar attack had happened in 1993 when the building was damaged by a car bomb. It became the cause of casualties but did not took either of the buildings down. There were six Islamic militants convicted in the attack, the attack was meant to pressure the U.S. to stay out of the Middle East and curb its support of Israel.³ Therefore, the September 11 is not a great surprise. The more surprising was the way that the U.S. chose to respond the attack and declared a new war against international terrorism at this time.⁴

Subsequently, the New World Order has been shaped by “Neoconservatives” views of the war on terrorism. Indeed, terrorism is not a new threat but the catastrophes of such incident excessively threaten American security and reputation. Reactively, the U.S. has amended policy operations to retaliate anyone who committed or supported such destructive incidents. Evidently, a well known notion of “axis of evil”, namely North Korea, Iran and Iraq, was articulated by President Bush in the State of the Union in 2002;⁵

“Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction. Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September the 11th. But we know their true nature.

³ “World Trade Center - New York City 9-11 Terrorist Attacks,” retrieved February 8, 2007, from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/eye/wtc.htm>.

⁴ Michael Cox, “From the cold war to the war on terror,” in *The Globalization of the World Politics: An introduction to international relations*, 3rd ed., ed. John Baylis and Steve Smith (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 152-155.

⁵ “President Delivers State of the Union Address,” retrieved February 8, 2007, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>.

North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens.

Iran aggressively pursues weapons and exports terror, while an unelected few repress the Iranian people's hope for freedom.

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens -- leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections -- then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world”

Among three countries, Iraq is the only country which was aggressively attacked by the U.S., while North Korea and Iran are still being in talk shop with the U.S. This was evident from the statement of Secretary of State Colin Powell that “with respect to Iran and with respect to North Korea, there is no plan to start a war with those nations”⁶ This is not a common perception of an international community that three countries were labeled as evil but only Iraq was immediately overthrown. Therefore, it is interesting to explore factors behind the U.S. decision to attack Iraq.

There are several noteworthy reasons to study and analyze this topic in relation to the concern of international community.

The first reason is a concern of the spreading devastation of terrorism. Considering the core components of terrorism, generally we think about using military force to achieve their goals, possessing of weapons of mass destruction, and ending with any number of civilian deaths and so on. As a result, when some incidents occur and they end with terrorist’s accomplishment, it will be considered as a severe problem. Importantly, September 11 was a catastrophe for the U.S. and a traumatic event for all nations. Not only has the major countries experience in terrorism but it has effected every country due to its world wide network. The

⁶ Michael R. Goedon and David L. Sanger, “Powell Says U.S. Is Weighing Ways to Topple Hussein,” *New York Times*, (2002), A1.

significant points concerning terrorism do not entirely focus on the number of civilian deaths, high-tech weapons that they use, or who are the commander. However, the most important and debatable points are: the reason why terrorists decide to attack the target destructively, what will be the next target, and when will the attack occur. Consequently, under a consternation of terrorism, peace will be gradually evaporated along with living uncomfortably with panic of terrorism for all nations. Therefore, terrorism is a hot issue, which catches the eyes of all nations.

The second reason is the influence of U.S. foreign policy toward any countries, both of its adversaries and allies. Academically, as a student in the field of international relations, we have gained vast knowledge and dramatic changes in several countries. It is inevitable to study the U.S. foreign policies because the U.S. policies act as a main catalyst in several countries. Regarding the main theme of this paper which emphasizes on the incident after September 11, particularly war in Iraq, it is useful to understand factor that influences the U.S. foreign policy by emphasizing on neoconservative point of view.

The third reason is the notoriousness of the war in Iraq. From time to time, the U.S. launches policies and strategies toward Iraq. Whenever, the U.S. operates its policies and all movements in the Bush team will be reported publicly. Unsurprisingly, the Iraq War can be posed in the top rank of the U.S. strategies. Moreover, after having launched decisive policies against Iraq, it is worth thinking whether the result is effective to pursue neoconservatives expectations.

This paper will explore significant reasons that influence the U.S. foreign policy toward Iraq. Moreover, as Neoconservatives is considered as the primary guideline of the current U.S. foreign policies, this paper will utilize this notion as the main approach in meeting with the objectives set in the paper.

Objectives of study

- 1) To study how neoconservatives influence the U.S. foreign policy toward Iraq.
- 2) To explain the U.S. operation in pursuing decisive foreign policy and reactions from relative actors such as the U.S. allies or the UN.
- 3) To understand the true motive of the U.S.'s decision to attack Iraq.
- 4) To evaluate whether the war in Iraq it succeeded or failed.

Research Questions

In order to concentrate on the issues highlighted above, several research questions are designed to understand and analyze the U.S. operation toward the war in Iraq.

1. What are the perspectives of neoconservatives?
2. How does neoconservatives influence the U.S. foreign policy?
3. What are the causes of war in Iraq?
4. What are the U.S. foreign policies toward Iraq?
5. Is the war in Iraq effective to pursue the U.S. decisive goals?

Scope

The war in Iraq occurred in March 2003 and ended with the declaration of Mission Accomplished by the U.S. two months later along with the capture of Saddam Hussein in December in the same year; these incidents occurred during the 1st Bush Administration (2001-2005). Moreover, the focal point of this paper is to understand the true motive of the U.S.'s decision to go to war in Iraq. In order to have a clearer understanding of the influence of the neoconservatives on U.S. foreign policy, it is helpful to limit the scope of this paper by emphasizing only on the first four years of George W. Bush Administration.

Conceptual Framework

This paper is conducted by using a concept of Realism by including national interest to be the core concept of this theory.

Realism

After the Second World War, Realism became the dominant theory in international politics. Previously, global politics was dominated by Idealism, which explained that individuals are good by nature. It supported democratic institutions that can preserve peace. Moreover, it referred to anarchic system that can be reduced or eradicated through the establishment of effective international organizations. However, it is argued that Idealism could not prevent the war and underestimated eagerness for power of human. For such reason, theorists and policymakers tend to find another theory to explain the nature of human being, to analyze ad hoc situation, and also to predict a possibility of situation in advance. At that time, Realism could be their appropriated answer.

Realism claim to be the oldest theory of international politics. Basic realist ideas and assumptions are: (1) a pessimistic view of human nature; (2) a conviction that international relations are necessarily conflictual and international conflicts are ultimately resolved by war; (3) a high regard of the values of national security and state survival; (4) a basic skepticism that there can be progress in international politics that is comparable to domestic political life. These ideas and assumptions steer the way of thought of most leading realist IR theorists, both past and present.⁷

Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, and indeed all classical realists share such view to a greater or lesser extent. They believed that the goal, the means, and the uses of power are a central preoccupation of political activity. Realism is grounded in an emphasis on power politics. It relies on assumption that the pursuit of power is the principal human goal. Its central assumption is that the state is the principal actor on

⁷ Robert Jackson and George Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 68.

the international or world stage and being sovereign, is able to act as an autonomous entity.⁸

Realists emphasize that there is no higher authority than the sovereign state, and international politics is characterized by anarchy, not harmony. The anarchic international system is one in which each state is forced to help itself and give priority to its own national interest. It is defined basically as state survival and territorial defence.⁹ Realists also emphasize on the role of power in international affairs and attend to understand power in terms of military capacity or force. Realists insist that the pattern of conflict and cooperation within the state system conform largely to the requirements of a balance of power. And when the balance of power is broken down, the war is the probable result of it.

According to Viotii and Kauppi, Realism can be concluded in assumptions that;¹⁰

1. Sovereign states are the principal actors in the international system.
2. The international system is anarchic. There is no authority above states which is capable of regulating their interactions.
3. States are rational and unitary actors, each of them can move towards their own national interest. It also distrust long-term cooperation or alliance.
4. The overriding 'national interest' of each state is its national security and survival.

⁸ Andrew Heywood, *Politics*, 2nd ed. (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 128.

⁹ Han J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th ed. (Calcutta: Scientific Book Agency, 1973), p. 3.

¹⁰ Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi, *International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism, and Beyond*, 3rd ed. (MA: Allyn&Bacon, 1999), pp. 6-7.

From assumptions mentioned above, such context are compatible with three core elements of Realism; ‘Three Ss’ – *statism, survival, and self-help*.¹¹

Statism defines state as the legitimate representative of the collective will of people. States exercise authority both domestically and internationally. Domestically, state can enforce the law. Internationally, state’s authority is limited by the notion of ‘anarchy’. International society is organized in an anarchical context, which is no overarching central authority above the sovereign states.¹² Therefore, the international realm is different from the other due to the lack of central authority.

Survival is the first priority for state leaders. Refer to anarchy theory, the survival of state cannot be guaranteed. As a result, all states seek to maximize their powers to get a better chance of surviving.

Self-help is the principle of action in anarchical system. Each state must take care of itself and they are responsible for ensuring their own well-being and survival. Therefore, states do not depend on the other while institutions and structure of the system do not permit friendship, trust, and honor.

As mentioned above, “survival” is the first priority, which is defined in a context of national interest. National interest covers a wide range of definition. It is considered as benefit of the country such as state’s survival and security, pursuit of wealth, economic growth and power. All of these aspects of national interest are mentioned in the U.S. foreign policy, particularly security issue which the U.S. claims in an operation to pursue the notion of war on terror. Therefore, national interest is a significant topic for guiding the way to analyze the topic of this paper.

¹¹ Tim Dunne and Brian C. Schmidt, “Realism,” in *The Globalization of the World Politics: An introduction to international relations*, 3rd ed., ed. John Baylis and Steve Smith (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 172-176.

¹² Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), p. 23.

National Interest

The Oxford Dictionary of Politics defines “National Interest” as the interest of the state, usually defined by its government. Two broad usages may be identified;

(1) National Interest is used by politicians for seeking support for a particular course of action, especially in foreign policy. For using in domestic policy objectives, it is less persuasive given the normal extent of differences. On the contrary, the term invokes an image of the nation or the nation-state, defends its interest within the anarchic international system where dangers abound and interests of nation are always at risk.

(2) National Interest is used as tool for analyzing foreign policy, particularly by political realists such as Morgenthau. National interest is used as a sort of foreign policy in terms of ‘public interest’ indicating what is the best for the nation in its relations with other states. Realist use the term of national interest to evaluate foreign policy by focusing national security as the core of national interest. Therefore, ‘interest of state’ and ‘national security interest’ are closely allied terms.¹³

Different scholars build the hierarchy of interests differently. Robert Osgood gave top priority to “national survival and self-preservation,” which he defined in terms of territorial integrity, political independence, and support for fundamental government institutions.¹⁴

Alexander L. George and Robert Keohane formulated a contradictory interpretation of the concept of national interests by grouping interests in three general categories:¹⁵

¹³ Iain McLean and Alistair McMillan, *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 360-361.

¹⁴ William C. Oslon, *The Theory and Practice of International Relations*, 8th ed. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1991), p. 36.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

(1) Physical survival (the survival of people, not necessarily the preservation of territory or sovereignty)

(2) Liberty (the ability of the inhabitants of a country to choose their form of government and to exercise a set of individual rights defined by law and protected by the state)

(3) Economic subsistence (the maximization of economic welfare).

It is the first category that causes some confusion, and it is unclear how survival of people can be achieved without territory or sovereignty.

John Chase formulated a sequence of interests:¹⁶

(1) to support self-government and democracy abroad.

(2) to protect and advance commerce.

(3) to help establish and maintain a favorable world balance of power.

As one part of national interest's definition mentioned that interest of state and national security interest are closely allied terms. Also, the normative core of realism is national security and state survival. The following part will provide some concept of national security.

National Security

National security is referred to the requirement to maintain the survival of the nation-state through the using of economic, military, political power and the exercise of diplomacy. Additionally, the modern concept of national security was introduced in the U.S. after World War II and it became an official guiding principle of foreign policy when the National Security Act of 1947 was signed on July 26, 1947 by U.S. President Harry S. Truman.¹⁷

¹⁶ William C. Oslon, David S. McLellan and Fred A. Sondermann, *The Theory and Practice of International Relations*, 6th ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1983), p. 58.

¹⁷ Frederick B. Cohen, *World War 3 : We are losing it and most of us don't even know we are fighting it : Information warfare basic* (Livermore, CA : Fred Cohen & Associates, ASP Press, 2006).

The majority of the provisions of the Act took effect on September 18, 1947 together with its 1949 amendment as follow;

(1) created the National Military Establishment (NME) which became known as the Department of Defense when the act was amended in 1949.

(2) created a separate Department of the Air Force from the existing United States Army Air Forces.

(3) subordinated the military branches to the new cabinet level position of the Secretary of Defense.

(4) established the National Security Council (NSC), a central place of coordination for national security policy in the Executive Branch, as well as the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the United States' first peacetime intelligence agency.

Since there is an increasing number of terrorism and an expansion of powerful countries, they have threatened national security of states. Security Sector Reform and Security Sector Management are needed in many nations for different reasons. Some are nations emerging from repressive regimes or recovering from civil wars. Others are developing nations with weak governments where national security sectors never existed or were never strong before. The U.S. saw its own security sector overhaul with the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security in the wake of the terrorist attacks in September 11.¹⁸

At this stage, there are some measures taken to ensure national security such as using diplomacy to rally allies and isolate threats, maintaining effective armed forces, implementing civil defense, using intelligence services to detect, defeat or avoid threats and espionage, and using counterintelligence services or secret police to protect the nation from internal threats.

¹⁸ James Chace and Carr Caleb, *America invulnerable : The quest for absolute security from 1812 to Star Wars* (New York : Summit Books, 1988), pp. 35-38.

Hypothesis

Neoconservatives influence on the U.S. foreign policy after the September 11 which strongly focus on military power particularly war in Iraq. The objective of neoconservatives on war in Iraq is the willingness to overthrow Saddam's regime in order to access Iraqi oil and long term U.S. domination in the Middle East.

Methodology

This paper consists of several sources of data assembles to provide additional understandings which based on qualitative research both primary and secondary sources and the other reliable sources.

The qualitative research is the way to gather and analyze data in order to answer the research questions. And this can be divided into two sources.

Primary sources consist of The United Nations Charter, Bush speeches. Secondary resources consist of news, critiques, and several opinions from academic institutes.

In addition, this paper provides descriptive analysis, which involves the study of various related information, theories, critiques, and apply an analytical method to recommend or anticipate on how to diminish the conflict and tension in Iraq.

Expected results

Firstly, the main goal of this paper is to understand the context of neoconservatives and learn how neoconservatives influence the U.S. foreign policy. Secondly, to understand the U.S. foreign policy operation and an attempt to use other influences to achieve expected goals of the U.S. foreign policy including interaction among relative actors to deal with Iraq war. The last is to understand the true motives of the U.S. foreign policy for attacking Iraq.