

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

The interest of the Bush administration's hawks, so called the neoconservatives, is an expansion of American military power and the promotion an idea to defeat the principal adversaries of the U.S., especially antagonistic states in the Bush administration. Neoconservatives who provided the driving force for war, foresaw that the conflict with Iraq was also likely to bring the U.S. into conflict with several states in the Middle East such as Iran. However, they thought that the U.S. armed forces could complete the war in Iraq without the battle spreading beyond Iraq's borders prematurely. These assumptions are likely to be mistaken.

After the U.S. decided to invade Iraq, the U.S. has still to see the democratic fruit of its labor even though Saddam's regime had been overthrown. The U.S. faces an ongoing regional war. The war on terrorism drives the U.S. to confront an expanding network of enemies in the region. As long as the U.S. troops are stationed in Iraq, it is inevitable that they will face the whole terrorist network including Islamic Jihad and militant groups backed by nations that are called the "terror masters"<sup>82</sup>

As a conclusion, this paper does not agree with the U.S.'s idea that terrorism can be solved by war and the neoconservatives's way of conflict resolution. It has too much cost of life and social lost including state failure. Like terrorism, war against terrorism can also threaten global peace and security. Many political, military, economic interests and incentives are interconnected in neoconservative U.S. foreign policy toward Iraq such as energy security, patro-politics and authoritarianism.

In light of evaluation of the U.S.'s operation toward the Middle East, the neoconservatives hard-line policy has been proven to have ineffective results, particularly the war in Iraq. In addition, it increases anti-Americanism in the Arab world. However, it is interesting to consider that the solution to deal with this

---

<sup>82</sup> Rober Dreyfuss, "Is Iraq the opening salvo in a war to remake the world?," *The American Prospect magazine* 14, issue 4 (2003).

situation could be political and economic development as witnessed in the democratic development of the other countries. The development never comes from outsiders but always from people in the country itself. For the U.S.'s policy of democracy promotion, the U.S. should not decide by itself when and where democracy comes about. Outsiders cannot impose democracy on a country that does not want it. The demand for democracy and reform must be domestic. Democracy promotion is a long term process that has to wait the gradual ripening of political and economic conditions to be effective.

Interestingly, Nation Building Process is a reasonable choice to establish solidarity. Building a nation can sustain a sense of nationhood, backed by a strong (non-sectarian) state which provides security and safety for its citizens. Nation building requires a community in which its members can feel that they belong to a political community. At this stage, Iraq lacks both the nation and the state, as well as a sense of national solidarity, which is increasingly being replaced by provincial tribalism and militant sectarianism as witnessed in the Shia and Sunni conflict.

More importantly, the new Iraqi government should also arrange new cultural and educational programs to propagate a post-Baathist Iraqi national identity. With new cultural and educational programs, it should promote a democratic minded community of Iraqi who do not identify themselves solely with their respective religious or political parties.