

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Tlemcen



Faculty of Letters and Foreign Languages
Department of English

United States Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003-2017) as a Case Study

Dissertation submitted to the Department of English as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master in Literature and Civilization

Presented by

Benaini Abdelmadjid

Supervised by

Sebouai Khadidja

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Dr. Zeghoudi Yahia	Chairman	(University of Tlemcen)
Mrs. Sebouai Khadidja	Supervisor	(University of Tlemcen)
Dr. Senouci Faiza	Examiner	(University of Tlemcen)

Academic Year 2016/2017

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my parents for their trustworthiness and encouragements. I love you both for everything you gave to me.

To all my friends who I tortured with my fears and complaints. I will be always grateful to each one of you.

Acknowledgements

Foremost, I am highly grateful to Allah. Then, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Ms. Sebouai Khadidja for her perfect sense of understanding and for her precious guidance.

I take this opportunity to express my deep gratitude to my reliable friends for providing insightful advice, suggestions, and precious documentation particularly Mr Fraine Youcef, and Mr Benameur Benamar

I would like to thank the jury members for accepting to examine my dissertation and for any remarks they would make to refine it.

Abstract

The present dissertation is an attempt to show how the United States through its political decisions was able to protect its interest and to what extent America's foreign policy was developed. However, the world events that happened throughout history had the huge part in explaining the evolution of the way the U.S conducted its foreign affairs and the tools it needed to secure the nation. Also, the thesis tackles the most important part in America's foreign policy which coincided with two administrations; George. W. Bush and Barrack Obama's administrations and the Iraq War as a case study to explain their unique foreign policies.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
Abstract.....	III
Table of Contents.....	IV
List of Acronyms.....	VII
General Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: U.S Foreign Policy.....	4
1. Introduction.....	4
1.1. Foreign Policy Definition.....	5
1.2. U.S Foreign Policy.....	6
1.2.1. The Historical Development of U.S Foreign Policy.....	6
1.2.1.1. U.S Foreign Policy during the First Isolationist Age (1776-1914).....	7
1.2.1.1.1. George Washington Proclamation of Neutrality.....	7
1.2.1.1.2. James Monroe’s Doctrine of 1823.....	8
1.2.1.1.3. Neutrality before World War I.....	8
1.2.1.2. Interwar period (1914-1945).....	9
1.2.1.2.1. The United States during World War I.....	9
1.2.1.2.2. Wilson Attempts in Making Peace during Post-War.....	10
1.2.1.2.3. Return to Isolationism	10
1.2.1.2.4. The Good Neighbor Policy	11

1.2.1.2.5. U.S Foreign Policy during World War II.....	12
1.2.1.3. American Foreign Policy during the Cold War Era (1945-1990).....	13
1.2.1.3.1. Truman Doctrine.....	13
1.2.1.3.2. Marshal Plan.....	14
1.2.1.3.3. NATO Formation.....	14
1.2.1.4. Post-Cold War American Foreign Policy.....	14
1.2.1.4.1. New World Order.....	14
1.2.2. U.S Foreign Policy Tools.....	16
1.2.2.1. Diplomacy.....	16
1.2.2.2. Sanction.....	17
1.2.2.3. Containment.....	18
1.2.2.4. Collective Security.....	19
1.2.2.5. Deterrence.....	19
1.2.2.6. Military force.....	20
1.3. Determinants of the Republican and Democratic Parties.....	21
1.3.1. Determinants of the Republican Party (Bush as a Model).....	21
1.3.2. Determinants of the Democratic Party (Obama as a Model).....	22
1.4. Conclusion.....	23
Chapter2: U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War 2003 as a Case Study.....	25
2. Introduction.....	25
2.1. The First Gulf War.....	26
2.2. The Iraq War.....	27

2.2.1. The 9/11 Events.....	27
2.2.2. Weapons of Mass Destruction.....	27
2.3. U.S Foreign Policy and Iraq: the Bush Administration.....	28
2.3.1. Neo-conservatism Foreign Policy.....	28
2.3.2. The Patriot Act.....	29
2.3.3. The Bush Doctrine.....	29
2.3.3.1. Pre-emption Doctrine	30
2.3.3.2. Democracy Promotion	31
2.3.3.2.1. The Nation-Building Project.....	32
2.3.3.3. American Hegemony	33
2.3.3.3.1. The Project for the New American Century (PNAC).....	34
2.3.3.4. Unilateralism Doctrine.....	35
2.3.4. The Hard Power.....	36
2.4. U.S Foreign Policy and Iraq: The Obama Administration.....	36
2.4.1. Renewing American Leadership.....	37
2.4.2. Obama Smart Power and Withdrawal from Iraq.....	38
2.4.3. Democracy Promotion.....	41
2.4.4. Multilateralism	43
2.5. Conclusion.....	44
General Conclusion.....	46
Bibliography.....	49

List of Acronyms

ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
FDR	Franklin Delano Roosevelt
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
ISIS	Islamic State of Iraq and Syria
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NSS	National Security Strategy
PNAC	Project for the New American Century
SOFA	Iraq Status of Forces Agreement
UN	United Nations
U.S./USA	United States of America
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WW I	World War I
WW II	World War II

General Introduction

U.S foreign policy focuses on how the state should behave towards other countries in the international arena. It is undertaken to fulfill certain goals; it focuses on safeguarding America's homeland, and preserving its national interest. However, the influence of history has affected U.S foreign policy in a great extent. It pushes the state to inherit a specific political style according to the nation's growth and the world events.

America has a long history of non-interference in European affairs. As a newly formed nation, President George Washington sticks in neutrality and in the same time strengthened diplomatic friendly connections with other European countries. America tried to stay aloof from any political commitments in the globe so that it could preserve its freedom. James Monroe Doctrine proved to be a one of the policies that enhanced the trend of isolationism until the First World War.

With the outbreak of World War I, attempts were made by President Woodrow Wilson to remain neutral towards the war. Wilson's non-intervention brought the opportunity to deal with warring parties and ensure economic advantages. Yet, the state of aloofness turned out to be impossible and in 2 April 1917 the U.S entered the war with allied powers. Consequently, after the war ends, the period witnessed a dramatic return to strict isolationism with attempts to settle the dispute between nations through international organization. In 1930's neutrality continued to be the hallmark of U.S foreign policy with a special emphasize that was given by the president Franklin Delano Roosevelt on looking after strong relations with neighboring countries and especially with Latin America. Before and during the World War II, the main focus of FDR administration was to guarantee the safety and security of the Americans. Yet, The U.S has been gradually influenced by major powers and by the rise of dictatorship which led to engagement in the second great turmoil. Accordingly, the country opened up to the external world, and went for international cooperation with others.

As the Cold War took place, it became necessary for the U.S to stop communist tendencies as well as help other countries to protect themselves from the soviet influence. The Truman Doctrine, the Marshal Plan, and the NATO, all these political and economical policies and organizations helped in great deal in stopping the tolitarian regimes. After the end of the Cold War, a New World Order emerged under the U.S leadership as the sole superpower in the world. President George W.H. Bush tried to maintain U.S global supremacy through multilateral means and promoting democracy and the same thing for Bill Clinton and Barrack Obama. Unlike these finals, George W. Bush chooses to employ unilateralism.

Diplomacy, sanctions, containment, collective security, deterrence, and finally military force are foreign policy tools that guided the U.S through history and when dealing with certain world events. These tools provided the right atmosphere for America to ensure and protect its interests.

All the previous historic phases has actually shaped U.S foreign policy, and influenced today's America. In fact, each time the country faces a crisis or an event, a new foreign policy term appears or sometimes just old term repeats its functions in a new era. Accordingly, George W. Bush and Barrack Obama administrations sought to lead America from different perspectives and much of their foreign policy decisions reflected their way of leadership. In fact, The Iraq War 2003 provided an excellent example to examine the process of Bush and Obama's foreign policies and their way of dealing with this crucial war. Each one of them committed his administration to specific approach.

The main question with which the research undertakes is:

- How had the Unites States conducted its foreign policy towards Iraq War during both George W. Bush and Barrack Obama administrations?

In order to answer the question, I would use for a descriptive approach since it aims at describing the core study of this research and casting light on current case. The use of this methodology involves data collection: Books, Articles, conferences papers, and any relevant materials.

The main motive this research is to provide valuable information about American foreign relations towards Iraq to the Algerian MLD students.

This research is an attempt to examine foreign strategies and policies of Bush and Obama in the Iraq war. It aimed to shed light on the different approaches and doctrines that shaped foreign policy of America during that war, also, it inquired USA mission to persuade an effective strategy to bring war to Iraq as well as ending it and how the nation went for political decisions to limit terrorists in rogue states like Iraq.

This dissertation would be expanded through two chapters. The first one is devoted to definitions of the concept of foreign policy and U.S foreign policy historical development and the way the nation conducted its relations towards others and towards world event. Also, this chapter is about America's political tools that were used in the past and still have an influence in the modern era and had a great part in the political arena. At the end of the chapter, a comprehensive assessment is given to two significant parties within U.S foreign policy.

The second chapter deals with the description of the foreign policy measures and structures of the Bush and Obama administrations and how their political visions were applied as a relation to the Iraq war. This chapter is related to the previous one since it has to do with foreign policy and its major interests and tools.

Chapter 1

U.S Foreign Policy

1. Introduction

U.S. foreign policy refers to the way and primary approaches that are used in the interaction with other states around the world, such as organizations and corporations (Foreign policy). “The appropriate goal of American foreign policy is to preserve . . . hegemony as far in to the future as possible,” and, furthermore, “to preserve and extend an international order that is in accord with both our interests and our principles.” (Tudor 123). This chapter introduces brief definitions about foreign policy in general and it highlights major historical aspects that guided U.S foreign policy. Besides, the chapter gave a brief insight of the successive concepts, doctrines, and political philosophies that helped maintaining security and protection for the Americans and helped shaping foreign policy and presented America as a hegemonic nation, from the days of revolutionary war to the post-Cold war.

Then, special emphasizes is given to political, economical, and military tools mainly diplomacy, sanctions, containment, and others that helped achieving specific goals and promoted American foreign policy as a powerful nation in the globe. Furthermore, this research gave a clear description of two significant parties within U.S foreign policy that took place during George Bush and then Barrack Obama administrations.

1. 1 Foreign Policy Definition

Many scholars explained foreign policy with different connotations. For example, George Modelski, Kumar Mahendra, Hugh Gibson, Parakach Chandra, and others gave unique and significant meanings of for the concept.

Modelski professor of political science defined it as “The system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behavior of other states and for adjusting their-own activities to the international environment” (6-7). In this definition, Modelski has focused only on those sides of policy, which aim at the change in the existing behavior of states, as the primary objectives of foreign policy. Yet, foreign policy may include both the change in the existing behavior and continuation of the behavior as far as they serve the national interests (Mahendra 197).

Gibson explains foreign policy as “a well rounded, comprehensive plan, based on knowledge and experience, for conducting the business of government with the rest of the world. It’s aimed at promoting and protecting the interests of the nation” (9). The foreign policy is the sum total of the principles, the interests and the objectives which a state formulates in conducting its relations with other states. In addition, William Wallace came up with the following definition “a stable set of attitude towards the international environment, an implicit plan about country’s relationship with outside world” (11).

Furthermore, Chandra promoted the opinion that foreign policy is an important activity of a modern state, for him a state without foreign policy is like a ship without radar which may be destroyed by a storm or by unexpected events (1). In the words of Norman Padelford and George Lincoln, “Foreign policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete courses of action to attain these objectives and pressure its interests” (197). Padelford and Lincoln have showed in this definition two major functions of foreign policy. The first one is to realize goals and the second function is to perform pressure on external interests.

1.2 . U.S. Foreign Policy

United States international relations can be difficult to reach unless there was an implementation of a developed foreign policy that helps in the conduct of relations with others and protect America's national interests around the globe. However, American foreign policy has gradually changed over time, from the days of independence until Post-Cold War era (War and International Law).

In order to understand the concept of U.S foreign policy, one must trace the historical background and evolution of this policy, through significant events and situations, including policies, doctrines, tools and instruments that are used in the implementation of this policy.

1.2.1. The Historical Development of U.S Foreign Policy

The U.S was under control of British colonialism, which was stationed on the south-eastern coast of North America and because of the tyrannical rule of English kings those colonies revolted against the British crown in 1775 led by George Washington. And in the fourth of July in the same year those areas declared independence (Mohamed 52).

Eight years after the declaration of independence the British troops were defeated due to the alliance between France, Spain, and Netherlands. In this case, treaty of Paris was signed in the third of September, 1783 between Great Britain and the United States, ended the American Revolutionary War. Britain acknowledged the United States as a sovereign and independent nation (Treaty of Paris). However, in 1787 constitutional conference of Philadelphia issued the U.S constitution, and then George Washington was elected as the first president of the United States (Primary Documents in American History).

After the emergence of U.S constitution, it became necessary for this new federal government to have its vision towards external issues, especially after the international

recognition by the major powers at that time. Since then, the United States recognized specific philosophical policies and tools in its foreign policy with others (Lefebvre 8-9)

1.2.1.1. U.S Foreign Policy during the First Isolationist Age (1776-1914)

This period was known as the construction phase of American power, in which American leaders after independence saw the need to build a state with the ability of providing internal needs and protecting itself from external threats and fearing that the European countries problems extend to this emerging force. So, within this period a policy emerged to limit contact with foreign nations, this ideology is called “Isolationism”. In addition to this, George Washington has confirmed this policy in his Farwell Address in 1796, when he described isolationism as “The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations” (Lefebvre 8-9).

1.2.1.1.1. George Washington Proclamation of Neutrality

The American isolationism first occurrence goes back to the early years of George Washington presidency when he proclaimed neutrality during the war between France and Britain. In fact, this conflict put the U.S in a puzzle because according to the Treaty of Alliance in 1778, America was supposed to defend France but Washington refused to join any kind of conflicts. Therefore, France used the Treaty as a reliable case to bring America to war. As a reply Washington issued the so-called Proclamation of Neutrality in April 1793, in which he insisted on the fact that the U.S is a neutral state that has no interests in foreign affairs. (Jones. M 82-83).

America was still seeking power and still building its political structure, so stability was important in such occasion because involving in a conflict may have a negative influence on the newly formed nation (Akis and Streich 3). Moreover, Washington’s vision of guiding the country to the top, made him skillfully proclaim neutrality especially after the rise of the American political opinions concerning with whom the USA would side in the war between France and Britain. Those opinions were divided into two sides,

the Federalists led by an Anglophile, Alexander Hamilton who saw the need of helping Britain and the Republicans led by Francophile, Thomas Jefferson, who want to defend France. So, Washington ended this confusion by his policy (Akis and Streich 3).

1.2.1.1.2. James Monroe's Doctrine of 1823

The situation in Latin America was turning into an aggressive form, especially after those Latin American countries went to war with Spain for the sake of getting back their freedom. As a reaction, President James Monroe and the Secretary of State John Adams warned European nations for supporting Spain and Portugal to get back their former Latin colonies and issued "The Monroe Doctrine". This latter aimed at threatening the European countries not to make any attempt to establish new settlements in the Americas. On 1823, in a message to congress Monroe confirmed that "The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects to future colonization by any European powers" (qtd. in Gilderhus 8).

This policy aimed to promote the U.S hegemony in Latin America, because the United States had the right to take a step in foreign affairs whenever those affairs coincided with its concern. Yet, the Monroe Doctrine that was displayed to Latin America's countries deemed as a policy to enhance the US policy of Isolationism (8).

1.2.1.1.3. Neutrality before World War I

Isolationist trend dominated the U.S foreign policy after George Washington and America remained politically isolated until the First World War. During 1914, things were getting foggy in the entire European continent and because of several reasons and motives; it was the beginning of the Great War. At this period two coalition emerged, the Allied Powers (France, Russia, and Great Britain), and the Central Powers (Germany and Austria-Hungary). However, U.S performed a sense of Neutrality in that conflict (O'Callaghan 88).

Chapter 1 ————— U.S Foreign Policy

Following the rise of WW II, U.S President Woodrow Wilson wished to remain Neutral towards the conflict, as he insisted on the fact that “the Americans should be impartial in thoughts as well as in actions”. Although, the American stance was ignoring involvement, in which Wilson hoped to avoid interior dilemmas within the Americans by implementing the notion of aloofness. Yet, both the Allied powers and the Central powers set an effort to deceive Americans opinion but none could alter American attitude. In fact, the president tried to convince the main fighting powers to work for peace as he called it “peace without victory”. Yet, none of the fighting countries were interesting in such idea (Jones. M 417-20).

The U.S considered the First World War a European war that has no interest in it, and its neutrality in the war was ensured the economic advantage of dealing with all parties (America in the First World War). The main exception was the “Monroe Doctrine” (1823): any attempt to colonize states in North or South America would be seen as acts of aggression, which means U.S intervention (The Monroe Doctrine).

1.2.1.2. Interwar Period (1918-1938)

1.2.1.2.1. World War I Background

On May 1915, Germany exercised “unrestricted submarine warfare”, and announced the area around British Isles a war zone. This resulted sank of a British ocean liner, RMS Lusitania. In addition, negotiations were held between U.S and Germany. As a result, Germany decided to restrict its submarine campaign (Taylor 14). In spite of this news, eight American ships were destroyed in 1917.

On January 16, 1917 the Mexican government received an enciphered message from German Foreign Minister Zimmerman, in which he proposed a Mexican-German alliance, in the event of German war with the United States. However, a copy of the Zimmerman telegram was sent to Wilson, who was convinced later that U.S is facing a threat. These events assured and convinced the United States to enter the Great Conflict. (Taylor 18). In

fact, on the 2nd of April, 1917 the U.S intervened in the war with the side of Allied powers after congressional approval (Taylor 18).

1.2.1.2.2. Wilson Attempts in Making Peace during Post-War

According to Wilson, entering the Great War was deemed to be the “war to end all wars”. However, the objectives of American foreign policy have taken on a new notion. American has usually been idealists. Idealism is a foreign policy where a state should set the aim of its foreign policy and make its domestic political philosophy; however, since Wilson’s presidency idealism played an important role in American foreign policy (Durant and Campbell 4). Consequently, Wilson tried to maintain peace after the First World War, and in the Fourteen Point address he expressed his foresight of a pacific postwar world, as he declared that “What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation” (President Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Point).

Among Wilson’s views and according to the Fourteen Point, he showed a clear desire for the establishment of an international organization to settle the dispute between nations, in order to promote international peace, and to guarantee political independence and territorial integrity. Moreover, by the end of the first world war, president Wilson attempt to create peace treaties, and the most notable treaty was the so-called the League of Nations. It was formed in order to preserve peace between nations (Ibid).

1.2.1.2.3. Return to Isolationism

Post-world war one was described as the most isolationist time in U.S history, in which the country witnessed a dramatic return to the old notion of isolation. This period was notably characterized by unexpected actions such as the U.S refusal to join the League of Nations that Wilson himself gave plenty of efforts to set up in the Versailles Treaty (Akis and Streich 96). In addition, during this period, there was an atmosphere of

exception isolationism because this latter didn't focus only on diplomatic and political arena but also on economic and moral matters. In fact, there was a total economic withdrawing with foreign countries and total ignoring of trade and investment. Furthermore, in addition to economic and political boy-cott there was a wide sense of superiority among Americans by which the American foreign policy makers believed that their nation was morally superior to the old world's nations and to protect this moral superiority, the country must not involve with the old world secrets politics, degenerate cultures and wars ethnic aversion (Morison and Commager 643).

1.2.1.2.4. The Good Neighbor Policy

The old concept of American foreign policy that once came to be named the Monroe Doctrine has gradually testified at several modifications. The policy that guided the U.S throughout a century seemed to be no longer efficient to protect American interests. American foreign policy makers saw the importance of modifying the Monroe Doctrine in to a simpler way so that to face new challenges and changes in Latin America. (Morison and Commager 510).

The first theoretical indicator of setting changes on the Monroe Doctrine was presented when Wilson gave promises for a new Latin America and his vision of promoting a Pan-American League of Nations that would provide cooperative work and political approach that would influence the Western hemisphere. The new political vision main goal was as president Franklin Delano Roosevelt called a 'Good Neighbor Policy' (511).

As self protection, the U.S wished to have a strong and unbrokenly relations with neighbors and this was introduced in FDR's Good Neighbor Policy. This latter main goal was non-intervention in the interior affairs of Latin America while U.S would be a Good Neighbor and take a part in mutual exchanges with Latin American countries (Morison and Commager 513). Overall, United States expected to have an influence in Latin America in the form of economic opportunities and agreements. Therefore, the Good

Chapter 1 --- **U.S Foreign Policy**

Neighbor Policy aimed at controlling Latin American in a peaceful way (Morison and Commager 514).

At the coming of the 1930's, many Americans preferred isolation. However, with in this period the Roosevelt administration tried to look after friendly relations. In 1933, FDR realize the USSR and initiate a Good Neighbor Policy with Latin America and claimed that the United States had the right to involve in other's affairs, he declared that "in the field of world policy I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor_ the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others" (MILESTONES 1926-1936).

1.2.1.2.5. U.S Foreign Policy during World War II

Following the First World War, Wilson main goal was to guarantee the safety of the United States because he knew that the U.S statutes in the globe had significantly changed for economical goals rather than political ones, in which he stated "no policy of Isolation will satisfy the growing needs and opportunities of America" (Legro 260).

During Fredrick Delano Roosevelt presidency, American ideas of safety and security were strongly promoted and reinforced by the concept of reluctance of armaments. In fact the USA wanted to stay away from political intervention but in the same time called for international commitments. However, American ideas of security have gradually changed from old to new and that's because of the growing threat of major powers. The shift of American thinking happened from 1939 in which the U.S favored Unilateralism. FDR stated in 1934 that the "United States cannot take part in political arrangements in Europe". Yet, between 1939 and 1941, other countries and major powers influences has gradually affected the American way of life. Tough, the United States understand the need to engage into the great turmoil in Europe for the sake of avoiding dictators' determination and provide security for the country, FDR spoke about isolationists who object the U.S internationalism, he called them as "selfish men who would clip the wings of the American people in order to feather their own nest" (261).

The United States foreign policy during 1942 was dramatically concerned with security. So, international cooperation and militarism were both concentrated subjects, since American foreign policy changed into involvement. Most importantly, the U.S safety was well served after integrating in foreign affairs. As a result, the traditional views were longer capable to fulfill the United States requirements. Thus the country's goals must take the surest path toward, cooperation, international intervention, and commitment of force to other power (Legro 262).

1.2.1.3. American Foreign Policy during the Cold War Era (1945-1990)

What can be said about this period is that the United States has dramatically opened up to the external world and now it has interests in most regions of the world. It also emerged as a powerful nation after a review of nuclear power in the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and its aid to Turkey and Greece in 1947 which has become known as Truman Doctrine. At this stage the U.S has found itself facing a world power represented by the Soviet Union. To face this communist threat the U.S has followed strategies notably (Asmaa 25).

1.2.1.3.1. Truman doctrine

The first successful application of the Truman Doctrine was in Turkey and Greece. The Doctrine was created to limit the huge Soviet influence in both countries. Therefore, American President Truman asked the Congress to help Turkey and Greece by economic and military aid so that they could resist communist domination. However, the Truman Doctrine was approved by Congress on March 12, 1947 and it was issued not only for Turkey and Greece but also for other nations threatened by communism (The Truman Doctrine and The Marshal Plan).

The U.S foreign policy during Cold War witnessed a stream of domination of the so-called the Truman Doctrine. This latter was totally inspired by a policy of Containment of communist expansion which was increasingly advocated by George Kennan (Ibid).

1.2.1.3.2. The Marshal Plan

Following WWII Europe was ruined, and most countries were so poor. So, the U.S sponsored program design to help recover the power Western European Countries. This attempt was known as the Marshal Plan and it was issued on June 5, 1947. In fact, the plan main goal was to rebuild the shattered economies of Europe and booster industry. Yet, the real reason behind initiating the Marshal plan was to stop communist influence on the broken countries (The Truman Doctrine and The Marshal Plan).

1.2.1.3.3. NATO Formation

The Western European countries which have received aid from America were willing to institute a collective security because they believed that the Marshal aids would not protect them from the totalitarian. Therefore, in response to increasing tensions and fear from communist, Europe wanted to initiate a military alliance under the American umbrella which they succeeded to form what was known as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 (McCaulay 36).

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization main goal was the defense of its western members against any unexpected threat from the communist regime. Also, it was issued for the purpose of maintaining peace and creating collective stability of its members. At first, the main ratifiers of the treaty were few but with time more nations joined the alliance. Thus, with the same vision of Truman Doctrine and Marshal Plan, NATO succeeded to bring stability to Europe. In fact, Senator Vandenberg conceived NATO as the most remarkable step in American foreign policy since the declaration of the Monroe Doctrine (Jones. H 266).

1.2.1.4. Post-Cold War American Foreign Policy

1.2.1.4.1. A New World Order

In the late of 1990's, President George Bush Senior stated, "This is a historic moment. We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict

Chapter 1 ————— U.S Foreign Policy

and Cold War. We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a New World Order.” (qtd. in Axelord 506).

After the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the communist Soviet Union in 1989, the United States became a unipolar power and the only remaining nation which enjoyed a significant global leading, therefore the “New World Order” emerged and the president George was the first to define this vision to the congress in 1990. He described his ideology of the new world order as an era “ freer from the threat of terror, stronger in the pursuit of justice and more secure in the quest for peace, an era in which in the nations of the world can prosper and live in harmony” (qtd. in Brennan 7-8).

The ideology of a new world order guided the U.S foreign policy all through the era of Post-Cold War and provided several interests; however, the major important interests were promotion of democracy and human rights, and open markets. All what president had in mind concerning a democratic world was reinforced and attained with total presence of multilateralism, such as the United Nations and many others (8).

Yahyaoui A. Kader and Ahmine El-Arbi wrote in their book ‘Tarikh El Alam Moaser’ that the bipolar system that has indentified international affairs for many years has finally collapsed alongside USSR. This latter helped to institute a New World Order under the U.S leadership. However, President Bush senior has inaugurated his new world order by political and military integration in some countries, such as, the invasion of Panama, military force against Iraq in the first Gulf War, and the arrest of the president Manuel Noriega (402-3). Also, Yahyaoui and El-Arbi reported some other U.S major acts that initiated the new world order, among them:

- In a total absence of the UN, the U.S adopted the peace-process negotiations such as the Madrid-Peace Conference 1991 between Israel and the Arabs.
- The U.S use of military force in North Korea, Sudan, Afghanistan, and Iraq, and justifying this aggression by the fact that these countries are holding Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). Yet, no reaction against Israel’s huge nuclear arsenal.

- For the sake of solving the ethnic civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1994, the U.S performed a military intervention in through NATO in the Balkan crisis.

By all this actions America proved to be a hegemonic power in the post cold-war (406-7).

The core of the New World Order was to spread security and peace, which means nations would work together through multilateralism in order to achieve a peaceful world. In fact, George W.H. Bush, Bill Clinton and Barrack Obama, had a vision that security and peace would be achieved by multilateral means. On the other side, George W. Bush disagree with them and stated that “While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively” (White House 6).

1.2.2. U.S Foreign Policy Tools

Foreign policy of any country of the world is moving according to particular approach, represent a framework that governs movement and push them towards achieving their goals. This like and intellectual frame work of reference of those countries. United States of America have a reference determines behavior and paths and methods to achieve their objectives, conduct of foreign affairs. However, what I can do is exploring some of the tools used in U.S foreign policy, specifically diplomacy, sanctions, containment, collective security, deterrence, and military force.

1.2.2.1. Diplomacy

Diplomacy in its backbone consists of representative at international organizations, and total object of the concept of communicating with other states through individuals and insists on multilateral communication. In a traditional sense, diplomacy includes skills and resources used by the state to promote its interests, in the form of negotiation and through diplomatic tools. In a deeper sense, it is a way in which states communicate with each other enabling them to have regular and complex relations (Berridge and James 70).

Chapter 1 ————— U.S Foreign Policy

Diplomacy includes four functions: the first function deals with state interests, by exercising negotiations and discussions with other party, in order to identify common interests, reaching specific goals, and avoiding conflict. The second function of diplomacy involves the collecting data and subsequent identification and estimation of the receiving state's foreign policy goals. The third function is expansion of political, economic, and cultural relations between two countries. For instance, countries such as the U.S and Britain focus their foreign policy after World War II at the extermination of communism. Finally, the fourth goal of diplomacy is that diplomacy facilitates and promotes the state's national interests and keeps connections with other state open (Amacker).

In the course of all diplomatic history, the U.S is considered to be the most influential country that preserved diplomacy and maintained it in its international relations, "The most famous of all peace proposals following World War I was the program of Fourteen Points, delivered by President Woodrow Wilson in 1918" (Ibid).

1.2.2.2. Sanctions

Steven Myers asserts that sanctions "are an irresistible, relatively risk-free and inexpensive way of assuaging America's sense of outrage" (Myers).

Sanctions in international relations involve official orders imposed by a state, a group of states, or the UN Security Council to stop commercial activities with a target, in order to change its behavior. In this sense, sanctions are very effective as a foreign policy tool and are often imposed by different sources, and have specific purposes. Some countries use trade restrictions only when authorized by regional organizations like the European Union (UN), or by sub-regional organizations like the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Some other countries such as U.S impose unilateral sanctions as an instrument of foreign policy. The main exception was the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), in which this final can authorize global sanctions if the international security was threatened (Biersteker 263).

Variety of different political discourses and scholarly literature focused on the fact that sanctions through its ability to change a target behavior has actually in its core specific purposes which can be translated in coercing, constraining, and signaling. Coercing is one of the central purposes of sanctions which involve coercing a state to do something that it would not do otherwise. However, sanctions may constrain a target from achieving its goal and to maximize the costs for it. Also, sanctions send signals to certain constituencies. For example, UN sanctions on Iran and North Korea tend to send signals for both countries as well as to other ones (Biersteker 264).

1.2.2.3. Containment

Containment is an ideology of creating strategic alliances in order to check the influence of a specific power and can be adopted by individual or group. For simpler understanding, containment is the act of containing and limiting something (Harcourt). So, along with sanctions, U.S government also chose to employ containment. Containment is a policy formulated by George Kennan, the U.S ambassador in Moscow in 1946 and applied by Harry Truman. This policy aimed to isolate and besiege the Soviet Union and prevent the spread of influence to neighboring countries (Pronger 9). George Kennan reported that “it is clear that the main element of any United States policy toward the Soviet Union must be that of long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies”(Kennan).

The U.S adopted a policy of containment to promote America’s power by using political, economic, and military strategies to confront the Soviet influence. According to Kennan, his policy was specified only on political and economic containment such as the Marshal aids to Western European countries which helped stalling the spread of communism. Also, containment has brought several distinctive organizations, stressed the importance of allies, and gave birth to NATO and the Warsaw Pact (Aggour 5-6).

1.2.2.4. Collective Security

Collective security is designed to get rid of aggression between nations everywhere. This system requires the full support of other countries. “As an ideal, collective security is without flaws,” argued Hans J. Morgenthau; “it presents indeed the ideal solution of the problem of law enforcement in a community of sovereign nations” (qtd. in Art 92).

The term “collective security” has become an important element of reference with large role for the United Nations and the League of Nations before that. Immanuel Kant extends this idea in one of his works or books towards the end of the 18 century *Perpetual Peace*, in which he declared that “the law of nations will be based on one federation of free states” (qtd. in Aleksovski, Oliver, and Avramovska 275). Adopting a system of collective security by any member state prevent them from acting in a way that might threaten peace, thereby avoiding conflicts. In fact, Cooperative system as a foreign policy tool seeks to reduce the risk of war and by adopting such instrument; the countries soon will realize that counting only on unilateral power may lead to a decrease in security (Aleksovski, Oliver, and Avramovska 275).

In this sense, there are some steps that must be followed so that the collective security is more reliable: collective security to work, all member states must act automatically and do the implementation of mass attack against the aggressor (Art 93). For example, Iraq invaded Kuwait; each of the international community gets to work; the United Nations Security Council suspended economic deals with Iraq and then sanctioned war against it. The war ended and Iraq was thrown out of Kuwait. This case proved that collective security can sometimes rise to the occasion (97-98).

1.2.2.5. Deterrence

Another tool within U.S foreign policy is “deterrence”. Roy E. Jones defines it as: “a calculated attempt to induce an adversary to do something or refrain from doing something, by threatening a penalty for non-compliance. A deterrence situation, or

system, is one where conflict is contained within a boundary of threats which are neither executed nor tested” (1).

For further understanding, deterrence is threatened use of force in order to deter a country or enemy from doing something undesirable. This use of threats is for manipulating an adversary’s behavior so that something bad doesn’t occur. “. . . the prevention from action by fear of the consequences. Deterrence is a state of mind brought about by the existence of a credible threat of unacceptable counteraction” (Morgan 1).

When a state employs the concept of deterrence against an adversary, it wants to prevent that nation from doing something undesirable. Yet, this use of threat is not tactical use of force but rather than is political-military in nature (Art 5). However, post-war II witnessed an important use of unilateral and mutual deterrence, especially between America and the Soviet Union. This use was supported by deployment policies such as “Massive Retaliation”. In fact, the U.S was having kind of nuclear superiority so it used it as a tool to deter Soviet aggression, but after the USSR had built up a nuclear arsenal things changed. The relationship between the two superpowers recognized a mutual deterrence, in which each one would abstain from attacking the other because of mutual nuclear power. Yet, deterrence is still one of the best defense policies of the United States (Cold War).

1.2.2.6. Military force

In some cases, state use the so-called military force to achieve foreign policy goals and most of times it involves weaker state controlled by strong state. However, using such tool would promise great benefits but in the same time it would be also costly because the war requires supplies and soldier for victory. However, Robert J. Art professor of International Relations states that “military power helps states fend for themselves, not simply because it provides physical protection to state but also because its employment produces political effects” (4). Hence, military intervention is an important tool in the

achievement of state strategic objectives and still having the big part of U.S foreign policy in many occasions either by deterring or defeating an adversary (Art 4).

1.3. Determinants of the Republican and Democratic parties

U.S foreign policy passed with numerous phases since independence, as each phase distinguishes from another one by president which has its own beliefs, determinants and methods. However, the purpose remains clear and lies in the control and dominance of the world. After 09 September 2001 events, which is considered as the most important turning point especially in American history, and generally in the globe. In fact, American decision-makers strategies have changed at this period and orientations were different between the Republican and Democratic parties. In this section I will look at the most remarkable determinants of the Republican Party (Bush as an example), and determinants of the Democratic Party (Obama as an example).

1.3.1. The Republican Party Determinants: Bush as a Model

Since Bush arrival to presidency in 2000, he surrounded himself with political symbols which were experts in the field of foreign and defense policy. Though, the formation of foreign policy work came to reflect the dominance of neo-conservative stream. This latter is an elitist intellectual movement began in the late 1960s and knew the widespread opposition to the U.S war against Vietnam (Spain).

Most of neo-conservatives were distributed in multiple positions in American society and in the official institutions, whether governmental or non-governmental. Yet, the people who represented Bush's administration were not neo-conservatives but they were inspired by their thoughts especially after 9/11 events, some of them are: Condoleezza Rice, National Security Advisor, Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, Colin Powell, secretary of state, Dick Cheney, vice president(Boot).

During Bush presidency, foreign policy was based on the military and economic power that is to say on "Hard Power", also known by Nye as Transactional Leadership,

which means coercing other nations in order to convince them to engage in his agenda, “Transactional leaders, on the other hand, create concrete incentives to influence followers’ efforts and set out rules that relate work to rewards” (Nye 7).

1.3.2. Democratic Party Determinants: Obama as a Model

If there is one idea that sums up Barack Obama’s approach to foreign policy, it’s engagement (Packer). In fact, Obama’s foreign policy unlike Bush’s sat on multilateral connection between U.S and other nations in order to achieve international goals. However, the vision of multipartner world has defined values of Obama’s foreign policy (Birkenthal 68).

Obama’s leadership style and foreign policy sought to move away from unilateralism and focus more on diplomacy and development aid that is to say “soft power” rather than hard power. He adopted transformational diplomacy, based on the fact that outcomes are reached through attraction and by spreading U.S values, promoting democracy and human rights (69). According to Celso “Obama adds some new components to U.S foreign policy. (...) sees a post American world where soft power and multilateralism become hallmarks of a new strategic paradigm” (3). Also, “Smart Power”, took an important role in Obama’s foreign policy, in which by acting this concept of power, Obama’s government may be taken towards a new kind of integration which is development as a third element to the three “Ds” of Obama’s doctrine- defense, diplomacy, and development (6).

The statement of American exceptionalism presumes that the U.S values and political system are unique. “American political leaders continue to justify the global engagement of the U.S. on the basis of American exceptionalism: no other nation has the capability or is morally qualified to lead.” (Birkenthal22). In fact, Obama did not refuse exceptionalism but he embraced it. He gave a huge importance to domestic rejuvenation such as

promoting educational and scientific fields. Also, he put great efforts in protecting other U.S interests like clear energy (Birkenthal 69).

1.4. Conclusion

The American foreign policy was first developed by a stream of isolationism which was promoted by George Washington in 1793, then an expansionist policy throughout the Western hemisphere was unleashed through the Monroe doctrine, in which this concept helped to shape the American foreign policy of aloofness, and preserved its own national interests. As the chapter highlighted how the U.S foreign policy dealt with different changes considering the world events and the way it adopted a strict isolationist policy during 1920s and 1930s. By the coming of the World War 23 things changed completely and the U.S foreign policy turned into involvement mainly because of the growing threats of major powers.

After World War II, the U.S was considered as a powerful nation especially after a transition to intervention policy, which was characterized in leading Western coalition in a severe Cold War against Soviet Union, through military and diplomatic containment of the communist influence by reinforcing Western-European allies with aid through Truman Doctrine and Marshal Plan, also ensuring the security of Western European countries by forming a military alliance or that is to say the NATO. However, the Cold War ended by the collapse of the Soviet Union leaving the capitalist bloc as the sole winner. After that, the world order had completely changed and a new political map of the world was drafted under the U.S leadership which has a vision in promoting democracy, peace and security and also modernizing the world.

Moreover, the American foreign policy from a systematic perspective needs instruments in order to conduct its relation with foreign countries. In this case the U.S adopted diplomacy, sanction, containment, deterrence, collective security and military power, to promote its interest, to expose domination, to prevent an influence, to deter a country, to provide security, and to defeat a threat.

Chapter 1—————**U.S Foreign Policy**

The United States came across different phases and each phase has its own significant president with special political vision. However, the most notable visions within U.S foreign policy are the republican and the democratic visions. As an instance, George W. Bush sought to lead America from unilateral republican perspective while Barack Obama led it in a democratic multilateral perspective. Thus, both of them served the nation's interests.

Chapter 2

U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War 2003 as a Case Study

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

2. Introduction

The United States is one of the countries where politics is the hallmark of power, where it has evolved in to practice. The chapter is intended to analyze foreign policy measures of the two American presidents George W. Bush and Barack Hussein Obama related to Iraq war as a case study. So, the chapter began with a background of the Iraq war back to 1991 and its major reasons and how President Saddam Hussein became a threat to the American government. Then, special emphasize is given to the 2003 Iraq war and its major tenets.

The chapter went to shed light on how neo-conservative stream as well as the Patriot Act provided the right atmosphere to lead coalition to Iraq. Also, this research focuses on the Bush Doctrine and its basic means: preemption, democracy promotion, American hegemony, and U.S unilateralism and their applications. Furthermore, a brief insight is given to Bush commitment to hard power as a tool engagement in Iraq.

When Obama came to office foreign policy changed a great deal. In fact, he adopted a less aggressive approach to Iraq than that of George Bush. The chapter went to focus on Obama's attempting to restore America's moral leadership with regard to the situation in Iraq. The work provides also a comprehensive assessment of Obama's commitment to smart power which led to an immediate withdrawal from Iraq. However, the new president administration sought to inherit democracy promotion policy as a mean to rebuilt America's democratic standing and create peace. Hence, a part of this research is given to democracy promotion as an instrument of foreign policy and to the conditions that the U.S had to face while spreading democratic values. Finally, a brief insight is dedicated to Obama's multilateralism approach, acknowledging the importance of engagement in a multi-partner world in fighting international threats.

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

2.1. The First Gulf War

The Iraq-Iranian war started in 1981 and because of foreign countries promotion and encouragement, this conflict lasted 7 years. In fact, both warring countries were rich in terms of oil, therefore, powerful nations such as the United States, Britain, Japan, and France supported either one of the sides by providing them with all military needs for the sake of economic benefits and in this case, the oil was the ultimate reason that led them to take this step (Ezeibe and Ogbodo 145).

Iraq possesses the second largest oil reserves in the Persian Gulf region after Saudi Arabia. Also, Kuwait tends to be one of the regional producers that have a huge oil reserves (Rosen 964). However, according to Iraq's president Saddam Hussein, Kuwaiti was excessively pumping out too much oil and exceeding level production quotas, lowering world oil prices and hurting Iraq. On August 2, 1990 Iraqi troops began to mass along the Kuwaiti border (Benmahammed 28).

After the invasion of Kuwait, Saddam Hussein had become a threat to America's economic domination. In this case, the UN Security Council met at the request of the U.S and Kuwait and passed a resolution condemning the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and demanded that Iraq unconditionally withdraw from Kuwait. On August 8, the U.S deployed military elements to Saudi Arabia to take up defensive positions and protect Kuwait. This mission was called Operation Desert Shield (29). President George H. W. Bush explained this step by saying, "There is no justification whatsoever for this outrageous and brutal act of aggression" (qtd. in. Benmahammed 29). On November 29, the UN Security Council threatened Iraq by using military force against it if it didn't withdraw from Kuwait. However, Iraq refused to comply with the UN demand (Benmahammed 29).

Saddam Hussein's refusal to withdraw from Kuwait, pushed the U.S to intervene and in fact on January 17, 1991, the allied powers (U.S, France, U.K, and others), invaded Iraq through the bombings of Baghdad and the use of high-tech cruise missiles, in order to

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

weakened Iraqi forces in Kuwait. The result was the quick defeat of Iraq. However, after the end of the Gulf war, there was a high tension between the USA and Iraq, and things were seriously getting foggy, because many believed that Saddam Hussein possesses chemical and biological weapons and he was trying to develop nuclear weapons. This led later to the invasion of Iraq by U.S military in 2003 (Benmahammed 29).

2.2. The Iraq War

2.2.1. The 9/11 Events

On September 11, 2001 the Americans woke up on the news of death and destruction caused by a “terrorist” Osama Bin Laden, the leader of a dangerous group called Al-Qaeda. The attacks were carried out in hijacking two commercial airliners and crashing them directly to the twin towers of the World Trade Centre in New York, then another attack was held on the Pentagon House in Washington D.C, and finally a fourth plane crashed in a field in Pennsylvania. It was clear that Osama had been angry with U.S for several reasons such as U.S attempting to corrupt Islamic laws and supporting Saudi royal family during the Gulf war. As a reaction to 9/11 events, U.S president George Bush opened the door to a new war with Islamic terrorists Al-Qaeda and Taliban in Afghanistan. This new war was called The Global War on Terror (Ezeibe and Ogbodo 146).

2.2.2. Weapons of Mass Destruction

Subsequently, what happened in Kuwait in 1990 proved for the United States that Saddam was a great source of tension; therefore it had not dropped all charges against it. So, with the outbreak of 9/11 events, Bush’s administration asserted that Al-Qaeda was receiving support from Iraq (Ezeibe and Ogbodo 146).

Bush tried to legitimize the war against Iraq by claiming that Saddam Hussein was actively developing weapons of mass destruction in the past 12 years, and hence that Iraq could use these weapons against U.S. In a deeper sense, after a disagreement with UN

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

Security Council concerning dealing with Iraq, Bush decided it to drop UN support and “go it alone” and invade Iraq on 20th March, 2003. The irony is that after the invasion, Iraq didn’t use any chemical or biological weapons when defending its regions. However, Saddam Hussein was captured in a short time, and the war has ended on May. Yet, bombing and air raid continued. Later on and precisely on 2006 U.S began to send troops to Iraq to limit the violence in the Middle East (Ezeibe and Ogbodo 146).

2.3. U.S Foreign Policy and Iraq: the Bush Administration

The U.S foreign policy under George W. Bush was greatly concerned with the aftermath of the 9/11 event, and how this crucial incident affected Middle East as well as USA. Therefore, Bush presented two different approaches to the Islamic countries, the ones he considered as enemies and the ones he saw as allies:

while some of the Muslim countries, such as Iran, Iraq, Syria and Libya are characterized ‘rogue’, ‘backlash’, ‘the bad sons of the world’ and ‘axis of evil’ by the US leaders and policymakers some other Islamic nations particularly Turkey, Pakistan are viewed as fully 'democratic countries (qtd in. Ribeiro 39-40).

Furthermore, if there is one idea to sum up Bush’s foreign policy towards Islamic world, it would be as Ribeiro put it, “If you are not for us, you are against us and therefore we have the right to defend ourselves”. Hence, the countries that were not willing to cooperate with U.S against terrorism were considered as enemies. In fact, many believed that Bush’s war was a sort of American jihad against both Islamist terrorists as well as those countries that had nothing against them. However, after 9/11, the war on terror took a new direction and the term “axis of evil” was more coined with Iraq as a country that considered as an enemy. Therefore, Bush’s dropping of diplomacy led to the invasion of Iraq and disposal of Saddam Hussein (40-41)

2.3.1. Neo-Conservatism Foreign Policy

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

U.S foreign policy in Bush's first term was highly influenced by neo-conservative ideas, especially after the 9/11 attacks. This latter, marked the defining moment or the opportunity for the president to accelerate and strengthen the neo-conservative forces in the White House. In fact, neo-conservatives set a lot of efforts to persuade George. W. Bush and society to demolish Saddam Hussein's regime. Thus, American political arena is not just changing but also turning into an aggressive revolutionary foreign policy (Soltani 87). Furthermore, neo-conservatives believed that organizations such as the United Nations was generally effecting U.S especially its member countries were serving and using policies that were against the policies of America. Yet, the UN still remains an effective tool for altering the attitude of more countries in to the coalition in Iraq (89).

The U.S leadership, democracy promotion, pre-emptive war, and others were neo-conservative ideas that were mentioned in the 2002 National Security Strategy. Apparently, the U.S invasion of Iraq was in a great extent based on the principles of neo-conservative taught in the country (90-91).

2.3.2. The Patriot Act

The Congress quickly passed and introduced Providing Appropriate Tools to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act (The Patriot Act), in 2001 as a response to the 9/11 attacks. The USA Patriot Act strengthens the intelligence and security services. This law increased the power of federal agencies by using techniques such as tracking and intercepting communications. The act expanded also the governmental authority to monitor financial transactions, controlling immigration, and improving law protection (Bloss 213-214).

2.3.3. The Bush Doctrine

The National Security Strategy (NSS) 2002 influenced the development of U.S foreign policy and characterized ideological interests that shaped later, the Bush Doctrine (Saikaly 66). Charles Krauthammer declared that, "the Bush doctrine is, essentially a

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

synonym for neo-conservative foreign policy” (qtd. in Schmidt and Williams 194). Accordingly, the neo-conservative stream formed the policies and objectives of the Bush doctrine, in which later supported the invasion of Iraq (Schmidt and Williams 194).

After 9/11, the Bush doctrine was a major change in foreign policy, in which Bush openly focused his doctrine on the possibility that the U.S would act unilaterally and use military interventions to defend itself and provide security for the nation by asserting its primacy in world politics. Joseph Nye the former assistant Secretary of Defense further explained this transformational agenda by mentioning three changes in foreign policy “reducing Washington’s reliance on permanent alliances and international institutions, expanding the traditional right of preemption into a new doctrine of preventive war, advocating coercive democratization as a solution to Middle East terrorism” (qtd in. Dimitrova 2). Furthermore, the former Secretary of Defense Condoleezza Rice promoted the most desirable policy in the Bush doctrine “transformationalist diplomacy” based on the policy of “freedom agenda” or in other words defending liberty and promoting democracy in rogue states in Middle East especially in Iraq (2-3).

2.3.3.1. Pre-emption Doctrine

American government marked the beginning of the war on terrorism, as a reply to the catastrophic consequences of the 9/11 events (Dresner 282). Therefore, the Bush doctrine as a hallmark of American political dealings contains ideas that led to the engagement in Afghanistan and later Iraq. The doctrine promote the strategy of pre-emption, which means that U.S would use force against other states whenever those countries posed a threat on U.S security, particularly the ones with nuclear weapons (Dresner 282).

The pre-emption doctrine seeks to deter adversaries that rely on acts of terror and the development of nuclear weapon programs. However, the U.S claimed that Iraq possesses such kind of weapons was a convincing reason to wage war against it. Bush believed that

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

U.S invasion of Iraq would make countries such as Libya, Iran, and North Korea to think again about their desire to develop chemical weapons. Yet, Iran and North Korea continued expanding their nuclear programs (Dresner 283).

U.S officials and intelligence services have presented their arguments for going to war against Iraq based on the fact that Saddam Hussein was developing WMD. Therefore, “the risk of inaction” and the truth that terrorists were able to endanger the world by purchasing WMD from Saddam confirmed for the U.S to go for a plan. President Bush in a June 2002 speech to the U.S Military Academy at West Point declared, “all nations that decide for aggression and terror will pay a price. We will not leave the safety of America and the peace of the planet at the mercy of a few mad terrorists and tyrants” (qtd. in Parraguez and Rodriguez 86-87). For further understanding, the consequences of inaction tend to be more dangerous than action. Hence, the U.S went for initiating the first preemptive war of the 21st century, which is called Operation Iraqi Freedom (Parraguez and Rodriguez 86-87).

2.3.3.2. Democracy Promotion

The U.S and its allies, including Britain and Australia began what was known as Operation Iraqi Freedom on March 19, 2003 to topple Saddam Hussein’s regime. In fact, Bush’s war was to disarm Iraq, remove Saddam, rebuild a valuable state for the Iraqi people, and also protect Iraqi oil fields (Boateng 33-34). Yet, the Bush administration acknowledged the claims that Iraq possesses WMD and has links with international terrorists were invalid. In this case, the U.S needed a solid justification to explain why they invade Iraq. As a consequence, America used the notion of democracy promotion in Iraq as a persuasive case to justify the intervention (Ibid).

Neoconservative strongly promoted the idea that U.S government should work to spread democracy. Bush believed that democracy was the cure to all problems in the Middle East especially terrorism. However, Iraq tended to be a place that needed to be democratizing in which American intervention in such country might have a significant

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

change in the Iraqi regime in which a democratic Iraq means the immediate removal of terrorism. Also, it was argued that by promoting democracy in Iraq things would change in the whole Middle East (Schmidt and Williams 199-200). In a speech to the National Endowment for Democracy Bush stated, “Iraqi democracy will succeed- and that success will send forth news, from Damascus to Tehran- that freedom can be the future of every nation” (qtd in. Schmidt and Williams 199-200).

The Bush administration assumed that spreading democracy and freedom values opens the path to “make the world not just safer but better” (Jervis 366). Democracy promotion was tended to advance American interests, minimizing terrorism, strengthen stability, and finally make solid relationships with alliances (367).

2.3.3.2.1. The Nation-Building Project

James Dobbins defined the notion of Nation-building as follow “the use of armed force in the aftermath of a conflict to promote enduring peace and establish a representative government” (3). In other words, the concept of nation-building came to be used as a political tool to increase freedom and to underpin democratization elsewhere. He justified this by mentioning some historical cases including Iraq, in which the U.S initiated set of peacekeeping operations in the post-war (Dobbins 4-5).

Iraq is divided ethnically and religiously and torn apart by tensions between Shi’a Arabs, Sunni Arabs, and Kurds. Through the whole country religious and ethnic factions overlapped. The goal of the U.S was to illuminate first such kind of problems in order to facilitate the process of democratization. According to Ali Bapir the nation-building theory in Iraq can be traced back to 1920, when colonialism had an important role in forming the state of Iraq and its society. Thus, both society and Iraqi state were “artificial”, which led to serious reduction of moral and social values and there was a huge misunderstanding between “sovereignty” and “identity” of the state (117-119). In fact, people living in Iraq didn’t consider themselves as Iraqis, and that’s because of the

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

horrendous use of power by Iraqi authorities for example Saddam's hostility over other social segments such as Kurds and Shi'a Arabs (Bapir 117-119).

Bapir also claimed that Saddam as a Sunni Arab nationalist with dictator leadership made hatred spread not only between society and state but also within the society. After, Saddam's regime collapsed in 2003, the parliamentary system directly replaced the authoritarian regime and Arab Shiites arose to power and Sunnis margined. This resulted a dilemma all over the country. Insurgents from different Arab countries proclaimed Sunnis position as the legitimate leader "Anti-Shiite" and fighting the U.S based on the fact that an Arab country was invaded "Anti-West and Anti-US". However, things get worsened and conflict between Shiites and Sunnis turned out to be more violent (119-120). In this case, the Bush administration main goal was to limit the violence even if this means performing negotiations with terrorists. It was believed that dialogue would make marginalized groups realize that politics was the appropriate tool to achieve their goals. Furthermore, the nation-building aimed at imposing security to prevent civil war by providing a strong power enough to control things over the country (Garth 19-21).

2.3.3.3. American Hegemony

The Bush Doctrine sought to put in to work the notion of American hegemony through political strategies and ideologies. Jervis concluded that this policy ignored universal norms and ideologies controlling the global community. So, for the U.S to expand its supremacy, preserve its liberal values, and ensure global order and stability, America must act differently from others (Jervis 376). Jervis added that the American hegemony was "consistent with standard patterns of international politics and with much previous American behavior in the Cold War" (377). This hegemony lasted until 9/11, which strengthened George W. Bush's unilateral perspective (379).

U.S foreign policy after 9/11 tended to replace its ideas of moderation and self-restraint with more aggressive strategies. The Bush administration was at the time trying

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

to influence and redesigning the world by establishing its interests and values, and by doing so, it has violated its commitment to international organizations (UN), disregarded its allies interests, and neglected multilateral mechanisms. These aggressive attempting was operated later in a military form, which is characterized in the invasion of Iraq. According to John Mearsheimer, a powerful country such as the U.S has accelerated the process of preserving the interest of hegemonic position for the sake of security. Thus, the invasion of Iraq was important for obtaining regional power as well as gaining hegemonic position in the Middle East (Yordán 125-126).

2.3.3.3.1. The Project for the New American Century (PNAC)

The Project for the New American Century (PNAC) was formed by an influential group of neoconservatives including William Kristol and Robert Kagan focusing on U.S foreign and military policy. This think tank policy served to support U.S hegemony in the globe. Therefore, the PNAC played an essential part in Bush's administration especially after September 11 where the ideology affected U.S decisions to foster the plan for America's dominance, and played an important role during the war in Iraq. The PNAC published the first public act entitled "Statement of Principles". The aim of this document was to strengthen the case of American global leadership by increasing defense spending, establishing a foreign policy that promotes American political freedom abroad like regime change and proceeding for unilateral actions (Barry 1).

On September 2000 PNAC published one of its influential reports called 'Rebuilding America's Defenses'. It is devoted to U.S security including increasing military budget for defending the American homeland, fighting imminent threats, and shaping the security environment in critical regions (Wogan 136). However, after 9/11 attacks the PNAC came across a chance to fit its goals which associated with bringing war to Iraq. In fact, Bush rushed for empowering U.S military and PNAC members including, Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz quickly linked the events to Iraq (138).

2.3.3.4.Unilateralism Doctrine

Jervis demonstrated a link between pre-emptive action and unilateralism and explained that preventive war was unilateral to the core because of the inability of the U.S to garner international support to destroy the threat. In addition, the U.S focused on gathering coalitions rather than alliances, simply overthrowing multilateralism. Jervis added that Bush leaders “made it clear that they would forego the participation of any particular country rather than compromise” U.S foreign policy aims (373-374).

Unilateralism was important element in U.S foreign policy. However, the policy witnessed continuity rather than change in foreign affairs. Jervis argued that Bush’s foreign policy of acting unilaterally was apparent before 9/11, as the U.S refused to join some international institutions such as Kyoto Protocol, the International Criminal Court, and the protocol implementing the ban of biological weapons (374). Lynch and Singh argued that Bush abandoned alliances when it is important to reach American foreign policy goals, but he has employed multilateralism in foreign policy when he can and when its necessary(43).

Schmidt and Williams asserted that U.S decision to proceed unilateral action against Iraq came with strong opposition of its allies, and this was realized when Bush refused to comply with UN Security Council resolutions for not invading Iraq (198). In fact, those who object the war believed that without an “explicit UN resolution,” overthrowing Saddam Hussein’s regime was illegal, despite his violation of UN laws (Lynch and Singh 39). However, it is undeniable that U.S held huge military arsenal and its display of this military strength in the 1991 Persian Gulf War was a very motivating reason to go for war in Iraq and ignoring the UN. Moreover, Bush’s neoconservative visions have stimulated the revolution in military affairs “RMA”, in which neoconservatives sought to use “stealth technology, air-delivered precision-guided weapons and...highly mobile ground forces to win quick and decisive victories” (Schmidt and Williams 199).Therefore, Bush’s unilateral procedures and full faith in the RMA were convincing strategies to fulfill U.S

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

foreign policy interests and going for regime change in Iraq Unilateral action was very beneficial when U.S conducted its foreign affairs. This step guided the Bush administration decision to dismiss the UN and declare war on Iraq despite the challenges (Schmidt and Williams 199).

2.3.4. Hard Power

Hard power in the field of foreign policy means coercing the adversary to comply with specific demands either by sanctions, military intervention, and coercive diplomacy (Wilson 114). According to Joseph S. Nye Jr. of the John F. Kennedy school of Government at Harvard University defined power as “the ability to produce the outcomes you want” (qtd. in Totoonchie 3). He further explained the concept of hard power as the possession of certain resources that are applied in certain situations to fulfill certain purposes. (Totoonchie 3). Totoonchie added that “any use of force to achieve goals falls under the definition of ‘hard power’” (10).

Soft power is another tool which lies in the use of soft methods like attraction and propaganda to successfully secure the outcomes, or as General Wesley Clark explained it, soft power “gave us an influence far beyond the hard edge of traditional balance-of-power politics. But attraction can turn to repulsion if we act in an arrogant manner and destroy the real image of our deep values”. Most importantly, it is important to note that soft power has affected US foreign policy in a great extent until September 2001 when soft power has lost its significance due to the current Bush administration policies of coercive diplomacy, military intervention, and acting unilaterally. By the coming of Iraq war the hard power of military became more favorable tool to achieve American interests which led to the decline of soft power (Shuja18-19).

2.4. U.S foreign policy and Iraq: The Obama Administration

Barrack Hussein Obama election as president brought unique changes to U.S foreign policy. In fact, his positive capability of decision-making and his insightful leadership of

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

foreign affairs were totally different from that of Bush. However, it is interesting to mention that one of Obama's controversial decisions when he becomes a president was ending the Iraq war as soon as possible. He insisted also, he insisted on renewing American diplomacy that was significantly based on supporting strong alliances (Khan 32). Most of Obama's foreign strategy was drafted in the 2010 National Security Strategy, which aimed at reaffirming American leadership. Thus, the Obama administration advocated the use of soft power where moral leadership, economy, and global engagement played an important role in achieving U.S foreign policy goals (Quarantello 77-78).

In addressing Obama's strategic vision towards renewing America's reputation, he emphasized his strategy on defining a global leadership role in terms of partnership and integration in the global community (Quarantello 79). The president also team tended to engage efforts for promoting democracy by institutional framework and multilateral engagement (Carothers 5).

2.4.1. Renewing American Leadership

Obama defended the necessity to rebuild American hegemony as he criticized the previous administration led by George. W Bush emphasizing on the damages he made in America's role in world politics and legitimacy. Accordingly, Obama promoted his perception of American primacy in his article entitled "Renewing American Leadership" in 2007. After visioning the legacy of F. D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and John F. Kennedy, Obama based his foreign security policy on a classical liberal way. He stressed that wealth and security of Americans were related to the wealth and security of people living abroad. Therefore, the article went on to assert that moving beyond Iraq and focusing on terrorists in the Middle East was the best step to recognize American reputation in the globe (Obama 1). As a first step Obama clearly focused on bringing an end to Iraq war and putting some pressure to stabilize civil war between Sunni and Shiite. According to him, "the only effective way to apply this pressure is to begin a phased

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

withdrawal of U.S forces... from Iraq” (2). The article also noted the importance of launching a comprehensive regional and international diplomatic initiative to provide security for the Iraqi people and to gain credibility for this effort (Obama 2).

In calling for renewing American leadership Obama intended to advocate his belief in revitalizing the military as he denounced the critical situation of U.S incapability to respond to a new crisis or emergency beyond Iraq. As a result, the plan was to increase soldiers’ number to the army as well as marines and providing them with the appropriate training, armory, and defense programs (Obama 3). Obama make it clear that using military force for securing global stability needed the support and participation of others just like in the Gulf War 1991, and he insisted on the fact that the current conflict in Iraq had been grave because of the ignorance of others and proceeding unilaterally (Ibid). Equally important, Obama continued to support the necessity of renewing alliances and forging new partnerships in order to effectively confront common threats. In the case of Iraq, Obama admitted that the U.S sent the opposite message to its allies, when “dismissed European reservations about the wisdom and necessity of the Iraq war”. Thus, the main goal was based on strengthen multi-lateral platform of NATO organization for effective collaboration in preventing threats (Obama 5).

The expectations and visions tackled by the Obama presidency of a new American leadership made him further focusing on bringing peace to the Middle East. Hence, in a historic speech at Cairo University in Egypt, Obama placed his hopes of resetting a good relationship with the Muslims, rejecting the Iraq war as a mean of promoting democracy. The speech also offered a series of matters including stabilizing the condition between Arabs and Israel, and overcoming religious extremism (Akis and Streich 275).

2.4.2. Obama Smart Power and withdrawal from Iraq

The concept of smart power was coined by Joseph S. Nye who defined it as “the ability to combine hard and soft power in to a winning strategy” (qtd. in Nuruzzaman 178). In this context, president Obama invested on both soft and hard tools to expand

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

American influence unlike George Bush who strongly promoted the use of force (Ibid). In other words, Obama administration draws a close and a fresh foreign policy based on the fundamental tenets of the notion of smart power. Hillary Clinton at her confirmation hearing in January 2009 advocated the practice of smart power which means complementing economic power and U.S military with development and public diplomacy investments (Guerlain 482-483).

The complexity of obstacles that Obama had to face during his first year of presidency really threatened his “smart power” approach. In fact, the situation in Afghanistan and Iraq, the nuclear issues of Iran and North Korea, the global recession, and others, all this presented a dilemma for the president. Therefore, at first he tried to restore America’s credibility in the globe and launching a new beginning with Muslims for more peaceful and prosperous world but, at the same time ordered sending troops to Afghanistan to deal with Taliban and Al- Qaeda terrorists. So, Obviously Obama use of smart power paid off and brought dramatic changes to the U.S. Apparently, global public opinions were positive, except the Middle East Muslims who were not pleased with new political change and this created another challenge for Obama. Therefore, he appropriately engaged in the Arab world turmoil to limit long and intractable problems. In fact the main electoral pledges Obama made was ending the war with Iraq (Nuruzzaman 179).

Obama first opposed the war in 2002 when he declared “I am not opposed to all wars. I am opposed to dumb wars”. He further explained that invasion of Iraq without a clear and strong reason would destabilize the Middle East (Randall 10). Already during his campaign in 2007 in a Washington speech, Obama laid out his plan of counterterrorism to end the war in Iraq, achieve a safer world from terrorists and extremists through multilateral corporations, reduce threats in homeland, and restoring U.S values. However, the strategy was based on essential elements such as; strengthen American military capabilities for minimizing terrorism, linking U.S agencies with foreign intelligence for expanding research process, and finally stabilizing and rebuilding Iraq through federal

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

agencies (Randall 16-17). During his campaign in 2008, he insisted also on the fact that President George. W Bush engagement in Iraq had been a disastrous mistake and that's because of the huge costs of humans and military and financial burden. According to him, the best thing to do to serve America's interests was to change the policy in Iraq in order to restore national honor and save money (Gregory 2-3).

The rounds of violence, the complexity of political Dynamics in Iraq, and the neighboring influence proved to be a huge challenge for the president Obama to accomplish his mission to withdraw troops from Iraq. Thus, violence measured in Iraqi society and political dilemmas were significantly associated with Shiite-Sunni sectarian violence and pro-Iran Shiite political elites. However, Shiite Iran and Sunni Saudi Arabia as two powerful neighbors to Iraq, each one tended to support its sectarian co-religion. Iran aimed at establishing a cooperative Shiite government in Baghdad, the U.S dissolution from Iraq, and limiting Sunni Arab domination. Saudi Arabia's interests were different; it was willing to form a secular government opened for both Shiites and Sunnis. Saudi Arabia courted two parties led by former Prime Minister Ayad Allaoui, Sunni tribal leaders and Secular Shiite. By contrast, Iran formulated the al- Sadr Movement and the Iraqi list Party under the supervision of the former Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki. After Saddam Hussein reign ended, the Shiites were supposed to draw down the minority of Sunnis. This urged Secretary Robert Gates to implore both Saudi Arabia and Egypt to seek greater engagement with the Shiite political elites to provide security and limit violence for more regional stability, and most importantly check Iranian influence. In this case, and because of the high Iranian influence in Iraq and Iraqi opposition to occupation, the U.S has no choice but withdrawal from the country (Nuruzzaman 180).

Before leaving office in December 2008, President Bush signed the Iraq Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) which guarantees the departure of U.S troops from Iraqi cities by June 30, 2009, and the country by 2011. With the arrival of the Obama administration and in a speech at Camp Lejeune in February 2009, Obama adopted a plan to withdraw U.S army (Gregory 3). According to his plan, American troops commitment in Iraq will

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

be draw down from Iraq before August 2010 and 35,000 to 50,000 remaining soldiers will accomplish some tasks in the country like undercutting terrorist groups, protecting civilians and military personnel, and strengthen Iraqi security until December 2011 (Hynek 2).

2.4.3. Democracy Promotion

If President Bush was overtly focusing his presidency on promoting democracy in the world, both president Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton clearly tended to retract from this freedom agenda. Obama did not even refer to democracy in his inaugural address and also in early months the task of establishing democratic governments in countries like Iraq was barely mentioned. Clinton also went to assert in her confirmation hearing in January 2009 for the position of Secretary of State, the three new pillars of U.S foreign policy which they were known as the “three Ds”: diplomacy, defense, and development ; surprisingly she ignored the fourth “D” of democracy (Carothers 27).

Obama team started talking about democracy promotion in the widely-received speech in Cairo in June 2009, acknowledging the existing controversy about the American democracy promotion strategies and its connection to the Iraq war. As the administration saw it, no form of government should be imposed on one nation by another by force. In his 2009 speech to the Ghanaian Parliament, Obama said that “Each nation gives life to democracy in its own way, and in line with its own traditions....America will not seek to impose any system of government on any other nation” (qtd. in Santos 131).. So, the task of democracy building was in fact lying with in local themselves, and for the United States the most important thing was working with the target countries to promote democratic institutions (Santos 131). However, one of Obama’s decisions when he comes to office was resetting America’s image as a symbol of democracy. As a first step, he signed the executive order for closing the prisoners’ facility at Guantanamo requiring all interrogations to be prohibited. By doing this, Obama’s team hoped through the new

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

president pre-democratic story and popularity, to restore America's democratic standing (Carothers10).

In the case of Iraq, American government established a strategy known as 'leading from behind' which called for "transition phase'. This latter aimed at taking responsibility to provide the Iraqis with military training and preparation for their security and for keeping terrorists away from their territories. The U.S tended also to cooperate with Iraqi government to built governance capability and liberal-democratic institutions. In 2008 an agreement was signed with Iraq and it was focused as Obama refer to it, on keeping some U.S troops in Iraq for enhancing security, defeating terrorism, and proving security for the civilians (Santos 132-133).

Since the breakout of the Arab Spring, Obama administration became more vulnerable to challenges and important foreign policy moves were necessary in such occasion related to American interests. The Arab uprising has brought the opportunity for the greatest advance for human freedom. Yet, when protests were made by Arabs and Muslims claiming for their universal rights, jobs, and education, Obama proved to be an extremely cautious democratic reformer. He strongly believed in his strategy 'leading from behind'. He continued promoting his deep-seated faith in liberal-democratic values, and even took a part in the Arab Revolt, declaring that it was up to the Middle East people to decide their fate. However, countries such as Tunisia, Egypt and others who tried to reform their institutions received democratic and economical support from the American government (134-135). Since democracy took hold in Egypt, questions arose about Iraq. In Iraq, the Arab uprising will have a focus on the Shia domination by its authoritarian tendencies on Nouri Al-Maliki government. However, the political structure of the Iraqi government has already witnessed a stream of democratic rule in which most of Iraq's Shia, democracy was synonymous with majority rule. According to this transformation Obama administration sought to initiate a withdrawal from Iraq by the end of December 2011 rather than coaxing the Al- Maliki government into requesting an extension of America's commitment (Pillar 4).

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

Moreover, the recent formation of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) has clearly threatened Obama's strategy of leading from behind. In fact, it endangered security and moderate-promoting opposition in Iraq. This country was not ready to face such kind of issues especially after American lefted the country. Most of the ISIL members were Sunnis and were ignored by the newly formed Iraqi government. This group found a gap of authority in Syria Sunni territories. In this case, the United States with the support of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) led a coalition of over 60 countries to limit the ISIL influence and again in July 2015 initiated intense air strikes redeploying Armed Forces to Iraq to diminish ISIL groups (Santos 139-140).

2.4.4. Multilateralism

The pledge for multilateralism was the prominent theme of the democrat president Obama's foreign policy, and it has been adopted to show a sense of anti-Bush preference and going for engagement through global institutions rather than proceeding unilaterally as the previous administration did. In fact, Obama's vision of multipartner world has created hopes for new era in international politics. In this regard, multilateral diplomacy became the hallmark of the political arena with a focus on a strong international commitment with the UN (Skidmore 43).

Obama's radical shift to engagement in the international community remained somehow huge challenge, especially after Bush's shameful episode with the UN in the Iraq war. So, it was Obama's duty to overcome the relationship with UN. Regarding this, the U.S needed the UN as a diplomatic tool because it can still legitimate and serve U.S interests abroad including peace keeping operations. Multilaterally, such kind of operations costs a lot and the dilemma is that if the U.S decided to precede unilaterally that would be critical for its financial budget (Valdés 75). Nevertheless, it is clear that the U.S needed the UN and that's because it shares political costs as well as financial one, reinvesting alliances trust and restoring global image. With regard to Iraq, the UN played

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

a transformative role in conflict resolution and providing assistance for the internal population for building a democratic state (Valdés 75).

In practice, Iraq presented a central example for an American strategy of partnership. The U.S has collaborated with both state and non-state partners to support Iraq's war against ISIS. In 10 September 2014, Obama campaigned on leading a coalition and limiting the influence of ISIS through airstrikes. He decided as well to conduct anti-ISIS operations in Syrian, Iraq and beyond. In this case, the Obama administration believed that only Iraq as a force in the anti-ISIS coalition has the capacity, military personnel, and courage to conduct the ground war against ISIS. Therefore, the U.S limited its efforts to control the war and instead of directly commanding Iraqi forces, it has offered them operational contributions such as equipments and training, air power, and intelligence (Dombrowski and Reich 137-138).

2.4.5 Conclusion

The United States foreign policy was deeply affected by ongoing war in Iraq and this affection goes back to the 1st Gulf War as a starting point. From the beginning Iraq presented a dilemma for the American government economically and politically. When the 9/11 attack took place, the U.S foreign policy has clearly changed to a more aggressive form. Yet, Bush's strategies and visions towards the international community remains the same in case of the aims particularly U.S leadership in the globe.

As the chapter highlighted how the U.S dealt with 9/11 events and the way it adopted a neo-conservative doctrine as well as the Patriot Act mainly because of terrorists threat. After insisting that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction and could use them or the fact that it could sell them to terrorist groups like al- Qaeda, apparently Bush doctrine revolved around the using of preemptive force against any challenge. In fact, American government aimed at disarming Iraq, removing Saddam Hussein, and promoting democracy in Iraqi society. At this point, the U.S hoped for a stabilized Iraq through

Chapter2 ————— U.S Foreign Policy: Iraq War (2003) as a Case Study

attempting to transplant both political and economical institutions and peace keeping operations that compromise the American democratic system.

The U.S hegemony was an important element within foreign policy, and the president tried to strengthen it by every possible way even if it means dropping allies. However, Bush adopted aggressive strategy and proceed for the invasion of Iraq because it was important for obtaining regional power as well as hegemonic position in the Middle East. Also, he adopted the Project for the New American Century which focused on rebuilding American Defenses as a step for defending American homeland. Moreover, after a disagreement with the UN, America went for war in Iraq alone putting all hopes on hard power including military strength.

When Obama came to office, his strategy tended to reverse the weakening tendency of the U.S primacy through more rational decisions. In other words, his administration attempted to end the war with Iraq, provide security for the Iraqi, and most importantly renewing alliances and bringing peace to the Middle East region. All this contributed in developing America's muscle. In his pursuit of a more smart power foreign policy, Obama aimed at ending the U.S war in Iraq.

Concerning the mission of democracy, Obama first avoided it in several occasions and speeches. However, he started talking about it in Cairo 2009. He adopted a new form of democracy promotion as he believed in his strategy of leading from behind. Consequently, when Arab Spring took place the administration sought advance for human freedom and fight terrorists groups including ISIS in Iraq. Finally, Obama tried to re-engage with the international community through multilateralism. This latter sought to overcome the distorted image with UN for the sake of mutual interests like minimizing the political and economical costs while defeating far-reaching terrorists groups in Iraq.

General conclusion

The U.S as a newly formed nation needed to realize non-entanglement policy with others. This was promoted by Washington and emphasized by Monroe. In fact, the new world must be kept away from the old world and strategy of aloofness was the only way to do so.

The First World War presented the first indicators that pushed U.S to interventionism. Though, Wilson wanted to stay away from the conflict yet, the German threat to America's interests dragged the nation to war. Post-war period witnessed a return to a strict isolation with a strong emphasizes on strengthening relations with Latin American countries.

Because of the growing threats of major powers 1939 and 1941, the U.S nation marked the beginning of a slow involvement in another disastrous war. First, FDR preferred unilateralism and avoided any political arrangements in Europe, but with the rise of dictatorship determination, he draws the U.S to the Second World War for the sake of providing security for the nation.

After the Second turmoil ended, another ideological conflict took place with another emerging threat that is the USSR. The cold War dragged the U.S to full commitment in world affairs. The nation needed to stop the communist influence so that it can protect its powerful state. The Marshal Plan and the Truman Doctrine were economical commitments and NATO was a military one that helped containing communism. It was clear that the U.S foreign policy was always changing whenever the nation's interests changed and whenever the country's sole was endangered. Post-Cold War, America became the world hyper power and fashioned a New World Order through expanding its global hegemony and taking unilateral and multilateral decisions.

The nation had its visions and methods to achieve certain goals or to conduct its foreign affairs. U.S foreign policy tools were many and most of them appeared through both historical and political events. However, diplomacy, sanctions,

containment, collective security, deterrence, and military force were tools that proved their application and success in many occasion, in the First World War, Second World War, Cold War, and even in Post-Cold War.

Concerning the U.S foreign policy's future, the nation became more involved in global affairs. The best example to justify this involvement is by studying the most critical administrations in America's foreign policy history "Bush and Obama administrations" in the Iraq War as a case study. This two presidents affected political arena in great extent in which each one demonstrated political leadership skills.

When Bush came to office, his administration was highly influenced by neo-conservative thoughts especially after 9/11 events. The task was to bring an end to terrorist groups by every possible way. Accordingly, Bush followed clues, instituted the Patriot Act, and gathered evidences in order to know the responsible of the attacks. Consequently, Iraq long history with U.S makes it a suspected country. So, Bush showed in his Doctrine a preference of a preventive war and proceeded unilaterally to invade Iraq. After toppling Saddam Hussein regime, the U.S went for promoting democracy in region as a new case to stay in Iraq. President Bush needed to restore the nation's credibility so, the invasion of Iraq was important to gain hegemonic position in the Middle East. However, it is important to note that Bush's foreign policy was more coined with the use of hard power and the Iraq war was the perfect case to do so.

The Obama administration presented a more unique shift in U.S foreign policy. His devotion to multilateralism presented his critical vision of the previous administration. Obama went first to renew American leadership through revitalizing military and strengthen multilateral platform. Then his commitment to smart power promoted his decision to withdraw from Iraq despite the challenges he faced and especially after the round of violence grow in the Iraqi society. Furthermore, Obama like Bush promoted democracy but in different way. He believed that building democracy was lying within the Iraqis themselves. This vision was promoted by "leading from behind strategy". As the Arab Spring and ISIS took place, Obama supported multilateral cooperation. In fact, the democratic Obama tried reinforcing strategy of partnership through overcoming relationship with the UN.

All in all, both George, W. Bush and Barack Obama has brought interest changes to U.S foreign policy through the different use of political tools and methods. Yet, the main goal of each one of them relied on expanding America's interests and securing its global leadership and providing security for the American population even if it requires involving in conflicts. The Iraq war has really affected their political decisions. However, after Obama presidency ended, Donald trump became the new president of the United States in 2017. Trump's foreign policy can be perceived as inconsistent. In the case of Iraq, he clearly and repeatedly criticized the war and admitted that it had been a mistake. At the same time he called for the use of force in the fight against ISIS in Iraq and increased military budget.

Works Cited

Books

- Akis, Kalaitzidis, and Gregory W. Streich. U.S. Foreign Policy. California: Greenwood, 2011. Print.
- Art, Robert. J. A Grand Strategy for America. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003. Print.
- Axelord, Alen. America's Wars. New York: Wiley and sons, 2002. Print.
- Berridge, G. and Alan, J. A Dictionary of Diplomacy, 2nd Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.print.
- Biersteker, Thomas J. "Sanctions." The oxford Companion to International Realations Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. 263-266. Print.
- Chandra, Parkash, International Relations. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd, 1994.
- Frum, D. The Right Man: The Surprise of George W. Bush. New York, Random House, 2003. Goodreads. Web.
- George, Modelski. A Theory of Foreign Policy. London: Pall Mall Press, 1962.
- Hugh, Gibson. The Road of Foreign Policy. New York: Doubleday, 1944.
- Jones, Howard. Crucible of Power: A History of American Foreign Policy from 1897. 2nd ed. Maryland: Rowman and Litllfield, 2008. Print.

- Jones, Maldwyn A. The Limits of Liberty: American History, 1607-1980. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. Print.
- Jones, Roy. E. Nuclear Deterrence, A Short Political Analysis. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.
- Lynch, Timothy J., and Robert S. Singh. After Bush: The Case for Continuity in American Foreign Policy. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Mahendra, Kumar. Theoretical Aspects of International Politics. Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala, 1967.
- Maxime, Lefebvre. La Politique Etrangère Américaine, 1er édition. France : Press Universitaire de France, 2004.
- McCauley, Martin. Russia, American and the Cold War, 1949-1991. 2 nd ed. Edinburgh: Longman, 2008. Print.
- Mohamed, Salim. Tataour El Siasa El Dooualia fi El Qarnayn El Tasii Achar Wa El Ichrin. El Tabaa El Oula. Misr: Dar El Amin, 2002.
- Morgan, Patrick. M. Deterrence Now. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Print.
- Morison, Samuel Eliot, and Henry Steel Commager. The Growth of the American Republic. Vol. 2. 5 th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947. Print.
- O'Callaghan, Bryn. An Illustrated History of the USA. 1990. Edinburgh: Longman, 2007. Print.

- Padelford, Norman J., and George A. Lincoln, The Dynamics of International Politics. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962.
- Soltani, Fakhreddin. George W. Bush and Security of the United States. Germany: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing, 2013.
- Tudor, Onea. A. US Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: Restraint versus Assertiveness from George H.W. Bush to Barack Obama. Palgrave Macmillan. 2013. Print.
- Wallace, William. Foreign Policy and Political Process. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1971. Print.
- Wogan, Chris. America and the New American Century: The Hidden History behind America's War on Terror and the Future of American Foreign Policy. Lulu.com, 2004.
- Yahyaoui A. Kader and Ahmine El Arbi. Tarikh El Alam El Moaser. Algiers: O.N.P.S, 2005. Print.

Articles

- Aggour, Lora. S. "Strategy of Containment of Fighting Terrorism." *Strategic Insights*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (2008).
- Aleksovski, Stefan, Oliver, Bakreski, and Avramovska, Biljana. "Collective Security- The Role of International Organizations- Implications in International Security Order." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 5, No, 27. MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy (Dec 2014): 274-282.

- Bapir, Mohammed. A. “Iraq: a Deeply Divided Polity and Challenges to Democracy.” *Information, Society and Justice Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (2010): 117-125.
- Barack, Obama. “Renewing American Leadership.” *Foreign Affairs* (2007): 1-7.
- Barry, Tom. “Rise and Demise of the New American Century.” *IRC Special Report: International Relations Center* (2006): 1-12.
- Bloss, William. “Escalating U.S. Police Surveillance after 9/11: an Examination of Causes and Effects.” *Surveillance and society*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (2007): 208-228.
- Boot, Max. "Think Again: Neocons." Jan 2004. Council on Foreign Relations. Dec 2016.
- Carothers, Thomas. “Democracy Policy under Obama- Revitalization or Retreat?” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (2012): 5-55. Print.
- Dobbins, James. F. “Nation-Building and Counterinsurgency after Iraq.” *Century Foundation Report: Report World* (2008): 1-22.
- Dombrowski, Peter and Simon Reich. “The Strategy of Sponsorship.” *Survival*, Vol. 57, No. 5 (2015): 121-148.
- Dresner, Ana. “Policy of Preemption or the Bush Doctrine.” *School of Doctoral Studies (European Union) Journal* No.1 (2009): 281-285.

- Ezeibe, Christian. C. and Stephen Ogbodo. "Political Economy of US Invasion of Iraq." *Journal of law, policy and globalization*, Vol. 40 (2015): 144-149.
- Gilderhus, Mark. "The Monroe Doctrine: Meanings and implications." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No.1(Mars 2006): 5-16. JSTOR. Accessed: 20 Oct. 2016. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27552742>>
- Gregory Anthony. "What Price War." *Independent Policy Report: The Independent Institute Oakland* (2011): 1-24.
- Guerlain, Pierre. "Obama's Foreign Policy: "Smart Power," Realism and Cynicism." *Springer Science* (2014): 482-491.
- Hynek, Nik. "Continuity and Change in the U.S Foreign and Security Policy with the Accession of President Obama." *IIR Policy Paper: The Institute of International Relations, Prague* (2009): 1-17.
- Jervis, Robert. "Understanding the Bush Doctrine." *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 118, No, 3 (2003): 365-388. JSTOR. Accessed: 7 Mar. 2017. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/300357800>>
- Kennan, George. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct (1947)." *The History Guide*. N.p., n.d. Web. Accessed: 15 Nov 2016. <<http://www.historyguide.org/europe/kennan.html>>
- Legro, Jeffery.W. "Whence American Internationalism." *International Organization*. The MIT Press, Vol. 54, Issue 2 (April 2000): 253-289. JSTOR. Accessed: 25 Oct. 2016. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2601298>>

- Myers, Steven Lee. "Converting the Dollar into a Bludgeon." New York Times 20 Apr. 1997. Web. 14 Nov. 2016.
- Nuruzzaman, Mohammed. "President Obama's Middle East Policy, 2009-2013." Insight Turkey, Vol. 17, No. 1 (2015): 171-190.
- Nye, Joseph S. "Soft Power, Hard Power and Leadership." seminar Harvard: Harvard University, 2006.

<<https://numerons.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/soft-power-hard-power-and-leadership.pdf>>

- Parraguez Kobek, Maria Luisa, and Mariana Gonzalez Rodriguez. "The American Way of War: Afghanistan and Iraq." Revista Enfoques: Ciencia Politica y Administracion Publica, Vol. XI, No, 18. (2013): 77-101.
- Pronger, Alan. "In the Pursuit of Economic Security: American Post-WWII Economic Objectives and the Origins of the Cold War." The Atlas: UBC Undergraduate Journal of World History (2009): 1-19.
- Randall, Stephen. J. "The American Foreign Policy Transition: Barack Obama in Power." Journal of Military and Strategic Studies, Vol. 11, Issues 1 and 2 (2008): 1-24.
- Rosen, Mark. E "The United States Naval Blockade of Iraq: A Foreign Policy and International Law Analysis." International Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 14, Issue. 5 (1991): 955-1031.
- Santos, Maria. H "Interests and Values in Obama's Foreign Policy: Leading from Behind." Institute of International Relations, Vol. 58, No. 2 (2015): 119-145.

- Schmidt, Brian C., and Michael C. Williams. “The Bush Doctrine and the Iraq War: Neoconservatives versus Realists.” *Security Studies*, Vol. 17, Issue 2 (2008): 191-220.
- Shuja, Sharif. “Why America Cannot Ignore Soft Power.” *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 290, Issue. 1688 (2008): 16-22.
- Skidmore, David. “The Obama Presidency and US Foreign Policy: Where’s the Multilateralism?” *International Perspectives* 13(2012): 43-64.
- Totoonchie, Kathleen. “The Power of Politics of the Bush Doctrine: International Security and the War on Terrorism.” 2004 Conference: 12th Annual Illinois State University Conference for Students of Political Science, Illinois. Apr 8, 2005.
- Ugalde, José. L. ““UN Security Council: Is the U.S. Playing at Multilateralism?” *Voices of Mexico*, No. 102.
<<http://www.revistascisan.unam.mx/Voices/special.php>>
- Wilson, Ernest. J. “Hard power, Soft Power, Smart power.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 616, Public Diplomacy in a Changing World (2008): 110-124. JSTOR. Accessed: 15 Feb. 2017. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25097997>>
- Yordán, Carlos. L. “America’s Quest for Global Hegemony: Offensive Realism, the Bush Doctrine, and the 2003 Iraq War.” *Journal of Social and Political Theory*, No. 110, the Politics of War II (2006): 125-157. JSTOR. Accessed: 7 Mar. 2017. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41802331>>

Websites

- Amacker, Christopher. "The Functions of Diplomacy." E-International Relations. N.P., Jul.20.2011. Web. Date Accessed: 11 Nov. 2016.
<<http://www.e-ir.info/2011/07/20/the-functions-of-diplomacy/>>
- America in the First World War. U.S. History pre-colonial to the New Millennium. UShistory.org, n.d. Web.
<<http://www.ushistory.org/us/index.asp>>7
- Cold War: A Brief History Nuclear Deterrence. Atomicarchive.com. N.p., n.d. Web. Accessed: 25 Nov. 2016.
<<http://www.atomicarchive.com/History/coldwar/page15.shtml>>
- Durant, Karis and Campbell, Randolph B., 1940-. The First World War: American Ideals and Wilsonian Idealism in Foreign Policy, paper, April 3, 2008;[Denton, Texas]. <digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc86949/> Accessed: 5 Nov. 2016. University of North Texas Libraries, Digital Library, digital.library.unt.edu; crediting UNT Honors College.
- Foreign Policy. Boundless Political Science, *Boundless*. 20 Sep. 2016. Accessed: 20/10/2016.
<<https://www.boundless.com/political-science/textbooks/boundless-political-science-textbook/foreign-policy-18/foreign-policy-108/foreign-policy-571-5486/>>
- Harcourt, Houghton Mifflin. "Containment." The Free Dictionary. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Company, n.d. Web. Accessed: 15 Nov. 2016.
<<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/containment>>
- MILESTONES. Good Neighbor Policy, 1983. 1921-1936, Office of the Historian, US Department of State. Web. 2015.
<<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/good-neighbor>>

- Primary Documents in American History. United States Constitution: Primary Documents of American History (Virtual Programs & Services, Library of Congress). N.p., n.d. Web. 06 Nov. 2016.
<<https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/Constitution.html>>
- President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points: 8 Jan, 1918. The Avalon Project. Lillian Goldman Law Library, n.d. Web. Date of access.
<http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson14.asp>
- The Monroe Doctrine. *Boundless* U.S. History. Boundless. Web. 7 Sept. 2016.
<<https://www.boundless.com/u-s-history/textbooks/boundless-u-s-history-textbook/democracy-in-america-1815-1840-12/the-monroe-and-adams-administrations-102/the-monroe-doctrine-549-10304/>>
- The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. *Boundless* U.S. History. Boundless. Web. 08 Jul. 2016.
<<https://www.boundless.com/u-s-history/textbooks/boundless-u-s-history-textbook/the-cold-war-27/the-cold-war-211/the-truman-doctrine-and-the-marshall-plan-1172-9755/>>
- Treaty of Paris (1783). Our Documents - Treaty of Paris (1783). N.p., n.d. Web. 06 Nov. 2016.
<<https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=6>>
- Spaan, Mike. "George W. Bush: A Neo-Conservative?" *E-international Relations*. N.p., 25 May 2015. Web. Accessed: 25 Nov. 2016.
<<http://www.e-ir.info/2015/05/25/george-w-bush-a-neo-conservative/>>
- War and International Law. Foreign Policy - Constitutional Rights Foundation. N.p., n.d. Web. 01 Nov. 2016.
<<http://www.crf-usa.org/war-in-iraq/war-and-international-law.html>>

Thesis

- Asmaa, Amina. “التوجهات الجديدة للسياسة الخارجية اتجاه ايران وانعكاساتها على دول المنطقة 2004-2003”. Modakkirat Master- Koliat El Hokouk Wa El Oloum El Siaasiya, Jamiat El Jilali Bounaama Khmis Malyana, 2015.
- Benmahammed, Fatima. Z. “Post-Cold War American Foreign Policy: The War on Iraq as a case Study, 2003”. Diss. Master. Deg- Constantine University, 2003.
- Birkenthal, Sara M. “Grand Strategy in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Carter, Bush, and Obama Doctrines”. Claremont McKenna College. 2013.
- Boateng, Rhonie. “Democracy Promotion and US Hegemony: A Case Study of Iraq”. Diss. Denmark University, 2015.
- Garth, Peot. “Iraq a Case Study in Nation Building”. Diss. Master. Deg- Lund University. 2006.
- Quarantello, Kim. “The Bush Doctrine and Presidential Rhetoric: Change and Continuity in US Foreign Policy”. Diss. Honors Thesis Collection- Wellesley College, 2013.
- Khan, Ismail. “The Obama Doctrine- a multipolar foreign policy”. Diss. Master. Deg- Linneuniversitetet, 2013.
- Ribeiro, Joana. M. “President Obama vs. President W. Bush: Can a President’s Leadership Style be an Effective and Efficient Influence for US Diplomacy and Foreign Policy?” Diss. Master Deg- Universidade Da Beira Interior, 2013.

- Saikaly, Ramona. “Decision Making in U.S Foreign Policy: Applying Kingdon’s Multiple Streams Model To the 2003 Iraq Crisis”. Diss. Doctorat. Deg- Kent State University, 2009.
- Taylor, Samantha Alisha. “A comparative Study of America’s Entries into World War I”. Diss. East Tennessee State University, Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Web. May 2009.

<<https://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/search/publication/1327866>>

Conference Papers

- Celso, Anthony N. “Obama and the Arab Spring.” The Western Political Science Association Meeting, Portland, 25-27 March. 2012. pp. 1-12.
- Dimitrova, Anna. “Obama’s Foreign Policy: Between Pragmatic Realism and Smart Diplomacy?” Institute for Cultural Diplomacy (ICD) Academy, Berlin, 10-16 June. 2011. pp. 1-7.

Periodical Documents

- Pillar, Paul. R “The Arab Spring and U.S. Foreign Policy”, *Perspectives on the Arab Spring*. U.S/Me Policy Brief: July 2011.3-4. Pdf.
- White House. 2002. “The National Security Strategy of the United States of America.” Washington, DC.

