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Abstract

The Iraqi war represents a form of coercive diplomacy between words and war in the enforcement of international norms, and is considered as a new and old notion at the same time. This holds true ever since the days of the Desert Storm: the war waged to liberate Kuwait. This mechanism was launched in 1990 under the title of the war to liberate Iraq or the punitive war, the core idea of which would correspond to the purposes and motivations of the 2003 war. This study begins with a review of the literature, both for background information and for the identification of variables of the events and factors in this issue. This war is analysed in relation to the US objectives in the region when it comes to maintaining its interests, ensuring security for its allies and dominating the whole region.

This study investigates the controversy surrounding the case of 2003 war on Iraq, which is embodied in the plural reasons for the war. The situation in Iraq is of course still a subject for debate, as the country has experienced a stalemate for some years now. The study focuses on one chosen central research question; What was the real reason behind that war? The methodological triangulation approach adopted is about using different research methods to complement one another, in order for the findings to have validity and credibility. Relying upon conceptual analysis, critical review of relevant literature and concepts, political discourses analysis and also on primary data in the form of interviews with Iraqi elite experts of intelligence service and weapons experts, including the former top administrators who are linked to this issue, this thesis provides both facts and opinions which could be used as qualitative data. The aim of the variegated sources and material used for this study is to exemplify contending perspectives on the subject under study.

The findings of this study suggest that since the war lacks a strong moral base, it remains suspicious as a legitimate policy instrument to solve the problematic issue in Iraq. While the war came about during the reign of the Republicans and the foreign policy then adopted, as this study demonstrates, the repercussions are severe to this day. Coercive diplomacy can ultimately lead the region into enormous chaos, which may have dire consequences for the whole region, not only within Iraq.
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1-CHAPTER I: Introduction and Background of the Study

1.1. Introduction

Between 1980 and 2003 Iraq was involved in three wars: the Iraq-Iran War in the 1980-1988, the invasion of Kuwait in 1990-1991 “Desert Storm”¹, and finally the US-led war on Iraq in 2003. These are three different wars with distinct and different characteristics. Iraq, the long-recognized “Cradle of Civilization,” was targeted in 2003 by the USA and its allies. Much like Helen of Troy, a country to launch a thousand AFVs,² and warplanes from multiple countries in the course of toppling a controversial regime after thirteen years of blockade and persistent confinement and containing. This is old news to almost all people around the world, but the main thing to ask here, with a preview of that famous caption of George W Bush on board the USS Abraham Lincoln, next to seizing Baghdad in 2003, would be: Is it true that “Mission Is Accomplished” with all those fleets reverting back to Iraq quite recently?

Historically, Scott Ritter³ points out in his interview in 19 October, 2005, “the US policy to remove Saddam Hussein from power started with President George H. W. Bush in August 1990.”⁴ This policy resulted in the US military invasion and occupation of Iraq. In fact, opinions on the 2003 Iraqi war were deeply divided between nations. Some states felt that Saddam Hussein and his regime are one of the 21st Century's worst despots and that free world should be obliged to remove brutal dictators and establish democracy there. On the other side, some arguments emphasized that the 2003 Iraqi war was an act of imperialism and claimed that America went to this war just to acquire Iraq’s oil. Yet, President Bush stresses: “In Iraq, a dictator is building and hiding weapons that could enable him to dominate the Middle East and intimidate the civilized world -- and we will not allow it.”⁵ After all these arguments, the United States invaded Iraq to topple Saddam Hussein and his regime for alleged ties to the Al-Qaeda terrorist organization as well as for acquiring weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Subsequently, no evidence emerged to prove that Iraq has had (WMD). Those were the justifications—indeed, the most prominent purposes as distributed by most US

---

¹ On January 16, 1991, President George H. W. Bush announced the start of what would be called Operation Desert Storm—a military operation to expel occupying Iraqi forces from Kuwait, which Iraq had invaded and annexed months earlier.
² Armored Fighting Vehicle.
³ He is the former chief UN weapons inspector in Iraq.
⁴ Seymour Hersh and Scott Ritter on Iraq, WMDs and the Role of the Clinton Administration in the 1990s. [http://www.democracynow.org/2005/10/21/seymour_hersh_and_scott_ritter_on](http://www.democracynow.org/2005/10/21/seymour_hersh_and_scott_ritter_on)
media channels and by Right-Wing politicians promoting that war was to establish democracy in Iraq and grant Iraqis a better life instead.6

However, Iraq remains a strategically critical state in the Middle East given its sectarian make-up and different ethnic mosaic, different communities, fragile and complex internal politics, as well as significant energy resources reserves.7 Various chapters have succeeded each other under different titles since March 2003, while the bloodshed over almost all Iraqi scenes has been escalating and defies description. In an exclusive interview before the war with the foreign minister of KSA with the BBC, he said: “If a change of regime comes with the destruction of Iraq, then you are solving one problem and creating five more problems.”8

In 2009, the US administration switched from a Republican into a Democratic reign with the inauguration of President Barack Obama in January of that year. During his election campaign, Obama vowed to put an end to the military presence of his country in Iraq.

This study aims at bringing this war back on stage to raise the very important question of how and why this war has been waged, and furthermore what the real purposes and motivations behind this war are. This thesis will highlight some of the problematic issues that will need to be addressed and interpreted; it will survey and understand evidence and writing on the war and, in the light of pivotal literature, suggest some of its implications for International relations theories, such as realism and security and their practices. Hence, this topic is still novel, fresh, unique and relevant for policy, economy, security, international relations and war history scholars.

1.2. Literature Review

A decade after the onset of the war led by the coalition of the United States and the United Kingdom to invade Iraq, this thesis still cannot approach Iraqi literature and archive today without recognizing the multiple shifts and varieties in its expression and biased tendencies. There is a sizeable literature discussing the issue of the 2003 Iraq war, focusing on both political and economic aspects. The core of the studies has largely overlooked the reasons of

---

8 The BBC, on Feb. 2003: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2773759.stm
the war. The main concerns of a number of studies were petroleum supply from or across this vital “Region”\textsuperscript{9}.

One might tentatively conclude that the war on terror and the invasion of Iraq are the most marked events of the Bush administration era, which reflected the nature of the US policy and its realist tendency. One of the scholars who cared to tackle these topics is Ahmed Mahdi whose book \textit{Energy and US Foreign Policy}, (2012) demonstrates how and why oil has played a central role in the American relations with the world, found itself facing challenges to its supposed supremacy after the failure of the intervention in Iraq. As a matter of fact, and quite traditionally, the analysis of United States politics has relied on character studies. Accordingly, the input and results of the US policy decisions are not sufficiently obvious to political researchers to enable broad interpretation and provide a clear explanation.

Bob Woodward’s book \textit{Plan of Attack} 2004, purports to disclose how flawed intelligence service was misused by President G. W. Bush and his top aides, as well as the war council of his administration, through exercising disinformation and deception for the public opinion of Americans and the whole world, to take the nation to the war. Besides, he gives an authoritative narrative of behind the scenes and maneuvering over many years, researching and exploring the consequences and causes of the greatest controversial war in the world.\textsuperscript{10}

Besides, James P. Pfiffner and Mark Pythia’s \textit{Intelligence and National Security Policymaking on Iraq: British and American Perspectives} 2008, shows how both the US and the UK justified their intervention in Iraq by shedding a humanitarian cover of the war. Moreover, it explains the consequences of the 2003 Iraq war, as well as the very controversial decision to go to the war.\textsuperscript{11}

This study had been made to examine diverse perspectives and refrain from being biased to one side. This is because until the current date one comes across totally opposing visions of the motives of this war. The topic of this study is crucial and many scholars have tackled it in broad lines with descriptive methods. Therefore, this study will focus on providing some necessary assumptions through an analytical view of the existing factors and hopefully fill this

\textsuperscript{9} The term ”Region” refers here and always to Iraq’s neighbouring countries, i.e. Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Kuwait and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.


gap by avoiding presumed predictions, and at the same time adhering to facts and deducing analysis from the progress of events. Data acquiring and studying of the information from the actual sources will form the pillars of this study that establish its structure.

1.3. Motivation for the Study
The motivation and the ambition of this study are to investigate and to explore the main reasons of the war and the purposes and motives. Strictly speaking, the United States policy towards finding a suitable political solution in Iraq has become increasingly required. Thus, my personal enthusiasm and interest in political studies, and especially in the Iraqi case, have led me to ask what the sensible solution might be to the complicated situation. Before it is too late.

1.4. Research Questions
First of all, answering the question, what is this case all about is considered part and parcel of the research process. Thus, the case-oriented strategy focuses on the central research questions. To understand how the 2003 Iraq war took place, through the core issues of this study articulated in the following these research questions:

A- Why and for what purposes and motivations did the United States invade Iraq?

B- Were the US allegations regarding waging the 2003 war true?

And there is a subsidiary question that is brought to the surface during the research: Which players is the war of Iraq meant to benefit?

1.5. The Objectives of the Study
The thesis provides a panoramic view of the new US political strategic scenes regarding the 2003 war. The aim of this study is thus to define and explain the 2003 war by giving an introduction and background on the war, then to put it in the context of international crises in the modern political world. Additionally, the central objective of the thesis is to observe the trend of the new US policy in the region, both before and after the 2003 war. Besides, it seeks to understand the need for theories and provide an empirical analysis of how the United States conducts itself in the political arena in the light of theories such as Realism, Security and other complementary theories such as Smart Power.12

1.6. Hypothesis\textsuperscript{13}

The main reasons for unexpressed stated objectives and the real objectives of the invasion of Iraq can only be properly understood through bringing together three levels of analysis to the situation:

1) The USA’s global grand strategy. (Dominate the world and ensure security).
2) The USA’s strategic position in the region (Middle East). (Strategic military bases).
3) The interests of the USA and its interests in Iraq and the whole region (Energy Resources).

*First Hypothesis:* The USA invaded Iraq because the latter was a threat to the national security of the US as it had (WMD). Also, Iraq had links with the terrorist group (Al-Qaeda).

*Second Hypothesis:* The USA invaded Iraq to have control of its (USA) vital interests in the region.

These questions will be brought to the surface during discussion of this hypothesis: Is the large state (Superpower) more likely to go to war than the small state? Is it the case that rich countries (Oil country) are more vulnerable to war and conflicts?

The thesis will investigate the level of the validity of these hypotheses, through a broad process of analytical analysis, relying on credible sources.

1.7. The Structure and Organization of the Research Study

According to Alan Bryman: "All of these differences in the research logics (or tools) must be taken into account when dealing with the steps of a research design, an important one being the selection of cases."\textsuperscript{14} Thus, the thesis is divided into Eight Chapters’ seeks and attempts to explain and discover again why the United States invaded and occupied Iraq. As Alan Bryman put it: “A research design provides a framework for the collection and analysis of data.”\textsuperscript{15} Therefore, the following chapters will investigate this issue using academic methods.

The thesis starts with an abstract followed by the *First Chapter*, which is an introduction and consists of a short background of the 2003 Iraq war. Furthermore, literature review, the motivation of study, research questions, aims and objectives, hypothesis and methodology are all included within this chapter.

The *second* chapter provides an interpretive understanding of the US policy through theoretical approaches grounded in theoretical assumptions and examines its motivations and

\textsuperscript{13} A supposition or proposed explanation made on the basis of limited evidence as a starting point of further investigation.


\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. P. 46.
purposes from the theoretical perspective of the Realism theory and its branches. (See figure-1-).

Security Theory is used in order to identify the US concerns aspect and to understand security as a phenomenon of the stability of the region and the world, especially the US allies in the region, such as Israel.

The analysis of Smart Power illustrates that this method is an instrument of the Obama administration. The former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton implemented a “Smart Power” approach to foreign policy and she claims: “For me, smart power meant choosing the right combination of tools – diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal, and cultural – for each situation.”16 This research will address this issue depending on these theories and their dynamic transformations.

The Third Chapter will deal with research methodology which consists of data and information collection and uses the relevant material to the subject in order to gain a deep understanding of the phenomena, to address the research problem and answer the research questions, through theoretical and methodological methods. Thus, the study will use the most significant methods Methodological Triangulation Approach, in order to gain credible and validate findings, which contains discourse analysis, interviews and empirical research. This chapter also discusses the limitations at the scope of this study.

The Fourth Chapter gives an introduction to 2003 war by providing a wide explanation of the US and UK policy and their stances, as well as the stances of the other parts of the world that can contribute to understanding the official and publicly stated motives of the 2003 Iraq War and, furthermore, the justifications and legitimacy of this war.

The Fifth Chapter analyzes the political discourses of President Bush and his administration, as well as Tony Blair and his Cabinet, to see how they used the political discourse to justify the legitimacy of the 2003 Iraq War it also analyzes Saddam Hussain ‘s speeches. This method contains critical discourse analysis CDA as well.

The Sixth Chapter will focus on the main and ulterior purposes and motivations of the war. The motivations are perhaps to ensure three key factors, firstly securing US interests, i.e. oil. Quoting Henry Kissinger as “Control oil and you control nations” the US policy believes in this rule. In addition, it sheds light on the geopolitics strategic and economic vitality of Iraq, for instance, in terms of oil lust and monopoly. Secondly, seeing to their privileged allies in the region, such as Israel. Finally gaining new regional military bases, which is completely in accordance with the new U.S. Middle East policy. These issues will be demonstrated in this chapter, through analysing the results of the primary sources and combining them with the secondary sources, to bridge the levels of analysis.

The Seventh Chapter arguably the most important Chapter in the thesis is a theoretically guided analysis of the US foreign policy and the invasion of Iraq and lays out the theories of why the US invaded Iraq that highlights the relevance of war aspects and the US policy tendency during the era of Bush’s administration and makes a comparative analysis of Obama’s administration of their political behaviors. Besides, it answers the research questions using theoretical analysis, methodology and literature materials. This chapter investigates and highlights the motivations and purposes of the war, which is along the same lines as the previous chapter but by the means of a theoretical analysis, as well as provides an articulated grasp of the novel US policy, which is best represented by the” Project for the New American Century” or (PNAC)17. (See Annex-2- ).

The final and Eighth Chapter draws conclusions and presents final findings on how the superpower states, such as the United States, contribute to waging the war, in order to achieve their own goals and secure their own interests. In addition, the war's repercussions. Again, one issue that immediately springs to mind when talking about the invasion of Iraq is: What was the real reason behind that war?

It is worth to mention, the author formulated some figures in order to illustrate the ideas.

1.8. The Significance of the Research and Expected Results

The thesis will provide an analytical view of the 2003 war in a fruitful way, regarding the purposes and motivations of this war. The main concern is to fill a gap in the literature of this

17 Established in the spring of 1997 and funded largely by the energy and arms industries, the Project for the New American Century was founded as the neoconservative think tank whose stated goal was to usher in a “new American century”. (See Annex-2-).
war. If these results could be confirmed, they would enhance the previous evidence and provide new compelling inferences for many readers, scholars, policy-makers, academics and those concerned with international relations and political sciences. Optimistically the outcomes will of the study yield results, depending on accurate theories and hypotheses enforced by concrete facts and figures which derive from credible sources (Primary Sources).
2. CHAPTER II: Three Departure Approaches of Theoretical Assumptions

2.1. Introduction

This thesis seeks to analyze a range of interpretations of causality that pertain to the war decision. According to Scott and Andrew: “No signal theory identifies, explains or understands all the key structures and dynamics of the international politics.” Therefore, this study will try to develop and evaluate applicable theories of IR. This kind of sensitive issue requires the researcher to be both neutral and daring, through utilizing methodological and epistemological methods for the purpose of coming nearest to the facts, which he or she is explicitly or implicitly looking for, along with developing and evaluating theoretical explanations. Mearsheimer argues that:” The ultimate test of any theory is how well it explains events in the real world.” However, theory without empirical content is empty, while empirical research without theory is blind. According to Jack Donnelly: ”It is the job of an analyst, not the theorist, to determine where a particular theoretical logic applies in the world,” which means that any phenomenon must be linked to its cause, through using methods of analytical theories. Furthermore, this study will try to formulate hypotheses and explain phenomena in this case by applying theories and causal mechanisms.

The theoretical aim of this work is to make thesis empirically constructive which means that the author wants to relate theoretical part with empirical as much as possible and he want to avoid being trapped into never ending theoretical dilemmas. The purpose of theory, in this case, would be to serve the empirical part and provide methodological guidance. It means theories will not be used in order to be verified, rather theory is present to help the researcher to generate explanations of what found in collecting data and information which derives from empirical research that related to this war case.

There are indications that the study has tended to Realism resources when it needed to get a closer look at certain aspects of realism, which emphasizes the US motives related to national security, power, and resources. The approach in this thesis will be based on the Realism Theory, which is branched into two theories approaches. (See figure-2- ). In means this study will primarily use realism sources. (See figure-1- ).

---

Although a considerable number of scholars have been committed to using many international relations theories, rather less attention has been paid to the Security Theory. This theory aims to pinpoint the behavior of the United States towards international politics to ensure its interests (oil) in the region and to guarantee the security of Israel and its allies in the Middle East.

Moreover, the idea of “Smart Power”\textsuperscript{22} was embodied in this concept as a descriptive for the US policy, especially during the Obama administration.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{22} The term smart power refers to the combination of hard power and soft power strategies.

2.2. Realism Theory

Without a doubt, Realism is the bedrock theory of International Relations in general, and according to Jack Donnelly again:” Realism provides a theoretical account of how the world works. It can be used for peaceful purposes there is a number of Quaker realizes, as well as for war.”²⁴ Donnelly adds that: “Power is the currency of great-power politics, while hegemonic directed by a signal great power and self-interest.”²⁵ Therefore, this thesis applies realism theory to try to get a better understanding of the phenomenon of why states act the way they do. Since Realism theory provides the most compelling IR theory when analyzing the war, it is the most suitable theory guiding this thesis. The approach in this thesis will be based on Realism which is branched into two theoretical approaches: Offensive Realism and Prudent Realism. Offensive Realism is considered as the Hard realist version, while Prudent Realism is considered as the Soft realist version. (See figure-2-).

(Figure-2- Offensive Realism is considered as the Hard realist version, while Prudent Realism is considered as the Soft realist version, illustrated by the author)

Joseph S. Nye explains the chief focus of Realism theory thus: “Realism portrays the world in terms of sovereign states aiming to preserve their security, with military force as their ultimate

instrument. As a consequence, war has been a constant aspect of international affairs over centuries.”

This might be seen as supporting the notion that the Realists consider the principal players in the international political arena to be sovereign states, which are concerned with their own security issues and perform in pursuit of their own strategic national interests and struggle for power. Thus, the interests of the state predominate over all other interests and values, Joseph S. Nye argues: “Traditional realists often distinguish between a foreign policy based on values and foreign policy on interests. They describe as (vital) those interests that would directly affect security and thus merit the use of force.”

As a result, realism theory offered the most powerful explanations of international politics for the future, regardless of the debates among politicians and academic are dominated by non-realist theories, to put it briefly, the real political world remains a realist world.

2.2.1. Offensive Realism

The war on Iraq can be analyzed as a way for the United States policy to gain power or as a way of controlling the oppositions to its policy and considering them as aggressors. The study analyzes the US foreign policy using offensive realism, (See figure-2- ) which holds that all states want to practice hegemony and gain the power to ensure their interests in the world. This is not a philosophical point. According to Mearsheimer:” Offensive realism is rich theory which sheds considerable light on the working of the international system.”

This theory adopts this system and extremely shapes the behavior of this state power and its foreign policy to maintain its position in this system. Thus, it is a descriptive theory, explaining the state behaviors on many occasions, as well as it is a prospective theory because it outlines the best way to survive in the dangerous world. Mearsheimer argues that if the state wants to survive, this state should act similar to good offensive realists. He developed this theory and explains: “Great powers, are perpetually seeking ways to gain power over their rivals, towards the ultimate goal of hegemony.”

Indeed, Mearsheimer's theoretical and empirical work represents an important addition to Realism theory, because it provides compelling answers to the behaviors of the aggressive state strategies and a rational answer to living in the international system to protect their

27 Ibid. P.218.
29 Ibid. P.10.
30 Ibid .10.
interests. He argues that the states always possess some military capacity enabling them to hurt and possibly destroy each other. Gathering these assumptions altogether, he concludes that the states soon understand that the most efficient method to ensure survival in anarchy is to maximize their relative capacity of power with the ultimate purpose of becoming the superior power and the sole hegemonic power in the globe. One might tentatively conclude that Mearsheimer's theory makes significant additions to realism theory and offers new important insights into the role of power and hegemony in the strategic geopolitics of world.32

Historically speaking, the master scholars that contributed to the development and growth of this approach are Thucydides, T. Hobbes, and N. Machiavelli. Through Realism, they emphasize on the significance of power, hegemony, military forces, interests and security issues in international relations.

Following Zbigniew Brzezinski33, the former U.S. National Security Advisor: “Hegemony is as old as Mankind…” The notions of both hegemony and potential hegemony are prominent in his theory, in short hegemony is the leadership in the international arena. The US wields power through the insistence on building more military bases, when the US strategy plans already possesses more weapons than is required to destroy the world, and this is based on "realism.", thus, wielding its hegemony. Indeed, a brief look at history makes it clear that many Americans respond favorably to the idea of hegemony, that the US should be a great power, should dominate other countries and regions, and thereby be number one in the world. Historically speaking, the US was free to drop nuclear bombs on Japan (Hiroshima and Nagasaki), not because the Japanese refused to surrender but because they refused to surrender unconditionally, thus, it was the novel doctrine of the American hegemony.34

Another argument emphasises that Machiavellianism dominates the foreign policy of the United States. Machiavelli first drew attention to the gap between an extract morality of the politicians and the interests required by a state. According to David Campbell: “The dominant tradition in International relations has endorsed a narrow a historical reading of the realist which has given us the slogans of power over ethics ends justifying means, and the necessity

33 He is also a senior research professor of international relations at the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, in Washington, D.C. and a member of the International Advisory Board of the Atlantic Council.
34 http://thebulletin.org/hiroshima-and-nagasaki-lessons-learned8599
of violence.”\textsuperscript{35} Other realists argue that there are two strategy plans for a states’ survival, one for controlling offenders and the second for gaining power.

While Tang emphasizes: “An offensive realist state actively seeks conquest and expansion not only because of fear or insecurity but also for the potential gain in relative power (and thus in security too) from conquest and expansion.”\textsuperscript{36} From the offensive realism viewpoint, the most significant issue which will be pinpointed in this study is the invasion of Iraq, which was understood correctly and exactly to be a test case, a demonstration case of the doctrine and policy that the United States arrogates to itself the right to attack or invade any country in the world it wants without credible pretext and justifications or without any international authorization or legitimacy actions.\textsuperscript{37}

\textbf{2.2.3. Prudent Realism}

As a point of fact, there is a new approach to American foreign policy that is called \textit{Prudent Realism}, (See figure-2-) as opposed to a more traditional realism in the international relations theories.\textsuperscript{38} There are indications that the form of primacy embodied in prudent American realism is based on the idea that America’s power is good not only for the United States itself and its interests but also for the region and the rest of the world. The foreign policy of prudent American realism recognizes certain operational principles which it applies with its interests in the politics world. First, it needs to distinguish between friends and allies, on the one hand, and enemies and adversaries, on the other.

The master scholars that contributed to the development and growth of this approach are represented by such twentieth-century theorists as Reinhold Niebuhr and Hans Morgenthau. They argue, through realism on the significance of power and diplomacy, most involved in and concerned about maintaining affairs stability and a peaceful balance of power in the globe.\textsuperscript{39} Furthermore, they emphasised, that there can be no political morality without prudence. They define Prudent Realism thus: “the ability to judge the rightness of a given action from among possible alternatives on the basis of its likely political consequences.”\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{39} Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace: https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/morg6.htm
\textsuperscript{40} http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/realism-intl-relations/
While Paul puts it thus: Prudent realism, to develop realism into both theories of international politics and political art, it is a useful tool of foreign policy, as well as a rational picture of politics.\textsuperscript{41}

President Obama emphasizes: “It's easier to start wars than to end them.”\textsuperscript{42} This might be seen as supporting the notion of a more prudent policy if we want to compare with the previous American administrations. He argues: “I know there has been controversy about the promotion of democracy in recent years, and much of this controversy is connected to the war in Iraq. So let me be clear: No system of government can or should be imposed by one nation by any other.”\textsuperscript{43} It is necessary to mention that the new American policy has already been applied by using this Realism Prudent theory and it is embodied in both eras of Obama's administration. It can engineer a genuine paradigm shift in the US foreign policy to assume a higher profile and more important role in the political world.

Indeed, the US has the most classical connection between force and diplomacy. American policy makers, motivated by the assumptions of liberal internationalism, have acted as if diplomacy alone is sufficient to achieve their foreign policy goals. Thus, the American doctrine recognizes that diplomacy without force is like music without instruments.\textsuperscript{44} Prudent American realism is aware that diplomacy and force are two sides of the same coin.

2.3. Security Theory

As a matter of fact, security theory may not be any better or worse than other subfields of International Relations, and according to Robert J. Jackson: “Most scholars of International Relations adopt security as a starting point for understanding activities in the field of IR.”\textsuperscript{45} Theoretically speaking, the Security concept is a fundamental rule and an articulated issue in the political world, often considered the central issue. As we have seen, the study did not ignore the insights generated by the dominant realist approach to security.\textsuperscript{46} Since the introduction of this dynamic theory in International Relations, security studies and their theory represent the principle of the IR, primarily dealing with war and peace issues. Indeed, some of the contributors to the policy seek to bridge the levels of analysis, focusing on

\textsuperscript{42} Obama's speech 2009. In Cairo. \url{https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-cairo-university-6-04-09}
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid. 2009.
\textsuperscript{44} CAUS. 2007. P.253.
traditional forms of statecraft, alliances, and institutions. One might tentatively conclude that security studies have become a synonym for Strategic Studies with a diverse focus on the military forces' sector.

In fact, security studies in this region have pointed to the limitations caused by the imposition of the superpower conflict when studying dynamics in other parts of the world. Therefore, in today’s political world international players attempt to influence and impact the domestic politics of states and regions in myriad ways, to achieve their aims.\textsuperscript{47} It means these players of the international system struggle to maximize their virtual power because they believed it is the optimal manner to maximize their security.\textsuperscript{48} Effectively, this extended constituency covered new titles such as (Allies’ security Israel), energy resources security, and a new kind of integrated strategic thinking.

It is necessary to understand the U.S. emphasis on security and the contradictions of its approach to it in a broader regional context. While this thesis does not dwell on the Arab Gulf policy, the US relationship with the region’s oil-producing states was often at odds with the alliance between the United States and Israel. In fact, the security tensions created by the US policies in the Arab Gulf have undermined America’s claims about pursuing regional security more generally.\textsuperscript{49} In actual fact, the international pressure on the players that can be exerted by state and no state players can target a state or a region in the whole, and it can involve military (using forces) or non-military means, such as economic embargo and sanction or intelligence games. As a consequence, this certainly lead to differentiation across states, as well as polarization within states, thus, it will lead to destabilization and insecure situations, hence to war.\textsuperscript{50}

\textbf{2.4. Smart Power}

Theoretically speaking, Smart Power is not a theory; on the contrary, it is rather a visionary idea supported by theories which has gone global and has come to be considered as equally important, or more important, and closely linked to state policy. It was pioneered and developed by Joseph Nye, who defined it as a descriptive rather than a normative theory. In addition, Hillary Clinton, the former US secretary of State during Obama's administration,

\textsuperscript{47} International Relations theory and a changing the Middle East, 2015. P.13.
\textsuperscript{49} Toby Craig Jones, America, Oil, and War in the Middle East. The Journal of America History. 2012: \url{http://jah.oxfordjournals.org/content/99/1/208.full}
adopted a new diplomacy in American foreign policy, calling for a "Smart Power" strategy in the Middle East and implicitly criticizing the Bush administration for having downgraded the role of arms control.\textsuperscript{51} In fact, Nye’s Soft power concept will form a theoretical background and understanding to the US public policy practice in this region. All these factors which are about plans for Iraq’s future, i.e. Realism, Separatism, and Partition, should be considered.

Smart Power stands in sharp contrast to the Bush administration, Kevin Govern argues: “Realists will tend to focus on national power and prestige, and limit the use of diplomatic, democratic or ideological weapons which challenge the realist world order.”\textsuperscript{52} Furthermore, use of the combination of the toolkits of Smart Power, such as diplomatic capabilities along with the military forces will help achieve American policy objectives in the region.\textsuperscript{53} In sum, the concept of smart power is essential to issues of regional and international security, to ensure security and spread the peace around the globe. These facts will offer some conclusions about what type of foreign policy can be expected from the next American administration.

Finally, since 2006 on Obama administration, American's interest in Smart power has started to grow. Over the last decade, the concept of Smart Power has undergone a considerable transformation in order to fit the new US’s worldview, its political values, and strategic objectives. As a result, a new perspective on Smart Power in the new US policy has been introduced. Hence, these questions brought to the surface during analysis the US policy system from this concept: What influenced the US's understanding of Smart power? How was Smart power re-conceptualized? And why does America perceive Smart power dualistically? All these questions will answer in Chapter Seven by Theoretical Analysis.

\textbf{2.5. Conclusion}

In actual fact, only an approach such as prudent American realism can stanch the loss of the US power, influence, and credibility in the world. It may be true that when national survival is at stake, responsible national leaders have no choice but abandon to all other considerations, including morality. It is precisely here that the importance of realism theory for understanding conflict and security becomes apparent. As will be explained later, this theory describes state

\textsuperscript{52} James Ferguson, 2004.
behavior driven by selfish leaders’ appetites for a power of both military forces and economy, by geopolitical goals or by the preemptive unfriendly actions mandated by an anarchic international system. According to the Waltzian system: “states fight for survival within a system without any global authority.” Consequently, the logical outcome of the realist studies is that the relations among states are characterized by suspicion, anarchy and the ever-present prospect of war and conflicts that tend to appear in repetitive patterns in the political world.

As a matter of principles and theory, interests are materialistic, in the sense that the US certainly has some worldly needs, simultaneously, it has an idea of war for maximising its interests in the region and Iraq, in particular for the resource of energy and oil. Edward W. Said stresses: "But it is worth mentioning that second to Saudi Arabia, Iraq has the largest oil reserves on earth," and that being available to Iraq is a crucial aim of the U.S. strategy. Thus, the concept of security is no longer defined only by the military and political context, even under the present circumstances.

---
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3. CHAPTER III. Research Methodology

3.1. Methodological Triangulation Approach

This thesis uses the methodological triangulation approach, is about using different research methods to complement one another, which is to answer the research questions, and solve the research problem.\textsuperscript{60} This is fairly self-evident. In this thesis, a qualitative strategy is used through in-depth interviews, discourse analysis and empirical research. (See Figure-3-). In the case of this study, and according to Alan Bryman, "confidence in the findings deriving from a study using a qualitative research strategy can be enhanced by using more than one way of measuring a concept."\textsuperscript{61} In this work, the results from all these used methods could be compared to see if similar results are found, since using more than one method in the development of measures, results in greater confidence in the findings.\textsuperscript{62} Besides this study employ a combination of these methods to get valuable facts, resolve disparities and to improve the validity through using data collection and document analysis.\textsuperscript{63} A research method is a technique for collecting data.\textsuperscript{64} Through providing multiple observations and conclusions, then, the combination of these data leads to an enhanced understanding of the context of the phenomena, and the convergence of the data promotes the reliability and utility of the findings. Hence to make compelling inferences, which constitute the research design.

3.1.1 Research Strategy: Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is one of the social research instruments that play a significant role in research writing, and according to Neil and Geraldine, a qualitative methodology is: “An approach to research which involves the collection and analysis of information based on its quality rather than its quantity.”\textsuperscript{65} Thus, qualitative research allows the author to develop a comprehensive understanding of a political phenomenon.

\textsuperscript{60} Donatello Della Porta, & Michael Keating. 2008. P.34.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid. P.46. P.392.
\textsuperscript{63} Donatello Della Porta, & Michael Keating. 2008. P. 282.
\textsuperscript{64} Alan Bryman. 2012. P.635.
3.1.1.1. Interviews

Qualitative methods in the field of political research include in-depth interviews with individuals. (See Figure-3-). In qualitative interviewing, there is much greater interest in the interviewee’s viewpoint and therefore, the author wants rich details in the answers which enables them to put new questions, and leading to a much less structured approach.66 This method is a logical and easy way of collecting credible data and information. Hence, this method would add to the analysis of information and the production of the thesis. Random selection of the interviewees has been avoided to maximize the reliability and validity of the findings. The selection should be carefully justified in order to serve the study purpose because these interviews are considered primary sources for this study and should cover the areas needed but from the perspective of interviewees.67 This thesis is based on a high level and quality of interviews and provides useful information relevant to American’s allegations against the Iraqi regime in 2003, which led to the war. Therefore, the qualitative interviewing would seem well-suited to such a case, since the interview can be directed at the focus and associated research questions and its hypothesis, furthermore to address the research problem.68

67 Ibid. P.471.
68 Ibid. P.496.
The author conducted several valuable personal interviews with nine important persons, those who were in charge of these subjects during Saddam's era in order to design and achieve the goal of the study by formulating interview questions in a way that helps answer the research questions. Three of which worked as experts in the Iraqi weapons program before the 2003 war, one of them was the Ex-Director General of the National Inspection Directorate, who was in charge of all inspection teams of UN before the 2003 invasion. (See Annexs-1-E-F-I-). The other two persons served in the Iraqi Intelligence Agency Service, IIAS, and one of them worked with the intelligence after the invasion of Iraq and under the supervision of the CIA, (See Annex-1-A-). The other one served as a Head of the US Branch Department – Secret Service of Iraqi Intelligence Agency Service before the 2003 war, (See Annex-1-B-). The other two served in the Iraqi Security Directorate- Political Security Department - 5th Branch that was specialized in following up and dealing with parties, organizations and movements using religion as a cover. (See Annex –C-D-). Another interview with Lieutenant General (Staff), a former commander in the Iraqi Ex-Republican Guards. (See Annex-1-G-).

In addition, an interview with an Ex-Iraqi Ambassador in Russia at 2003, who served as well as in a high level elite of the Iraqi political positions at Saddam Hussein’s era. (See Annex-1-H-).

3.1.1.2. Empirical Research Approach

The study will adopt an empirical research approach, which is based on observation and derives knowledge from experience, and is suited for establishing cause-and-effect relationships. (See Figure-3- ). Also, the author has experienced the horrors of three wars in this region, and has conducted previous studies and has over 16 years’ experience in the political field. Donatello Della Porta and Michael Keating stress that "Unfortunately, only a limited number of social phenomena may be investigated via experiments." In order to make the thesis empirically constructive, the theoretical part will be related to the empirical as much as possible, which will also prevent being trapped into never ending theoretical dilemmas. The purpose of theory, in this case, is to serve the empirical part and provide methodological guidance.

The author plans of observation are to update information and data by following up on the traces of this case day by day, i.e. daily presence in wartime Iraq, a war diary, daily following

the news and coverage of the war. Through using several resources, for instance, the internet, daily incentive communications, daily deep media observation, maps, archival or traditional library research and the novels published articles, and books. Indeed, the observations of the times and variables for circumstances were both surprising in the case of Iraq because the events are still rapidly continuing.

The author has had to go through a series of shuttle trips to Egypt, Jordan and Iraq to conduct necessary meetings and interviews with prominent figures including former officials of the Iraqi government, commanders, politicians, elite editors and journalists, businesspeople, activists, Ex-army and intelligence officers and average street people. It was crucial for the research to come out with a bird’s eye vision and a valued understanding of the problem and how Iraqi people view it.

3.1.1.3. Discourse Analysis

The analysis of the political discourse is considered as the most important methodology for finding out where the political compass is heading, since it is a method to show and understand how the international politics work. (See Figure-3- ). According to Hodder and Cameron: “its general critical outlook has encouraged the development of new approaches, in an attempt to answer new research questions, and allay doubts about its method and theoretical grounds.” This method offers a powerful toolbox and the causal mechanism for analyzing political communication. The actors draw on the political discourse to legitimate their actions and positions in the political world. As Alan Bryman puts it: “Discourse is conceived of as a means of conveying meaning.” Therefore, no amount of discourse analysis can offer sufficient evidence of what goes on in politicians’ heads. As John Collins and Ross Glover explain: “Numerous terms and phrases emerge during the war to describe, justify and explain notions action to the people of the nation.” The part that tackles the purposes and motivations of the war is based on statements, discourses, and points of views of famous politicians, those who are involved in this war, as well as Saddam Hussein’s speeches, which make out the material analyzed.

---
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In order to gain a deeper understanding of the working of the discourses, Critical Discourse Analysis CDA will be adopted as well. Since the political reality is made and produced through political discourses, the political interactions cannot be fully understood without references to the political discourses that give them meaning, making it crucial to explore the relations between discourses and political realities.\textsuperscript{76} Thus, CDA, considered a substantial part of this study, tries to focus on relations between ways of talking and manners of thinking, and highlights the traces of cultural and ideological meaning in speeches and written texts, and in the case of the politicians involved in the war decision. Thus, from theoretical viewpoint, CDA make visible the linking between language, ideas and power.\textsuperscript{77} In effect, manipulation of discourses as one of the crucial notions of CDA that requires further theoretical analysis,\textsuperscript{78} will be illustrated in this study.

The benefit gained from using CDA, is knowledge of how specific actors construct an argument in a particular case, and how this debate fits into broad political practices.\textsuperscript{79} From a rhetorical point of view, words are weapons in war, what we hear is what we see. As Alan Bryman puts it: “a discourse is much more than language as such: it is constitutive of the social world that is a focus of interest or concern.”\textsuperscript{80} The operationalization of CDA is focusing on how political discourses are operationalized, transformed into novel methods of acting and interacting by inculcated into these new manners of being in the political world.\textsuperscript{81}

In other words, the different approaches of CDA are able to translate their theoretical claims into methods and instruments of analysis.\textsuperscript{82} Political power is a concept which is central for CDA, as it often analyzes the political language use of those in power, who are responsible for the particular political actions, such as the war decision in our case. Therefore, linguistic manifestations are under examination in CDA to gain insight into the reality behind them.\textsuperscript{83} To put it briefly, discourse analysis gives the researcher the tools to demonstrate and explain these speeches and statements, while CDA allows researcher seeing how these practices of discourse are reproduced and interpreted.

\textsuperscript{76} Alan Bryman. 2012. P.535.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid. P. 254.
\textsuperscript{79} Florian Schneider. 2013.
\textsuperscript{80} Alan Bryman. 2012. P. 528.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid. P.537.
\textsuperscript{83} Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer. 2009. P.8.
Once again, the author stresses the importance that language plays in trying to justify the intervention and waging of the war. Given the importance of this methodological tool in this study, it has been given a separate chapter, which is concerned with demarcating the boundaries of the meanings of political discourse to justify the legitimacy of the 2003 war.

3.1.1.4. Data Collection

Data collection is fundamental and essential to a study of this kind. It has to adhere to the actual sources to collect relevant data and information for the issues of war while taking into consideration the validity and credibility of these resources. In fact, the thesis uses both primary and secondary sources. For instance, the thesis takes into account existing scholarly books, charters and other available declassified official documents about the time before and after the war in Iraq. The materials used in this study are the transcripts of President Bush’s and President Obama’s speeches, and their administration’s members, as well as of the Prime Minister of the UK Tony Blair. The thesis also relies on books analyzing the evolution of the thought itself: how the war idea was conceived. There is a sizable literature discussing the issue of the war, despite the fact that some of these books and sources are somewhat more journalistic than academic, which is something the researcher has to take into account. Accuracy is sought throughout this study through practices of credible academic research.84

3.1.1.5. Analysis, Materials and Documents

Studying documents is considered as a way of gaining access to an underlying reality, which covers a wide range of different types of sources that can be used in qualitative research,85 This work relies on a variety of documents and materials, such as political discourses, statements, official documents, reports, agreements, interrogations etc.... For the investigation into the scientific rationale for defining the war and its purposes and motivations, the one made in Chapter Four, “the RAND Corporation’s”86 report titled Blinders, Blunders, and Wars. (See Annex-3- ). For the material in Chapter Seven on the US policy, official archives of the CIA reports such as the (Released Documents That George W. Bush Used to Sell the Iraq War), were used as a source. In addition, the chapter relies on the document of the (Project for a New American Century), (PNAC) (See Annex-2- ). These official records offered support for the study as per its arguments regarding the main reasons for the war.

84 Alan Bryman. 2001 P.46.
85 Ibid. P.554.
86 RAND is an American nonprofit global policy think-tank originally formed by Douglas Aircraft Company to offer research and analysis to the United States Armed Forces. It is financed by the U.S. government and private endowment.
Certainly, many research institutions such as The United States Energy Information Administration (EIA), Center for Arab Unity Studies (CAUS), Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), James Baker Institute for Public Policy and Council on Foreign Relations and American Research and Development Corporation (RAND), produce war studies and security-related research papers, reports and articles, but these studies are primarily policy-rather than theory-oriented. Therefore, an analysis method for these documents will be adopted. The most important document in this study has gained is a report consists of 511 pages, issued in June 2003 by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence began a formal review of U.S. intelligence into existence of Iraqi's WMD programs and Iraqi's ties to the terrorist group. This report indeed has a valuable information.\footnote{https://fas.org/irp/congress/2004_rpt/ssci_iraq.pdf}

3.2. Grasp of the Phenomenon
Grasping the subject is considered the central objective of the thesis because it helps to explain and analyze the targeting of the subjects. The author considers himself as a part of the phenomenon (The 2003 War), which leads to an easy grasp of this phenomenon. The thesis repeatedly mentions war as a negative effect on the stability of the world as well as something leading to serious consequences, such as the domination of the energy resources and globe control. To understand how war takes place, the thesis takes care to explain what exactly the motivation(s) and purpose(s) were of the 2003 Iraq war. The thesis remains theoretical as the illustrations such as maps and tables will mostly come in the next chapters that will focus on a qualitative data collection.

3.3. Limitations of Study
The limitation is evident from the fact that this case of the 2003 war in Iraq is still novel, and there is no access to most of the US official documents, which reflect the main reasons and purposes of the war, and what is behind the scenes in the preparation of the war and who encouraged the idea of the war and who benefited from this war. These controversial questions will appear in the research process.

As a matter of fact, all studies and research projects have limitations, especially when these kinds of sensitive issues in a novel political realm are related to specific routes of the US policy. Therefore, the research limitations for this thesis are under consideration.
**First**, the secrecy of this subject is an added difficulty. The reason is simple, its novelty. Since the investigating in this hypersensitive case (2003 War) which is still considered a top secret of the US administration, in other words, not all data is accessible as it is classified. Even there is still an official censorship regarding the literary sources of the 2003 war.

**Second**, the geographical area is considered as most dangerous, with most of the Sunni parts occupied by ISIS and the other parts resting with militias. It surely deprives any researcher of accessing the scenes of actions and of any chance of meeting with people out there. In addition, there is a panic that is all contacts in Iraq were under control and monitoring, whether by the Iraqi government or ISIS, for this reason, most people were afraid to speak by phones to conduct the interviews.

### 3.4. Conclusion

A best researcher knows how to use both primary and secondary sources in writing and to integrate them into a cohesive model.\(^{88}\) This study selects the triangulation framework for the purpose of analyzing the materials in an academic way. Using a triangulation method is a way of ensuring the validity of research through the use of a variety of methods, which includes details about interviews, observations, and analysis, to collect data on the same topic to deepen the understanding of the phenomena and maximize the confidence in the findings of qualitative research methods. Indeed, the author deliberately chose this kind of research design to get credible findings in this thesis, despite the fact that this approach requires more sources, as well as it requires more time to analyze the information and data yielded by the different methods.\(^{89}\)

---

\(^{88}\) [https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/owlprint/559/](https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/owlprint/559/)


4.1. Introduction

Through the vision of the international political scene at that time, it was becoming apparent to policy-makers in the US and the UK that the policy efforts of containment was making way for a policy of removing the Iraqi regime.\textsuperscript{90} The President Bush’s instructions to develop a plan for war were given to the Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld on November 2001. This suggests that the decision was taken two years prior to the war. (See Annex-8-). Therefore, and after all these preparations, the Bush administration and Blair Cabinet decided to invade Iraq and remove Saddam Hussain and replace the whole regime. The main instruments of foreign policy available to decision makers are: political, economic, cultural/ideological and military, these elements help them to translate their intentions into actions.\textsuperscript{91} Indeed, finally, they used the military option. In March 2003, several days before the war, President Bush offered Saddam Hussain and his sons a 48-hour ultimatum to leave Iraq. At 19 March the war started, through the heavy bombing of Baghdad, which called “Shock and Awe.”\textsuperscript{92} At 9 April 2003, the U.S. Marine Corps entered Baghdad. Saddam’s statue was toppled, marking the symbolic end of the military operations, and officially declared the occupation of Iraq.\textsuperscript{93} They called this war \textit{Operation Iraqi Freedom}. This war formally ended in August 2010 with President Obama’s declaration that America’s combat mission was over.\textsuperscript{94}

4.2. American Political Stance of the 2003 War

In order to grasp the complex and multidimensional factors contributing to the decision of the 2003 war by the US and the UK, one must go back further and explore post- 9/11 US foreign policy. There were many intelligence reports were asserts that al Qaeda would be unable to organise an attack like 11 September without a state sponsor. Some in the Bush administration felt that Iraq was involved.\textsuperscript{95} Therefore, Bush’s decision-making style was based on his assumptions (or, at least, that was what he deliberately wanted it to look like) that somehow Saddam Hussain and his regime were behind the attack on 11 September, or that they were

\textsuperscript{90} Steve Smith, et. al 2008. P.347.  
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid. P.158.  
\textsuperscript{92} Shock and awe (technically known as rapid dominance) are a military doctrine based on the use of overwhelming power and spectacular displays of force to paralyses the enemy's perception of the battlefield and destroy its will to fight.  
\textsuperscript{93} CAUS. 2007. P.974.  
\textsuperscript{94} Steve Smith, et. al 2012. P.323.  
\textsuperscript{95} David C. Gompert, et. al. 2014. P191.
planning for the next attack on the US. Furthermore, President Bush and his adviser assumed that Iraqi regime possessed WMDs, plus their worries about likelihood that Iraqi regime propensity to share WMD technology with Al-Qaeda. Thus Bush had by then a new strategic mission called (Preventive war) as a President of the US: to prevent another, possibly worse attack. According to Shiping Tang: “Preventive war is primarily driven by a state’s concern about the (real or perceived) impending adverse shift to relative power.”

Obviously, the purpose of the war had been debatable, since there were many hidden agendas in the Bush administration offensive against Iraq. Assumptions about the purpose of the attack have been diverse while the actual motive behind the war remains blurred. Therefore, one must look at the unofficial motives and purposes which were determinants of equal importance. The ulterior motivations of the 2003 war will be discuss in Chapter Six.

4.3. British Political Stance of the 2003 War
The prime minister of the UK, Tony Blair took the decision to go to war without the backing of his cabinet and even the UN Security Council. Thus, the state being deeply divided. However, the United Kingdom has its interests in Iraq and the region as well; it will not forget its past historical colonialism in the region and its vital interests there. Moreover, the UK has its strategic foreign policy with a connection to a particular relationship with the United States. Through his decision to go to war and giving unconditional support to America, Blair tried to influence the course of the US grand strategy and to maintain the special relation between London and Washington DC. This relationship is based on defence cooperations and the sharing of information by their intelligence services, as well as the shared values and connected histories of both states. Just regarding policy formulation, there is a significant degree of confidence in the US and the UK several strategic political issues.

The intention of the principle of multilateralism as a doctrine of the Labour government under the Blair era, which had been the cornerstone of the British foreign policy, was consistently demonstrated. These notions come from a long-standing belief in the internationalist values of this government. Even Blair and his cabinet have a realism tendency, which we can see
when we analyze their discourses and behaviour against the issue of the 2003 war, for example when he emphasized the term pivotal power and connected it to Britain’s capacity: “a country is that the crux of the alliances that shape the world and its future.”

Indeed, he played an active role in foreign policy by putting values and ideas of the new British policy in the world: “When America is fighting for democratic values we fight with her.” He has described these issues as critically essential to British identity and national security.

4.4. Europe and the World and their Stances of the War

President Bush and Tony Blair made their decision of war against Iraq believing that the legitimacy of their actions was the purity of its motives while the legitimacy of the 2003 Iraq war has been viewed as controversial in many debates and analyses. Whereas President Bush was prepared to try UN resolution when he reached an early decision to oust the Iraqi regime, he was not willing to change the main course of the war. In fact, the UK and the US were preparing for the war without the approval of the security council of the UN, the international public opinion was overwhelmingly against the military attack. Moreover, the Security Council was also divided among five permanent members and took a different views. For instance, France threatened that it would veto any resolution of military strike while China and Russia opposed the position taken by both of the United States and the United Kingdom. The speeches of opposition member states of the Security Council, such as China, France, Russia, similarly emphasized that the world remains convinced that the UN inspections should be given more chances and more time to complete their tasks there, since the Iraqi regime does not pose any immediate threat to the peace and international security cooperation and avoiding a war were then the priorities.

Furthermore, the Western alliance of NATO was among the strongest opponents, except for Spain, which supported the United States and the United Kingdom in their decision of waging the war. It was evident, from Spain’s Prime Minister, José Maria Aznar, lined up with both Bush and Blair. Indeed, the war may have caused “the starkest rift in modern history”
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within the western alliance as well as the whole world. Once the US Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld made comments and described opposing countries such as Germany and France as "Problems", even calling them “Old Europe.” These comments were uttered during the preparation for the war and were clearly meant to divide Europe in relation to the war.

Finally, it should be mentioned here that many international figures opposed the war as well, for example the Pope, who said the following in a 2003 speech: "For months the international community was living in great fear, because of the danger of a war that could destabilize the entire Middle East region and aggravate tensions, that will exist unfortunately at the beginning of the third millennium.”

4.5. Iraqi Regime Stance of the 2003 War

According to Realism theory, the fundamental interest of a state in the anarchic system is security. Only if survival is assured can states safely seek other aims, such as tranquillity, power and profit. The first concern of countries is not to maximise power but to maintain their positions in the political system in the globe. Following the realists, the Iraqi regime struggled to prove itself as a central power in the Middle East and the Arab region, particularly after the Iraq-Iran 1980-1988 war. The first objective of Iraq’s foreign policy would then be to remain a dominant power in this region. Raymond Hinnebusch argues: “Small states may be able to adapt to, even temporarily profit from, bandwagoning with the hegemon, but it is they that are potentially most threatened when a hegemonic power undermines the international constraints on the use of power.”

Our analysis can thus assume that the Iraqi regime wanted its state to be the most dominant force in the Middle East. This assumption is affirmed by many studies of the inner political workings and behaviour of this regime, and therefore it is in line with the realist assumption that the hegemon can be treated as a rational actor defending the national interest that it presumably possesses in a stable world order that it dominates. It seems like the Iraqi state’s response was to a large extent determined through the decisions made by a single man,
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in this case Saddam Hussain. In effect, after 11 September events, the American foreign policy has noticeably changed from being soft to being characterized by a hard line, in particular against the Iraqi regime. However, this regime was willing to risk facing a hard-line U.S. Thus, the war occurred.

Regarding the 2003 war, the Iraqi President Saddam Hussain indeed told the coalition states in very clear terms, albeit via back channels, that he had no WMD. For instance, Sir Jeremy Greenstock, the UK's ambassador to the UN in 2003, argues that: “Iraq's representative at the UN told me in September 2002 that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction (WMD) but the UK government was not in a position to ascertain whether this was true.”\(^{116}\) He also allowed inspectors into Iraq who, contrary to the usual rhetoric, were hardly obstructed in their work and opposed the war. In addition, Tariq Aziz, the Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister in 2003, on ABC television: "Everybody in the region and in the world knows Iraq has no connections with al-Qaeda."\(^{117}\) These facts are highlighted also by The Senior Military Command, Ex-Iraqi Ambassador in Russia and four others of the Iraqi Intelligence officers in the interviews conducted within the present thesis. (See Annexes-1-A-B-C-D-G-H-). However, FBI special agents carried out twenty formal interviews and at least five casual conversations with the former Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein, after his capture by the US military forces in December of 2003. In the interrogation, he explained this issue that he was more worried about appearing weak to Iran than concerned about an actual American invasion.\(^{118}\) (See Annex-4-). Therefore, he wants to show Iran the abilities of Iraqi military forces. Furthermore, in this interrogation he acknowledged Iraq had made a mistake in destroying some weapons without UN supervision. This fact is emphasized also by Iraqi weapons experts in the interviews conducted within present study. (See Annex-1-E-F-I-). During this interrogation, he also emphasized to the FBI’s investigators, that the Iraqi government had no connection with Al-Qaeda, and he also denounced Osama bin Laden as a zealot and said he had no dealings with him.

Through the author's experience and observation empirical research approach during the Saddam Hussein era, this analysis is informed by the reality of the Iraqi policy before the 2003 war. Apparently, the response of the Iraqi government was opinionated by the same trending that had been standing off from the West. There was a high hierarchy of authority to
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make decisions. Part of it may have been a natural result of dictation style of “the one and only leader”. The man who had held the country in his iron grip for over 30 years, which contributed to gagging the mouths of wise politicians and leaders, replacing honest administrators and leaders with a set of opportunistic, impotent and failed alternatives. Another was due to the ideology followed for decades since 1968. These facts are in line with the interview conducted within the present study. (See Annex-1-G-).

Finally, One issue arises here that deserve attention, namely the author’s role as analyst and researcher and his personal biases and tendencies towards matters in question. In fact, the author, being a supporter of human rights, has always disapproved of Saddam Hussein’s regime for capturing the power and abusing the democracy of the people and ruling Iraq exclusively based on his personal vision.

4.6. Judging the Declared Motives of the 2003 War

4.6.1 Establishment the Democracy in Iraq

The idea that war would bring democracy to the Middle East was no more than just propaganda, and according to Donald Rumsfeld's statement in an interview over a decade later: “[T]he idea that we could fashion a democracy in Iraq seemed to me unrealistic. I was concerned about it when I first heard those words.” It means never a realistic goal.

(Figure- 4- Declared Motives of the 2003 War, illustrated by the author)
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This time with the more naive expectations that the transition to a “friendly” democratic new government would be quick and easy, and that Iraq would become a secular democratic model that would urge the region and the whole Middle East to transform too.\textsuperscript{120} (See Figure-4-). However, quite unfortunately, the result was counterproductive, thereby triggering massive popular support for radical Islamic terrorism, while the situation in Iraq go from bad to worse, and the mission in Iraq would not be short and easy.\textsuperscript{121} According to Joseph Biden the US Vice President: “It is increasingly clear that President Bush does not have a strategy for victory in Iraq. Rather, he hopes to prevent defeat and pass the problem along to his successor.”\textsuperscript{122} Thus, after the US forces left the country regarding President Obama decision, Iraq has functioned as a failed democracy. In quite a related vein, the power vacuum in Iraq plus the wrong post-war American planning is too thorough, both of them produced the chaos and instability in the country. Hence, the American democracy project in Iraq failed.

4.6.2. Iraqi Regime and Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)

President Bush was simple: “Saddam Hussein is hiding dangerous weapons and is defying the United Nations.”\textsuperscript{123} (See Figure-4-). In addition, the Prim Minsters Tony Blair emphasized many times that Iraqi WMD could be ready to deploy within forty-five minutes of an order to use them.\textsuperscript{124} These important revelations are the latest in a series of multiple works robbing the 2003 war decision of any credibility or legitimate basis.\textsuperscript{125}

In June 2003, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence began a formal review of U.S. intelligence into existence of Iraqi's WMD programs, and Iraqi's ties to the terrorist group. One of its conclusions was:

> The Committee found significant shortcoming in almost every aspect of the Intelligence Community’s human intelligence collection efforts against Iraq's WMD activities, in particular that the Community had no sources collecting against WMD in Iraq......\textsuperscript{126}
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In 2004, the CIA released that the National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) but with many of vital info being redacted, which could explain much about the false credibility of that war decision. In the long run, all evidence on mobile biological labs, uranium ore purchases from Niger, and unmanned-aerial-vehicle delivery systems for WMDs proved to have had been false.\textsuperscript{127}

A report issued by the government-funded think-tank RAND Corporation titled "Blinders, Blunders, and Wars" (See Annex-3-) disclosed too many fallacies in NIE,\textsuperscript{128} that allowed the Congress to pass approval for waging that war although no concrete evidence was given therein.\textsuperscript{129}

In short, the accusations and allegations against Iraqi regime were weak. "Nearly two years after the invasion of Iraq, Charles Duelfer leader of the investigative Iraq Survey Group, reported that the search for weapons of mass destruction had been given up and that no stockpiles of weapons had existed in Iraq when Coalition forces invaded."\textsuperscript{130} (See Annex-7-) All these information above is confirmed in this study, in personal in-depth interviews by the author with three of Iraqi weapons experts and Senior military commander. These interviews which clarified, that are Iraqi regime has no WMD before the 2003 war. (See Annexes-1-E-F-G-I-).

4.6.3. Iraqi Regime and it Links to Al-Qaeda

One of the war reasons, the Iraq has ties to terrorism. The alleged links between the Iraqi regime and these terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaeda have also been questioned, these facts adding more elements to this broad argument of the primary reasons for the war.\textsuperscript{131} (See Figure-4-).

In June 2003, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence began a formal review of U.S. intelligence into existence of Iraqi's ties to the terrorist group. One of its conclusions was:

\begin{quote}
The investigations of the Committee show that the intelligence failures leading up to the war in Iraq were serious and pervasive. So were the failures prior to the September 11
\end{quote}
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attacks. While the investigations will continue, reform must begin. There can be no delay when the safety and security of America and Americans are at stake.\textsuperscript{132}

Apparently, after more than a decade, there is still no concrete evidence that Iraqi regime had a link or any kind of cooperation with this terrorist organization. Despite the fact that US forces arrested and investigated many of the officers in Saddam Hussein’s intelligence service after the occupation of Iraq, they have no found any evidence proving that the Iraqi regime had any kind of link to al-Qaeda. However, they did find information that is Iraqi regime had had a troubled relation with this terrorist group with Iraqi security agency even arresting and imprisoning a number of its members before the war. In sum, Al Qaeda and its ideas were forbidden in Iraq during Saddam Hussain’s regime. The fact is confirmed in this study, in personal interviews by the author with four of Iraqi Intelligence service officers at Saddam Hussein’s era, and with the Iraqi Ex-Ambassador in Russia, these interviews which clarified that there were no verified links between the Iraqi regime and al-Qaeda and that it saw the organization as a threat, not as an ally. (See Annexes-1-A-B-C-D-H). Even these facts emphasized during the interrogation with Saddam Hussain by the FBI after his capture in Dec 2003. (See Annex-4-).

\textbf{4.7. The Legitimacy of the 2003 Iraqi War}

The task of the researcher is, therefore, to analyse both sides of the coin at the same time in this case of the 2003 war. According to RAND report: “In the end, however, there were no such weapons, and Saddam’s links to al-Qaeda were unproven. This robbed the invasion of legitimacy.”\textsuperscript{133} (See Annex -3- ). Consequently, after the end of the war, the US troops and inspection teams found no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.\textsuperscript{134} Sir Jeremy Greenstock, the UK's ambassador to the UN in 2003 has told the official inquiry into the war: “The Iraq war was not “legitimate” because Britain and the US failed to win international support for the 2003 invasion.”\textsuperscript{135} In addition, this war lacking to the democratic backing, both domestically and internationally.

The question is how these allegations were sold out to the British, American public and the world. Therefore, the road to the war raises important and controversial questions about the
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reality of the Iraqi threat at 2003. According to George Tenet:136 “mistakes were made, but instead of mistakes, the evidence points to political pressure forcing the intelligence community to support its preferred policies.”137 While, Henry Kissinger is known to have said once: "What political leaders decide, intelligence services tend to seek to justify."138 The intelligence services are an arm of the machinery of government, then in times of crisis, its activities have always served as a tool of propaganda for their politicians. In this respect, the coalition between the US and the UK and their military attack in 2003 represented a war founded on an erroneous accusation.139 On 11 September 2011 and in an interview with the Aljazeera TV Channel, the former Secretary of the State Collin Powell admitted that the information he provided by his speech in February 2003 to the UN Security Council,140 which led to the invasion of Iraq, is a "blot" on his record. He added141:

I gave that speech on a four days’ notice based on an intelligence estimate that had been done months before and provided to Congress, and every word in that speech was gone over by the director of the Central intelligence Agency (CIA) and his deputy director and all experts.

Moreover, during a visit to Harvard Law School, he took part in the State Program developed jointly by the Program on Negotiation the Future of Diplomacy Project. He said: 142

I regret it. I will always regret it. It was a terrible mistake on all our parts and on the intelligence community … I wish it had been different, I wish I had more time. Maybe if I had another week or two my instincts would have seen through this or been able to do double-checking, but I didn’t have more time. But I’m not looking for an excuse. I gave it believing that everything I had said had been double-sourced, triple-sourced, and was accurate, but it was not.

Hence, all of his claims about weapons of mass destruction turned out to be false in that speech. According to Edward N. Luttwak: “The U.S. is depleting its military strength, diplomatic leverage, and treasure to pursue an unrealistic goal.”143
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Ironically, one of the politicians who had a significant role in waging this war made an important statement regarding the invasion of Iraq with an interview with CNN, “Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair said: he is sorry for ‘mistakes’ made in the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq in 2003.”

Thirteen years after the United States launched its war in Iraq, the secret CIA intelligence reports which were repeatedly cited by the Bush administration as it campaigned for war have finally been made available to the American public. This document states through a close reading of the information and contents, which reflects the lack of consensus of the CIA at the time, as well as an intelligence community at controversy with itself about the nature of the alleged claims of potential threat; according to Gregory Krieg, “This information, apparently never provided to the UN, suggests Iraq did not have any Scud-variant missiles after 1991, resolving a key question for the international community.” This fact is emphasized also by Iraqi weapons experts and elites in the interviews conducted within present study; (See Annex-1-E-F-G-H-I-). It might be seen as supporting the notion that the aim of providing this disinformation was to push and persuade the international community represented by the United Nations Security Council and its members to make the decision to war or, at least, to convince the US and the UK public of the legitimacy of the war.

4.8. Conclusion
Despite the defeat of conventional military Iraqi forces, an insurgency and resistance had continued an intense guerrilla war in the most of the Iraqi cities in the years since President Bush announced military victory with the famous statement: “Mission accomplished.” The war plunged Iraq into chaos, resulting in years of deadly sectarian violence and the rise of the Islamic State (IS). Tens of thousands of Iraqis, more than four thousand American troops and one hundred eighty individuals of British service members were all killed in the lengthy conflict, as well as millions of Iraqi civilian deaths and displacements until this moment. Furthermore, this war has left thousands of wounded and physically challenged individuals on both sides of the conflict.
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Finally, the lesson of the 2003 war is: without legitimacy, the exercise of power alone can only get the policy-makers so far. With the concept of the legitimacy comes international support and assistance as well as a cushion of goodwill, which means that history will not record these negative things and blame the actions.\textsuperscript{148}

5. Chapter Five: The Political Discourse to Justify the Legitimacy of the 2003 Iraq War

5.1. Introduction

One of the primary tools, which used to justify the war, was the political discourses. There were two objectives of official justification for the 2003 war. The first was the threat of weapons of mass destruction WMD. The second was the menace of terrorism as the most serious challenge to the national security of the United States by then, after suffering a series of terrorist attacks on the 11 September. Since this study is concerned with tracing the political discourse, as a political phenomenon, it intends to employ political discourse analysis as one of its research methods. Therefore, this study will offer a possible perspective on a particular instance of the US and UK foreign policy discourses, which implies that this analysis will be to a certain degree subjective. Indeed, it falls broadly under the theory of critical discourse analysis (CDA). Thus, the role of the researcher, in this case, shifts from an objective observer to a subjective interpreter. Therefore, this has significant implications for both the process and the results of this study.

5.2. Definition of Political Discourse

To define the political discourse and language of war one can say that it “is characterized and underpinned by linguistic expressions carefully selected by speakers to achieve certain purposes of intent and have a particular kind of impact on the listener.” Occasionally, politicians use discourses as a means of conveying political agendas that are far from the truth and reality. Hence, the analysis of political discourse helps answer genuine and relevant political questions on a particular issue. This political phenomenon is based on one of the essential purposes for which language is used, such as understanding the political world around us, thus the task of the discourse analysis deals with the relationship between discourse and reality. In order to understand the US foreign policy at that time, then, it is essential to examine the rhetoric of politician’s speeches relating to the 2003 Iraq war. Jim A. Kuyper’s argues that: “In this sense they are actually using rhetoric to try to gain acceptance of their ideas.” This study probes the use of linguistics/rhetoric in the speeches of President Bush and other political leaders such as Tony Blair and Saddam Hussain, before and during
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the 2003 Iraqi war. As we shall see, the effects of the rhetoric of this war were unique and productive.

5.3. Descriptive Analysis of Political Discourses of 2003 War

It is obvious that terms such as Nation, Democracy, Dictator, Peace, Threat and Terrorism have varying meanings for different politicians and in diverse political discourses. These terms can be used by politicians in different contexts to serve different political agendas, so that manipulation of meaning in political discourse can be achieved through the different uses of such terms. The term of international terrorism in political discourses has become the main argument for the security policies of President Bush, Tony Blair and other political leaders, especially when associated with weapons of mass destruction and Al-Qaeda.153 This issue in the listener's mind, this serves to further justify the legitimacy of the 2003 war on Iraq.

Strikingly, in analysing Bush’s discourses on several occasions relevant to the 2003 Iraq war, it becomes evident that he relies heavily on American patriotism, although he focused on using historical and biblical symbols, in order to persuade Americans and reinforce his plan of waging that war. This was also his method for justifying the decision to go to war and for guaranteeing the support of not only Americans and his party and Congress decision-making, but also the rest of the world. He implemented this by repeatedly using words and phrases that referred to God and religious and American historical missions. He would give an excerpt of American history, which is a standard procedure in this kind of speech. For instance, in his speech addressing the nation on 19 March 2003, he used religious words like: “I know the families of our military are praying that all those who serve will return safely and soon.”154 Also, he would always end his speech with this phrase: “May God bless you all and may God continue to bless America.”155

In the same vein, we can see Saddam Hussein using this style of discourse, employing religious rhetoric and symbol, such as the mentioning of some verses of the holy Quran to affect his listeners. This is apparent in a speech given before the war, in March 2003, where he said that: “it is without a doubt that the faithful will be victorious against aggression.”156 Automatically, the audience will assume that what America has planned is to invade Iraq and
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seize its land and wealth. It is equally important to note that Saddam Hussein's discourses included these words to reassure the Iraqi people: “Iraq will be victorious, God willing.”\textsuperscript{157} He even deliberately recites poetry in his speeches, because he knows very well that it has a significant effect that provokes the audience and listeners, since Arabs tended to use poetry to encourage troops to fight the enemies. In fact, he always ends his speeches with these words to evoke certain feelings: “Allah is the supreme, Allah is the highest, long live to Iraq, long live to Iraq,”\textsuperscript{158} to remind the audience that his own purpose is to defend Islam and his homeland under the flag of Islam. In fact, he used the Arabic language, which was an obstacle that challenges American participants in his attempt to win the support of the Arab and Muslim listeners. The considerations above indicate that political discourses are variable in their content and direction, due to the different individuals or groups making out the political communities.

However, President Bush in the following sentence of his speech aims to justify the act of waging the war on Iraq: “This regime has already used (WMD) against Iraq’s neighbours and Iraq’s people.”\textsuperscript{159} It is not surprising that he emphasizes the negative characteristics of the enemy, Saddam Hussein, such as in the following passage that he put in his Press Conference on 20 November 2002: “We did talk about Iraq. There is universal recognition that Saddam Hussein is a threat to world peace.”\textsuperscript{160} It is fairly evident that he tactically employed the use of certain phrases, words, and clauses to come up with the desired addressing structure. Indeed, support for the war effort was the main aim of President Bush’s public address. He built his argument and stated clearly the reasons for the threat that Iraq poses, in order to draw the listener's attention immediately to what is obviously a crucial issue. Tony Blair also said when he delivered an order to British army to attack Iraq: “Their mission: to remove Saddam Hussein from power and disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction,”\textsuperscript{161} he wants to justify the military actions and to show Britain's status to the world as a great regional power.

The rhetoric President Bush used was aimed at creating a suitable climate and preparing the groundwork needed for any military action to be self-evident in this case.\textsuperscript{162} At 13 March 2002 Press Conference President Bush said: “Moreover, so should people who love freedom
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be concerned about Iraq.” It is important to point out here that terms like “security, enemies, justice, threat, democracy, freedom, values, peace and evil” offer suitable examples of how discourse can be utilized to produce consent.

In the name of national security, President Bush exhorts the American people to conduct themselves with the utmost vigilance and to gather efforts to defeat enemies. He uses a dramatic structure and forceful parallel phrases in his speeches to create a sense of urgency, a desire in the listeners to rally behind the US-led coalition to achieve peace and security in the world, as well as to promote justice and democracy through this war. He wants to lead the audience to come to that conclusion on its own.

5.4. Critical Perspective of Political Discourses of 2003 War

Theoretically more attractive, however, is the notion of political discourse as utilized to persuade the listeners and justify specific objectives. According to John Collins: “A politician employing this type of language can justify a variety of different actions with impunity.”

Thus, Bush’s speech on a radio address on 5 October 2002 emphasized security issues, American values, and threat: “American security, the safety of our friends, and the values of our country lead us to confront this gathering threat.” This speech played an important impact in facilitating the linguistic, conceptual and political change articulated through the pre-emption policy regarding the war. In effect, through empathy and fear, President Bush first draws the nation’s attention towards himself and then in a crucial way threatens them and very delicately justifies the inevitability of waging the war on Iraq, indeed the word “evil” was used by the President many times in his speeches because it is powerful and can evoke fear within the audience and spectators. In the same vein, he always uses a dualistic “We”/“them” language in his speeches to construct a vision of reality in which enemies stand in opposition to America and the world. By these words he means, "We" as the peace and "them" as the evil.
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From a critical perspective, President Bush is highly selective in the facts and figures he chooses to state in his speeches. He said: “I made my decision [for war] based upon enough intelligence to tell me that [our] country was threatened with Saddam Hussein in power.”

He uses structure and language as a means to motivate his audience to prove that his cause is fair, and that therefore, God will support him. He creates a vision of “reality” that works well to accomplish his ultimate objective: winning public support. Obviously, President Bush uses these facts as proof of the bad character of Saddam Hussein as well, which is again one argument in the legitimization and support of the war idea. For example he puts emphasis on these words in his speech: "Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator who is addicted to weapons of mass destruction.”

In his address to the United Nation General Assembly in New York on 12 September, 2002 President Bush stated: “This threat hides within many nations, including my own.” One main style coined by George W. Bush was his famous slogan “You are either with us or against us”, forcing the whole world to agree to his campaign against Iraq and Afghanistan, as though any country disapproving of his plan is necessarily a pro-terrorism state and a partner in the 9/11 crimes. His speech arose out of a dual need: to justify US military involvement in Iraq and to win domestic and international public support for military actions. According to his speech, which clearly identifies Iraq regime as a sponsor and supporter of terrorism, and therefore considers the primary target and central front in the War on Terror.

President Bush repeatedly refers to the United Nations and the international community, plus the American Congress, in order to legitimate the war on Iraq and his support for it as valuable for the whole globe, by the following words in his speech: “Members of the Congress of both political parties, and members of the United Nations Security Council, agree that Saddam Hussein is a threat to peace and must disarm.” Through these words he wants to gain two objectives: Firstly, he uses this manoeuvre to emphasize the relevance of the unanimity of Resolution 1441 of the UN, which is now brought to bear in a request for support for action against Iraq. Secondly, this phrase again politically implies sending a message that those who oppose that policy are not working in the best interest of American
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citizens and the whole world. Therefore, the ability to manipulate meaning is considered as a political skill.

Interestingly, the results of the keyword analysis can be interpreted as Bush’s attempt to concentrate on security issues, which he does by using the theme of “Protect America”, and highlighting the collocation “Our Nation” as well as appealing to democracy as “a novel chapter establishing democracy in the region.” The democracy concept can be viewed as an illusion in the case of Iraq because this value should not be forcefully imposed. He even went as far as stating that, “God told me to end the tyranny in Iraq,” in an interview broadcasted by the BBC after the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003.

5.5. Conclusion

We should admit that the speeches of President Bush and Tony Blair in the case of the Iraqi war are an excellent example of the genre of war-rhetoric, theoretically speaking, it is a mechanical application of offensive realism theory. This selection and brief characterization show how they are engaging in political discourse and its well-known constructions and strategies in their discussions of the Iraqi 2003 war. They tried, in their speeches, to paint a picture of half-truths to serve their political agendas regarding the war. Obviously, political discourse brings an alternative narrative to the misinformation provided by the politicians. Thus, in the discourse, America’s war on Iraq legitimised.

Finally, this political analysis of the 2003 war speeches may be a contribution to the study of the political function of rhetoric in the political process of international relations.
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Judging the Ulterior Purposes and Motives.

6.1. Introduction

The invasion of Iraq has been described as a war of oil, power, money and land, which is also seen in the analysis of the US foreign policy, its management of external relations and activities of the US strategy policy.

Ted Galen Carpenter stresses: “The United States did not need to intervene in civil wars in the Balkans in the 1990s, since America had no meaningful strategic or economic interests at stake in those conflicts.”\(^{177}\) It means that America does not engage in any conflict without real reasons for intervention, concerning its strategic vital interests.\(^{178}\) These elements draw upon the studies of diplomacy and war that represented a *Smart Power*, as well as *Realism* is a natural starting point of the US policy while *Security* will also play an important role.\(^{179}\) This issue when viewed through theoretical contexts, hence give reasonable explanations and convincing evidence. There are ulterior purposes and motives of the 2003 war, which provide the basic point of departure of this study, the purpose of this Chapter is to illustrate them. (See Figure-5-).

(Figure-5- The Purposes & Motivations of the 2003 Iraq War, illustrated by the author)
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\(^{178}\) CAUS. 2007. P.1608.

wars, August 26, 2002, stresses thus: "Saddam Hussein wants WMD in order to dominate the entire Middle East, control a major chunk of world oil supplies, threaten America’s friends, and subject the U.S. to nuclear blackmail." These few words put the real reasons of the war on the ground.

6.2. Oil Lust and Monopoly

The body of this study sees the US policy towards oil of the region as a growing problem. According to the US Energy Information Administration. (EIA):” Iraq has the fifth-largest proved crude oil reserves in the world, and it is the second-largest crude oil producer in OPEC” (See Figure-6- ). Oil in the discourse of these analysts is interpreted as a part of America’s ambition, for both political and economic influence through the doctrine of “Oil as a weapon.” According to Joseph. Nye: “Mao Zedong once said that power comes out of the barrel of a gun, but many people today believe that power comes out of a barrel of oil.” The Americans politician simply could not give away the plentiful and very high-quality petroleum they went there for. Mahdi, Ahmed puts it thus: “The relation between Iraqi oil and the US foreign policy was thus more than just a war to seize Iraq’s oil resources. Oil was an end in itself and the means for other ends.” In other words, these were the interests, of the prime tenets of the realism theory.

According to (PNAC), the invasion of Iraq in 2003 and the US military occupation there represented the significant stage of the US strategy in the region. (See Annex-2-). This war was the outgrowth of several decades of strategic thinking and policy making about oil in the region and Iraq. Therefore, oil and war have become increasingly interconnected in the region. Indeed, that relationship has become a seemingly permanent one. As Henner Fürtig has put it: “No other region in the world harbours as much of the single-most important natural resource of modern times—liquid hydrocarbons—as the Middle East does, no other region is situated on the borderlines of three different continents (Africa, Asia, and Europe), and no other region is the cradle of all Abrahamic religions.” The Washington Post reported that even as the Bush transition team prepared to take power in 2001, changing Iraq’s regime
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and seizing its oil were already on the table, at the same time they brought in a group of oil executives to advise them on the new Iraqi oil policy. After the occupation of Iraq, the country depends on the US on security issues. Furthermore, the US military forces were the only power able to keep stability and security in the region. The apparent paradox seems to be realised by the new Iraqi politicians, and they took these issues in their considerations while at the same time favouring close partnerships with the famous American Petroleum firms. If they do not so, they will face a lot of political and security problems.

On May 9, 2016, an interview was held by Arabia TV Channel with the last Saddam regime’s representative in UN. Prf. Mohamed Al Dory. They asked him this question: Thirteen years ago, on the ninth of April of 2003 at the last day of the Iraqi regime, you said, "Game over." When did it start?

In my opinion, the game started since the nationalization of the Iraqi oil. I think that the nationalization of the Iraqi oil at that stage was a very serious decision. It was important to Iraq and significantly affected the international oil companies which were controlled at that time -- and are still in fact by Britain, the United States of America. I think that it was a very hard slap given to those companies. The role of those companies is well known in international politics.

Assuredly, the US policy strategies first and foremost have to serve American interests. Thus, this policy becomes strategically imperative to secure its access to oil-rich countries. But substantial economic development and oil market expansion cannot be gained through money and power politics alone, but through the use of force and going to war, this notion embodied by realism theory perspective. While, from a security theory point of view, there are some arguments, that the capturing of Petroleum and oil fields by establishing director imperial control over oil fields in the region has not been part of the America’ strategic logic for war and conflict. But the main reason is protecting oil, oil producer states, and to ensure the flow of oil to the global market has been. This is a real critical distinction. According to Alan Greenspan again: "The Iraq war is largely about oil." Gen. John Abizaid, former head of U.S. Central Command and Military Operations in Iraq, in 2007 puts it thus: "Of course, it's

---

about oil; we can't really deny that.”

In addition, Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel emphasized the same in 2007: “People say we're not fighting for oil. Of course, we are.”

Furthermore, one of the architects of the war at the Bush administration, U.S. Defence Undersecretary Paul Wolfowitz who is a senior member of the Project for the New American Century (PNAC) (See Annex-2-), when asked at a security summit at 31 May 2003 why the US did not attack North Korea after it admitted to possessing (WMD) weapons of mass destruction, replied without hesitation: “Iraq floats on oil.” Yet, Petroleum was not the only goal of the 2003 Iraq war, but it was certainly the fundamental one. Consequently, and from a realist perspective to enable the US to use oil as power.

(Figure-6- ) “World Oil Reserves”

The real issue is candidly described in a May 2001 report on "National Energy Security", commissioned by the former US Vice-President Dick Cheney, Colin Powell the former Secretary of State and others, these facts published by the Council on Foreign Relations and
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the James Baker Institute for Public Policy. (See Annex-6-). They emphasize that: “Energy security must be a priority of U.S. trade and foreign policy.” The recommendations of this report address the energy challenges facing America. Furthermore, they argue: “On our present course, America 20 years from now will import nearly two of every three barrels of oil – a condition of increased dependency on foreign powers that do not always have America’s interests at heart.” By any estimation, Iraq is swimming in oil, (See Map-1- ) in contrast, by 2020, the US will need to import twice as much fuel per year as it did in 1990. (See Annex-6-).

Here, it could also be interesting to adapt a Security theory perspective, which could help examine the US concerns in the region. Thus, the US policy nowadays is preserving the security not just of Iraq, but of the entire Arab Gulf region and to ensure the flow of Middle Eastern oil, this issue is among the United States’ chief political-economic concerns. America will continue to have a critical interest in keeping the region oil flowing and to increase oil suppliers.195 Security is an integral part of nation interests, which is to be protected at all means. Thus, one of the main reasons to invade Iraq is to take control over Iraq oil, hence to improve security of supplies to the US, and possibly the UK.

Economically speaking, most of Iraq's major known fields are producing or in development yet, though much of its known hydrocarbon resources have not been fully exploited. Now the West have ensured its unhindered access to Iraqi oil and as a result is benefiting greatly from it. Joseph. Nye stresses that: “Oil is the most important raw material in the world, in both economic and political terms, and it is likely to remain a key source of energy well into this century.”196 In fact, industrial powers in the world will continue to rely on oil as the main driver of the economy in the nearest future, meaning that the presence in the Middle East, which has the largest oil reserves is fundamental.197
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The former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan puts it thus: “Before the war, Iraq supplied on average 800,000 barrels of crude oil a day to the US, or about 8.6% of total U.S. crude oil imports, according to the US Energy Department. That made it the sixth-largest supplier to the America, after Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Canada, Venezuela and Nigeria.”199 As we know war and profit have always gone hand in hand. For this reason, the Bush administration planned after the war to establish military bases there, in defense of the country's oil fields and its interest. According to Richard Ned Lebow: “The Pentagon’s occupation plans, based on Rumsfeld’s most optimistic scenario, were designed only to secure the oil ministry and oil fields, and secondarily to search for WMD.”200 This fact is in line with the author’s observation of when the American troops entered Baghdad on 9 April 2003 the date of the invasion of Iraq, and how the US troops had only one: protecting the building of the Ministry of Oil, and leaving other important buildings without any protection, they were prone to looting and destruction.
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6.3. Securing the United States Regional Allies & Friends Commitment

One of the famous statements of Saddam Hussein worrying and scaring Israel is: “Still, I believe that the Arab nation has a right to ask: Thirty-nine missiles? Who will fire the Fortieth?" He perpetually threatened Israel and said that during the 1991 Iraqi war when he gave orders to launch 39 missiles to Israel. (See Annex-1-E-I-). In fact, Israel did not forget this horrible incident; Israelis are affected by fear, terror, and considered Iraq the main threats to its security. Therefore, Israel was encouraged to any efforts that lead to the removal of Saddam Hussain and his regime from the power. The outcomes of the investigations of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence indicated explicitly and implicitly to this issue.: “The Intelligence community relies too heavily on foreign government services and third party reporting, thereby increasing the potential for manipulation of U.S. policy by foreign interests.”

According to John H. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt: "The power factor believed that removing Saddam would improve America's and Israel's strategic position [---] because they were eager to see the US topple on of their main regional adversaries-and the man who had lunched Scud missiles at Israel in 1991." From another angle, however, an interview the author conducted in this present study with an Ex-Iraqi Ambassador in Russia. He explains (See Annex-1-H-).

There had been a meeting for the US Congress envoy headed by Senator Bob Dole with Saddam Husain in spring of 1990 in Hotel Oberoi- Mosul and Tariq Aziz present there. The meeting was about WMD, the position with Israel and the bilateral relations. The envoy demanded that Iraq commits to the following points to establish good relations with USA: One of them was: “To refrain from Palestinian issue except for peace between Palestinians and Israelis, and to refrain from encouraging radical Palestinians.” After that important visit, the representative of the Pope visited Baghdad carrying a message asking Baghdad to recognize Israel as a state and to promote for peace with Israel. The response of President Saddam Husain was sheer refusal and rejection as he considered it an intervention in Iraqi national issues. This response further deepened the idea that Iraq was a straying country.
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This matter is embodied by the discourse analysis of the UK prime minister: “President Bush and I have committed ourselves to peace in the Middle East based on a secure state of Israel and a viable Palestinian state.”\(^{205}\) The security of Israel is linked to the security and stability of the Middle East region, hence to the American and British interests there. Thus, security object justifies the use of extraordinary measures to handle them, through legitimization of the use of force for neutralization of the threat.

Realism theory has a comprehensive approach to explaining the continuation of the state of Israel in the region as the US’s strategic ally, and the continuing American hegemony in the world, which clarifies these political phenomena. As Assistant Secretary of State Andrew Shapiro stresses: “Israel is a vital ally and a cornerstone of our regional security commitments,”\(^ {206}\) Furthermore, Israel is the only state in the region never to oppose the US on key international issues. The strategic co-operation between Israel and America melds into tactical realities since decades, a truly realist assessment in the world today.\(^ {207}\) Johan Hudak\(^ {208}\) puts it:” the United States’ stable allies in the region will play the key and strategic roles in the execution of American foreign policy.”\(^ {209}\) Therefore, the US military presence in Iraq is an insurance policy against any extreme behaviour in the region, especially of close neighbours to Iraq, such as Iran and Saudi Arabia. Therefore, the policy-maker of Israeli security considered invading Iraq one of the vital security issues.\(^ {210}\) This, however, will be an issue for Israel’s future security consideration, which is consistent with its interests. Thus, Israel is considered the most benefited of this war.

The PNAC’s notions, however, suggests a wide-ranging set of motivations other than loyalty to Israel, considering the fact, there was (PNAC) note states that: “Israel's fight is our fight [...] for reasons both moral and strategic, we need to stand with Israel in its fight against terrorism.” (See Annex-2- ). Without a doubt, the US and Israel have historically been close allies. Some scholars are tempted to define the common security for them, and according to Johan Hudak:”The final dominant foreign policy issue in the 2016 campaign involves American support for Israel.[---] Therefore, Israel’s security, autonomy, defence, and interests
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must be a primary part of the nation’s foreign policy”. In theory, the US, sharing none of Israel’s demographic or geographic constraints, while the overwhelming message here was placed on Israel security, even if there were also very public statements on the issue of national interests. Politically speaking, Israel considered a staunch supporter of the US policy doctrine, moreover, it has a particular niche in the US strategic plans, correspondingly Israel backed by America, through continued efforts on many occasions and at several international forums, both words and deeds.

6.4. Maintaining the United States Regional Military Bases

From a Realism theory viewpoint, American politicians struggled to increase the US military power to enhance its influence and hegemony in the world, to fill the vacuum left by the collapse of the Soviet Union. Moreover, to achieve a balance of power around the globe, which remains without any another superpower rival. Politically speaking, two decades after this collapse, US policy-makers still believe that overseas military bases are essential to protecting the national security of the US and maintaining its national interests. Joseph Nye puts it “Maintaining that edge and preventing a peer competitor challenging military primacy have been major objectives of American strategy since the end of the Soviet Union in 1991.” Definitely, international relations are not a static field and conditions are constantly threatened.

The US military forces has bases in 63 countries, and there are 255,065 US military personnel deployed worldwide. According to the database of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), America spends the most on armaments in the world. The total cost of maintaining bases and military personnel overseas reaches, at least, $71.8 billion every year and could easily be in the range of $100-$120 billion. (See Annex-5-). The expenditure after the 2003 war was extremely increased. (See Figure-7-). Therefore, the PNAC letter states that: “to increase defence spending significantly" to "challenge regimes hostile to our interests and values" and "to accept responsibility for America's unique role in preserving and extending an international order friendly to our security, our prosperity, and
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our principles." (See Annex-2- ). Through the view of the US policy-makers, Hard Power represented by military bases remains crucial component, since it helps to structure and manage international relations and world politics.217

(Figure-7- The US Military Expenditure)218

From a security theory viewpoint, one of the primary purposes and motivations of the invasion is to establish the US military bases in this vital region. (See Figures-5-). Thus, the logical order of the America domination strategy refers to:

1- Ensuring the security of its allies and interests there.
2- Imposing and enhancing its foreign policy in the world.
3- The control of the global economy and its financial markets.
4- The taking over of all natural resources, such as oil, natural gas, primary resources and non-renewable sources of energy, moreover to ensure its supplies.219
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Bases should not, of course, be seen directly regarding just military ends, yet, their objectives are to promote the economic, diplomatic and political intents of the American strategy.\footnote{http://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/the-worldwide-network-of-us-military-bases-the-global-deployment-of-us-military-personnel/} As Joseph. Nye concludes about strategy: “Strategy, the skill in combining resources to accomplish goals, is the key of smart military power.”\footnote{Joseph Nye, S. 2011. P.40.} Military resources can produce both soft and hard power, strategies, which combine the two successfully represent smart military power.\footnote{Ibid. P.48.} For instance, coercive diplomacy, which is used to comply or to deter potential enemy.\footnote{Ibid. P.45.} The PNAC report highlighted: “As a supplement to forces stationed abroad under long-term basing arrangements, the United States should seek to establish a network of deployment bases or forward operating bases to increase the reach of current and future forces.” (See Annex-2 ). The United States policy in the Middle East, could rebuild an American-led order with traditional allies. Finally, this area has a pivotal geopolitical impact, one political analyst once said: Who controls Middle East- rule the World.

(Map-2- American Military Bases in the Iraq and the Middle East) \footnote{https://www.google.se/search?q=american military bases in the world.}
6.5. Conclusion

As we have seen, US policy-makers, use many appeals to achieve real national security as a rationale for its drive toward more expansive hegemony in the whole world.\(^{225}\) These factor leads to the notion that the overwhelming superiority of the US will oblige others to accommodate America's needs and desires whether for cheap oil, ensuring the security of its allies especially Israel, more military bases and commitment of its strategic security policy, which achieve its goals to gain more bases in the Middle East, the Arabian peninsula and the whole world. The 2003 Iraq war has significantly advanced the pursuit of U.S. control over Central Asian and the Arab Gulf oil and natural gas supplies through the presence of thousands of U.S. military forces. Thus, from a Realism theory viewpoint, the tasks of the US military bases in the region collected three vital elements in the US foreign policy, power, hegemony and interests.

7. CHAPTER VII: The 2003 Iraq War as an Aspect of the United States Foreign Policy: Theoretical Insights

7.1. Introduction

The most dynamic question of foreign policy would perhaps be: what are the factors that lead to war today, and how can International Relations theories explain them? The task of this Chapter is to analyse and explain the 2003 Iraq war (as an aspect of US foreign policy) from the viewpoint of IR theory. According to Scott Burchill: “[W]hether a good theory, in the sense of a rigorous logic of interaction, is a good theory to apply in any particular case depends not on the theory but contingent facts about the world.” Analyzing the United States policy in the Middle East from a theoretical perspective is both challenging and contradictory. It is challenging because there is a wide variety of theories one could apply, and it is contradictory because one theory might exclude or supplement the other one. A quick look backward, therefore, might shed some light on the deepest meaning of Bush’s approach. Since we are discussing US foreign policy, let us take the Iraqi case. It is becoming increasingly clear that President Bush did not act on pure idealism in this war, and in this sense his promotion of democracy was selective, or one might say differently applied to diverse regimes and regions in the world, not to mention the fact that his doctrine was too narrow to appeal to modern-day idealists. In addition, his doctrine of national interest seems to determine which time and place America will promote democracy and thus we should try to understand these elements of the Bush doctrine in particular. The study has also focused on the theories that gave compelling answers to its research questions.
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Theoretically speaking, Iraqi throws into considerable doubt the reliability of realism master key to international relations, namely the balance of power, in both the region and the world. Therefore, the job of the analyst, not the theorist, is to determine where a particular theoretical logic applies in the political world. As Jack Donnelly formulates it: “Realism simply cannot even begin to explain the vast majority of what happens in international relations.”228 It is impossible to analyze such issue without engaging with theories found in the foreign policy-literature, hence this analysis provides the key context for understanding the actions of the US foreign policy.229 Therefore, the study has applied other theories of IR to tackle the issues of the 2003 war, as well as to provide frameworks for asking and answering core research questions of the thesis. (See figure -8-).

7.2. The 2003 Iraq War as an Aspect of the United States Foreign Policy: Offensive Realism Insights

Offensive Realism considers as a Hard realist version. Following Robert Jackson: “Offensive theory: A theory developed by John Mearsheimer, and according to this theory: Great powers, are perpetually seeking ways to gain power over their rivals, towards the ultimate goal of hegemony.” Realists can obviously draw diverse policy prescriptions from theory, and John Mearsheimer writes: “The United States is the most powerful state in the world, and it usually gets its way on issues it judges important.”

A question has been raised about the association between great power and hegemony to achieve the ultimate goal of their interests. As Rainer Bauböck puts it, “Power is a primarily tool for the satisfaction of preference, and political action can be understood as a means towards that end.” There were three conceptions in the context of the US foreign policy and its behavior during the preparing for the 2003 war: power, hegemony and interests. They merged with each other to be the general trend of the US foreign policy, as a Hard version of Realism. Thus, they represented the perception of offensive realism.

(Figure-9- (Offensive and Prudent) Realism and the United States Foreign Policy, illustrated by the author)

Realists argue that the application of the Offensive approach of states is assessed across several dimensions- Limited of military actions, economic blockade, geopolitical ring and

---


preventive and pre-emptive war. (See figure-9- ). Here we can make assumptions regarding the nature of the US interests which served as a roadmap and study empirical findings and interpret them in the region and Iraq. According to Tang, “For offensive realism, states are inherently aggressive, either by nature or because of anarchy, [...] a state will be aggressive when it possesses the capability to be aggressive.” In this sense, some theorists argue that: power and interests are important factors in the explanation of the hegemony of power, but hegemony is the only great power in its system. Consequently, if a region contains more than one great power, then there is no hegemony. As Scott Burchill puts it, “These kinds of political games claimed by realism are zero-sum, meaning that gains of one state are the ultimate result of the losses of the other state.” Therefore, states interests’ are considered the most vital issue in this context. Drew Dennis, stresses that: “In the international realm, states prefer to maintain maximum control over their vital interests, up to and including the use of organized armed force to protect or promote their interests.” For these reasons, there are several pathetic commentaries that have framed the invasion of Iraq as a war of necessity rather than of choice. One example of this when Donald Rumsfeld, was questioned before the war as to whether the UK would participate in the war, upon which he replied that the US would do it alone. In addition, Mr. Feith argues: “As a participant in the confidential, top-level administration meetings about Iraq, it was evident to me at the time that, had there been a realistic alternative to war to counter the threat from Saddam, Mr. Bush would have chosen it.” Indeed, these words symbolize this matter, since, as John Mearsheimer has stressed, that is American foreign policy has usually been guided and conducted by realist logic. Thus, foreign policy should be practical rather than ideological.

Generally speaking, and as we have seen, Offensive Realism offers profound insights into the US strategy plan in the region and particularly in Iraq during Bush’s administration era as a Hard version of Realism. Therefore, some of the scholars argue that Realism can be considered as a comprehensive theoretical perspective of international relations, and is
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extremely representative of the US policy in the globe.\textsuperscript{241} The visible evidence, which proves the trends of the US foreign policy to Offensive Realism is PNAC.


This document lays out a plan for a future policy of the United States in the next century. In point of fact, of the 25 people who signed this document (PNAC), ten of them went on to serve in the administration of U.S. President George W. Bush. Indeed, the word Iraq is mentioned twenty-five times in ninety pages in this report. It argues, for example, that:

The United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein. … We cannot allow North Korea, Iran, Iraq or similar states to undermine American leadership, intimidate American allies or threaten the American homeland itself. (See Annex-2-).

This document discovered that President Bush and his administration were planning a premeditated attack on Iraq to secure 'regime change', they suggested the removal of Saddam Hussein's regime from power and the use of force, if necessary, to remove him.\textsuperscript{243} This document explicitly revealed how the future of the US foreign policy will be, in fact this document signed before G.W Bush took office in January 2001, and even before the terrorist attacks of 11 September.\textsuperscript{244} (See Annex-2-).

This demonstrates the desire to increase the United States grip and policy of domination over the Middle East region as part of this hemisphere, much of which has been in revolt against United States control. One might tentatively conclude that a new face was needed for America’s ambitions. This new image was necessary in order to close the international and domestic credibility gap created by the Bush era and his policy. This is the role of president Obama and further US administrations, to remedy the situation of the US foreign policy to be more prudent.

\textsuperscript{241} Scott Burchill, et.al. 2013. P. 53.
\textsuperscript{242} http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NAC304A.html.
\textsuperscript{243} http://cryptome.org/rad.htm
\textsuperscript{244} http://www.peace.ca/bushdoctrine.htm
7.3. The 2003 Iraq War as an Aspect of the United States Foreign Policy: Prudent Realism Insights

Prudent Realism considers as a Soft realist version, as well as a rational foreign policy to be good foreign policy; for only a rational foreign policy maximizes benefits and minimizes risks, thus complies both with the moral basis of prudence and the political demands of success.\footnote{Hans J. Morgenthau: \url{https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/morg6.htm}} Realists argue that the application of the Prudent approach of states is assessed across several dimensions – diplomacy, moral and financial support, negotiation and ideology. (See figure-9-).

President Obama came into American office promising to turn the page on a chapter in US history defined by two wars in the region; his new policy is to avoid his predecessor’s mistakes regarding the use of US force abroad. As Paul puts it: “Prudential realism, thus acknowledges the mutual elements of security and explains attempts by countries to avoid generating intense security dilemmas.”\footnote{T.V. Paul. 2000. P.5.} As we have seen here, Obama’s 2009 speech in Cairo made public the claim that the US would try to help the region shift to the new Arab state system, but from an analytical discourse viewpoint, he never backed his statement up with an actual policy, let alone resources.\footnote{Kenneth M. Pollack. 2016. Fight or flight: America’s choice in the Middle East. BROOKINGS.} This might be seen as indicating, at the very least, that the Obama administration proved that it has a Prudential view of international politics to address a lot of political dilemmas, perhaps more than the Bush administration. The most prudent course is for the US to steel themselves against the costs and step up to stabilize the Middle East.

I also believe that events in Iraq have reminded America of the need to use diplomacy and build international consensus to resolve our problems whenever possible. […] Today, America has a dual responsibility: to help Iraq forge a better future -- and to leave Iraq to Iraqis. And I have made it clear to the Iraqi people that we pursue no bases, and no claim on their territory or resources. Iraq’s sovereignty is its own. Moreover, that’s why I ordered the removal of our combat brigades by next August.\footnote{Obama's speech in 2009 Cairo. \url{https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-cairo-university-6-04-09}.}

In view of this aim, the Obama administration took a great decision to withdraw US troops from Iraq in 2010. President Obama argues: “As Commander-in-Chief, I will not allow the United States dragged into fighting another war in Iraq.”\footnote{This question embodied in the}
Iraqi case as a new doctrine in the US foreign policy. The result is the end of the military operations there. Furthermore, a prudential and strategic policy approach to the employment of the US military force in the globe. Hans. J. Morgenthau. Stresses: “Realism, then, considers prudence—the weighing of the consequences of alternative political actions—to be the supreme virtue in politics.” For these reasons, the thesis gives President Obama rationale and prudential marks for carefulness and strategic thinking in the US foreign policy in the Iraqi case. The American with an enlightened foreign policy in the Obama administration, and fundamental change in the norms that underpin great-power politics, are what characterize America now. There is no doubt that Obama’s action fundamentally transformed the US foreign policy.

It was President Obama who championed diplomacy and multilateralism, advocated withdrawing troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, and criticized Bush's counterterrorism tactics. Ironically, however, as we have observed in the Obama doctrine the president's determination to avoid the mistakes of the past. Has resulted in decisions which show his belief as an advocate of offensive realism. Example of such decisions are conducting an escalating war against an unknown terrorist enemy Islamic States in Iraq and Syria, through the American-led coalition against ISIS, with no geographic boundaries, contrary to his promise to the American people, the secret operation in Pakistan to kill Bin Laden, an American-led NATO coalition to defeat Al Gaddafi in Libya, and so on. It was the same observations apply to the concept of power. These strategic mistakes during his two administrations period indicate that there are no clear military or distinct objectives.

7.4. The 2003 Iraq War as an Aspect of the United States Foreign Policy: Security Insights

The security framework is rooted in a long tradition of analysing the causes of war based on the features of the political strategic environment. John Mearsheimer emphasizes: “Security competition is endemic to daily life in the international system, but war is not.” One might tentatively conclude that Realism and Security theories offer profound insights into the US strategy design in the region. From a Security theory perspective, in conjunction with other events listed in the 2002 National Intelligence Estimate, further proof is provided suggestion that President Bush, his aides, and military council purposefully mischaracterized and

exaggerated the dangers posed by the Iraqi regime to stoke fear about a WMD attack on the United States and its allies. They used the concept of security to pass a war decision, by creating a state of fear and threat. Based on this rationale and depending on these security assumptions, they launched a preventive war.

One of the main reasons for this war is the US economic potential inability to fill the requirements of domination, this fact an additional concept genuinely interacted with this question, is what drives America to engage in this war. As well as, the new millennium, in conditions of a heightened global demand for natural resources such as oil, this situation forced the US policy-makers to find new strategic resources for these kinds of energy which are considered the nerve of the political-economic life of the US to ensure its energy for the future. Therefore, they consider this issue as a matter of national security; that is the crux of the great powers and their foreign policy. (See Annex-6-).

States will compete for access to the resources and control over it to ensure their future energy, which means that the principle of the security for both suppliers and buyers of energy is to maintain stability and safety between exporting and importing countries. Those states that hold natural resources become more susceptible to greed by another powerful state whether the latter is within the region or somewhere else in the world. Therefore, Iraq is becoming more insecure and threatened, as well as more easily fallible under the so-called “resource wars” or “resource curse,” is part of the global powers struggle to secure their energy resources.

Discourse analysis can reveal the errand of President Bush’s speech in front of Congress on October 17, 2000, in which he said: “Too much of our energy comes from the Middle East […] Our country needs greater energy independence. This issue is a matter of national security.” The observer saw that President Bush emphasized national safety linked the case with energy resources. The reason for this that energy resources are crucial for the American ability to dominate the globe in the future. This significant matter is considered at a high level in the daily political process and the US foreign policy. Therefore, the Bush administration
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struggled to create a healthy climate to persuade the people to make the decision in favor of a military action to achieve this end, in other words, to secure supplying energy resources to America, whether now or in the future. These facts were emphasized by the US National Energy Report as well. (See Annexes-6-).

No-one can predict the future security situation in the region; John Mearsheimer puts it thus: “We do not have theories that can anticipate economic and political developments with high confidence.” It is nevertheless important to attempt to analyze the future of the US forces in the region, especially considering the claim that only the presence of a potential hegemony can keep the American forces engaged in the Middle East. The US is rethinking the establishment new military bases in the region, especially in Iraq, for two purposes: one is to maintain its interests and the other is to ensure the security of its allies. In fact, the US embarked on the implementation of these plans in the region before the 2003 Iraq war. There was the following excerpt from an important Pentagon planning document to that desirable goal:”..... our strategy must now refocus on precluding the emergence of any potential future global competitor.” This means that the US foreign policy cannot give up on the concepts of realism and security in its strategic political conduct in this vital region of the globe.

According to excerpts from Pentagon's Plan: "This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power." The ongoing upheaval in Iraq and neighboring countries thus means new challenges for the presence of America in this region.

7.5. The 2003 Iraq War as an Aspect of the United States Foreign Policy: Smart Power Insights

One might argue that the doctrine of Smart Power first was coined in the 2003 war as a term that highlights the need for combining both Soft and Hard Powers. This has been concretely useful in dealing with current situations of relevance to the US administration on an international relations scale based on the innovated perception that the mere Soft Power
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tactics stand short of allowing the United States to resolve its issues with foreign conflicts and rising threats (mainly concerning terrorism and Islamic world issues). Coercion, payment, and attraction are the three available ways of applying power to affect the conducts of other states in the direction most desirable to the US. The effects of Smart Power range from eliciting anger, contradiction and fear with every serious conflict or dilemma to inspiring optimism and hope in an era characterized by decline in the influence, attraction and power of the USA around the world. According to CIA report: “There is no magic formula to solve the problems of Iraq. However, some actions can be taken to improve the situation and protect American interests.”

To go with Smart power, the USA needs to associate both its military might and economics with soft power investing to face global conflicts and engagements. The first two approaches form what is known as “Hard Power” while the third “Attraction” is about “Soft Power.” It is evident that the United States prefers a soft power approach when dealing with the Islamic world, since hard power can bring too much havoc and turbulence to the region. Smart Power includes any attractions that can align other states in conformity with US choices based on “Carrots” rather than “Sticks”. In reality, the foreign policy of the Bush administration neglected America’s Soft Power. This is evident, since as Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld asked about soft power in 2003 before the war, he replied: *I do not know what it means.* Therefore, their administration paid a high price for that ignorance of this kind of the prudential foreign policy, which led to miscalculation.

Considering the perspective of *Smart Power* as revealed by President Obama from his statement in August 2014, the following example is illustrative:

> So let me close by assuring you that there is no decision that I take more seriously than the use of military force. Over the last several years, we have brought the vast majority of our troop home from Iraq and Afghanistan. Moreover, I’ve been careful to resist calls to turn time and again to our military because America has other tools in our arsenal than our military. We can also lead with the power of our diplomacy, our economy, and our ideals.

Through political discourse analysis, it is evident, here that President Obama’s administration wields this concept as recommended by Obama’s political consultants and advisories, and

---

enduring this commitment to uphold this novel notion of running the new US policy. It is a hallmark of the new American leadership.

7.6. Conclusion

The US employed its military power in what some deemed an imperial fashion in large part because it could. Thus, the Americans realists expect that it will eventually use that power to expand its sphere of domination, whether for security, interests, or other motives. Although democratic governments or autocracy, monarchy, and dictatorship remain the region’s norm, this pattern will not affect the relations with the US on the whole. Quoting Henry Kissinger once again, “America has no permanent friends or enemies, only interests,”268 which means that America will follow its interest regardless of any consideration. In other words, the US does not care if Iraq and the region are divided or not, or whether there are autocracy and dictatorship regimes in the area, but the most critical issues are the maintaining of the ordinary American interests there. In parallel, America is committed to protecting and supporting its allies in the Middle East. Today’s political world is governed by strategical interests under Presidency of both parties democratic and republic, the US has asserted a responsibility in the Middle East, and this conduct reflects the nature of its foreign policy.

---

8. CHAPTER VIII: Conclusions

On the basis of the findings, it can be argued that the new US policy regarding the 2003 war can be drawn and summed up in the form of these theses:

In political science within international relations, a regional power means a state that has a power within a geographic region.\textsuperscript{269} From the realism theory perspective, these countries struggle to exert their authority and influence within an area to possess regional hegemony, as well as to maintain their military, economic or political interests. In other words, these regional powers seek to establish spheres of influence across the state to preserve their interests. Thus, these powers can exercise hegemonic influence in the region and considerable influence on a global scale as well.\textsuperscript{270} Consequently, the war created a new regional order, which led to shifts in the regional balance of power and international re-alignments. It also offered some valuable lessons to regional and external powers about the perils of intervention. The war created new sectarian divides; Iran has been empowered by the demise of its old rival Saddam Hussein; new 'pivotal' states like Saudi Arabia and Turkey have emerged; the new US foreign policy has had to review their policy prescriptions and assumptions of regional predominance.

In the same vein but from a smart power perspective, in the modern world, a nation does not become dominant through occupation; instead, today's powers are defined by the strength and competence of their economies, as well as their whole formations of military forces and the possession of strategic nuclear weapons. The international circumstances of the Middle East are changing rapidly after the war in Iraq. It has urged the region's three major powers neighboring Iraq to rethink of their interests, international relationships, and regional strategies, thus, to rearrange their cards accordingly.

As far as Iraq is concerned, the withdrawal of the US army from Iraq allowed Smart Power to be applied to a new era in the International relations. According to Ivo H. Daalder, a “country must have a general game plan, but it also must remain flexible in the face of events.”\textsuperscript{271} Thus, America, if it continues on the flexible and practical track that the Obama administration policy has set out, could see new opportunities and prospects to secure its
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interests in the region and the world, without the over-commitment of military force and use of power that has characterized the US policy since 9/11.

The 2003 Iraq War should prompt a behavioural revolution in the searching of the causes of war in general, and in international-relations theories in particular. Apparently, the lessons that President Obama learned from the mistakes of his predecessors were woefully incomplete. The Obama doctrine is similar to the Bush doctrine but not in the case of Iraq, which is now at a crossroads, that reflects the actual picture of the US foreign policy.

Without a doubt, the political discourses for those involved in this war constituted valuable political actions and they put significant contributions to advancing the future of the political discourses in international relations, despite the lack of credibility and validity. These discourses reflect the conflict between secrecy, a necessary condition for the policy, and openness, a necessary condition for performance improvement for the foreign policy, especially, in the crucial issues.

The selfish behavior associated with realism, is considered the primary theoretical approach in the US policy. This might be seen as supporting the notion that there is a mutual interest between US politicians and those who have economic interests (corporations and figures of power). There are indications that they support each other to achieve their own interests, for instance “in late October 2003, a report by the Centre for Public Integrity (CPI) said that many of the US firms which won Iraqi reconstruction contracts were major donors to George W. Bush's political campaigns, especially the year 2000 campaign.” On one hand, the only American owners of oil interests and the owners of the US weapons factories, who benefit from the 2003 Iraq war, are the elite wealthy oil people who financed Bush's election campaigns twice. Naomi Klein argues: “there was a lack of competition on awarding contracts in Iraq after the war and this has been one of the distinguishing features of the Bush administration.” All these results of the behavior of Bush administration appear to offer a strong confirmation of offensive realism.
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The US foreign policy continues to look to PNAC as a strategic political plan. However, what strategy plan is the most likely to achieve its ends at acceptable costs is a question open to fresh debate by American politicians to date. Accordingly, and as observed by the author, this issue dominates the discussions and debates of the US presidential candidates these days. In addition, the vast majority of the voting public who were involved in the American presidential race see the 2003 Iraq War as a mistaken case. As a consequence, the next American president is going to face a choice in Iraq: to do much more to secure and stabilize it, or to disengage and leave it in chaos and partitions. Grasping the real objectives that the US is seeking in the region and Iraq requires a deeply honest understanding of what is going on there. However, the US should take an option of its plans in the region; it would be better than muddling through.

Finally, this war should never have been embarked upon until the alternatives had been exhausted. In other words, when the means of diplomacy get exhausted, the voices of war rise. On this account, any action in war is impermissible without a legitimate reason. Thus, it should take a war resolution through the international consensus via the UN Security Council, respecting its international prestige.

Word count included Footnotes (without counting Cover, Table of Contents, Declaration, Acknowledgments, List of Acronyms and Abbreviations, Abstract, Bibliography and Annex): 24996 words.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

- Bremerton Meriam and Hurting William, Lessons from Iraq, to avoid the coming war,
- Carpenter Ted Galen. Smart Power Toward a Prudent Foreign Policy of America. The Cato Institute. 2008
- Edward W. Said, *From Oslo to Iraq and The Roadmap*, Great Britain by Clays Ltd.2004


E-Book
- International Relations Theory and a changing the Middle East, George Washington University. 2015. The book is available on:
  (Accessed 10 May 2016).

  The book is available on
  http://ir.rochelleterman.com/sites/default/files/glaser%20review%20of%20measheimer.pdf
  (Accessed 1 Feb 2016).


-The Geopolitics of the United States, 2015. The book is available on
**Articles:** There are numbers of scholarly articles both in English and in Arabic which will be collected for the thesis, which reflects common or specific official attitudes towards this case.


- Deruis Mehdi, Plan for Redrawing the Middle East, The Project for a ""New Middle East”", Global Research. November 18, 2006. URL available on: http://www.globalresearch.ca/plans-


Reports: There are several reports published and they will be included in the research process to get an objective view on the issue analyzed, e.g. of these reports are:


- Rising to the humanitarian challenge in Iraq, Briefing Paper, July 2007, OXFAM International. URL available at:


**Speeches**


- Tony Blair's speech during he gave an order to British army to attack Iraq. This is the full transcript of Tony Blair's address to the nation, given on Thursday evening as British forces went into action in Iraq. URL available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/2870581.stm. (Accessed 1 Feb 2016).


**Interviews conducted by other persons than SAT**


- John Kasich interviewed by CNN’s Dana Bash. In an interview with on "State of the Union". The presidential candidate for the US elections for the Republican Party,

- Joe Biden interviewed by Larry King in 2010 with the CNN host. The Vice President.


- Paul Bremer interviewed by Evan McCurry | 7:54 am, June 16th, 2014. MSNBC.


- Prince Saud al-Faisal interviewed by the BBC. Saudi Arabia has warned the United States against a possible war against Iraq in an exclusive interview with Saudi Foreign Minister. The full interview can be seen on BBC World from Wednesday and on Simpson's World on BBC News 24 this weekend (1130 GMT on Saturday, 0230 GMT on Sunday, 1430 GMT on Sunday, and 0030 GMT on Monday).


-In an interview of Arabia TV Channel with the last Saddam regime’s representative in UN. Prf. Mohamed Al Dory. URL available at:


**Personal Interviews Conducted by the Author**

The objective behind these interviews are to include them as primary sources within the study conducted by Salwan Al-Taie for his Master’s thesis at Linköping University.

-1- Personal Interview number one with Mr. **Salem Al Jumaili**. A voice chat interview on 5/4/2016 arranged with Mr. Salim Al Jumaili, head of US branch department – Secret Service of Iraqi Intelligence Agency before 2003 war. (See Annex-1- A-).

2-Personal Interview Number Two with **Mr. Dhafir Hameed**. 
A voice chat interview on the 7th of April, 2016, with Mr. Dhafir Hameed, an ex-officer in Iraqi Intelligence Agency who served both before and after 2003 until 2006 when he was targeted by assassins and was seriously wounded. He had to quit the Iraqi scene and seek a
safe haven in Egypt along with his family. Before the 2003 war he served in (Syria’s Department), a branch of (Hostile Activities) directorate. Next to the 2003 war, he joined the new formation of Iraqi Intelligence that was coordinated by US Army. He was supervised by an American Intelligence officer called “George”. His position was a head of Jordan’s department followed by Gulf Countries department. (See Annex-1- B-).

3- A voice chat interview on 12/4/2016 arranged with Ex-Colonel Alla Al Zaidi. This interview with one of the managers at the Iraqi Political Security Directorate, the Colonel Alla Al-Zaidi, which was part of the crew of the Fifth Division in the Directorate of the Iraqi Political Security, he served in this Division which its task is monitoring and anti the activities of militant religious parties such as al Qaeda and other terrorist groups before 2003 war. (See Annex-1-C-).

4- An interview conducted in 20th of April 2016 with Ex-Colonel Khalid Abed Nassir who spent his entire service years in Iraqi Security Directorate- Political Security Department - 5th Branch that was specialized in follow up and dealing with parties, Organizations and movements using religion as a cover. He served up till 2003. (See Annex-1-D-).

5- An interview conducted on 15th of April, 2016 with (Kamal Almaadheedi), Deputy of the General Manager of the Iraqi National Monitoring and Scrutiny Department prior to 2003 war. This directorate was in charge of implementing Security Council resolutions aiming at dismantling all (WMD) programs facilities and stocks. (See Annex-1-E-).

6- An interview conducted on the 27th of April, 2016 with Dr. (anonymous) who served as an engineer in Military Manufacturing Ministry years before the 2003 war. (See Annex-1-F-).

7- An interview conducted on the 5th of May, 2016 with Lieutenant General (Staff) Ra’ad Alhamdani, a former commander in the Iraqi Ex-Republican Guards for as late in this position as March 2003 marking the occupation of Iraq. He is currently residing in HKJ. (See Annex-1-G-).

8- An interview conducted with Dr. Muzhir Al Dory, on April 2016, an ex-Iraqi Ambassador in Russia and who is currently residing in Cairo-Egypt. (See Annex-1-H-).
9- An interview conducted on the 8th of May with (The General Hussam Mohammad Amin), an ex-director general of the National Inspection Directorate, who was in charge of all inspection teams of UN before the 2003 invasion. (See Annex-1-I-).

Internet /Websites: Sources and Research Centres, Projects and Online Documentation:

Internet resources are extremely useful and provide the attitudes and opinion polls data, as well as tendencies and information about the US policy tracks in the region and Iraq.


- 12- The BLACK VAULT is the largest online freedom of information Act\Government record cleaning house in the world. The research efforts the declassification of thousands of documents throughout the United States government.


Moseley Alexander. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. UK.


Hiroshima and Nagasaki: Lessons learned?

What is Primary Research and How do I get Started?


Works Paper


URL available on:


ANNEXES

(ANNEX-1-A-B-C-D-E-F-J-H-I-). Personal Interviews, these interviews conducted within the present Thesis by the author).

ANNEX-2- Project for a New American Century (PNAC).


ANNEX-4- Interrogation. FBI special agents carried out 20 formal interviews and at least 5 "casual conversations" with former Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein after his capture by U.S. troops in December 2003, according to secret FBI reports released as the result of Freedom of Information Act requests by the National Security Archive and posted today on the Web at www.nsarchive.org.

ANNEX-5- SIPRI- Military Expenditure Database.

ANNEX-6- The United States National Energy Policy. Dick Cheney.


ANNEX-8- Document of preperaing to the War. 2001.