

Realism and Morality
The U.S Foreign Policy in Iraq

Vivian Kanj

Lebanese American University

LEBANESE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
Division of Social Sciences and Education

Graduate Studies / Thesis approval Form

Student Name : Viviane Kanj

I.D.#: 863933

Thesis Title : Realism and Morality : The US Foreign Policy in Iraq

Approved by:

Advisor :

Chairperson of Supervisory Committee

Member :

Member :

Member :

**Program Authorized
To Offer Degree**

MA in International Affairs

Date

21 June 2004

RE
413
c.1

**Realism and Morality:
The U.S. Foreign Policy in Iraq**
Vivian Kanj
Lebanese American University

Dr. Walid Moubarak
International Affairs
MA Thesis
June, 2004

DEDICATION

*To my Parents, Sisters,
My loving Husband Elia and mostly
To my Son Robert*

With all my love

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I sincerely thank every person who assisted in the accomplishment of this work. I am greatly thankful to Dr. Walid Moubarak for his guidance and constant support and encouragement. I specially thank Dr. George Nasr for his kind assistance and motivation. I also thank Dr. Latif Abul Husn for his perception and critique and for giving us the opportunity to visit the UN headquarters in Nakoura.

Special thanks to the Lebanese American University for granting me a degree I am very proud to have. I also thank the Library staff for their assistance, and the Registrar team for always being supportive and welcoming.

Thanks to my dear friends and partners in study and in graduation, Rita Rizk and Julie Raad for their friendship. We surely were a good team!

I Specially thank Mrs. Saada Rizk for typing my paper, and for her constant motivation and sincere care. And I cannot but mention my students for keeping me surrounded with their enthusiastic spirit.

Finally, my deepest thanks goes to my loving parents, Robert and Aida Kanj and my dearest sisters: Vania, Mireille, and Claire for their love and for all the good times. Last but not least, I thank my husband, partner and friend Elia and my son Robert for being my strength, will and inspiration.

Outline

Chapter I: Realism versus Morality

A. Introduction

1. U.S unilateral power
2. U.S foreign policy dilemma
3. September 11 outcomes
4. Realism and Morality: universal forces

B. Realism

1. Definition
2. Realist philosophy
 - a. Thrasymachus
 - b. Thucydides
 - c. Machiavelli
 - d. Realism of state
 - e. Thomas Hobbes
 - f. E.H.Carr
 - g. Hans J. Morgenthau

C. Idealism

1. Definition
2. Idealist philosophy
 - a. Plato
 - b. Immanuel Kant
 - c. Perpetual peace
 - d. Harmony of interests

D. Moral relativism

1. Moral values socially constructed
2. Lack of universal ethical rules
3. Morality lies in the eyes of the beholder
4. Morality: A diverse judgment
5. Freidrich Nietzche's equation
6. Kant's universal law
7. John Stuart Mill: Greatest Happiness Principle
8. Aristotle's natural moral virtues
9. Democracy a new trend

Chapter II: Historical review of U.S foreign policy

- A. Introduction
- B. The American Constitution
 - 1. Democracy
 - 2. Federalist papers
- C. American political culture
- D. U.S and the international system
 - 1. Realist and moralist visions
 - 2. Major trends in the world
 - 3. The aura of uncertainty
- E. Global forces
 - 1. Globalization
 - 2. Fragmentation
- F. Isolationists versus internationalists
- G. U.S national interests
- H. Diversity of U.S involvement
- I. U.S National style
- J. Patterns and consequences
 - 1. Patterns
 - a. Unilateralism
 - b. Pragmatism
 - c. Legalism
 - 2. Consequences
 - a. Loosing the peace
 - b. Double standards
 - c. Impatience
- K. Domestic politics and the U.S foreign policy
 - 1. The importance of domestic policy
 - 2. American domestic sources
 - a. The societal environment
 - b. The institutional setting
 - c. The individual characteristics
 - 3. Twentieth- century leaders
 - a. Crusaders
 - b. Pragmatists

- L. Foreign policy and U.S presidents
 - 1. Past failures and successes
 - a. Theodore Roosevelt
 - b. Woodrow Wilson
 - c. Franklin Roosevelt
 - d. Harry Truman
 - e. Dwight D. Eisenhower
 - f. Richard Nixon
 - g. Jimmy Carter
 - h. Ronald Reagan
 - i. Bill Clinton

M. Learning from the past.

Chapter III: The Significance of September 11, 2001

- A. Introduction
 - 1. An age of terror
 - 2. A stateless enemy
 - 3. Understanding the world order
- B. September 11, 2001
 - 1. What really happened?
 - 2. Rhetoric questions!
 - 3. Terrorism: what it means?
- C. The Terrorists
 - 1. Bin Laden's declaration
 - 2. Al-Qaida statement
- D. Terror or Resistance
- E. Opinions on terrorism
 - 1. Ali Salem
 - 2. Oscar Arias
 - 3. Chinua Achebe
 - 4. Filipe Gonzalez
- E. The U.S response

Chapter IV: Images in "Explaining War"

- A. Introduction: Images by Kenneth Waltz
 - 1. Individual
 - 2. Internal state structure
 - 3. International system
- B. Failures and Frustrations
- C. U.S dominance and power
 - 1. Economical
 - 2. Technological
 - 3. Military
- D. U.S detachments
 - 1. Kyoto Protocol
 - 2. International Criminal Court
- E. Image 1: Individual intellectual outlook
 - 1. President Bush's personality
 - 2. The Bush doctrine
 - 3. A messianic mission
 - 4. A "realist eye"
- F. Image 2: The Neo-conservative Hawks
 - 1. Overview
 - a. Neocons origin
 - b. Neocons links
 - c. Neocons commitments
 - 2. The realist minders
 - a. Founders of PNAC
 - b. Founders of the road map
 - 4. The concept of fear
- G. Image 3: The International Environment

Chapter V: The case of Iraq

- A. Introduction
- B. US versus UN
- C. US a nation builder
- D. Preemptive of preventive!

- E. Components of nation building
 - 1. Regime change
 - 2. Deployment of troops
- F. Studies by Cornigie Endowment
- G. Nation building in Iraq
 - 1. Reasons for failure
 - a. The unilateral approach
 - b. Iraq's characteristics
- H. Iraq's Structure
 - 1. Tribal structure
 - 2. Ethnic structure
 - 3. Shiite of Iraq
- I. Weapons of mass destruction
- J. The U.S interests
 - a. Topple Saddam's regime
 - b. Regime change
 - c. Democratization
- K. Democracy: an alien principle
 - a. Democracy as a rule of God
 - b. Democracy in the Muslim world
 - c. Features of democracy
 - d. A conflict of ideology
 - e. U.S rhetoric of democracy
 - f. Muslims disappointment
- L. The coming of the UN
 - a. Casualties statistics
- M. The U.S election polls
- N. U.S betrayal
 - a. Hurting itself
 - b. Hurting the international community

Chapter VI: Conclusion

ABSTRACT

Realism and morality are recognized as parallel forces that are in an eternal dilemma in international relations. Historically, the United States foreign policy was a reflection of this vicious circle. In the current Bush administration, the U.S is trying to practice a "realist" engulfed ideology of foreign policy throughout the Middle East and especially in Iraq. It aims at using Iraq as a model to democratize the entire Middle East, regardless of their cultural and religious affinities. Knowing that Iraq was ruled by a totalitarian regime, there is no doubt that it is difficult to assimilate democracy as a new ideology. Although it has been proven that morality is interpreted differently by various cultures, the U.S seems to ignore this reality by trying to impose Western democracy in Iraq. Democracy is believed to be unworkable in Iraq, because where democracy and morality flourishes in one culture it might not see the light in another.

Realism and Morality

The U.S. Foreign Policy in Iraq under the Bush Administration

Socrates: Therefore, since each perception is peculiar to my being, my perception is true for me and, as Protagoras says, I am the judge of the things that are for me, that they are, and of the things that are not, that they are not. (Plato, Theaetetus, 160 c)

Introduction

One of the most enduring dilemmas in international politics is between realism and morality. Our world today is passing through an era of tension between the two.

For the longest time, Americans engaged in a debate over human rights and ethics. The American diplomatic history reflects an endless struggle between realism and morality. Today ethical rhetoric has permeated American Foreign policy and most evidently in Iraq.

The U.S. today enjoys a preeminence of unilateral and unrivaled power. The U.S. sees itself as a source of democracy, acting as a judge, a mediator, and at times as a peacekeeper. However, the American hegemony and vision is facing various irrelevant currents that aim at transforming the world order. Today, the International Community seems more skeptical and confused than before regarding US power and long-term objectives.

America seems like an avid democratizer keen on transforming societies into democracy regardless of their cultural and historical background. This is evident in its war against Iraq.

The U.S. Foreign policy seems to be in a dilemma On one side it holds the missionary or leadership position and on the other hand it holds deliberate quest for hegemony. In the abstract, American Foreign Policy is facing a challenge whether to adopt realism or morality (interest or values) in its foreign Policy.

According to Francis Fukuyama: "American Foreign Policy has always been pulled in two directions, toward a realist defense of national security defined in relatively narrow terms, and toward an expansive Sense of American purposes that rests directly on the exceptionalism of American institutions and the messianic belief in their universal applicability." (Holtsberry, 2003)

It is well known that all global "new orders" carry some sort of ethical content. Nevertheless, in reality, states use rhetoric of justice and ethics to disguise or screen their national interest.

Looking at the attacks of September 11, 2001, it obviously signals a challenge to the U.S. civil society and security. These attacks destroyed the American "Pollyanna syndrome" of globalization and democracy as being pervasive. Thus, revealing the harsh reality that not all the people around the globe are fond or appreciative of the U.S. values particularly some in the Middle East. There seems to be, not a clash of civilization, as Sammuel Huntington calls it, but rather a clash over the U.S. Foreign Policy towards the Middle East or a clash of ethics.

This paper will analyze the U.S. Foreign Policy in Iraq. It will question the tools of ethics or diplomacy used by the U.S. Foreign Policy under the Bush Administration. The question is not whether the U.S. objective contains ethical content because most objectives do in one way or another. The real question is whether the pursuit of the objective is consistent with the critical norms of the society of states.

It is clear that the pursuit of ethically justifiable ends may generate intense conflicts. This is one of the essential elements in the U.S.- Middle East conflict, taking into consideration that from the Arab perception or objective, there is always a reflection of a moral concern. This stems primarily from the existing Arab-Israeli conflict and long-term Arab objective for creating a homeland for the Palestinians.

This paper will question:

- To what extent are tools such as democracy workable in the Middle East and particularly in previous totalitarian regimes like Iraq?
- How effective are the U.S. Foreign Policy tools? Did this policy succeed so far in Iraq?
- Where does the U.S. Foreign Policy lie now on the realism-morality scale? Where is it heading?

The paper will study the case of Iraq from different levels. There will be a consideration for the close correspondence between ethics, belief systems and value orientations of policy makers and special focus on culture and the diversity of morals.

- Chapter I : A historical and philosophical review of realism and morality.
- Chapter II : A review of the American foreign policy, political culture, global forces, national interest and style. Also, a review of foreign policy under different US presidents.
- Chapter III : An overview of the significance of Sept. 11 , 2001, its impact on US foreign policy and the world, and its purpose.
- Chapter IV : A study of the American foreign policy from three images: the individual, bureaucratic minders and the international system.

Chapter V : The case study of Iraq which analyzes the Bush administration's foreign policy.

The U.S. war against Iraq, its presence and involvement in Iraq, is regarded by many states as unethical and unjustifiable, due to the fact that the US went to war alone without the consent of the international community of states. The U.S. claims that its primary concern in Iraq is transforming it into a democracy.

Chapter I: Realism and Morality

Power and morality are in an eternal dilemma and they are parallel forces with alternating impulses of universal destiny.

Similar to the Chinese symbols of Yin and Yang, Realism and morality are forces that symbolize the natural phenomena of the universe. One force assumes a unified and hierarchal world, while the other force perceives the world as competing States striving for security and power.

According to Chinese tradition, the unity of both principles, symbolize the dual idealist and realistic characters of foreign affairs. (Cox, 1997 p.146)

Is this the image of foreign affairs in our modern world? Is this the case with the U.S. Foreign Policy? The fact remains that the history of the U.S. Foreign Policy reflects a continuous struggle between two philosophies: realism and idealism or between power and morality.

Before taking in depth the U.S. policy we need to analyze the true meaning of the philosophies realism and morality and how they overwhelmed the history of mankind.

Realism:

Realism is an image of international relations that is based on the assumption that the state is the principal, unitary and rational actor. This perspective focuses on the action and interaction of states. It emphasizes the importance of security national interest, objective, and specially power as key components of realism. (Viotti, 1999 p.480)

The realist philosophy of practical life goes back as far as the pre-Socratic thinkers of ancient Greece. It was stated by Thrasymachus that “the just is nothing other than the advantage of the stronger”. Moreover, Thucydides in his famous classic History of the Peloponnesian War stated that “the standard of justice depends on the equality of power to compel and that in fact the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept”.(Frankel, 1996 p.250)

Many experts today accuse the United States of strictly following the philosophy of power and dominance in its foreign policy practices. Many do not favor the U.S. superiority and forceful leadership role. In other words, the role of the strong taking over the weak.

Is this truly the reality today? One cannot ignore that there is obviously a reduction of morality, and an expansion of power and self-interest in our world. This image was also reflected among the Romans when Tacitus announced the famous phrase: “Might is Right”.

During the Medieval period this philosophy became associated with the expression “realism of state”. This law permitted rulers to legally violate law and morality for the good of the state in order to maintain political order under divine and natural law.

This concept or the “Realpolitik” became popular in Machiavelli’s classic “The Prince”. Here the prince or ruler is entitled to commit evil deeds in order to preserve the state. “A man who wants a profession of good in all regards must come to ruin among many who are good. Hence it is necessary to a prince, if he wants to maintain himself, to learn to be able not to be good.” (Prince, 15.61)

The ideology of “*raison d'etat*” crowned the classical age of European politics. Furthermore, it was practiced by several rulers such as Napoleon I, Mussolini and Hitler.

The aim of the "*Raison d'Etat*" is the achievement of preservation and security. However, for these variables to be maintained, man has but one means and this is force...till he sees no other power greater enough to endanger him. (Frankel, 1996 p.251)

In other words, states do whatever it takes to achieve their objectives which includes high political concerns of assuring state survival, security, even trade and finance. (Viotti 1999, p.56) This is clearly reflected in the preventive or preemptive policy used by states today. A lucid example is the case of Iraq. The United States declared that the reason behind attacking Iraq was taking preemptive measures on terrorism and assuring that weapons of mass destruction in Iraq do not develop or become available to other states that are hostile to the U.S.

The Extreme Realist thought also goes back to Thomas Hobbes' unblinking view of a cruel "State of Nature", virtually a state of war. There is also the Darwinian version of a fearful global jungle where only the fittest can prosper and survive. (Higgins, 2000)

E. H. Carr in his book "The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939" realized political realism as a doctrine of foreign affairs, and an approach to understanding international relations and international politics. In other words, he believed that world politics is power relations. (Cox, 1997, PXV, XV)

Carr presented the realistic philosophy as ethics of politics. He viewed power politics under a scientific defensible terrain of objective necessity. He did not regard war as immoral, on the contrary, it is rational and beneficial because it achieves ones interest as well as it diverts the wrong to right. (Frankel 1996, p 230)

For the realists, right is achieved with power. For where there is no power, there is no politics. According to Hans J. Morgenthau, "Internal politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power... power is always the ultimate aim." (Viotti 1999, p.57)

In Morgenthau's theory " the history of political thought is the history of the moral evaluation of political power. Morgenthau sees man as a political animal by nature who is born to seek power, yet he also is a slave to the power of others.

Man naturally does evil while he tries to do good because he must abandon the moral end in favor of the others. According to Morgenthau, all action is at the same time means and ends.

Realists are criticized for their immoral perception and for being blinded by power of domination. On the other hand, the realists argue that it is the idealists that are blinded by their moral beliefs and are unable to see the issue as the survival of the fittest and that in reality it is the fittest that survives. (Frankel 1996, P: 231)

Extreme Realists may sound tough minded but fail to recognize that the ethical-like reputation for generally fair dealing- can itself benefit national interests and that international co-operation has become critical to safe guarding the common interests of international stability and environmental sustainability. (Higgins, 2000, p.4)

Who are the idealists? What is their philosophy?

Idealism

As heirs of the Enlightenment as well as the religious traditions, the Idealists argue that ethical (or moral) values should govern all relationships. They believe that we cannot acknowledge morality's crucial place in our private, professional or domestic political life and then toss it aside at the nation's borders. (Higgins, 2000, p.3).

Idealists focus in their perception on the philosophy of ethics. Ethics is defined as The Science Of Moral, moral principles or rules of conduct. Morals are concerned with the distinction between right and wrong (Frost 2000, p.1)

Idealist's emotions and perceptions were battled against since the time of Plato, but they held tight to the foundation of moral experience. Their philosophy reflected man's deep desire to identify morality within himself and show concern for others. (Teehan 2003, pp.50-51)

Idealists scholars like Immanuel Kant focused on moral values and the freedom of mankind. For him, mankind's duty is to recognize and to treat every person as having the same ultimate moral value and claim as oneself. (Cahn 1997, p.554)

Kant's moral philosophy embodied a rethinking of the value that all human beings are equal no matter what their differences may be. (Hoy 2000, p. 11)

Morality or ethics is a universal phenomenon under the normative international theory. It is a value oriented concept that revolves around "What ought to be". In other words, it is a universal image of a world society that shares common values in an aim for achieving perpetual peace. (Viotti 1999, p. 484-489)

Universalism goes back to the Roman Empire and the concept of the common law. Ciero, a Roman Orator stated that: "true law is right reason in agreement with nature, it is of a universal application, changing and everlasting". (Viotti 1999, p.484) This philosophy asserts the primacy of ethics over politics.

The Idea of common universal good and international morality are the heart of the idealist philosophy. It focuses on the duty of individuals to sacrifice their interest for the sake of the community's interest. By this the individual is promoting his interest under the concept of the harmony of interests. (Carr 1962, p.42). Harmony of interests provides a rational basis for morality. If states act in a spirit of contribution to the welfare of humanity, international harmony would prevail. (Carr 1962, p.46)

By believing in the attainability of moral ends and the importance of a human meaningful cause, man has a chance with perpetual peace.

According to Kant, perpetual peace is a condition for ethical action. It is possible if the diverse states respect moral equality and adopt democratic means and international rights. In other words, nations must work together towards fairness and equitable solutions within a cooperative process of conflict resolutions. (Holtberry 2003, p.2)

If fair play, freedom, justice and compassion make legitimate claims at home, so they must abroad. Morality cannot, on this view, be turned on and off at national convenience: life is either morally meaningful or it is not. (Higgins 2000, p.3)

Idealists view the world from an optimistic lens of how they want the world to be. It is a progressive and positive outlook where men and nations are basically good and what holds them back are the circumstances that surrounds them.

Many moral philosophers believe that moral qualities are nonexistent. One reason is due to the diversity of moral judgments across different cultures. This encouraged modern thinkers to conceive moral values as socially constructed. This could mean that every society can determine its own moral standards. Thus Moral truth becomes simply an internal cultural consensus.

Many experts believe that morality is convenient for socially approved habits. Therefore, there are no ethical rules that apply universally because moral standards are grounded in social approval, which varies from culture to culture. This moral diversity is seen as “morality lies in the eyes of the beholder”. (Shomali 2001, p.24)

Other experts believe that this is not the case. Some political scientists believe that politics does require practical wisdom and ethics. However, the validity of all moral principles is relative to the culture or individual choice.

According to David Wong, an expert in morality, "moral relativism is a cluster of doctrines concerning diversity of moral judgments across time, societies and individuals". (Shomali 2001, p. 25)

For many, it is not easy to be a morally competent being. Scientists believe that in order to understand the natural world, we must train people's minds to become morally competent. Therefore, our moral judgment must be trained in order to perceive moral reality more accurately. Thus, "ones moral judgment is not necessarily as good as others". This also applies to understanding democracy and whether we treat it as a high moral vision or a device for securing political legitimacy. (Robinson 2003, p.48)

Although morality is considered diverse for some, still modernists attempt to legislate morality through universally applicable codes of conduct. Nevertheless, it is argued by Freidrich Nietzsche that there is nothing beyond this world or within ourselves from which we could derive universally valid moral principles. To him every actual morality has emerged under various conditions and in response to specific psychological and social needs of human beings in the course of history. (Shomali, 2001, P.39)

Nietzsche also challenges morality by stating: "what is right for one cannot by any means be right for another". He concludes that the demand for one morality for all is detrimental to precisely the higher men. His equation reveals an order rank between "man and man, and between morality and morality". (Frost, 2000, p.7) Here one can conclude that one man or nation is more important than another and that actions have different perceived values.

As an idealist, Immanuel Kant would have argued for the importance of universal law. He believed that man has a duty towards morality and it is man's motives and intentions that indicate whether he is good or bad.

Kant emphasized that in action, there is a difference between duty and interest and “only by acting from duty one could be acting morally.” (Frost, 2000, p.8)

John Stuart Mill, another moralist, emphasized utilitarianism, which is the ethical doctrine of The Greatest Happiness Principle.

This means that virtue is based on utility and that conduct should be directed towards promising the greatest number of people. This system is widely accepted in the West as an ethical system. (Frost, 2000, p.6)

How can one acquire virtue? We have to remember that virtue can be both, intellectual or moral. Intellectual virtue is acquired from teaching. However, moral virtue is presumingly acquired by nature. According to Aristotle, one must learn to be virtuous because morals are habits and therefore moral virtues cannot arise in man by nature. One can argue that there are some virtues that are absolute such as truth. Here is where we question democracy. Is democracy absolute? Can democracy be introduced to cultures without previous democratic practices? Can it be successful in multi ethnic societies?

Democracy is now a trend in our world. In fact newly developed democratic states are looked upon favorably. The United States is the leader in promoting democracy and it has adopted it as an integral part of its foreign policy. In fact, the U.S seems to be exporting American democracy around the world as if trying to mold the world in its own image.

If democracy is learned, is it possible to teach it to states that do not have a history in democracy or to those with a long record of human rights violations? The American unique government grew out of many years of struggle and development. Can it possibly succeed in teaching democracy to states with alien cultures such as Iraq?

Before heading to the second chapter of this paper and prior to reviewing the history of American foreign policy, it is essential to point out that change is possible. However, change can only be achieved if cultures are considered when reform is considered. It would be hard and unrealistic to accept what some realistic commentators assume that some societies are not good enough for freedom.

Chapter II: History of U.S Foreign Policy

The history of the United States is rich with experiences that reflect realism and morality. However, before reviewing these stages we need to make reference to the American constitution as well as understand the global setting of the American foreign policy. During the cold war, the US strictly implemented a policy of containment against its adversary the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, America emerged as a world's unilateral power. The world was overwhelmed with high expectations that peace and harmony will embrace the international order. The US was constantly striving for a unique role in world politics; a role that fosters a world environment where the American system can prosper.

The American Constitution:

The American constitution was drawn up in 1787, ratified in 1788 and inaugurated in 1789. In fact the constitution was amended 28 times.

The ancient framers of the American constitution Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and John Jay sought to create a government capable of protecting liberty as a natural right. This philosophy was derived from the works of John Locke who argued that in a "state of nature", all men cherish and seek to protect their life, liberty, and property. (Wilson, 1998,p.27)

The problem with this approach is the difficulty arising from having a government strong enough to preserve order, yet not so dominant that it would threaten individual liberty.

This description applies to what we now know as "democracy".

Democracy was the core of the Federalist Papers which has become a unique masterpiece of the American political philosophy.

The American version of representative democracy was based on two major principles, the separation of powers and federalism. Federalism came to mean that the American political authority was divided between a national government and several state governments with independent authority. Federalism refers to a political system in which there are local (territorial, regional, provincial, state or municipal) units of governments, as well as a national government that can make final decisions with respect to all governmental activities. (Wilson, 1998, p. 33,52)

American Political Culture:

Many questions arise as to how the United States has maintained its federalism. In the past, nations who had adopted the American model had only brief periods of democratic rule. According to Alexis de Tocqueville, a French political observer, "the reason why democracy took root in the United States and not in other countries was due to the abundance and fertile soil offered by this country for roots to grow." (Wilson, 1998, p. 85) The vast territory of the U.S created innumerable opportunities for people to acquire land and make a living.

Tocqueville believed that the constitution and the physical advantage of the land are not the only means for the persistence of a nation's democracy. There are countries with vast stretches of land, where democracy did not take root. Thus, there are other reasons for the maintenance of democracy.

To him, there must be considerations made for the customs of the people and for their “moral and intellectual characteristics.” (Wilson, 1998, p. 86)

The American system of government is supported by a political culture that fosters liberty, equality, democracy, civic duty, individual responsibility and pride in a nation.

US and the International System:

The realist and moralist visions are clearly present in the US foreign policy. However, they are influenced by the international system and its decentralized nature where there is no common political, cultural or settled norms governing the behavior of states. (Hastedt 2000, p.3). The international system is also a self-help system where states rely only on themselves to accomplish their foreign policy goals.

Another fact is that our world system is stratified, which means that there is inequality among states since resources are distributed unequally across the globe. (Hastedt 2000, p.4) All these factors had major influences on the US foreign policy and on the perception of the US political leaders.

From this aspect there were major differences in assumption and ideology among US leaders or decision makers. During Reagan’s period, there was the belief that the international system is bipolar with only two actors in a global power struggle. However, during the administrations of Carter, Ford, Nixon, there was the concept of global distribution and the possibility for coexistence. (Hastedt 2000, p.4)

Between the 1970s and the demise of the Soviet Union, the bipolar system was evolving into a multi-polar system. Satellite and client states on both sides of the polarity began to act with some manifest degree of independence. Powerful states such as Yugoslavia, China, Japan and non-aligned bloc asserted their independence from both blocs.

In the primary setting of the international system after World War II, major trends occurred in the world. These were: the diffusion of power, issue and actor proliferation, and regional diversity. (Hastedt 2000, p.5) Furthermore, there were major concerns regarding the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The US foreign policy seems to be surrounded with an aura of uncertainty over its content and conduct. The reality is that in foreign policy there are no monolithic or standard rules. Foreign problems come in many shapes and sizes. It also differs in terms of their history and origin. Some foreign policy problems are inherited from previous administrations while others are old with records of failure and success, or long-term rooted problems. (Hastedt 2000, p.18)

Global Forces

Foreign policy is influenced by global forces, that mold and divert the policy direction. Globalization and fragmentation are two competing global processes that emerged after the collapse of the cold war and that have changed the domestic foreign nexus in American policy making. These parallel forces are political, social and economic.

While globalization aims at binding people together, fragmentation on the other hand, separate states pushing political actors towards another direction.

The process of globalization has affected the fabric of state system. It helped develop organizations such as NAFTA and NATO. Globalization created a new map that has knitted states together. Fragmentation coexists side by side with globalization. It describes the conflicts that exist within states. (Wittkopf et al., 1999, p.xi)

These two forces have affected the American foreign policy and influenced the shaping of the world politics. It fueled a debate with respect to the U.S involvement in the world. The situation after the cold war and the collapse of communism has eliminated the threat that used to hold decision makers together.

The new world order divided the Americans into various bureaucracies, members of Congress, differing interest groups, and the public. All these divisions seek to present their issues and their varied opinions. (Wittkopf et al., 1999, p. xiii)

Amongst all the diversity, there existed two major U.S ideologies in struggle, the Isolationist and the Internationalist.

Isolationists Versus Internationalists

Throughout its persistent struggle the US was facing a major dilemma whether to concentrate on its domestic problems or fulfill its missionary objective as a superpower and be a protector of democracy. Henry Kissinger in one of his famous quotes stated that the US can neither withdraw from the world nor dominate it.

This is reflected in the two ideologies that struggle within the American thought: the Isolationist and the Internationalist. The isolationists see the world as threatening to US values thus they construct barriers to US moral obligation. Internationalists on the other hand believe that the US involvement in the world as beneficial for sustaining the American System.

This debate became apparent due to globalization and fear of the global consumer culture that is irrelevant to the US democratic system.

Realists envisioned a well-defined national interest routed in the US desire to protect itself from hostile state. Moreover, they were completely against US humanitarian interventions as it threatens the country's national security. The moralists however, were often inspired by the country's values, which were reflected in the U.S desire for leadership, adoption of democracy, human rights, and universal values.

US National Interest

We know for a fact that the essence of foreign policy are values and objectives that people want to achieve, as well as threats they desire to be protected from. However, the key term that defines US foreign policy is national interest. It is whatever the US policy makers are willing to make sacrifices to achieve. (Hastedt 2000 , p.19)

In the abstract, national interest is linked to national purpose, national identity and national survival.

It is very interesting how US foreign policy shifts very swiftly. Looking back in US history, the concept of human rights appeared during the Carter administration. Previously, during Nixon's administration anticommunist rhetoric was very high. However, Nixon announced in the early 70s that he would visit the Peoples Republic of China. Here it is evident how the US swings in its foreign policy. There seems to be a tendency to fluctuate between isolationism and internationalism (Hastedt 2000, p.30)

Isolationists believe that US interest lies in its detachment from the rest of the world. The internationalists, on the other hand, focus on an activist foreign policy believing that US involvement promotes US national interest.(Hastedt 2000 , p.32)

Diversity in US Involvement

Internationalist perspectives can be viewed in the numerous examples of US involvements such as membership in the UN and NATO, as well as the US intervention in Korea and Vietnam.

According to Frank Klingberg, there are five periods of US foreign policy each of 25-30 years duration. Klingberg designed two phases in foreign policy, an introvert and an extrovert phase. He described the period between 1918- 1940 as an Introvert phase, where as the period between 1940 – 1967 as an Extrovert phase. Klingberg expects the next introvert phase to set in 2014. (Hastedt 2000, p.34)

US National Style

The US national style is influenced by its geographical position, its historical experience, economic system and political values. The American national style has led the country to sway between isolationism in peacetime and moral crusading in wartime.

In the American national life, the American sense of destiny created a strong belief in freedom and social justice and it aroused the Americans to the role of leadership; to lead mankind away from evil. Americans believed in their destiny therefore they stood for peace, opportunity, and democracy as an example of a superior democratic pattern of international behavior. (Spanier, 1995, p. 10)

Democracy is the source of American security that reflects the US political thought. The virtues that developed America are incorporated in the American national style which rely on individual self – reliance, flexibility, and improvisation (Hastedt 2000, p.34)

According to Alexis de Tocquerille, “America was born free as middle – class, individualist, capitalistic, democratic society. It didn’t experience a feudal past. It was politically secure, socially cohesive and economically prosperous.” (Spanier 1995, p.12)

Yet, America has both a shared political culture and some distinctive sub-cultures associated with various ethnic and religious groups. This is what creates a unique political culture that values liberty, equality and rights.

Multiculturalism is the basis of American culture. Based on this experience, the United States believes in a democratic process that is internationally pervasive. But the question is, do all states share the American experience? Do they have a similar historical, geographical and educational background? The answer is no!

Therefore, how could it be possible for democracy to blossom in societies that share nothing in common with the American destiny neither the "American Way Of Life".

Many experts believe that not all the tropical plantations can be replanted in the desert, because some plants need special soil and the appropriate environment for it to survive.

Patterns and Consequences

What is the special environment that engulfs the U.S national style? There are three patterns of thought and action that maintain the American national style. The first pattern is Unilateralism. It represents a rejection of the balance of power approach for providing national security. It is the will to act alone in a sense of exceptionalism. This is evident in the U.S objective in applying its approach to security on a global basis.

U.S unilateral behavior was apparent in the Cuban Missile Crisis, the invasion of the Dominican Republic and the invasion of Granada and Panama. Another example of U.S unilateral behavior is the U.S control over NATO's nuclear force. President George H.W Bush during the war on Iraq in 1991 took the initiative of assembling a global coalition against Saddam Hussein. Certainly, it was the U.S who took control over the launching of air strikes, when to begin, and when to end the war. (Hastedt 2000, pp. 35-36) The recent war on Iraq is also a repetition of U.S unilateralism.

The second pattern to American foreign policy is moral pragmatism. This sense of morality involves certain moral standards of state behavior based on the American morality.

The American actions are taken to be morally correct and therefore provide universal standards for making judgments. For this reason, the U.S feels morally obligated to intervene in other state's business in order to "set things right". (Hastedt, 2000, p. 37)

The problem is that some states see this intervention as morally unjust and as a potential threat. Both the Monroe Doctrine and its Roosevelt Corollary show the influence of moral pragmatism. President Roosevelt justified the American intervention on the grounds that the nations neighboring the U.S could not maintain law and order within their borders, therefore the U.S was forced to intervene. (Hastedt, 2000, p. 38)

Another example of moral pragmatism in U.S foreign policy is evident in the Iran-Contra fiasco. Believing in moral correctness and in freeing their hostages in Lebanon, the Reagan administration sold arms to Iran and diverted monies gained to its contras fighting in Nicaragua. Today, the U.S has Iran on its terrorist list and is sending observers to investigate Iran's weapon of mass destruction program. (Hastedt, 2000. p. 38)

The third pattern of U.S foreign policy is Legalism. This system is also a rejection of the balance of power approach. The U.S seems to clothe its actions in terms of legal principles. In doing so, the U.S tries to put forward a statement of principle and then requests from other states to sign a treaty to support it. An example of that is when the U.S fought the Korean war under the UN flag. This pattern continued in Iraq when president Bush received UN endorsement for his military campaign against Iraq. President Clinton did the same in Haiti. (Hastedt 2000, p. 40)

The American national style while following the patterns of unilateralism, moral pragmatism, and legalism had to face also challenging consequences.

Winning the war and then losing the peace is apparent today in the U.S foreign policy. Throughout history, the U.S has proven its unbeatable ability in defeating the enemy. However, the U.S seems to break the record in its inability to deter war and attain peace.

A double standards in judging states, is another consequence of the U.S national style. The U.S as a unilateral power has on various occasions committed actions that it described previously as unethical when practiced by other states. In addition, the U.S who has an advanced nuclear weapon program does not permit other states to test or develop such weapons. Moreover, the U.S describes its interventions in Iraq as ethical whereas it considered the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan as an act of imperialism. (Hastedt, 2000, p. 42)

This misunderstanding or complexity in judging other states puts the U.S in a dilemma and locks diplomacy in trap. If the U.S continues to perceive other states strictly from its ethical and moral standards, then it is not giving diplomacy a chance. The U.S superior post is not allowing it to conduce positive foreign relations.

With this patronizing attitude, the U.S appears impatient and in constant demand for quick results and thus, the U.S ends up relying primarily on military power rather than seeking other political means.

All these consequences are clearly apparent in the case of Iraq. The United States did succeed in winning the war against Iraq, however there is little evidence in its success in bringing consensus and peace to the country and to the region as a whole.

Changes that might occur in the U.S. national style can lead to major changes in U.S. foreign policy. Historical records suggest the American national style is a source of strength as well as weakness.

Change can occur when major diversions happen in the international or domestic order. Therefore, certain conditions in the world can change the foreign policy from a realist conduct to a moral one and vice versa.

Realism and morality vary or change according to the nature of the problem or crisis facing decision makers. It is also a reflection of their ability to learn from the past. Here is where we come to question the link between domestic politics and the U.S foreign policy. Can domestic politics reflect or explain foreign policy?

Domestic Politics and U.S Foreign Policy

According to political realists, foreign policy is an action that occurs outside national borders. Domestic politics does not explain foreign policy. States are the principal actors; power and national interest are the dominant policy considerations as well as maintenance of the balance of power. For the realists, domestic politics exerts little if any impact on state behavior.

Thucydides, the father of realism, did however recognize the importance of domestic Policy in shaping the external behavior of Athens and Sparta. In addition, Immanuel Kant's thesis on perpetual peace suggested that democracies rarely fight one another because they are "natural" forces for peace. (Wittkoff et al., 1999, p.xiii)

In the early twentieth century, V.I. Lenin observed that domestic economic structures of states were a reflection of their foreign policy. He explained that war was inevitable between capitalist states seeking to expand and thus are in competition.

It is true that the period after the cold war highlighted the absence of war between democratic states. It is also true that state's foreign policy is a result of its domestic policy.

This was evident in the British policy's reluctance to join the E.U. Another example was apparent in Bosnia where political leader's actions were a result of religious and ethnic divisions existing in the Balkans. (Wittkoff et al., 1999, p. xiv)

The United States is a democratic country, but is it acting democratically in Iraq?
Can war be democratic?

The U.S has always perceived itself as an exceptional nation whose policy is derived from its unique domestic values. According to the French political sociologist, Alexis de Tocqueville: "foreign politics demands scarcely any of those qualities which a democracy possesses; they require, on the contrary, the perfect use of almost all those faculties in which it is deficient".

The American foreign policy follows three domestic sources: the societal environment, the institutional setting and the individual characteristics of the nation's decision makers. (Wittkopf et al., 1999, p. xv-xvi)

The societal environment is the basic needs, values, beliefs and self-image of American political culture. The American political culture constitutes of democracy, capitalism, and the values of the American liberal tradition-limited government, individual liberty, due process of law, self-determination, free enterprise, inalienable (natural) rights, the equality of the citizens before the law, majority rule, minority rights, federalism, and the separation of power and multiculturalism. (Wittkopf et al., 1999, p.xvi)

There are domestic divisions that obscure and blur the U.S foreign policy's vision and its response to the issues that populate the global agenda. This is reflected in the dilemma in public opinion between those who believe that America must continue to support U.S involvement in the world, and others who prefer a retreat from globalization and a return to isolationism.

Some Americans worry about becoming victims of the international economic system, while others worry about the influx of immigrants and the changes they might bring to their culture. (Wittkopf et al., 1999, xviii)

Americans are concerned with the costs of leadership. Public opinion will not tolerate U.S involvements that will cause a large number of casualty losses in the pursuit of foreign policy objectives. In Iraq today, the Bush administration is facing great pressure from the public who is frustrated from the American losses in Iraq.

The institutional setting is another source for American foreign policy consisting of various branches of governments, departments and agencies assigned responsibility for decision making and management. The most essential aspect of it all is the division of authority and responsibility for foreign policy making between the Congress and the President. It is a system that maintains political power by fragmenting it in a system of checks and balances.

Since the American foreign policy is lodged in separate institutions sharing power, therefore there is a struggle among legislative and executive branches over control of foreign policy. Whether it is the Whitehouse, the National Security Council or the CIA, the vast number of agencies in foreign affairs creates inconsistency in U.S policy. This also adds pressure on the decision maker or the president. (Wittkopf et al., 1999, p. xx)

The personal characteristics of a decision maker, plays an important role in influencing the direction of foreign policy. His / her personality traits, perception and psychological predictions are an ultimate source to the ends and means of American foreign policy on the realism - morality scale.

The twentieth-century American leaders are described as either crusaders or pragmatists. The crusader is the one that focuses on preconceived idea rather than on the basis of experience. He / she is someone who believes in a missionary role that makes the world a better place. The pragmatist, on the other hand relies in his judgments on experiences and facts. Woodrow Wilson is a good example of a crusader, while Harry S. Truman is described as a pragmatist. Today many observers portray president Bush as a crusader due to his foreign policy decisions in Iraq. Where does his policy stand on the scale of realism and morality? Where did the previous president's policy stand? To answer these questions, we need to review several American leader's foreign policy and make a comparison with the U.S policy today.

Foreign policy and U.S presidents

There are 18 men who served as presidents of the United States since World War II. These leaders have accomplished great success and spectacular failures as well.

The greatest successes were the defeat of Nazism, fascism, and Communism in Europe and Japanese militarism in Asia. These were considered special gifts from America to the world. However, the failures in the U.S foreign policy have left no real meaning for the gift.

One of the past dreadful mistakes was the unwillingness and the inability of the U.S to prevent communist takeovers in China. Moreover, the U.S has failed and is still failing to bring peace to the Middle East and particularly between Israel and Palestine. America's blunt and absolute support to Israel has created frustration in the Arab world and further hostility towards American foreign policy.

Another major setback is the U.S failure to give support to the United Nations and to the value of collective security. By acting unilaterally, the U.S has disrespected and undermined the role of the U.N in the world.

The unwillingness to stop or slow international arms trade is another failure in the U.S foreign policy. Even today when president Bush has set serious measures for the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, one cannot ignore the reality that the weapons America is trying to control are mostly made in America.

Some of the United States presidents are democrats others are republicans. Some are realists while some are idealists and some are both.

Theodore Roosevelt (1901 – 1909) was a republican who took an active role in treating the balance-of-power as a distinctive feature of international relations. Roosevelt did not regard the U.S as a missionary leader but as a super power. It seems obvious that the Roosevelt administration followed the realist approach. (Kissinger, 2002, p.240)

In 1908 Roosevelt did not object to the Japanese occupation of Korea on the grounds that Korea was unable to defend itself and no state was willing to take the risk and defend it.

Roosevelt's realist approach was reflected in the "Roosevelt Corollary" where he proclaimed America's right to intervene in the Western Hemisphere in order to vindicate and protect U.S national interest. (Kissinger, 2002, p.241) Roosevelt was concerned primarily with pursuing U.S interest at the cost of somebody else's interest. He was least involved in international responsibility, righteousness and theological underpinnings. (Abrams, 2001, p.8)

Unlike Roosevelt, president Woodrow Wilson (1913 – 1921), a democrat, believed in the unique role of the U.S in the world as an exceptional nation. He thought that what was good for America was good for the rest of the world. Wilson was an idealist in his approach to international relations. During Wilson's presidency, U.S entered the war at its final stages in 1917 by striding into the international arena and establishing a higher moral status and ethical plane.

According to Wilson, the only valid purpose for America's entry into the war was to remake the world into its image. It manifested itself in a quest for a "new world order", featuring national self-determination, free trade and collective security. (Moller, 1997, ¶9)

The American commitment to multilateralism and global order was evident in the leading roles of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt who in their international outlook laid the foundations of the League of Nations and the United Nations, respectively. (Misra, 2003)

Wilson wanted to make over the international system by active participation and leadership role in world affairs and by spreading U.S values worldwide. (Kissinger, 2002, P.243-245) However, Wilson's opponents questioned the global relevance of the American values. Implementing moral duty worldwide can be very dangerous. The Americans experienced this danger in Vietnam when they followed their missionary impulses in trying to promote democracy and capitalism in a country lacking a middle-class and any experience with self-government. (Kissinger, 2002, p. 247)

Amongst the U.S presidents, there are two realists who left their footprints for the other presidents to follow; they are Franklin Roosevelt and Harry S Truman.

Franklin Roosevelt (1933 – 1945) was a democrat who created the U.S leading international role, and unalterably opposed Nazism, Fascism and Japanese militarism. He succeeded to persuade the U.S. to join the allies in the war against Nazi Germany and Japan. (Moller, 1997)

Harry Truman (1945 – 1953) was also a democrat. He focused on the U.S commitment to the reconstruction of Europe, to the building of democracy in Germany and Japan, and to the support of Israel and NATO and the containment of communism. (Ambrose, 1991, p.120)

Many later presidents attempted to create their own doctrine, however they could not divert from the path drawn by F. Roosevelt and Truman's doctrines. Both presidents designed U.S interest tied to democracy and belonging to a joint venture between U.S and Europe.

It took a foe the size and strength of the Soviet Union to affect an abandonment of isolationism, as was manifested in the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, the Vandenberg resolution and the subsequent creation of NATO. The containment policy became the slogan for an almost boundless expansion of the nation of "Vital interests" that had to be defended at all costs. (Moller, 1997, ¶11) Multilateralism on the form of alliances such as NATO was necessary to dismantle the Soviet Union Veto power.

After Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953 – 1961) a Republican, became president and he was given primacy in foreign policy. This policy freedom was given to him after threats posed by the Soviet Union and the legacy of Pearl Harbor. (Wittkopf et al., 1999, p.159)

It was Eisenhower who made major decisions to stay out of Vietnam in 1953, not to go to war with China over the off-shore islands, not to support the Hungarian rebels, nor support the British/French/Israeli cabal in Suez in 1956, to force Israel to pull out of Sinai Peninsula in 1957. In all these decisions except for Vietnam, the Congress wanted Eisenhower to adopt different policies. (Ambrose, 1991, p.120)

Eisenhower developed a doctrine regarding intervention in the Middle East. In 1957 Congress granted Eisenhower authority to use armed forces in the Middle East. He implemented it in Lebanon in 1958. (Spanier, 1995, P. 117)

It is interesting to learn that during Eisenhower period, the trust and confidence of the Americans was high, however this was not the case during Nixon's period. In fact it was the largest mistrust period due to the Watergate scandal. (Wilson, 1998, p.100)

Richard Nixon (1969 –1974) was a republican who carried the wreckage caused by idealism. Although he admired Woodrow Wilson, yet he could not proceed with the same foreign policy. Nixon had knowledge in world affairs and thus he decided to return American foreign policy to its realist roots by giving priority to national interest. Nevertheless, Nixon had an idealist approach and this is reflected in his policies towards arms control and when promoting Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union. Nixon also initiated the peace process in the Middle East and an international convention banning biological warfare and by bringing the American involvement in Vietnam to an end. (Wilson, 1998,p.106) (Kissinger, 2002, P.248)

Nixon's doctrine entailed a quest for disengagement via a strengthening of regional "hegemonies" such as South Vietnam, Nicaragua, Iran, Zaire and South Africa. (Moller 1997, ¶ 13)

Nixon's policy of "our interest must shape our commitments" was described as power oriented and lacking moral purpose. (Kissinger, 2002, p. 249) His policy disregarded crying international issues like hunger, poverty and global inequality. (Hastedt 2000, p. 52) Nixon was not the absolute decision maker because the Congress used its power to limit his policies. Still the setback in Nixon's presidency was the Watergate scandal that forced him to resign from presidency.

It was Jimmy Carter (1977 – 1981) a democrat who revived Wilsonian idealism and gave emphasis to human rights. He stated that, "we ought to be a beacon for nations who search for peace and who search for freedom, who search for individual liberty, who search for basic human rights." (Kissinger, 2002, p.250)

While Nixon-Ford-Kissinger foreign policy had stressed realpolitik and balance-of-power, Carter promised a foreign policy that was democratic, based on fundamental values, and that uses power and influence for humane purposes. With Carter human rights became a crucial element in American foreign policy and not only civil and political right but also economic and social rights.

Many experts criticized Carter's administration as incoherent and as immoderately optimistic. Clearly, the Bush administration today would not look favorably on Carter's foreign policy believing it is too utopian. This is due to the fact that the Bush administration is distancing itself from moral involvement and participation in the world.

Jean Kirkpatrick who served as ambassador to the U.N argued that Carter's administration was unable to differentiate between right wing governments and a left wing totalitarian one such as the Soviet Union. She explained that the right wing governments could make a transition to democracy, and their violations of human rights are usually done in the name of national security.

On the contrary, totalitarian regimes could not make a transition to democracy because their violations of human rights are committed on principle. (Hastedt 2000, pp.58-59)

The Reagan's (1981 – 1989) foreign policy was different to Carter's. While Nixon and Carter sought to establish a working relationship with the Soviets by using "carrot and stick" policy, the Reagan's administration relied only on the stick and described the Soviet Union as an "evil empire". (Hastedt 2000, p.59)

President Ronald Reagan supported Wilson's principles of America's leadership role, he also rallied Jacksonian crusading attack against ideology; and he carried the also the Hamiltonian tactics of Nixon. (Kissinger, 2002, p.252)

Reagan's primary concern was building America's military power, sustaining and restoring the credibility of the American power and stopping the expansion of the Soviet influence.

Bush (1989-1993) unlike Reagan, was experienced in world affairs and the hallmark of his administration was its pragmatism. Bush promised during his election in 1988 that his overall policy would be based on continuity. However, the Bush administration suffered few setbacks, such as its short term planning horizon and its unilateral commitment. By acting unilaterally the United States lost a great deal of leverage. This policy was reflected in the American involvement in Iraq and its attempt to achieve complete and unconditional withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait. (Hastedt 2000, p. 72)

The Bush administration committed a major offence when it used the United Nations as an authorizer of its policy.

Bill Clinton (1993 – 2001) was a democrat whose plan was based mostly on domestic issues and it was this emphasis that made Clinton win the presidency. Clinton is still criticized by the isolationists for not safeguarding the U.S security and preserving its system of government. Many experts blamed Clinton's foreign policy for the terrorist attacks on September 11th, 2001. Other critiques looked favorably on Clinton's embracement of multilateralism and his support for peacekeeping.

American commentators described Clinton's "neo-Wilsonian" policy as inconsistent and lacking clear focus. Michael Mandelbaum described it as a "supermarket... grabbing whatever it takes a fancy to, without worrying about the costs or whether the product is the right brand or is genuinely needed" (Hastedt 2000, pp. 80-81)

The problem with Clinton's administration was its inability to focus its foreign policy on questions of true national interest. It focused its attention instead on the political, social and economic problems of other countries such as Bosnia and Somalia and Haiti. (Hastedt 2000, p.82)

Many commentators lamented the weakness and irresolution of the Clinton years. Distracted by Monica-impeachment et al., Clinton passed several chances to capture Osama Bin Laden. Also, some experts predicted that if only the military hadn't been weakened, Sept. 11 might not have happened. (Bock, 2003)

Learning From the Past

Whether the president is a democrat or a republican, or whether he follows a realist or a moralist path, or an internationalist or an isolationists policy the fact remains that policy makers don't seem to learn from past mistakes. The same mistakes occur over and over but by different people.

It is essential to point out that traditionally, it has been the Democrats who have waved the internationalist banner, while the Republicans have tended more towards isolationism. However, this is not always the case. For instance, several "containment alliances" were forged by Eisenhower; the Reagan doctrine envisioned the promotion of democracy abroad; Both Clinton and later Bush were animated by the Vision of a liberal international order in which the United States played a Central role. But Bush called for something like Theodore Roosevelt's version of "The Strenuous life", a conscious striving to achieve a larger and more secure liberal order; Clinton, with his emphasis on economic forces and international organizations, acted as though the Pax Americana would somehow expand itself, requiring only a modest military efforts. (Donnelly, 2003). That is why policy makers need to evaluate previous policies and avoid those that have failed previously and repeat policies that were successful.

Here and before analyzing the recent Bush administration, we question: Is the Bush administration learning from the past? Is it aware of the failures of previous strategies? Does it have a clear goal in Iraq? Is the administration aware of the situation in Iraq? ... the cultural differences? Is it excessively reliant on military action? Is the administration patient enough? Is it still maintaining good relations with its allies? Is it succeeding in fighting terrorism? Is it succeeding in spreading democracy in Iraq?

Before finding the answers to these questions, we need to remember that the turning point in the Bush administration was the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. What is the significance of this incident and where is it leading the world? These questions will be answered in the following chapter.

Chapter III: The significance of Sept. 11, 2001

Terrorism has existed through many centuries and since the rise of mankind. However, the world has never witnessed an act of terrorism like the attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. There is no doubt that the Sept. 11 attacks were immoral, unethical and had a tremendous impact on the fabric of American life as well as on the international community. In other words, the Sept 11 crisis is global as it binds many different countries to conflict, most obviously the U.S. and parts of the Muslim world. Its effects on the other hand, expand further reaching various levels in life, be it political, economic, cultural or psychological.

Many experts were baffled by the Sept.11 events. Some believed that everything will change with the coming terrorism. Obviously, though not everything has changed but certainly many things did. It is widely argued that the terrorist attacks changed everything dramatically as the world entered a new and frightening “age of terror” signaling a sharp change in the course of history. However this might be questionable.

September 11, 2001 takes us back in history to operation Pearl Harbor in 1941 and the Cuba Missile Crisis in 1962 and the fear of nuclear exchange between Washington and Moscow. (Crockatt, 2003, p.9) However, these tragic events cannot be compared to the September 11th attacks because they are not attacks launched by a state against another, but by a peculiar enemy who is “Stateless” and does not have a fixed territory or border.

The hijackers who committed the terrorist attacks were Arab Muslim young men belonging to an extremist Muslim group known by the name of "al-Qaida" which means "the base." This group is based in Afghanistan but has followers and supporters worldwide.

One must observe and analyze the world order before attempting to understand the meaning and the significance of the Sept 11 attacks. This crisis must be understood in the light of the interaction between America's dominant position in the world since the end of the cold war, the rise of political Islam and the phenomena of globalization. One must also take into consideration the politics and the history of the U.S, the conflict in the Middle East, the nature of Islam and the role of the United Nations and other international organization. Before analyzing these aspects we shall review the September 11 events.

September 11, 2001

On September 11, 2001 at around eight o'clock in the morning (New York time), four passenger planes took off from various East coast cities in the United States bound for destinations on the west coast. Within an hour, all four had been taken over by hijackers and transformed into flying bombs targeting the American financial and governmental power.

Two planes crashed into the World Trade Center in lower Manhattan while a third crashed into the Pentagon building in Washington DC, the headquarters of the U.S Defense Department. The fourth plane whose intended target was the White House or the Capital building, crashed into open ground in rural Pennsylvania Southeast of Pittsburgh.(Crockatt, 2003, p.1)

September 11, 2001 was a day of terror. The violence was not only aimed at endangering the lives of innocent people, but also jeopardizing their fundamental freedom.

Although these attacks were indeed an intolerable return to barbarism, yet the perceptions about its nature differ immensely at the opposite ends of the guns. Nevertheless, the main questions that puzzled people were: Are the attacks on the American people a declared war against America? Or are they targeting the Americans for what they symbolize and not for what they do?

What were the aims of the terrorists? Was it to weaken the United States? Was it to awaken it? To punish it? Or simply to change the U.S policy? Before observing and analyzing the objectives of the terrorists, it is essential to review certain factors and facts in the world order.

First fact in the world order is the U.S. dominance in the world. America is the largest and richest developed country in the world. It is a symbol of freedom, democracy and modernization. One might question, if these attacks were to occur in other states would it have the same international impact?

Since the U.S. has a preponderance of power and control over the world, the September 11th events shook and stunned the world not only by the scale of the attacks but by the fact that it was the powerful, almighty America that was under attack.

Here we are reminded by a question raised by the American people: "but why us?" "why so much hatred towards America?" The answer is simple if we investigate the source of the terrorist attacks. These attacks were committed by an Islamic extremist group.

If we were to define terrorism, we will not succeed simply because many politicians and historians have failed to identify a clear definition for terrorism. Terrorism these days have become more brutal and global. It became so widely used and in so many contexts as to become almost meaningless.

Terrorism is a politically motivated violence directed against non-combatant or symbolic targets which is designed to communicate a message to a broader audience. The critical feature of terrorism is the deliberate targeting of innocents in an effort to convey a message to another party. (Richardson, 2000, p.209) What kind of message were the terrorists conveying, and for what reason?

There are many reasons behind terrorist acts. Some believe it results from the rapid developments in modern technology, communication facilities and convenient travel. In addition, many believe that the rise of terrorism is due to fragmentation of nationalism and the intensification of religious fundamentalism. Other causes are capitalism, racism, and occupation.

At this point one questions, is the attack on America a fight for human rights? Is it a struggle for power or is it merely an act of destruction? To learn the reasons we need to review a speech by Osama Bin Laden, the leader of "Al- Qaida" and the chief mentor behind the September attacks, broadcasted on Jazeera Television. In his speech Bin laden claimed responsibility for the attacks: " The twin towers were legitimate targets they constituted pillars of American economic power. These events were grandiose from all points of review. It was not only the twin towers, but the towers of that country's morale which were destroyed... Bush and Blair do not understand anything but relative power. Each time, they kill us, we kill them so that a balance of forces is reached ". (Meyssan, 2002, p.103).

The statement by Bin Laden reveals intense hostility towards the United States. There was clearly an aim for destroying the American morale, spirit and national style. The founding statement of "Al Qaida", written on 23th February 1998 illustrates explicitly the veiled goals. "Praise be to God....and says in his book but when the forbidden months are past, then fight and slay the pagans whenever you find them, seize them, beleaguer them and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war)....."

The Arabian peninsula has never since God made it flat.....been stormed by any forces like the crusader armies spreading in it like locusts, eating its riches and wiping out its plantations.....First, for over seven years, the United States has been occupying the lands of Islam in the holiest places, the Arabian peninsula, plundering its riches, dictating to its rulers, humiliating its people, terrorizing its neighbors, and turning its bases in the peninsula into a spearhead through which to fight the neighboring Muslim peoples.....Second, despite the great devastation inflicted on the Iraqi people by the crusader-Zionist alliance, and despite the huge number of those killed, which has exceeded one million.....The Americans are once again trying to repeat the horrific massacres, as though they are not content with the protracted blockade imposed after the ferocious war. Third, if the Americans aim behind these wars are religious and economic, the aim is also to serve the jews petty state and divert attention from its occupation of Jerusalem and number of Muslim there...All these crimes and sins are clear declaration of war on God, his messenger, and Muslims...

On that basis, and in compliance with God's order, we issue the following "fatwa" to all Muslims; The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies - civilians and military - is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country....This is in accordance with the word of almighty God and fight the pagans all together as they fight you all together and fight them until there is no more tumult or oppression and there prevails justice and faith in God. (Halliday 2002, p.217-219)

The statement of Al Qaida reveals the purpose and objective behind the attacks. However, it was written with extreme fanaticism and exaggeration. According to Chalmers Johnson (2001) there is no political cause that can justify the killing of innocent people in the U.S. On the other hand, he adds, "just as nothing can justify American's killing of innocent people elsewhere in the world." In his book, "Responding to Terrorism", he explains that the September 11th attacks were not directed against American people but against American foreign policy.

The statement of Al-Qaida accuses the Americans of occupying the land of Islam such as Iraq. It also accuses them of interference in Arab relations and blames the U.S. for all the Middle East problems. However, the major anger is apparent in the third point where Al-Qaida suggests that the U.S. "the crusaders" along with the Zionists are an alliance with religious inclinations in an aim to destroy Islam. The U.S. alliance with Israel is the main reason behind the Arab hostility and frustration towards the United States.

In one of the interviews with vice president Dick Cheney for Fox television, he commented that the U.S "understands" Israel's need to assassinate top Palestinian officials. (Kuttab 2001, p.3).

Cheney's statement was obviously widely broadcast all over the Arab and Muslim world. In his article "Why Anti-Americanism?" Daoud Kuttab explains that Cheney's declaration added fuel to the raging fire in the Middle East.

Nowadays, many Arabs don't see the rosy American picture of the defender of rights and protector of freedom. Many argue that U.S officials no longer care to justify human rights violations in third world countries. To them, by supporting Israel, the U.S is supporting the aggressor. Therefore, terrorist attacks have become an essential form of resistance. This is where the real conflict arises between terror and resistance. The U.S. army manual defined terrorism as "the calculated use of violence or threat of violence to attain goals that are political, religious, or ideological in nature.....through intimidation, coercion, or instilling fear."(Chomsky,2003,p.188)

Terror or resistance have created a major dilemma or debate with respect to the legitimacy of actions. According to the United Nation's Charter, "people who are forcibly deprived from their right under colonial and racist regimes and foreign occupation are entitled to the right and self determination, freedom, and independence". These quoted words are stated by the U.N. General Assembly resolution adopted in December 1987. (Chomsky, 2003, p.190)

The U.S and Israel were the only states amongst 155 to deny that violent actions can be legitimate resistance and they insisted on declaring these actions under terrorism. The phrase "foreign occupation" was identified as referring to Israeli military occupation. Therefore, it was impossible for Israel to consider Palestinian fight as a resistance but as terrorism.

This case applies to Iraq today, while some of its people are resisting U.S. occupation, the U.S. calls them terrorists. (Chomsky, 2003, p.191)

Going back to the September attacks by identifying the hijackers one would be surprised by the nationalities of the hijackers. One would expect the hijackers to be belonging to Hamas organization, mainly of Palestinian nationality. However, the terrorists were mainly from Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Yemen, belonging to Al-Qaida, an extremist group that found a home in the caves of the mountains of Afghanistan.

According to Ali Salem, an Egyptian playwright and author; "Extremism may claim God as its redeemer, but it is really the selfish product of lunacy...." Once they have secured a religious cause, they search for a way to ennoble it in the eyes of ordinary people who do not share their holy delusion.. So they look for a nationalist cause; this is what Osama Bin Laden did when he claimed the Palestinian cause as a justification for the destruction of September 11. Beneath their claims is a sadder truth; these extremists are pathologically jealous. (Salem 2002, p.79)

Oscar Arias, former president of Costa Rica and Noble Peace laureate also believes that people are envious of the United States. The images that flash across television all over the world portray a wealthy, comfortable society unlike many states around the world that suffer from poverty, violence and misery.(Newsweek, Sept 9,2002, p.56)

But envy alone does not incite anti-Americanism. There is also a great deal of resentment towards the United States for its unilateralism, which is very obvious in the Bush administration, particularly with its disregard for international initiatives like the Kyoto Protocol, more recently its unilateral decision and action with regard to war on Iraq.

According to Oscar Arias “ in the aftermath of the cold war, the U.S. was in search for an enemy. Now it has found one: “terrorism.” Chinua Achebe, a Nigerian novelist sees America different than in the past. “In the past, we thought of America as the country that was on the side of colonized people, those who were oppressed.....Today, people in Africa find America on the side of the oppressor” (Newsweek, Sept 9, 2002,p.56).

In the past, the United States did care about the world. However many experts criticize its aids as arrogant. In fact, U.S. arrogant unilateralism is worrying the world. According to Felipe Gonzalez, former prime minister of Spain; “defining the terrorist attacks as an act of war made it easier to carry out military operations with the backing of the United Nations. (Newsweek, Sept 9, 2002. p.56)

Many observers consider that the U.S. is confusing terrorism with the precepts of a classical war, with which it has nothing in common. Terror is part of armed conflict, yet armed conflicts do not usually target civilians. It is directed at legitimate military targets. Terrorism can serve as a supplementary measure in a traditional armed conflict. In some conflicts it is used to bring a particular cause to attention or to deny weakness or defeat.

The horror of what happened on September 11 commands Americans to look at their homeland with new eyes and remember that Osama Bin laden and the Taliban are not representatives of international opinion. Nevertheless, the anger from American unilateralism did not emerge after September 11 but there were plenty of complaints harbored by many states against America prior to the attacks.

Criticism came from the very leaders who stood side by side with America against terrorism, notably British prime minister Tony Blair, German chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, and French president Jacques Chirac. Those leaders, prior to September 11 disapproved of the Bush administration's withdrawal from both the Kyoto protocol on global warming and the Anti-ballistic missile treaty and the refusal of the United States to join the International Criminal Court. (Hertsgaard 2003,p.5)

This superior behavior made many states fear that the Bush administration wants submission and not friendship. It is peculiar for a democratic nation like the U.S that preaches democracy to the world, to expect other states to submit to its policies blindly. In addition, by defining or pointing out some state as Axis of Evil the U.S is creating massive tensions around the world.

What happened at the world trade center and the pentagon and outside Shanksville, Pennsylvania, was not a natural disaster or some colossal accident, it was mass murder perpetrated by madness bent on destroying not only American lives but also American values. The attacks were no just on the people but on the very things that define American society: religious freedom, equality, economic opportunity and political choice. (Guiliani 2002)

It is clear to all, that what happened in America the morning of September 11 2001 was an immoral, and unethical crime. However, was the U.S. response by the Bush administration ethical and wise? In its attack on Afghanistan and Iraq, Washington left no doubt that it would proceed in its war on terrorism all alone.

Bush called his war against terrorism a “crusade”, a word he soon abandoned for fear of stoking Muslim resentment of Christian domination in medieval times. Months later, secretary of defense Rumsfeld stated, “if we have to go in to ten or fifteen other countries [to eliminate terrorism], we should do it”. Bush clichéd the point in his “axis of evil” speech in January 2002, in which he indicated that the United States was prepared to unilaterally expand the war against terrorism to include Iraq, Iran and North Korea as well as Libya and Syria. (Hertsgaard, 2003, p.192)

Just as fifty years ago the threat of communism led other nations to band together beneath American leadership in the cold war, Condolizza Rice argued, “so today the threat of terrorism justifies a new phase of America leadership. The Bush administration has adopted war on terrorism as the organizing principle of the U.S. foreign policy”. (Hertsgaard, 2003,p.193)

Is this unilateral policy and black or white perception the right way to deterring and combating terrorism? Is this policy adequate and appropriate for a powerful state like the U.S. with a history of rich democracy? Can democracy be taught only with a firm rigid stick? The Bush administration is playing the role of a democracy teacher holding a stick preferring an old teaching method that no longer applies in schools internationally. In the next chapter we will review this school and study its thoughts, ideology and perception.

Chapter IV: Images in Explaining War

In understanding why wars happen, and in analyzing a state's foreign policy behavior and international outcomes it is essential to study three images designed by Kenneth Waltz. The concept of "explaining wars" by Kenneth Waltz analyzes conflicts by looking at the individual, internal state structure and the international system. Waltz adds an additional image, the bureaucratic organizational system, which plays a crucial role in any foreign policy arrangement. (Waltz, 1965)

In this chapter we will review and analyze the U.S. power from various perspectives and then review...The images by Kenneth Waltz in order to come closer to understanding the U.S. foreign policy, particularly the Bush administration and its war on Iraq.

We have observed the recent collapse of the Iraqi regime and today amidst all the tensions, the attention and fear is centered around the power and the role of the U.S. in Iraq. The question that seems to hover around is "which country is next?"

Obviously the war on Iraq has witnessed worldwide frustration and stress in the global order, whether from the Western alliance, the European Union or the United Nations. (Zakaria, 2003)

It seems that the war on Iraq was an indication of the failure of both conflict management and preventive, as well as coercive diplomacy. Not to mention the obscene failure of the United Nations in forestalling the conflict situation and preventing the outbreak of hostility and disruptive behavior.

It also did not succeed in stopping the escalation of violence and the removal of the conflict by transforming the underlying dynamics of the conflict.

However, in order to achieve a conflict resolution there should be a removal of the "source" of the conflict altogether. This requires major changes in the goals, attitudes and perceptions of the conflict settlement.

This leaves us with the question; is it possible for states to change their perception of other states and ignore previous historical experiences upon which their foreign policy is built?

The terrorist attacks of September 11th 2001 has become the most horrifying day in the American history. Since then, fighting terrorism has become the goal and the priority of the United States.

In its war against Afghanistan and Iraq, the U.S. showed the world that it is keen on combating terrorism and maintaining its dominant position in the world. In his speech to the Congress following the September 11 attacks, president Georges W. Bush called for a "war on terror" that will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated.(Dudley, 2001, p.8)

Bush named his enemies " the enemies of freedom" who have committed an act of war against America. He also declared "what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight." He proceeded; "right now we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend our freedom. Our grief has turned to danger, and anger to resolution. Whether we bring our enemies to justice or justice to our enemies, justice will be done." (Dudley, 2001, pp.10-14)

It is evident that the Bush administration's war on terrorism has become the U.S. grand strategy in today's uni-polar world.

The American unilateral and preemptive strategies even preventive use of force refuses to be constrained by the rules and the norms of the international community. (Ikenberry 2002, p.44)

The U.S. dominance and preponderance of power reminds us of the Athenians in the Thucydides's classic "History of the Peloponnesian war". The realist perspective and emphasis on power described by Thucydides, reflects the U.S. ambition today.

The U.S. arrogates to itself the global role of setting standards, determining threat, using force and in the name of justice and democracy. This new neo-imperial strategy threatens to rend the fabric of the international community and would also trigger hostility, resistance and even more terrorism. (Ikenberry 2002, p.45)

The U.S. represents a potential hegemony. From its beginnings, the U.S. has been entwined in the affairs of the global community and has been called to perform roles previously fulfilled by traditional powers. Nevertheless, the U.S. role had always focused on the perspective of moral authority founded in its principles and its commitment to its peoples. This moral national identity has been strengthened by the relationship between an informed public and the federal government. (Covarrubias,2003).

The American dominance is not only military, but also economic. The U.S. economy is as large as Japan, Germany and Britain put together. (Zakaria 2003, p.4) Along with a large and growing economy, the U.S. plays a leading role in the economic markets and in the technological sector; leading the world in major modern technological developments.

The various industries considered high technology are also space, computers, electronics, communication and pharmaceuticals. In these industries the U.S. is accounted for nearly 32 percent of world high technology production. (Covarrubias, 2003).

In terms of military capabilities and political power, the U.S. dominance in military affairs is unquestionable. This has been clearly demonstrated by the Americans in Iraq against Saddam Hussein in 1991 and in Afghanistan in 2001 and respectively in Iraq again in 2003.

The U.S. today maintains the highest state of spending towards defense than any nation in the world. In 2003 its defense budget reached \$ 396 billion, the budget of 25 nations combined. (Covarrubias, 2003) Many experts such as Georges Soros criticized the Bush administration and the Bush doctrine for relying primary on military power and military adventures abroad and endangering civil liberties at home and braking international relation's laws. (Soros, 2004, p.2).

Furthermore, the U.S. in its struggle for supremacy and being so absorbed with attaining power, it detached itself from its responsibilities towards the international community. The U.S. refused to ratify the Kyoto Protocol on global warming which the international community as a whole was working extensively on. In addition, the U.S. refused to participate in the International Criminal Court. It is in president Bush's belief that his country should lessen its involvement in rebuilding other countries. (Fukuyama, 2002) (Peterson 2002, p.78) To understand why president Bush took such a position it is necessary to view the first image by Kenneth Waltz, which relates conflict to human behavior.

Waltz explains that in order to have peace we need to change people's mentality or even change leader's intellectual outlook as well as their psychic social behavior. (Viotti 1999, p.131)

According to an UN famous quote: "Wars begin in the minds of men. It is in the minds of men that defenses of peace must be constructed."

Political scientist Harold Lasswell believes in the politics of prevention and the reduction of tension in a society derived from the orientation in people's minds. This he proposes as beneficial for the organization of governments. (Waltz, 1965)

George W. Bush

We know for a fact that Bush's personality, attitude, perception and behavior are important elements in understanding the new American foreign policy with regards to war against Iraq. Many experts believe that on September 11, 2001, Bush seemed to meet the moment. Then Bush came to prove them right. Bush's doctrine came to express both his rage and that of his people. "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists." These words fell like thunder, threatening the world with an American hurricane, with a new declaration of American hegemony.

George W Bush's new world order is Bipolar, instead of being divided between East and West the world is divided between the evil and the righteous. The world of evil is shared by international terrorism expressed by countries like Iraq, Iran and N. Korea; whereas, the righteous world comprises countries that support the US in its campaign against global terrorism.

The Bush doctrine is built on two pillars. First, the United States will not tolerate any military rival, globally or in any region of the world. Second, the U.S. has the right to engage in pre-emptive military action. (Soros, 2004)

According to Robert Higgs (2003) from the Independent Institute, the Bush doctrine and the warfare conduct of the U.S. in Iraq are deeply immoral. "we are not dealing with a gray area here."

True, the situation can't be looked upon as gray. However, gray is one thing president Bush is not interested in. Some experts believe that Bush looks at matters from a white or black judgmental outlook and this reflects his religious devotion.

He believes that Saddam is evil or black and the U.S. has been chosen by God to be a model in the world of justice.

According to Robert Parry founder of Consortium News, " Bush apparently sees his mission in messianic terms, believing that he is the instrument of God as he strikes at Saddam Hussein and other U.S. adversaries." (Cabrejas 2004 , p.22) If this is true, then why target only Saddam Hussein? There are other dictators in the world. Bush won't attack North Korea because it would be too costly. Also, Africa isn't important to the U.S. interest. (Cabrejas, 2004 p.21). If interest is the lens that Bush views the world through then he is looking through the "realists" eyes. Consequently, Bush's prior and utmost consideration is for power.

Bush is regarded as a quick decision maker who does not look back to see whether his decision was right or wrong. As a matter of fact, his war on Iraq went to automatic military action without any regards to diplomacy. In taking decisions prior to September 11, 2001, president Bush was not the sole decision maker.

He was part of what is known as "the neo-conservative hawks." This takes us to the next image, "bureaucratic organizations" which is as a source of conflict and a major contributor to war.

The Neo -Conservatives

There are many skeptics and mysterious thoughts that surround the American neo-conservative group. It is the long-term conspiracy theory that many experts are suspicious about. Many believe that the neo-conservative project of a new road map in the Middle East has been underway many years before president George W. Bush entered the White House. (South News, 2003).

Neo-conservatism emerged from the original Western conservative tradition. Many believe that it is an ideology observed by a right wing US group of self-proclaimed intellectuals.

According to Michael Lind from "New Statesman," the neo-conservatives are "products of the largely Jewish-American Trotskyist movement which morphed into anti-communist liberalist between the 1950s and 1970s and finally into a kind of militaristic and imperial right". (eurolegal.com,2003).

Nevertheless, there are other commentators such as Max Boot from National Security Studies at the council on foreign relations, who argues that this accusation is "a malicious myth." He explains that the idea came because member of the neo-conservative group have obvious Jewish names such as Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz, and Eliot Cohen. Boot argues that though neocons have links to the Likud party, but they also have links to the British Tories and other conservative parties around the world, "and while many neoconservatives are Jewish, many are not, such as ex-CIA director James Woolsey, the Reverend Richard John Newhaus, social scientist James Q. Wilson, theologian Michael Novak, and Jeanne Kirpatrick." (Boot, 2004).

Boot explains that the neoconservative group is committed to liberal democratic values and not on commitments based on religions and ethnicity. They were concerned in the 1980s with the democratization of Nicaragua, Poland and South Korea. He argues that in the 1990s they intervened in Bosnia and Kosovo which were missions designed to rescue Muslims, and not Jews.

Nevertheless, according to Joaquin Cabrejas from the American Humanist association, neoconservatives place a high value on religion in society. Irving Kristol, a chief figure in neoconservatism, believes religion should play a much larger role in American society and avoid separation of church and state.

Religion is necessary to keep social order, this thought is derived from philosopher Leo Strauss, an advocate of religion. He together with Marx, agreed that "religion was the opium of the masses" and that the masses also need their opium. (Cabrejas 2003,p.1)

Apparently, religious Americans were more likely to support the war on Iraq than their secular counterparts. Statistics show that 60 percent of people who identified themselves as religious supported the invasion, while less than 50 percent of nonreligious people did. (Cabrejas 2003, p.3)

The neocon minders are realists and pure believers in power, dominance and superiority. They were the first to assail the "land-for-peace" formula that guided the U.S. policy in the Arab-Israeli conflict since the 1967 war. (Lobe, 2002) They were the founders of the New American Century project or PNAC in 1997.

Today secretary of defense, Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney the vice president and Paul Wolfowitz deputy at the Pentagon were the designers of the PNAC. (South news, 2003)

The Primary objective of this group is the radical transformation of the Middle East and the creation of the biggest political change, since the notorious 1916 Sykes-Picot treaty. (Margolis 2002, ¶2)

The neocons have been pushing for the reshaping of the political landscape of the Middle East and to them Iraq is the first piece of the puzzle. The overthrow of president Saddam Hussein of Iraq is merely a first step in the region's transformation.

In a speech in August 2002, vice president Dick Cheney revealed that the overthrow of Saddam would enhance U.S. ability to advance the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. (Donnelly, 2002). In other words, the attack on Iraq was directed as a message to the rest of the region, making it clear the U.S. is prepared to unilaterally deploy its military power to achieve its goals, objectives and values.

According to professor Francis Fukuyama (2002) in his article "Beyond our Shores," conservatism in America can be identified in international relations terms as "realism" that is, "the view that the world politics is a remorseless struggle for power on the part of sovereign nation-states that must ultimately look to themselves for their security."

Fukuyama characterized the Bush administration from first glance as it would obviously seem to be a conservative-realist, insofar as it has focused on pursuit of American national security through prosecution of a war on terrorism." (Fukuyama, 2002).

The neoconservative's new national security strategy lays out an ambitious road map for the Middle East, using Iraq as a means to pressurize other authoritarian regimes in Egypt, Syria, Iran and Saudi Arabia in order to convert to democracy.

According to New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman, what confronts the U.S. in Iraq is “one of the noblest things this country has ever attempted abroad, that is electing a decent, legitimate, tolerant, pluralistic representative government from the ground up.”

President Bush in one of his speeches confirms “60 years of western nations excusing and accommodating the lack of freedom in the Middle East.” (National catholic reporter, 2003) This is the moral picture that the Bush administration is trying to use behind the emphasis on power, sovereignty and self-help. The Bush administration has articulated a not-so-hidden idealist agenda that is encapsulated in the term “regime change,” and is broadly promoting democracy in a hostile part of the world that has proven stubbornly resistant to all democratic trends. (Fukuyama, 2002).

Fukuyama analyzed the U.S. “realism versus morality” dilemma which we defined earlier in chapter one. Fukuyama explains that the American foreign policy has always been pulled in two directions, “towards a realist defense of national security and towards an expansive sense of American purposes that rests directly on the exceptionalism of American institutions and the messianic belief in their universal applicability.” (Holtsberry, 2003).

The realist path and the neoconservatives thought stemmed from the principle of Ronald Reagan; “A strong American security and American interests.” (South News, 2003) However, the father of neoconservatism is Donald Devine whose purpose is to maintain the United States unprecedented position on the global stage despite the costs it may inflict on others. (Cabrejas, 2003)

As John Ikenberry pointed in *Foreign Affairs* that maintaining U.S. power means using military force, if necessary to prevent the rise of any "peer competitors" on the world stage. (2003) This point takes us back to the concept of "fear" of the growth of the other which in reality was realized since the time of Thucydides. The way Thucydides perceived it, it was the "growth of the Athenian power which terrified the Lacedaenonians and forced them into war." (Viotti, 1999, p.134).

This takes us to the third image in Waltz theory of "explaining wars." States are shaped by the international environment, as are men by both the national and the international elements.

The third image or systemic level focuses on the anarchic structure of the international system. This includes several factors that constitute the external environment common to all states. It also refers to the outcomes in the international system, to the strategic interaction between states and to the national level of state's foreign behavior. States may develop unconsciously a desire to maintain their power, in fear that other states might cast a shadow over them or even attempt to belittle their status. Thus, states attempt to engage in force in order to secure their hegemony, achieve their goals and maintain their reputation.

Chapter V: The Case of Iraq

The assumed purpose for president G. W. Bush's so called preemptive strike against Iraq is to rebuild Iraq and convert it into a democracy. The war on Iraq was the first application of the new theory that preemptive war can be an effective instrument against the spread of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. (Cirincione, 2003)

US versus UN

This unilateral military option of preemptive strike and use of force disregarded the UN's mandate. In addition it dismantled the role of the United Nations as the guardian of International peace and security. Therefore, the UN has become under serious threat in the wake of the U.S invasion of Iraq. (Misra, 2003)

By following a "unilateral" agenda, the US has defied the norms of constructive diplomacy and multilateral global order. Despite strong opposition from France and Russia and intense debates at the UN Security Council (UNSC), the US proceeded and imposed its doctrine of "regime change" in the context of Iraq in violation of the principles of the United Nation's Charter. However, is the US foreign policy compatible with the UN Charter?

Most UN Resolutions on Iraq including Resolution 1441 reaffirmed the commitment of all member states to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq. The UN from the beginning, refused to give legitimacy to the US in its war on Iraq. Therefore, the US-led invasion of Iraq is a violation of the UN Charter. And by this violation the US has initiated a war not only on Iraq but also on the United Nations.

US a Nation Builder

The United States is the most active nation-builder, since in the past it has attempted to send its armed forces on more than 200 occasions. These occasions varied from peace-keeping missions (as in Bosnia) proxy wars (as in Nicaragua and Angola) covert operations (as in coup in Chile in 1973) humanitarian interventions (as in Balkan in 1990), rescue of American citizens defense of allies (as in Korea in 1950) and one-off retaliation strikes (as the bombing raid against Libya in 1986). (Kasper, 2003)

Today, in Iraq, the Bush administration's concept of preemptive action has become a lightning rod in domestic and international politics. In September 2002, National Security Strategy of the United States declared that the U.S. will exercise the right to act preemptively in the event of deadly challenges to its people or allies emerging from rogue states or terrorist groups.

This strategy was condemned by various experts, such as Jimmy Carter who criticized this act and pointed to its effects as having catastrophic global consequences. Carter argued that preemption is nothing but prevention and that no one has the right to take such action. (Kroning, 2003).

David C. Hendrickson, a political scientist at Colorado College argued that "revolutionary" reorientation of U.S. foreign policy towards "the acceptance of preventive war and the rejection of multilateralism" runs counter to fundamental values in the American political tradition. (The Wilson Quarterly, 2003).

According to the department of defense's own official dictionary of military terms, preemption is "an attack initiated on the basis of incontrovertible evidence that an enemy attack is imminent." (Kroning, 2003) To "preempt" is defined in Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary as "to prevent from happening or taking place; forestall; prelude." (Bunn, 2003)

Prevention is different; a preventive war is "initiated in the belief that military conflict, while not imminent, is inevitable, and that to delay would involve greater risk." (Kroning, 2003) This is quite obviously the logic being pursued by the U.S. leadership, especially in relation to Iraq, for there is simply no evidence of any imminent threat.

Amidst this confusion and misunderstanding about the administration's concept of preemption, Iraq seems to be the first case study in the new U.S. policy. Another confusion in terms is observed between the ordinary military intervention and nation-building efforts. This can be differentiated by applying several criterias and observing the purpose behind nation-building.

First of all, the purpose of American nation-building according to the Bush administration is regime change or survivability in order to overthrow hostile regimes or maintain a friendly one. This undoubtedly shows a moral purpose in the American foreign policy.

Nevertheless, some experts believe that nation-building has a moralistic package from outside while it is merely colonial rule and a "realists" approach by another name from the inside. (Kasper, 2003.)

Consequently, as in Iraq, the U.S. replacement of Saddam's regime is considered by many a defense for U.S. security and economic interest. Therefore it is not aimed at building democracy but at building U.S. power in the region.

Another element or component of nation-building is the deployment of large numbers of American troops to depose a U.S. targeted regime or simply to perform essential administrative functions such as establishing law and order, and also restructuring the key political institutions such as rewriting the constitution and other important laws. (Pei, 2003.) This is precisely the U.S. plan in Iraq. However, is there any hope for its success?

According to studies conducted since 1900, by Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there are 16 out of 200 American military interventions that can be considered attempts at nation-building through the promotion or imposition of democratic institutions. (Kasper, 2003)

The United States had a successful nation building in Japan, West Germany, Granada and Panama. However, the U.S. failed to establish and sustain democracies in other countries (excluding Afghanistan), such as in Haiti, Cuba, Nicaragua and Cambodia. It is essential to point out that out of the 16 cases, 12 were undertaken unilaterally. Two (Afghanistan and Haiti) were authorized by the United Nations. Of the 16 cases of nation-building, 7 can be classified as instances of interim rule by American supported surrogate regimes. This means that there is an almost total dependency on Washington and on the American protectorate. This policy was evident in Cuba (1917-1922), Haiti (1915-1934,) The Dominican Republic 1965-1966) ... ect. (Carnegie Endowment,2003).

According to Carnegie Endowment, historically, the U.S. success in democratic nation-building is about 26 percent (4 out of 15 cases) how much chance does the U.S. foreign policy have in Iraq, particularly on its own?

Nation-building in Iraq

The question is as complex as the factors contributing to failed nation-building efforts. Failures occur due to certain social-economic characteristics and governing capabilities in target nations. However, failures also could occur due to unilateral decision. Carnegie Endowment studies reveal that out of 12 unilateral efforts, 10 were a failure. (Pei, 2003). The U.S. commits the same mistake repeatedly in Iraq. To make nation-building work in Iraq, the United States must first and foremost recall its own experiences in other countries.

According to Minxin Pei (2003) from Carnegie Endowment, historical examination in other countries would show that a key aspect in nation-building failures has been a unilateral approach. (Pei 2003, p.52). The ideal form of political transition in nation-building appears to be the quick transfer of power to legitimately elected local leaders, as in Grenada and Panama. In the case of Iraq, this system is not workable because a fully open electoral process is very likely to elevate radical religious leaders to power because they have a broad popular support.

Iraq has all the characteristics that have impeded democratic transitions elsewhere; a large impoverished population deeply divided along ethnic and religious lines; no previous experience with democracy; and a track record of maintaining stability only under the grip of a strongly autocratic government. (Ottaway 2003 , p.55). To understand the difficulty in establishing democracy in Iraq, one has to review the history of this country and study its culture and society.

Iraq's socio-political structure

Iraq has a complex tribal structure. Saddam was aware of such complexities, therefore he used repression to maintain his political grip on the country and achieve social stability. The Tikriti clan, of which Saddam was a member was one of those uniquely favored in Iraq.

On the contrary, many other groups were treated with inferiority and discrimination, such as the Kurds, Shiites, Turkomen, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Yezidies, Jews, Saban and others.(Simons, 2003, p.47) U.S. led war effort in 2003 was aided in various ways by the long- standing tensions between the northern Kurds and the ruling Sunni Arab minority. Therefore, there is obviously a serious potential for conflict between Iraq's diverse religious and ethnic groups.

According to David Pryce-Jones author on Arab affairs; "for Sunnis, Shias, Kurds and Turks, when war stops, the trouble starts" (Simons, 2003, p.48)

Not surprisingly, the U.S. administration was aware of the principal national divisions but there were few signs that it had serious knowledge of the complex tribal character of Iraq.

Although Iraq is heavily urbanized, it still contains many characteristic features of tribal social organizations, particularly in the more isolated rural areas.

The traditional pattern, heavily stressed by modern pressures, has been for several clans to unite as a tribe (Ashira) under a single sheikh. Saddam realized that the tribal system is a useful adjunct to his power base and therefore the tribes became a prime source for his power outside Baghdad (Pollack, 2002, p.6). That is why the Americans in Iraq are still facing obstacles with Saddam's tribal followers.

The United States following Saddam's customary practice, was then trying to buy the allegiance of the Iraqi tribes. Dozens of teams of U.S. troops and intelligence specialists were sent into Iraq with millions of dollars to induce local tribal leaders. (Simons 2003, p.57)

Another problem facing the Americans are the Shiites of Iraq. The Shiites of Iraq have always posed a problem for the Baghdad regime. The Americans realized that their attempts to remake Iraq as a democratic society might not be successful with the Shiite majority. Since the Shiite are closely tied to Iran the so called "axis of evil", fears and speculations that the worse scenario will occur and the Shiite will rule Iraq and turn it into an Islamic state, in contrast to the secularism of Saddam Hussein. The Shiite of Iraq would definitely encourage other Shiite in the region to rebel. (Simons, 2003, p.58)

In general, Iraq in official American propaganda has long been a problem in the Middle East, especially with Iraq identified with Saddam Hussein.

The Washington strategists called Saddam “ the beast of Baghdad “ and created a range of covert agendas that action against Iraq was permissible. Over more than a decade Iraq suffered cruise missile strikes, endless bombing, Iranian attacks in the south, Turkish invasions in the north, terrorist sabotage, anti-Saddam coup attempts, remorseless black propaganda, and a continuous sanctions regimes. (Simons, 2002, p.13)

The events of 11 September 2001 heightened the forum on Iraq. The U.S. was hoping to find any convincing links between Saddam Hussein and Osama Ben Laden or the Al-Quaida terrorist network, but they didn’t succeed in attaining their objective. (Pollack, 2002, p.xxi). Therefore, the United States had to invent an excuse; the threat of weapons of mass destruction, in order to make its attacks on Iraq sound legitimate. As a matter of fact, “legitimacy” is an intangible factor in foreign policy, but like so many intangibles it can have a great practical significance.

According to Robert Kagan, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment (2003), neither this nor any future American administration wants to be regarded as behaving illegitimately when it goes to war, hence president George W. Bush sought UN support before the conflict.

The preventive war called by the Americans against the spread of nuclear biological, and chemical weapons from Iraq to other countries in the region was regarded by the U.S. as a legitimate cause for its war on Iraq. It is vital to mention at this point that the bulk of American arms exports go to the Middle East.

According to Shannon Blanton, between 1992 and 1994, the Middle East received over 17 billion in U.S. arms, comprising 45 percent of the total U.S. arms exports (Blanton 2000, p.127).

However, until today the U.S. has failed to prove the existence of WMD in Iraq. U.S. teams have found scant evidence supporting the prewar diagnosis. There is a possibility that the weapons programs did not exist on the scale that the U.S. asserted before the war. (Cirincione, 2003)

Nevertheless, discovering any banned weapons would be evidence of Iraq's non-compliance with the United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 of 29.11.1990, and resolution 1441 of 8.11.2002. This however might improve the U.S. position and image in the public eye.

Unfortunately, if the U.S. misleads the world and the American people, and does not produce evidence of a large WMD program in Iraq, the "war" by no doubt will appear to many nations as unethical, immoral or simply unnecessary.

The U.S. interests

The failure to discover any traceable evidence of Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq proves to many that the whole issue was only a pretext employed to obtain the consent of U.S. allies as well as the support of few nations in the region in order to launch an attack on Iraq.

According to Burhan Ghalioun (2003) the director of the Centre d'Etudes sur L'Orient Contemporain in Paris and a professor of political sociology at the Universite de Paris III, "the real objective behind the U.S. strike against Iraq was....to topple the regime of Saddam Hussein. The Bush administration also clearly considered regime change...a prelude to a general makeover of the regime."

The reason behind the need for a makeover of the Middle East, stems from the U.S. strategic vision and particularly of the Bush's team convictions that Arab regimes need reformation due to the tensions and instability in their regimes.

In addition, Bush claims that the weakness in the Arab regimes is due to the lack of democratic practices, which prompted the growth of fundamentalists and terrorist organizations that threaten the United States and the whole world. (Ghalioun, 2003)

One cannot deny that there are weaknesses in the Arab regimes, there are also violations of human rights in some and there are no opposition parties in many. According to statistics conducted by Freedom House Index of political rights, Arab Muslim states are not democratic and not free. Obviously this measure is taken on the Western scale of democracy, which adopted democracy as an ideology incorporated in its system with its social and political life.

However, many Arab-Muslim states regard democracy as a foreign idea that is alien to Islamic principles and values that play a central role in shaping their society. (Abed 1995, p.117) One can assume that democracy is in the eye of the beholder or that democracy means different things to different people. (Sisk, 1992, viii)

The reason why some Islamic states reject democracy is due to the fact that Islam is regarded as the rule of God and not as a rule of man.

Al-Mawdudi, a Pakistani thinker in criticizing democracy says: "Democracy has put man on God's throne by granting him ability to legislate and produce law...Democracy places the entire governmental structure at the service of man instead of the sovereignty of God....(Abed, 1995, p. 122)

This is obviously a Muslim fundamentalist's view of democracy and not necessarily the view of the entire Muslim population. Nevertheless, most Arab political traditions are tightly knitted to the Muslim faith principles of the "Sharia".

According to Dr. Eliya Harik (2003) a professor of political science at Indiana University "democracy remains at the embryonic stage in some Arab states and is non-existent in most". Harik emphasizes the importance of civil society and encourages privatization of cultural and social organizations as essential in a democratization process.

Democracy cannot function without the appropriate cultural practices and social attitudes that pave the way for a democratic environment (Harik1996, p.276). The features in the American national style such as individualism, liberty, equality and public spiritedness are considered as the moral and intellectual characteristics of people. These characteristics are necessary for enriching the persistence of democracy in a nation. Therefore the question is, are the moral and intellectual characteristic of the society of Iraq and of the Arab world competent with democracy?

Unfortunately, Iraq does not possess the basic prerequisite for democracy nor the political culture or civil society that can pave the path for democracy. Similarly, many Arab states claim that they are democratic, however their systems reflect authoritarian practices. These political practices are derived from the typical ancient rule by authoritarian sultans in Islamic states.

The problem with Islamic states and democracy lie in the fact that Islam experiences difficulty in differentiating between sacred and secular. It is a way of life based on the concept of uniting religion and politics. (Huntington, 1997, p.210)

However, this is not the only reason behind the clash with democracy. There is a major reason for this clash and the rise of Islamic fundamentalism; it is the total failure of political institutions in the Arab world. Therefore, we come to the conclusion that the conflict is a conflict of ideologies between totalitarianism and liberal democracy.

There is no doubt that these ideologies are incompatible and they can't coexist, "between democracy and totalitarianism there can be no compromise," said an authority on the subject of B. Mussolini. (Packer, 2003, p.15) It is also the same approach used by the Bush administration against totalitarian and hostile states like Iraq.

Nevertheless, in the past, it was the U.S. that has supported Saddam and other totalitarian regimes in the region. According to John Cooley (2000) in his book "Unholy Wars", the United States established serious affairs in the 1990's with fanatical followers of Islam like Osama Bin Laden. Cooley describes it as an "American flirtation with Islamism." (p.1)

Many commentators emphasize that the U.S. moral assumptions or judgments are based on its interest and how its interests acknowledge and perceive the reality. Using morality as a means for realism or using values as means for interest is the policy of the United States. It is purely a Machiavellian philosophy.

The U.S. uses rhetoric of democracy in its war against Iraq. The consequences of such a policy is the increase in the number of radical Muslims believing in the inevitability of a clash of civilization, and the so called a Muslim "us" and a Western "them" (Haggani, 2003).

The rage of Muslims around the world is a reflection of Muslim's frustration and disappointment towards what they believe is a biased and a one-sided America. Furthermore, the images on world televisions showing blind folded prisoners in Guantanamo angered Muslims even more. To top it all, the pictures of Iraqi detainees at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq increased the disrespect and outrage towards the U.S. administration.

The despicable acts at Abu Ghraib violated the Geneva conventions, U.S. rules on interrogation and common decency. However, the Bush administration who neglected to impose the rules of interrogation in Iraq, indirectly, may have encouraged the abuse. (Mc Geary, 2004)

The images at Abu Ghraib could not have emerged at a worse time. With barely a month before the occupation officially ends, the U.S. plans to hand over Iraq to UN's representative Lakhdar Brahimi whose work involves directing Iraq towards a new government and a democratic election by January 2005. (Powell, 2004)

Moreover, Brahimi's delicate situation is to ensure that the new planned government reflects Iraq's diverse religious and ethnic mix. Brahimi has to create a government that will establish legitimacy in the eyes of the Iraqis.

With the involvement of the U.N. and the transfer of responsibility to an interim government there would be a slight reduction of U.S. casualties in Iraq. 782 Americans is believed to have died there since early 2003 (in 15 months). Almost weekly there are over 12 casualties with an average of around 35 attacks launched against U.S. soldiers everyday. With this number continuing to mount, the distrust of American people in their government also continues to rise. (Duffy, 2004)

Since the latest incidents at Abu Ghraib prison and the ugly images that were posted around the globe, more and more voters are having second thoughts about the Bush administration. According to a recent poll conducted by CNN, 46% of the American people believe that going to Iraq was a big mistake. The same number today declared they would vote for president Bush whereas 51% said they would vote for John Kerry. (Dickerson, 2004) Moreover, only 37% of the Americans believe that the war on Iraq was worth the toll it has taken in American lives.

With regard to whether president Bush is doing a good job or a poor job handling foreign policy, today, only 42% believe that Bush is doing a good job. Only 39% think that he has done a good job in Iraq. Only 46% assume he is handling the war on terrorism well. (Time/CNN Poll).

It seems that the 43rd president is heading into the danger zone of American politics. A majority of Americans no longer believe that the war on Iraq was necessarily to defend the nation against terrorism. According to an editorial article in American magazine (Vincible ignorance, 2003), the editor states, “ as we preach democracy abroad, we need to revive it at home. We need to protect American democracy against the self-inflicted wounds of the war on terror, of which the war in Iraq is the most grievous gash.”

While the United States has acted within its borders as a nation of goodwill and a true example of democracy, equality and freedom, the U.S. did not adhere to its values elsewhere and outside its borders and very evidently in Iraq. The United States also drifted from the international community by launching a war unilaterally. It irreparably damaged the international order and severed transatlantic ties. Transparently and openly, the U.S. tried to promote its interests rather than the interests of the international community. (Kagan 2003, p. 71).

President Bush declared from the beginning that whatever the Security Council decides, America has the right to attack Iraq in self-defense. But it is essential to note that the UN charter's article 51 authorizes military self-defense only "if an armed attack occurs," not before one has taken place. However, Mr. Bush believes that in an age of terrorism and weapon of mass destruction, the UN rules are not good enough to combat terrorism. Therefore, the U.S. has the right to use "pre-emptive" action against the aggressor. (Economist 2003, p.9)

Preemption is a typical "realist" strategy that has no sense of morality and ethics. Can one imagine that states around the world have the right to attack its neighboring states, because it simply senses that it might in the future be strong to attack it?

The strategy does not make sense, because if this strategy becomes legitimate the way the U.S. proposes, then the world will be in a catastrophe. However, every knowledgeable expert and every non-educated human being knows for a fact that the whole story is about U.S. interests in Iraq.

Iraq sits upon the second largest oil reserves in the world. It is ideally situated in the Middle East, sharing borders with Saudi Arabia, Iran and Syria. In Iraq, the U.S can maintain control and hegemonic power throughout the region, as well as keep close eye on Saudi Arabia and create a direct threat for Iran and Syria. (Ewins, 2003, p.5)

U.S. occupation will use Iraqi oil export to pay for U.S. construction firms in the petro-dollars. Using this strategy the U.S. will increase its oil supply as well as bring down oil prices.

Looking at this “realist” strategy, one needs to look ethically on what is happening in Iraq. However, according to Noam Chomsky, the U.S. does not regard this aspect because its fundamental assumption lies behind the imperial grand strategy that “we are good, even noble” and that its intervention is righteous in intent. (Chomsky 2003; p. 16)

According to Aristotle’s theory, all regimes skew their politics to their interests rather than the interests of the whole or the common good. (Smith, 2000, p.913) History shows that most people can be persuaded that evil is not evil but rather something else.

According to Madeleine Albright “Romans saw glory in the pillage of the Parthians; pious Catholics saw purity of faith in the Spanish Inquisition; the United States founding fathers saw economic necessity in slavery; Bosnia Serbs saw justice for past wrongs in ethnic cleansing. Even many Nazis were sure they were doing the right thing; after all, what could be more moral than “peace in our time!” (Albright, 2003,p.11)

However, with all these moral intentions, murder remains immoral and evil. There is nothing that can justify that the murder of people is ethical. Similarly, invading Iraq can by no means be a pathway for democratizing the region.

The U.S. officials or soldiers today, lack credibility preaching the virtues of freedom while they search and destroy houses in Iraq and treat prisoners the way images revealed at the Abu Ghraib prison. Iraq could have been handled better if the U.S. would avoid its preemptive and the “us” verses “them” philosophy to friends as well as foes. The U.S. should have stressed the collective power of the world and with that proving that terrorism just like genocide and slavery is unethical and would be fought against by the international community.

The use of ethical rhetoric was only a necessary ingredient for the U.S. to further its national security agenda and its counterterrorism agenda. These have created frustrations in the Arab world as well as it divided Americans and Muslims around the world, since many Muslims see terrorists as freedom fighters. (Gelb, 2003, p.7)

Across the Middle East, some people insist that they do not “like American ideas about democracy.” All around the world, fewer and fewer people accept that any connection exists between their aspirations and the principles that Washington and the Bush administration preaches. (Berger 2004, p.48)

According to Newsweek editor and columnist Fareed Zakaria, “what we need in American politics today is not more democracy but less.” (Judis 2003, p.128)

Zakaria argues that the best way to turn developing societies into liberal democracies is by fostering constitutional liberty rather than democracy. Constitutional liberty is the protection of individual right of speech, property and religion through a system of law not subject to arbitrary government manipulation. Whereas democracy is a political system based on open, free, and fair elections. (Judis 2003, p.129)

Zakaria like many experts, speculates that if elections were held in the Middle East, they would be won by fundamentalist parties that would definitely destroy future liberty and elections. Zakaria also devises a solution; he believes that the problem with Arab countries is their wealth, not their poverty. Therefore, they should devote their revenues to popular education and economic development. (Judis 2003, p. 130)

Earlier in chapter II of this paper we studied the American National Style and that democracy in America flourished on the basis of liberty and this eventually led to a democracy.

It is essential to note that the United States became a full-fledged liberal democracy after women won vote in 1920 and the blacks were guaranteed access to polls in 1965.

(Judis 2003, p. 129)

Therefore, what is the use of pushing democracy on a nation that is not ready for it yet ?!

Conclusion

Realism and morality are recognized as parallel forces that are in an eternal dilemma in international relations. Historically, the U.S foreign policy is a reflection of this vicious circle.

In the current Bush administration, the U.S is trying to practice a "realist" foreign policy throughout the Middle East and especially in Iraq. It aims at using Iraq as a model to democratize the entire Middle East and beyond, regardless of their cultural and religious affinities.

Knowing that Iraq was ruled by a totalitarian regime there is no doubt that it is difficult to assimilate this new ideology. Although, it has been proven that morality is interpreted differently in various cultures, the U.S is deliberately ignoring this reality by trying to impose Western democracy on Iraq and beyond.

Democracy is believed to be unworkable in Iraq because, where democracy and morality succeeds in one culture, it may not see the light in another.

The presence of U.S troops in Iraq may be a historical first for the region, but the United States is not writing history on a blank slate. Each side is ignorant of the other, and there is deep mutual suspicion, colored by the region's bitter Israeli-Palestinian conflicts. Achieving a positive outcome requires every single element of wisdom and patience in Iraq, particularly as the Americans are getting ready to hand in Iraq to the United Nation's expert Elakhdar Brahimi in June, 2004.

It would be a miracle if the model of Iraq can produce regime change in the Middle East. For Arab states to contemplate moving beyond their “semi-authoritarian and liberalized autocracies” would require a climate of regional stability that discredits Islamist extremism. Moreover, the Arab states need to make a serious commitment to freedom and human rights in order they pave the way for a future democracy.

The real political reform hinges on a comprehensive solution of Arab – Israeli conflict that allows for an independent Palestinian state.

The U.S “pre-emptive” use of force cannot be successful in reshaping Iraq without the support or admiration of its people. This will keep the U.S in a vulnerable position to the kind of threat represented by terrorist movements.

Nevertheless, it is evident from the Israeli – Palestinian experience that overwhelming force cannot by any means achieve a resolution between disputing states, nor is force capable of promoting democracy.

Therefore, Iraq requires a generational commitment by the international community; a collective action and a cooperative security rather than a preemptive policy or a concept of deterrence and containment. The Bush administration committed a big mistake by launching the war on Iraq unilaterally without the consent of the United Nation and the international community.

Regardless of the justification of this war, everyone today should be concerned with stability in Iraq. The disintegration of that country along ethnic and religious fault lines would destabilize the Middle East and energize radical movements that threaten the world.

When the U.S decided to go to war in Iraq, the Bush administration believed that most of their allies would get on board, if they made it clear that the U.S would leave without them. The U.S also believed that it does not need the legitimacy of the United Nations.

These misperceptions, led to a failure in gaining the support of capable allies such as France and Germany; and resulted in increasing the human, financial and strategic costs of the war, as well as, threatened the success of the occupation.

Rather than showing off its unbeatable power, the U.S government should have stressed the collective power instead.

With all these misunderstandings between the U.S, its allies, and the rest of the world, it seems factual that the United States is often on a different ethical and moral track from others. This is evident with the U.S rejection of the Kyoto Protocol on climate change, the International Criminal Court, the treaty banning land mines and the genocide convention.

While most nations approved of these conventions as part of their moral stance, the U.S however, refused to ratify it on the grounds that it will suffer immensely under their terms.

The United States has a history of a dilemma between its realist and moralist principles or perceptions. However, the U.S today, is definitely not in a dilemma. The Bush administration is aware of its "realist" intentions, which are nicely wrapped with a sugar-coated tale of democracy. On the scale of realism and morality, the U.S has hit the top of realism in its policies today.

Although the U.S has its own ethical standards, yet its pursuit of its objectives is considered irrelevant to the norms and moral standards of the international community and the society of states. For this reason, the U.S foreign policy tools in Iraq did not win the approval nor the satisfaction of other nations.

The United States who always believed in its leadership role in the world must realize that a true leader does not coerce others to follow his / her path because they will willingly choose to so if they respect his genuine wisdom and morality.

In our world today, morality is rare and ethical concerns are hardly recognized when an issue is related to national security or interests. Moral issues will continue to be debatable. Although morality strives to achieve a universal significance, yet contradictions of self- interests stand in the way. Still the morality of the strong over the weak will prevail and the "might" will be right and just.

Work Cited

- Abed, S.B. (1995). Islam and Democracy: Democracy, War, and Peace in the Middle East. Indiana University Press.
- Albright, M.K. (2003). Bridges, Bombs, or Bluster? Foreign Affairs, 2.
- Ambrose, S.E. (1991). The presidency and the foreign policy. Foreign Affairs, v70 n5 p120(18). Retrieved Aug 13, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Berger, S.R. (2004). Foreign Policy for a Democratic President. Foreign Affairs, 47.
- Bock, A.W. (2003). Criticizing U.S. Foreign Policy. The Independent. Retrieved Nov 29, 2003 from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Boot, M. (2004). Think Again: Neocons. Foreign Policy. Retrieved Feb 12, 2004, from CIAO database.
- Brumberg, D. The Middle East's Muffled Signals. Foreign Policy. Retrieved Feb 15, 2004, from CIAO database.
- Bunn, E. (2003). Preemptive Action: When, How, and What effect? National Defense University. Retrieved Feb 20, 2004, from CIAO database.
- Cabrejas, J. (2003). Behind Bush's drive to War. The Humanist, 63p 20(5). Retrieved Feb 10, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Cahn, M.S. (1997).(ed). Classics of Modern Political Theory: Machiavelli to Mill. New York, Oxford.
- Carr, H.E. (1962). The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939. London, MCMillan & Co.
- Chomsky, N. (2003)a. Hegemony or Survival: America's quest for global dominance. New York: Metropolitan books.
- Chomsky, N. (2003)b. One Man's World. New Statesman, v132 i4664 p16(4). Retrieved Feb 10, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.

- Cirincione, J. Can Preventive War Cure proliferation. Foreign Policy. Retrieved Feb 15, 2004, from CIAO database
- Cooley, J. (2000). Unholy wars: Afghanistan, America and international terrorism (2nd ed). London: Pluto Press.
- Covarrubias, J.A. (2003). The U.S.: Reluctant Sheriff or Potential Hegemon?. American Diplomacy. Retrieved Feb 12, 2004, from CIAO database.
- Cox, W.R. (1997). The New Realism: Perspectives on Multilateralism and world order. Tokyo: UN, U Press
- Crockatt, R. (2003). America embattled: September 11, anti-Americanism, and the global order. New York: Routledge.
- Donnelly, T. & Shadid, A. (2002). U.S. War Hawks have Plans to reshape entire Mideast. Owner IMAP. Retrieved Dec 1, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Donnelly, T. (2003). The Meaning of Operation Iraqi Meaning. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Retrieved Feb 12, 2004, from CIAO database.
- Dudley, W. (Ed). (2001). The attack on America: September 11,2001. San Diego, California: Greenhaven press.
- Duffy, M. & Cooper.M & Dickerson J.F. (2002, sept). Marching Alone. Time, 38.
- Economist Newspaper, (2003). Procon and Muddled, The Legal Arguments. The Economist, v366 i83 p16. Retrieved Feb 10, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Ewins, T. (2003). The New Killing Fields: Human Catastrophe looms in Iraq. Arena Magazine, p5(3). Retrieved Feb 10, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Frankel. B. (1996).(ed). Roots of Realism. London, Frank Cass.
- Freedom House Survey Team, (2003). Freedom in the World 2002: The Democracy Gap. Retrieved August 6, 2003, from <http://www.Freedomhouse.org>.
- Frost, C. (2000). Media Ethics and self regulations. Longman.

- Fukuyama, F. (2002). Beyond our Shores. Opinion Journal. Retrieved Nov 24, 2003, from [http:// www.opinionjournal.com](http://www.opinionjournal.com).
- Gelb, L.H. & Rosenthal, J.A. (2003). The Rise of Ethics in Foreign Policy. Foreign Affairs, 2.
- Ghalioun, B. (2003). Iraq and the return of Colonialism. Retrieved Nov 12, 2003, from <http://www.ssrc.org>.
- Giuliani, R. (2002, sept). Getting it Right at ground Zero. Time.
- Halliday, F. (2002). Two hours that shook the world: September 11,2001: Causes and Consequences. London: Saqi books.
- Harik. E. Pluralism in Arab World. In: Diamond, L., & Plattner, M.F., (Eds).(1996). The Global Resurgence of Democracy (2nd ed). Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Wopkins University Press.
- Haqqani, H. Islam's Weekends Moderates. Foreign Policy. Retrieved Feb 20, 2004, From CIAO database
- Hastedt, G. P. (2001). American foreign policy: Past, Present, Future (4th ed). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hertsgaard, M. (2003). The Eagle's Shadow: Why America fascinates and infuriates the world. London: Bloomsburg publishing.
- Higgins, R. (2000). Sainly or Cynical: an Ethical Dimension to Foreign Policy? Retrieved Nov 29, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Higgs, R. (2003). Military Precision versus Moral Precision. The Independent Institute. Retrieved Nov 29, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Holtsberry, K. (2003). You Get What You Pay For. Retrieved Nov 24, 2003, from [http:// www.Kevinholtsberry.com](http://www.Kevinholtsberry.com).
- Hoy. T. (2000). Toward a Naturalistic Political Theory: Aristotle, Hume, Dewey, Evolutionary Biology and Deep Ecology. Westport: Praeger Puff.

- Huntington, S.P. (1997). The Clash of civilizations and the Remaking of world order. New York: Touchstone.
- Ikenberry, J. (2002). America's Imperial Ambition. Foreign Affairs, 44-60.
- Judis, J.B. (2003). Putting Liberty First: The case against Democracy. Foreign Affairs, 128-134.
- Kagan, R. Looking for Legitimacy in all the wrong places. Foreign policy. Retrieved Feb 12, 2004, from CIAO database
- Kasper, S. (2003). Lessons from the Past. Retrieved Nov 12, 2003, from <http://www.Ceip.com>.
- Kissinger, H. (2001). Does America need a foreign policy?: Toward a diplomacy for the 21st century. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Kroning, V.(2003). Prevention or Preemption? Towards a clarification of Technology. The project on Defense Alternatives. Retrieved Feb 4, 2004, from CIAO Database
- Kuttab, D. (2001). Why Anti-Americanism? Retrieved August 5, 2003, from <http://www.alternet.org>.
- Lobe, J. (2002). Neoconservative Hawks. Retrieved August 6, 2003, from <http://www.bintjbeil.com>.
- Machiavelli, N. (1986). The Prince. Middlesex, Penguin Books.
- Margolis, E. (2002). Bush's Mideast Plan: Conquer and Divide. Owner IMAP. Retrieved Dec 12, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Mathews, J.T. (2003). Iraqis can do more. Retrieved Nov 12, 2003, from <http://www.ceip.org>.
- MCGeary, J. (2004, march). Which Way is the Exit? Time, 26.
- Meyssan, T. (2002). 9/11: The big lie. London: Carnot publishing.

- Micklethwait, J. (2002, Jan). A year of living dangerously. The Economist, 12-13.
- Misra, S. (2003). US versus UN. Asia affairs. Retrieved June 25, 2004 from <http://www.asianaffairs.com/may2003/focus-us-versus.htm>
- Moller, B. (1997). The U.S. and the New World Order. COPRI working paper. Retrieved Feb 12,2004, from CIAO database.
- National Catholic Report, (2003). Who Do We Say We Are? National Catholic Reporter, v39 i19 p28(1). Retrieved Feb 10, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Ottaway, M.S. One Country, Two Plans. Foreign Policy. Retrieved Feb 15, 2004, from CIAO database.
- Packer, G. (Ed). (2003). The fight is for Democracy. New York: HarperCollins.
- Pei, M. (2003). Lessons of the Past. Foreign Policy. Retrieved Feb 15,2004, from CIAO database.
- Peterson, P.G. (2002). Public Diplomacy and War on terrorism. Foreign Affairs,74-94.
- Pollack, K.M. (2002). The Threatening Storm: The case for invading Iraq. New York: Random house.
- Powell, C.L. (2004,oct). A Long, Hard Campaign. Newsweek, 37.
- Richardson, L. (2000). The Future of Terrorism. SWIDOC, Amsterdam.
- Robinson, D.N. (2003). Praise and Blame: Moral Realism and its applications. Institute of religion and public life, v3 I138 p48. Retrieved Feb 10, 2004,from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Salem, A. (2002,sept). An Apology from an Arab. Time.
- Shomali, M.A. (2001). Ethical Relativism: An Analysis of the Foundations of Morality. London: Islamic College for Advanced Studies Press.
- Simons, G. (2002). Targeting Iraq: Sanctions and Bombing in US policy. London: Saqi books.

- Simons, G. (2003). Future Iraq: US policy in reshaping the Middle East. London: Saqi books.
- Smith, T.W.(2000). Ethics and Politics: A Response to Terchek and Moore. American Political Science Review, v94 i4 p913. Retrieved Aug 13, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Sisk. T.D. (1992). Islam and Democracy: Religion, Politics and Power in the Middle East. U.S Institute of Peace.
- South news (2003). Neoconservatives' 1998 Memos a Blueprint for Iraq War. Owner IMAP. Retrieved December 1, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Spanier, J., & Hook, S. W. (1995). American foreign policy: Since World War 2 (13th ed). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.
- Staff, (2002, Sept). Why Hate America? Newsweek, 56.
- Staff, (2003). Funding the U.S. Neoconservatives. Retrieved August 6, 2003, from <http://www.eurolegal.org>.
- Teehan, J. (2003). Kantian ethics after Darwin. Zygon, 38.
- Soros, G. (2004).The Bubble of American Supremacy. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved Feb 12, 2004, from CIAO database
- Stephen, A. (2003). Continuing US Losses in Iraq are tragic but necessary, insists the Bush administration. New Statesman, v132 i4663 p8(1). Retrieved March 5, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Vincible ignorance (2003). America, v189 i18 p3. Retrieved Dec 2, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Viotti, P.R, & Kauppi, M.V. (1999). International relations theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism and beyond. Needham Heights: Library of congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Waltz, K.N. (1995). Man the State and War. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Wilson, Q.J., & DiIulio, Jr. J. J. (1998). American government: The Essentials (7th ed). New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Wittkopf, E. R., & McCormick, J. M. (Eds). (1999). The Domestic sources of American foreign policy: Insights and Evidence (3rd ed). Boston way, Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Woodrow Wilson International Center (2003). Now, America the Imperial? The Wilson Quarterly, v27 i2 p90(3). Retrieved Feb 10, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Zakaria, F. (2003). The Arrogant Empire. Retrieved August 6, 2003, from <http://www.Columbia.edu>.

Bibliography

- Albright, M.K. (1998). The Testing of American Foreign Policy. Foreign Affairs, p50(1). Retrieved Aug 13, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Art, R.J. (2003). A grand strategy for America. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Bartholet, J. (2001, Oct). Method to the Madness. Newsweek, 56-61.
- Bessmertnykh, A. (2003). The Iraq War and its implications. International Affairs: A Russian Journal. Retrieved Feb 12, 2004, from CIAO database.
- Bishop, Ch. (1998). Review of International Studies. Foreign Policy, v1 i13 p128(3). Retrieved May 28, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Blanche, E. (2004, Feb). Rumour, Conspiracy & gobble. The Middle East, 14.
- Blanton, L.S. (2000). Promoting Human Rights and Democracy in the Developing World: U.S. Rhetoric versus U.S. Arms Exports. American Journal of Political Science, v44 n1 p123. Retrieved Aug 12, 2003, From JSTOR database.
- Boot, M. (2003). The New American Way of War. Foreign Affairs, 41.
- Carothers, T. (2003). Punishing Democracy. Retrieved Nov 12, 2003, from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>.
- Dawisha, A.& Dawisha, K.(2003).How to build a Democratic Iraq. Foreign Affairs,36.
- Deaver, M.V. (2001). Disarming Iraq: Monitoring power and resistance. London: Praeger.
- Dobriansky, P.J, & Carothers, Th. (2003). Democracy Promotion. Foreign Affairs, 141.
- Eland, I. (2002). War on Terrorism gets too Excessive. Charlotte Post. Retrieved Nov 29, 2003, from File: A:\The Independent Institute War on Terrorism gets too Excessive, By Ivan Eland.htm.

- Eland, I. (2003). The Bush Administration's Weapons of Mass Deception. Retrieved 29, 2003, from File: A:\ The Independent Institute The Bush Administration's Weapons of Mass Deception, by Ivan Eland.htm.
- Elliot, M. (2003). Following Familiar Footsteps. Retrieved August 12, 2003, from [http:// www.time.com](http://www.time.com).
- Emons, T. (2000). Unreal Realism. The National Interest, p137. Retrieved May 28, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Feinstein, L. & Slaughter, A.M (2004). A Duty to Prevent. Foreign Affairs, v83 i1 p136. Retrieved March 4, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Ferguson, N. (2003). Hegemony or Empire. Foreign Affairs, 154.
- Forde, S. Natural Law, Theology, and Morality in Locke. University of North Texas. Retrieved Feb 6, 2004, from JSTOR database.
- Friedman, Th.L. (2003). Longitudes and attitudes: The world in the age of terrorism. New York: Anchor books.
- Frum, D. & Perle, R. (2003). An End to Evil: How to Win a War on Terror. New York: Random House.
- Gerges, A.F. (1999). America and political Islam: Clash of cultures or clash of interests? London: Cambridge university press.
- Gibbs, N. (2004, March). Counting the Days. Time, 22.
- Grossman, Z. (1995). Over a Century of U.S. Military Interventions. Retrieved Dec 1, 2003, from File: A:\ Over a Century of U.S. Military Interventions.htm.
- Gorsevski, E.W. (2001). The United States and the Human Rights: Looking Inward and Outward. International Journal on World Peace, v18 i2 p86(5). Retrieved May 28, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Hansen, B. (2001). Unipolarity and the Middle East. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Hirsh, M. (2002). Bush and the world. Foreign Affairs, 18-43.

- Hiro, D. (2002). War without end: The rise of Islamist terrorism and global response. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Holsti, K.J. (1992). International politics: A Frame work for analysis (6th ed). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Ignatieff, M. (2001). Human Rights as politics and Idolatry. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Johnson, C. Responding to terrorism without Committing Terrorism. News Abroad. Retrieved Nov 29, 2003, from File: A:\ Responding to terrorism without Committing terrorism.htm.
- Junkerman, J. & Masakazu, T. (Eds). (2003). Power and Terror: Post-9/11 talks and interviews, Noam Chomsky. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Kamiya, G. (2001). The Bloody Jordan now Flows through America. Retrieved August 5, 2003, from [http:// www.alternet.org](http://www.alternet.org).
- Katznelson, I. & Kesselman, M. & Darper, A. (2002). The politics of power: A Critical Introduction to American government. U.S: Thomson learning.
- Kessler, G. (2003). U.S. Decision on Iraq has Puzzling Past. Washington post. Retrieved Dec 1, 2003, from file: A:\Glenn Kessler, U_S_D Decision On Iraq has Puzzling past.htm.
- Kissinger, H. (1994). Diplomacy. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Lapid, Y. (2000). Moral Spaces: Rethinking Ethics and World Politics and International Society. American Political Science Review, v94 i2 p503. Retrieved Aug 13, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Lawson, C. (2003). How best to build Democracy. Foreign Affairs, 206.
- Lynch, M. (2003). Taking Arabs Seriously. Foreign Affairs, 81.
- Mandelbaum, M. (2002). The Inadequacy of American Power. Foreign Affairs, 61-73.
- Mandelson, P. (2004). Give peace a chance. The world in 2004, 57.

- Mansfield, E.D. & Snyder, J. (1995). Democratization and War. Foreign Affairs, v74 n3 p79(19). Retrieved Aug 13, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Marshall, P. (2002). God and the constitution: Christianity and American Politics. England: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Marshall, M.J. (2003). Remaking the World. Foreign Affairs, 142.
- Mathews, J.T. Now for the Hard Part. Foreign Policy. Retrieved Feb 18, 2004, from CIAO database.
- Meyer, K.E. (2001). The Quick sands of Realism. World Policy Journal, v18 i13 p89(11). Retrieved May 28, 2003, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Middle East Forum. A Shot at Peace: Can the U.S. Enforce the Road Map. Retrieved August 5, 2003, from [http:// www.meforum.org](http://www.meforum.org).
- Middle East Forum. After Saddam? Remaking the Mideast. Retrieved August 5, 2003, from [http:// www.meforum.org](http://www.meforum.org).
- Morrow, L. (2001,sept). The case for Rage and Retribution. Times.
- Nakash, Y. (2003). The Shi'ites and the Future of Iraq. Foreign Affairs,17.
- National Catholic Reporter, (2003). Noble goal in Iraq lacks moral Foundation. v40 p32(1). Retrieved Feb 10, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Nicholson, M.E. (2003). An Essay on Terrorism. American Diplomacy. Retrieved Feb 12, 2004, from CIAO database.
- Nye, J.S. (2003). U.S. Power and Strategy After Iraq. Foreign Affairs, 60.
- Pipes, D. (2002). Militant Islam reaches America. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Pipes, D. (2003). Why the U.S. is Discarding War's Rules. Retrieved 5, 2003, from [http:// www.meforum.org](http://www.meforum.org).

- Peters, R. (2002). Beyond Terror: Strategy in a changing world. Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole books.
- Pfaff, W. (2003). Scaring America Half to Death. Retrieved August 12, 2003, from [http:// www.iht.com](http://www.iht.com).
- Power, J. (2003). Morality to Avoid War, Iraq. Retrieved Nov 12, 2003, from [http:// www.transnational.org](http://www.transnational.org).
- Roth, K. (2003). The Law of War in the War on Terror. Foreign Affairs, 2.
- Said, E. (2000). Reflections on American Injustice. Retrieved Dec 1, 2003, from File: A:\ Edward Said, Reflections on American Injustice.htm.
- Satloff, R.B. (Ed).(2002). War on terror: The Middle East dimension. Washington, DC: Washington Institute for near east policy.
- Sherman, T. (2003). Real ethics: Rethinking the Foundations of morality. Theological Studies, v64 I 4 p 892(1). Retrieved Feb 10, 2004, from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Simes, D.K. (2003). America's Imperial Dilemma. Foreign Affairs. 91.
- Singh,R.(2003).Contemporary American Politics and Society: Issues and Controversies. London: SAGE Publications.
- Simon, J. D. (2001). The terrorist trap: America's experience with terrorism (2nd ed). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Staff, (2003). U.S. Politics: Political System. Retrieved August 6, 2003, from <http://www.magazineusa.com>.
- Stern, J. (2003). The Protean Enemy. Foreign Affairs, 27.
- Usher, R. (2001,dec). A Different World. Times, 74-93.
- Zakaria, F. (2001,oct). The Roots of Rage. Newsweek, 14-33.

Zakaria, F. (2004). The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad.
New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Zunes, S. (2001). 10 things to know about U.S. Policy in the Middle East. Retrieved
August 5, 2003, from [http:// www.alternet.org](http://www.alternet.org).

Zunes, S. (2001). U.S. Arrogance on Display in UN Human Rights Commission Flap.
Retrieved Dec 1, 2001, from File: A:\ Stephen Zunes, U.S. Arrogance on Display
in UN Human Rights Commission Flap.htm.