



Rt  
439  
c.1

# **Lebanese American University**

## **International Affairs Program**

### **Thesis:**

## **The Effect of Neoconservatism on American Foreign Policy**

**Presented by: Sara Salman**

**Thesis Advisor: Dr. Sami Baroudi**

**Committee Members: Dr. Shafic El-Masri**

**Dr. Fawaz Traboulsi**

To my Mother and Father

...  
*America*  
*Against the cultures of the peoples*  
*With no culture*  
*Against the civilizations of the civilized*  
*With no civilization*  
*America*  
*A mighty edifice*  
*With no walls!*

...  
*I am with terrorism*  
*If it is able to save me*  
*From the immigrants from Russia*  
*Romania, Hungary and Poland*

...  
*We are accused of terrorism:*  
*If we defended with full force*  
*Our poetic heritage*  
*Our national wall*  
*Our rosy civilization*  
*The culture of flutes in our mountains*  
*And the mirrors displaying blackened eyes*

...  
*I am with terrorism*  
*If it's able to free a people*  
*From tyrants and tyranny*  
*If it is able to save man from the cruelty of man*  
*To return the lemon, the oil tree*  
*And the bird to South of Lebanon*  
*And the smile back to Golan.*

...  
*I am with terrorism*  
*If it will save me*  
*From the Caesar of Yahuda*  
*And the Caesar of Rome*

...  
*I am with terrorism  
As long as this new world order  
Is shared  
Between America and Israel  
Half-half*

...  
*I am with terrorism  
With all my poetry  
With all my words  
And all my teeth  
As long as this new world  
Is in the hand of a butcher*

...  
*I am with terrorism  
If the U.S senate  
Enacts judgment  
Decrees, reward and punishment*

....  
*I am with terrorism  
As long as the new world order  
Hates the smell of Arab*

...  
*I am with terrorism  
As long as the new world order  
Wants to slaughter any offspring  
And send them to dogs  
For all this  
I raise my voice high:  
I am with terrorism  
I am with terrorism  
I am with terrorism*

Excerpts from Nizar Quabbany poem, London, 15<sup>th</sup> April 1997  
This poem is his response to the oppressors who use the word  
'Terrorism' to defame a national liberation struggle

## Introduction

This thesis is a study on the role of the neoconservatives in the formulation of American foreign policy. It particularly focuses on the George W. Bush policy towards the Middle East. (2000- Present)

Neoconservatism is one branch of the diverse conservative school. That has been gaining more attention and influence in contemporary American thought and politics. The current Bush administration has placed it in the spotlight due to their important role in formulating the aggressive foreign policy specifically the Bush Doctrine, as this study will prove.

The roots of Neoconservatism date back to the 70's and early 80's when a group of mostly Jewish ex-Trotskyites and ex-liberals formed an intellectual movement. The prefix "neo" hinted at their recent arrival to the conservative camp.

The neoconservative passion is directed towards foreign policy. They started as passionate anticommunist, and after the break down of the USSR, they rechanneled their energy and refocused their mission on supporting a Pax-Americana and a "New World Order" that was lead by the United States. In addition they vehemently supported and rallied for the State of Israel.

Their first political success was during the Reagan administration, in which they gained access to key policy making positions. After a political demise through the Bush Sr. presidency and the Clinton Presidency, the neocons resurfaced in the second Bush administration.

This thesis is divided into five chapters.

Chapter One will provide a brief historical background of conservatism and its different schools such as Libertarianism and Traditionalism. It will emphasize the neoconservative trend. It will highlight its members in the different fields, whether in the government, academia, or media. It will also describe the important institutions that form the nerve center of the neocons.

Chapter Two will describe the evolution of neoconservative foreign policy. It will trace their foreign policy agenda prior to the George W. Bush doctrine stressing the Reagan presidency. It will examine the documents produced during the Bush senior administration and the Clinton administration, such as the *Defense Planning Guidance* prepared by Paul Wolfowitz, and *A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm* supervised by Richard Perle and Douglas Feith, in addition to the several works of the Project for New American Century, the mouthpiece of the leading neoconservatives. The chapter will concentrate on the birth and formulation of George W. Bush doctrine from his first months of presidency, to the post September 11 events, the National Security Strategy that he put, reaching the current situation of the war on Iraq, and his plan for a Grand Middle East. It would explain the role of the neoconservatives in formulating and influencing this doctrine.

Chapter Three will provide a brief overview of the geo strategic importance of Afghanistan. It will highlight war on Afghanistan and the role of the United States in Post war Afghanistan. The chapter will conclude with a study of the legality of the war.

Chapter four will focus on the war on Iraq. It will describe the planning of the war prior too the G. W. Bush administration, the planning during the administration prior to September 11, the actual war, and on post war Iraq. It will argue the reasons behind the war, the legality of the war, and it consequences. The main emphasis will

be on the role of the neoconservatives in the complete process of planning and waging the war.

Chapter five will briefly discuss the influence of two factors on the neoconservatives: the ties of the neoconservatives to the State of Israel, as they are usually labeled Likuniks, and to the military industrial complex. The main focus will be the evaluation of the effects of applying neoconservative ideology on American foreign policy, on the international system, and on their own popularity.



## Chapter I

### Schools of Conservatism

*The only thing new in the world is the history you don't know*  
Winston Churchill

The conservative school has played an important role in formulating and shaping the American intellectual and political life since the end of WWII. However there is no “single satisfactory, all encompassing definition of the complex phenomenon called conservatism, the content which varies enormously with time and place. It may even be true that conservatism is inherently resistant to precise definition.”<sup>1</sup> Yet three major trends could be roughly distinguished: the Libertarians, the Traditionalists, and the Neoconservatives.

#### **Libertarianism:**

Libertarianism, one of the oldest branches of the conservative school, is mainly concerned with “resisting the threat of the ever expanding state to liberty, private enterprise, and individualism”<sup>2</sup> Economics is viewed as the basic factor of society. They based their argument on the works of John Locke, John Stuart Mill, and Frederick Hayek.

The starting point of this movement can be traced back to 1944 when Frederick Hayek’s book *The Road to Serfdom* was first published. Hayek, an Austrian economist escaped from totalitarianism, immigrated to England then to Chicago. He devoted his work to defending antistatist Liberalism. He became, along with other economists such as Milton Friedman (who both insisted that

---

<sup>1</sup> Nash, (1996), p. xiv

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. xv

they weren't conservatives) "an important voice on behalf of a form of Libertarianism in modern society and a bitter critic of the collectivism he saw sweeping through Britain and America in the 1930's"<sup>3</sup>.

In his *Road to Serfdom* he reflected his fears of the state, and his belief in the supremacy of individual liberty and personal freedom, and the fact that they are inseparable from economic freedom. According to Hayek "economic control is not merely control of a sector of human life which can be separated from the rest; it is the control of the means of all our ends. And given that connection, the most dangerous form of economic control was statism, for the separation of economic and political aims is an essential guarantee of individual freedom<sup>4</sup>. Thus all forms of collectivism were inherently totalitarian.

Nevertheless, Hayek stressed that he did not agree with total *laissez faire*, state control was tolerable as long as it is within the framework of the rule of law. His book caused great controversy in the academic circle, and was announced 'an affective restatement of the faith in individualism' and the faith after all in the western Christian civilization"<sup>5</sup>.

The same year witnessed the publication of another book *The Omnipotent Government and Bureaucracy* by the Australian economist Ludwig Von Mises. He was even a harshest capitalist, and whose book later in 1949 *The Human Action* was declared as the "capitalist Manifesto"<sup>6</sup>.

In addition Albert Jay Nock, founder of the *Free Man* wrote his *Memoirs of a Superfluous Man* and *Our Enemy the State*. Although he died in 1945, the Remnants which he hoped for in his book were surfing such as Robert Nisbet, Russell Kirk, the journalist John Chamberlain, and William F. Buckley

---

<sup>3</sup> Brinkley, (1994), p. 416

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 417

<sup>5</sup> Nash (1996) , p. 5

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 9

jr. who were a personal acquaintance of Nock<sup>7</sup>. All of them later became leading conservative figures. Another actor who appeared on the scene was the Jewish Russian immigrant Frank Chodrov who first revived the *Free Man*, then established *Analysis*, which was discovered by Murray Rothband who later became a leading Libertarian.

Several other names in academia also appeared. However books alone did not create the conservative movement for it was

imperative to recognize that the postwar Libertarian intellectual movement was a movement of ideas in action. It was not solely a phenomenon of academic journals, lectures, and seminars, although many of its most distinguished and influential leaders lived in academe. Instead, it was the intellectual flank of what became a political movement or, to put it differently, an intellectual movement with political implications.<sup>8</sup>

Institutions were established, such as the Foundation for Economics Education, founded in 1946 by Leonard Raed, the manager of the Western Division of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, along with others such as Hayek and Mises. It served as an outlet to the ideas of prominent Libertarians.

Another institution was established in 1938 by Walter Lippman and other prominent European scholars such as Hayek, Mises, Wilhelme Röpke, called the *Centre International D'etude pour la Renovation du Liberalism*. It was revived by Hayek in 1947 under the name Mont Pelerin Society. This served as a link and a "rallying point" for the Libertarians. The papers presented there were often published.

*The Free Man* magazine was also revived in 1950, edited by Chamberlain and Hazlitt, and later by Chodrov, presented a professional

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p. 12

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p. 16

reputable journal to reflect their ideas. Other journals such as the *American Mercury*, *Faith and Freedom*, and *Analysis* were founded. Additionally, in 1953 Chodrov initiated the *Intercollegiate of Individualists*, with William F. Buckley Jr. (author of *God and Man at Yale*) as president, which later became the intellectual home of the Libertarians.

The mid 50's and the 60's witnessed an uprising in the Libertarian movement in an attempt to face the Liberals' activity, and what Buckley in his *God and Man at Yale* emphasized: the Liberal domination of the American universities and media. A consolidation within the different fragments of the conservative movement was attempted.

One of the first moves in the direction of consolidation was the *National Review* journal, which was established by Buckley in 1955. This journal contained regular columns contributed by Russell Kirk, one of the leading Traditionalist conservatives. In addition it was strongly influenced by ex-Trotskyites such as Burnham, Weaver and Kendell who formed the anti-communist conservatives.

The enemy that was fought viciously in the *National Review* was Liberalism. Buckley called for conservative alliance to stand together to face the common danger or as he described his journal on the front page of the first issue: it "stands athwart history yelling stop..." The journal represented a forum for the conservatives, or the "non-licensed non conformists"<sup>9</sup>.

This consolidation was also strengthened by the work of Frank Meyer who aimed at "fusionism" among the different trends, to find the common factor uniting them. The *National Review* and other conservative journals played the major role in producing a cohesive Right by the 70's. "The history of reflective

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 137

conservatism in America after 1955 is the history of individuals who collaborated in -or were discovered by- the magazine William F. Buckley Jr. founded”<sup>10</sup>.

However, this doesn't imply that a unified conservative movement that shared identical opinions existed. Each branch maintained its views and even clashed with other conservatives, which some Liberals called the “conservative wars”. Nevertheless, they managed to compose a dignified Right. Yet, one fact was obvious: their need for a political program that would mean something for the masses and that would mobilize them.

Other than fighting Liberalism at home, the conservatives had a stand on foreign affair issues. An example is Meyer's proposal of a “counter force strategy that would ... require a first strike on the enemy's military installations”<sup>11</sup> rather than waiting for them to strike first (which is similar to today's doctrine of pre-emption). Another view is Buckley's belief that peace is not identical with pacifism, and the utmost necessity for facing the communists “better the chance of being dead than the certainty of being Red. And if we die? We die”<sup>12</sup>.

They advocated a strong aggressive cold war posture that would keep the USSR threatened. This “conservative understanding of foreign affairs as a titanic conflict of ideologies, religions and civilizations was decisively shared by the former communists and Trotskyites who dominated the *National Review* circle in the early years.”<sup>13</sup> They blamed the current crisis (such as the case of Hungary and Congo) on Liberalism, which led to America's feeble policies abroad.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, p. 140

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, p. 242

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 243

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, p. 243

They viewed the United Nations as a means through which the Liberals conducted their foreign affairs. The conservatives had a mission as reflected in Bonzell's declaration "we of the Christian west ... owe our identity to the central fact of history – the entry of God onto the human stage. It is our task to build and defend a Christian civilization".

In contrast to the isolationist Liberals, the conservatives advocated a strong forward strategy, rather than a "U.N.-Third World" strategy. Their demands could be summarized in several points: First the United States must maintain military supremacy, they distrusted disarmament policies. Second the U.S. should terminate all its relations with the communist block and all the unfriendly regimes that support it, including the "suspicious" cultural exchange missions. The United States should support its allies regardless of accusations of colonialism. American policy should be based "upon the premise that [the U.S.] cannot tolerate the survival of a political system which has both the growing capability and the ruthless will to destroy [it]"<sup>14</sup> (Which is again similar to the current rhetoric of George W. Bush replacing Iraq for Soviet Union).

This Libertarian outlook is reflected in modern day America by Washington think tanks such as the Cato Institute. Libertarians have recently gained a lot of attention due to their opposition to the Bush policies as echoed in Justin Raimondo's writings for example.

### **Traditionalism:**

A second wing of post war conservatism that emerged was the traditionalists or the New Conservatives as they were known. They aimed at

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, p. 255

turning “American conservatives away from the bourgeois Lockean philosophy and toward a mildly aristocratic Burkean one”<sup>15</sup>.

One of the founding fathers of this movement was Richard M. Weaver who was influenced by the “bygone theory of chivalry” for he believed that it is what keeps civilizations from warring on each other, which is an obvious consequence from his southern origins. He declared the south as the “last non-materialist civilization of the western world”<sup>16</sup>.

By 1948 his book *Ideas have consequences*, which is considered as the building block of the conservative school, was published. It focused on the theme of the dissolution of the West. He dates the origins of the dissolution to the 14<sup>th</sup> century when man made an “evil decision ... he had abandoned his belief in transcendal values or universals and thus the position that there is a source of truth higher than, and independent of, man ...”<sup>17</sup> Among one of the reasons behind this deterioration is the “Great Stereopticon” or mass media which was responsible for corrupting society. He proposed a reform strategy based on the right for private property, purification of language since it was “a great store house of universal memory”, and finally he pleaded for and “attitude of piety toward Nature, other human beings, and the past”<sup>18</sup> his book was greeted with the same furor that received *The Road to Serfdom*.

Another book *A pattern of politics* appeared in 1947 by August Heckscher which also called for the need of restoring to social life some “moral content, some valid meaning and purpose”. He criticized the teachers of political science for separating politics from ethics thus spreading corruption among the students.

---

<sup>15</sup> Wolfson, 2004

<sup>16</sup> Nash, 1996, p. 32

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, p. 33

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, p. 34

Another political scientist who echoed similar thoughts was John Hallowell who claimed that politics approached with “scientific” detachment from all ethical consideration, or Positivism led to the current state social degeneration. He linked Positivism and Liberalism to totalitarianism.

An additional concept was added by Bernard Eddings Bell, which was that the masses cannot be trusted; instead they need an elite to lead them. By the mid 50’s several other theorists had surfaced such as Anthony Harrington, Elias Vivas, and Eric Voeglin who believed that the “Gnostic revolution” was taking place, that is, there was a process of re-divinization of society.

To those different conservatives and others, the era of the 1930’s and 1940’s was for them a “time for liberal retreat and abdication before the apocalypse of fascism, communism and total war. The beast man controlled all modern life ... not only had liberalism failed to contain the brutality ... passions ... and lusts that Vivas said existed in everyone, Liberalism according to its rightwing critics, had encouraged and in part caused the moral decline of western civilization”<sup>19</sup>.

Another scholar concerned with the decline of the western Man was Leo Strauss, a Jewish German émigré from Nazi Germany in 1938. Strauss identified Machiavelli and Hobbes as the basic villains behind the decline. In 1953 he published his *Natural Right and History* in which he criticized the priority of man to the state, positivism, and historicism.<sup>20</sup>

His views were shared by the sociologist Robert Nisbet, who in his *Quest for Community* traced the decline of the relation between Man and State, and the weakening of such ties as the family and the church, which instead of liberating Man, as Liberals believed, isolated and alienated him.

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, p. 42

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p.45



The most noteworthy feature of this trend of thought in conservatism is that “it was overwhelmingly intellectual history”. They did not focus the blame on economic or social forces instead they highlighted the importance of ideas or “Evil thoughts”<sup>21</sup>.

Christian orthodoxy was on the rise. Several theologians such as Reinhold Neibuhr, Paul Tillich, and Kierkegaard published their works. Christianity presented to the Traditionalists a stabilizing factor of communities instead of totalitarian regimes. They preached a community that was “God centered rather than Man centered”<sup>22</sup>.

However the popularity of the term conservative can be referred to Peter Vierick. Like other Traditionalists, he doubted man’s abilities “we don’t need a century of the common man; we have it already, and this has only produced the commonest man, the impersonal and irresponsible and uprooted Mass Man”. Nevertheless he introduced a new notion of coalition between conservatives and liberals to face totalitarianism. It particularly reflected the ideas of Edmund Burke which aims for a “recall to the principles, values and traditions which are the heritage of the political and international society of Christendom”<sup>23</sup>.

Vierick was not the only one influenced by Burk; other Burkeans were influenced by his thought such as Nisbet and Russell Kirk. Kirk published his famous book *The Conservative Mind* in 1953 which highlighted the belief that a “divine intent” rules society and that political problems are usually reflections of moral or religious problems. He also declared that there is a need for classes to organize society and govern the interrelationship between property and freedom. His book not only summarized the intellectual Rights ideas, but

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, p. 49

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, p.54

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, p. 61

sharply criticized the Left. Thanks to his work, conservatives could “claim an intellectually formidable and respectable ancestry ... he had ... devulgarized conservatism”.<sup>24</sup>

Upon this brief summary, few differences between traditionalists and Libertarians could be traced. First, most Traditionalists were academicians who printed their work in scientific quarterlies, while Libertarians were mostly journalists who published their work in journals. Second the Traditionalists were more European oriented, influenced by Burk and Metternich; in addition some were originally European such as Strauss and Vierick. Third the two groups lacked contact and mingling among each other. They all emphasized their difference from the “selfish Lassaiz Faire” individualism. Fourth and most importantly while the Libertarians favored economic arguments against the state, Traditionalists were concerned with the “ethical and spiritual causes and consequences of the Leviathan”.<sup>25</sup>

However they both had their similarities, such as their common abhorrence of totalitarianism and collective state, their support for private property, decentralization, free economic system, and their common disdain of the crowd culture and their belief in the enlightened few (or the Remnants). They completely opposed communism (along with other anti-communist conservatives such as Burnham who were mostly active for a decade after the end of WWII). Vierick for example accused the intellectuals of sugarcoating the Russian aggression.<sup>26</sup>

During the 50's and 60's the major branches of conservatism attempted at consolidation. The reason behind that need was the fact that the Left were

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid, p. 67

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, p. 73

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, p. 94

becoming more vocal, publishing books and magazines and organizing their political activity. One example of this attempt was Kirk's Quarterly journal *Modern Age: a Conservative Review*, which became "the scholarly medium deliberately designed to publish conservative thought in the United States"<sup>27</sup>. Most if not all contributors held positions in universities.

By the mid 70's conservatism in America was popular, and the Traditionalists worked hard to include religion and particularly Christianity as a specific feature of it (by stressing the revival of American tradition such as family values, etc). Current day Traditionalists are best embodied by the Religious Right and the Paleoconservatives.

The Religious Right gained popularity in the 1980's and 90's were mainly concerned with the degeneration of society, its demoralization especially with the widespread corruption among the youth such as drug and alcohol abuse, homosexuality, pre-marital sex, and abortion. All issues which they are very fervent about.

### **Paleoconservatism:**

Paleoconservatism, which is defined as "the expression of rootedness: a sense of place and of history, a sense of self derived from the forebears, kin, and culture"<sup>28</sup>. The Paleoconservatives are best described as the heirs of Kirk and the Traditionalists.

They began towards the end of the 1980's and only became known through the work of Patrick Buchanan. Buchanan wanted to reform the Republican Party, and restore the "old conservative". He "stood for anti-free trade and anti-Globalism in economic policy and isolationism in foreign

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, p. 132

<sup>28</sup> Williamson, 2001

policy”<sup>29</sup>. However he did not receive great support even from the Religious Right conservatives.

The most prominent names of this trend are: Thomas Fleming (editor of Paleoconservative journal *Chronicles: a Magazine of American Culture*), Paul Gottfried author of *The Search for Historical Meaning* and *The Conservative Movement*, and Samuel Francis (political editor of the *Chronicles*) who called for “radical opposition to the regime”.

The Paleo’s have received more attention during the current Bush government due to their strong antagonism of the government’s policies, domestic and foreign. This conflict has been marked as the “neocon/paleocon wars”. The main point of difference remains American foreign policy. The paleocons isolationist foreign policy reflected in Buchanan’s article “a republic not an empire” clashes with neocons imperialist foreign policy agenda.

### **Neoconservatism:**

“A neoconservative is a Liberal mugged by reality”. This is how Irving Kristol the “Godfather” of Neoconservatism defined the trend that started in the early 70’s. Kristol is a Jewish ex-Trotskyite, an ideology which he embraced during his college years at City College. Soon after, he met his wife to be Gertrude Himmelfarb, a Trotskyite herself at the time.

However he soon got disenchanted with the Left and began his journey Rightwards. He drifted towards what was later known as Neo-liberalism, and worked in *Commentary*, a Jewish magazine published by the American Jewish Committee, that was run by the Jewish activist Norman Podhoertz.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Wolfson, 2004

<sup>30</sup> Kristol, 1999, p. 15

Podhoertz symbolized the American Jews movement to the Right after decades of Liberalism. Kristol approved it highly for he believed that Jews might give conservatism “an intellectual vigor, and cultural buoyancy it has sadly lacked”<sup>31</sup>. Kristol also edited the *Reporter* and the *Encounter*: an Anglo-American journal which was revealed in the 1960’s to have been funded through “the CIA, as a part of a network of anti-communist intellectual institutions”<sup>32</sup>.

Kristol was representing a new trend, skeptical of both liberalism and conservatism, appalled by the threats poised by the Soviet Union. The main inspiration and the mentor of Kristol was no other than the Jewish German philosophy teacher Leo Strauss (neocons are sometimes referred to as Straussans).

Strauss main argument was that the Weimar Republic, rather than fascism that led to the rise of Hitler. His extensive work on Machiavelli led him to the conclusion that “Truth is the reserve of the Elite few who might have to tell noble lies to the uncomprehending masses”. Nationalism and religion were the best mobilizers for the masses, and that “only a military nationalist state could deter aggression. The creation of such nationalism requires an external threat – and if one is not found it has been manufactured”<sup>33</sup>. Evidences of Strauss’s views will be later traced in the neoconservative rhetoric.

In 1965, Kristol along with sociologist Daniel Bell, established *The Public Interest* to articulate their views. The *Alternative* sponsored a collegiate Education for Democracy conference in Cambridge in 1971. the conference was attended by Martin Diamond a Straussan, Norman Podhoertz, Ganet Scalera

---

<sup>31</sup> Nash, 1996, p. 310

<sup>32</sup> Lind, 1996, p. 80

<sup>33</sup> Clark, k.

(from the Hudson Institute), Alexander Bicke a Yale Professor, and Robert Nisbet. The conference was run by Kristol's own son William. The importance of this is that it represented the widening circle of "disillusioned Liberals" who then became known as the Neoconservatives.

The neoconservatives were an "intellectual movement, originated by former Leftists that promoted militant anti-communism, capitalist economy, a minimal welfare state, the rule of traditional cultural values ... Neoconservatism was modernist, Liberal, democratic and ideologically aggressive"<sup>34</sup>. The prefix "neo" hinted at their recent arrival to the conservative camp after being Leftists or Liberals. However the main characteristic that differentiated them was their high interest and involvement in foreign affairs (which will be discussed in detail in the following chapters).

During the early 70's, the neocons supported Democratic senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson. In 1976, they supported Democrat Jimmy Carter versus Gerald Ford. However Carter disappointed the neocons in his dovish foreign policy towards the Soviet Union and its client states. As a result few intellectuals such as Moynihan and Bell remained in the Democratic, while the rest crossed the floor, and joined the Republican Party.

The first to do that was Irving Kristol Norman Podhoretz. However Kristol did not highly view the Republican Party. He criticized it, highlighting its

basic political impotence of traditional conservatism which lived of the Democratic errors, but had no governing policy of its own-at least not one that could strike a popular nerve among the electorate. There were many fine people in the Ford administration, and by election time they were all defeatist, in the sense that they thought the Republican Party would be better off out of office than in it.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Nash, 1996, p. 62

<sup>35</sup> Kristol, 1999, p. 34

They weren't warmly welcomed by some Republicans such as Patrick Buchanan who warned from neocons takeover of the Republican Party. Kristol believed that the "historical and political purpose of neoconservatives [was to] convert the Republican Party, and American conservatism in general, against their respective will, into a new kind of conservative politics suitable to governing a modern democracy."<sup>36</sup>

1980 represented a breakthrough to the neoconservatives. They were able to infiltrate the government ranks, and play a major role in the formulation of policies. The election of Ronald Reagan was the first real political success for the neoconservatives.

An important part of this victory could be attributed to Kristol himself, due to his approach to the business class. He explained that Neoconservatism became influential by defending the prerogatives of the class that could not defend itself "we had to tell the Business men that they needed us ... [business] want intellectuals to go out and justify profit, and explain to the people why corporations made a lot of money. That's the main interest. It's very hard for Business to understand how to think politically"<sup>37</sup>. So the neocons took it upon themselves to teach them how to do exactly that.

They were the same businessmen who were convinced to channel an estimated 25 million dollars to the Republican candidates in 1980. "Corporate America, like Sunbelt oil barons, played a major role in financing a Republican victory in 1980. Because it wanted a changed political environment in Washington, Business gave generously to the Republican candidates,

---

<sup>36</sup> Kristol, 2003

<sup>37</sup> Ansell, 1998, p. 71

contributing 19.2 million dollars to pacs in order to defeat as many liberal Democratic incumbents as possible.”<sup>38</sup>

The neoconservatives achieved great political success. Kampelan, Eliot Abrams, Richard Perle, Eugene Rostow, Kenneth Adelman, Richard Pipes, were all appointed in high ranking foreign policy positions. William Bennet, Chester Finn, William Kristol, Linda Chavez and other neocons worked in various domestic affairs offices. It seemed as if the “Trotskyites orphans were taking over the government”<sup>39</sup>.

Even though the neocons gained public attention, due to their contribution in formulating the economic policies, and setting the Reagan Doctrine (which affirms that the U.S. is committed to supporting forces fighting communism around the globe), however to the neocons towards the end of the Reagan term showed their lack of satisfaction. Podhoretz labeled Reagan as the “crippled hawk”<sup>40</sup>.

The George H. W. Bush presidency was not the best of times for the neocons. Bush tended more towards the traditionalist conservatives rather than towards the neoconservatives. Few neocons held high positions in the administration (Paul Wolfowitz, William Kristol and a few others). According to Kirkpatrick, “Reagan was the first neoconservative” and Bush definitely did not follow in his footsteps<sup>41</sup>.

On that basis, Clinton aimed at attracting the neoconservatives to his camp. He hired Richard Schifler (who was assistant Secretary of State in the Bush Administration) as his foreign policy advisor, and started recruiting

---

<sup>38</sup> Berman, 1994, p. 8

<sup>39</sup> Ibid, p. 63

<sup>40</sup> McLaughlin, 1986

<sup>41</sup> Barnes, 1992



Democrat neocons such as Zbignew Brezinski, Joshua Muravchik, and Samuel Huntington.<sup>42</sup>

They also aimed at retrieving the neoconservatives that left the Democratic Party in the 80's. According to Bennet "the shift out of the Democratic Party took away a lot of intellectual fire power from the democrats ... it was largely responsible for making the Republicans the Party of ideas"<sup>43</sup>. However most hardcore neocons were not impressed by Clinton's offer, Podhoretz for instance, believed that his administration would only be a replica of Jimmy Carter's administration.

The recent presidency of George W. Bush has been a dream comes true for the neoconservatives. What began as a mediocre presidency without many expectations for the neoconservatives became the most powerful administration. In 2000 a group of neocons took their seats in the administration next to "corporate chieftains" such as Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, and Condeleezza Rice, who after September 11 became the neocons strongest backers along with the president.

Naturally the neoconservatives directed their energy to their primary field of interest, foreign policy. Some critics from both Republicans and Democrats have feared that the neocons have taken over Capitol Hill, just as there were neoconservatives takeover of the Republican Party.

The neocons have been under excessive exposure due to the current events such as the war on Afghanistan, and the war on Iraq. Their foreign policy agenda will be dealt with in the following chapters. However what has rendered a small group so powerful and exactly who are the current leading neocons figures will be the focus of the conclusion of this chapter.

---

<sup>42</sup> Lind, 1996, p. 66

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, p. 66

### **Neoconservative Institutions:**

One of the major factors that made the neoconservatives so powerful was the set of institutions and think tanks through which they operate.

**The American Enterprise Institute (AEI):** Established in 1943, it is one of the oldest institutions in the United States. It was able to compete with the Brookings institution, a Liberal establishment. By the mid 70's with the financial support from major corporations and multibillionaires, it managed to mobilize public opinion on their behalf. It published journals such as *Regulations* and *Public Opinion*, sponsored conferences and seminars, and produced materials that were aired on radios and TV's.<sup>44</sup>

By the 1990's it was able to establish itself as a reliable and leading think tank. Its board of trustees was basically businessmen. However the neocons were able to dominate it by representing the businessmen and working for their own interests in the foreign policy field. Currently it has fifty resident scholars, among them Richard Perle, Lynne Cheney, Jeanne Kirkpatrick, and Robert Bork. Gertrude Himmelfarb is on its Academic Advisory Board. It is highly connected to the Bush Jr. government. In an important speech before the war on Iraq, Bush addressed the audience at an AEI dinner saying "you do such good work that my administration has borrowed twenty such minds"<sup>45</sup>.

**The Heritage Foundation:** It was created by three Right wing billionaires: Joseph Coors, Richard Mellon Scaife, Edward Feulner, and the Rightwing activist Paul Weyrich in 1973. It was not concerned with the Fortune 500, it was rather concerned with the entrepreneurs of the "Sunbelt", that is "the self made men who eagerly promoted Ronald Regan's drive for presidency"<sup>46</sup>.

---

<sup>44</sup> Berman, 1994, p. 67

<sup>45</sup> [www.csmonitor.com/specials/neocon/spheresofinfluence.html](http://www.csmonitor.com/specials/neocon/spheresofinfluence.html)

<sup>46</sup> Berman, 1994, p. 68

The Heritage foundation was more ideologically oriented. Its mission statement stated that it was a “research and education institution—a think tank—whose mission was to formulate and promote conservative public policies based on the principles of free enterprise, limited government, individual freedom, American traditional values, and a *strong national defense*.”<sup>47</sup>

In addition to publishing materials and holding conferences, it was actively involved in “legislative battles on Capitol Hill, where it provided advice and assistance to conservative legislators on a variety of different issues of concern”<sup>48</sup>. Its slogan was “people are policy” thus its approach was to form connections with key figures on Capitol Hill and elsewhere who supported their objectives. A stepchild of this institution was Empower America which is the “implementation organization”. It trains the conservative candidates, many of which have become key figures in the administration.

**The Project for a New American Century (PNAC):** it was established by William Kristol and Robert Kagan in 1997. The blunt goal of this think tank is to promote American global leadership. It has been highly active since its recent creation. It produced a blueprint for the U.S. foreign policy, which the administration did take into consideration as will be demonstrated later.<sup>49</sup> Its importance is that it “cemented a powerful alliance between right wing Republicans like Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld, Christian and Catholic Right leaders like Ger Buaer and William Bennett, and the neocons behind a platform of global U.S. military dominance”<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> [www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon.htm](http://www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon.htm)

<sup>48</sup> Ibid, p. 68

<sup>49</sup> [www.pnac.info](http://www.pnac.info)

<sup>50</sup> Lobe, 2003

**The Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA):** It is one of the institutions on the long list of neoconservative institutions. Its aim is to communicate with the government and the public to explain Israel's vitality to the U.S. as well as to link the American and Israeli interests.

**The Center for Security Policy (CSP):** The Center for Security Policy is one of the most "hard-line policy groups" that supports American expansionism and opposition to nuclear weapon control treaties. "It isn't just a think tank-its an agile, durable, highly effective main battle tank in the war of ideas on national security".<sup>51</sup>

Dozens of other think tanks such as the Hudson Institute, the Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, the Ethics and Public Policy Center, The Foundation for Community, Faith Centered Enterprise, The Americans For Victory Over Terrorism (AVOT), and the Federalist Society for Law and Public Studies (its aim is to rollback the remaining influence of liberalism in the legal and judiciary system).<sup>52</sup> All those institutions are non-profit, non-partisan institutions thus exempted from taxes.

A striking characteristic of those institutions is the small number of members who operate them, usually same members operating different institutions (as will be demonstrated). Their views are articulated through journals which had already been mentioned such as the *Commentary*, *National Review*, *the Public Interest*, in addition to other journals such as the *National Interest* founded by Irving Kristol focusing on international relations, *The Weekly Standard* founded by William Kristol in 1985, which encourages the "cultivation of the American Empire" and *The New Republic*, which is an old journal established in 1914, however the neocons managed it during the Reagan

---

<sup>51</sup> Lobe, *The Right weaves a tangled but effective web*

<sup>52</sup> Ibid

administration. Today it is pro-Israel, pro-interventionist U.S. foreign policy and a leading neocons outlet.

**Neoconservative Family:**

The following are some of the most prominent neoconservatives (listed in alphabetical order). Several have been key actors in the current Bush administration. Brief information about them, important official offices they held, and institutions that they belong to are also provided.

**Elliott Abrams:** He first gained reputation as a leading neoconservative when he served as Reagan's Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights in the early 80's, then as Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. He was accused of covering the inhuman acts of American supported regimes such as El Salvador and Guatemala. He was indicated by the Iran-Contra special prosecutor for giving false testimony about his role in illicitly raising money for the contras. He pleaded guilty to the charge of withholding information to congress. He was pardoned by president Bush Sr. in 1992. Abrams worked in a number of think tanks; he headed the Ethics and Public Policy center, where he wrote extensively on the Middle East and the threat of U.S. secular society. He is the son in law of Norman Podhoretz.<sup>53</sup>

**Richard Armitage:** He is the Deputy Secretary of State in the Bush Jr. administration. He was Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Reagan administration and Emissary with an Ambassadorial rank under the Bush Sr. administration. He is a member of the Heritage Foundation and the Project for a New American Century.<sup>54</sup>

**William Bennet:** He was the Secretary of Education under Reagan, and the Director of National Drug Control Policy, in the first Bush administration.

---

<sup>53</sup> [www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon.htm](http://www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon.htm)

<sup>54</sup> Ibid

He heads the American Victory Over Terrorism, Co director of Empower America. He is an associate in the Foundation for Community, Faith Enterprise. He is member of the Heritage Foundation, Project for New American Century.

55

**John Bolton:** He is the Under Secretary of State in the current Bush administration. He was Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs at the Department of State under Reagan. He has been supportive of an anti-U.N. anti-International Criminal court. He was the one to sign the letter addressed to Kofi Anaan in May 2002 renouncing the role for the U.S. in the ICC. He was the former vice president of the American Enterprise Institute. He has also been on the Advisory Board of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs.<sup>56</sup>

**Midge Decter:** She started as the secretary at the *Commentary*, became the editor there, then editor of *Harpers Magazine*, and editor at the Legacy Books and Basic Books. She served as the executive Director of the Committee for the Free World (an anti-communist organization). She is affiliated with the Heritage Foundation, PNAC, and on the visiting board of the Foundation for Community. She is the Biographer of Donald Rumsfeld and the wife of Norman Podhoretz.<sup>57</sup>

**Lynne Cheney:** She is on the National Security Advisory Board in the current administration. She is a member of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Lynne is the wife of Vice president Dick Cheney.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid

<sup>56</sup> Ibid

<sup>57</sup> Ibid

<sup>58</sup> Ibid

**Douglas Feith:** Feith is the Under Secretary of Defense in George W. Bush administration. He served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Negotiations (Reagan), White House National Security Staff (Reagan), and as a Special Council to Richard Perle when he was Assistant Secretary of Defense under Reagan.

His career in the private sector was in the law business as a partner in a law firm (Feith and Zell), it had a branch in Israel, and much of the case work in the U.S. involved representing Israeli interests. Feith in 1993 was on the Advisory Board of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, from 94 onwards he co-chaired it with Paul Wolfowitz. He's a member of the Zionist Organization of America; he has been honored by it several times including on its 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary along with his father Dalck Faith (a follower of the Zionist leader Vladimir Jabotisky). He has been a frequent participant at ZOA sponsored policy briefings on Capitol Hill, and he now receives ZOA lobby parties. He is also affiliated with the Center for Security Policy.<sup>59</sup>

**Frank Gaffney:** He was Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy under Reagan. He is the founder president and contributing editor to *National Review Online*. He is a columnist for JewishWorldReview.com. He's affiliated with Center for Security Policy and Project with the New American Century.<sup>60</sup>

**Newt Gingrich:** He was Former Speaker U.S. House of Representatives 1995-1999. He led the House battle against President Clinton and called for impeachment. Gingrich was fined 300000\$ by the Congressional

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid

<sup>60</sup> Ibid

Ethics Committee for using tax exempt foundation for political purposes. He is a member of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.<sup>61</sup>

**Gertrude Himmelfarb:** Professor Emeritus of History, wife of Irving Kristol and mother of William Kristol. She is a member of the Heritage Foundation, American Council of Trustees and Alumni, and National Associations of Scholars.

**Robert Kagan:** He is a Senior Associate Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Kagan is a contributing editor at the *Weekly Standard*, Deputy For Policy in the State Department under Reagan, co-founder and Chairman of the Project of the New American Century.<sup>62</sup>

**Jeanne Kirkpatrick:** She was a member of National Security Council, and U.S. Ambassador to U.N. (Reagan). She became known for her Kirkpatrick doctrine, which advocated U.S. support of repressive governments around the world if necessary to fight communism. She called on the Congress; along with empower America co-directors William Bennett and Jack Kemp, to issue a formal declaration of war against the "Entire Fundamentalist Islamic terrorist network" the day after the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks. She's associated with the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Empower America, national Association of Scholars, and Council on Foreign Relations.<sup>63</sup>

**William Kristol:** He was Chief of staff to Secretary Bennett (Reagan), Chief of staff the Vice President Quayle. He is the editor of the *Weekly Standard* (part the Murdoch Empire), son of Irving Kristol. Co-founder if the

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid

<sup>62</sup> Ibid

<sup>63</sup> Ibid



Project of the New American Century, He is also an Associate at the Faith Centered Enterprise and Foundation for Community.<sup>64</sup>

**Michael Ledeen:** He is foreign policy advisor to George W Bush. He was advisor to Secretary Haig (Reagan). He is and advocate of regime change in Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Saudi Arabia. He is Resident Scholar American Enterprise Institute. He is also affiliated with Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs.<sup>65</sup>

**Lewis "Scooter" Libby:** He is chief of Staff to vice president Dick Cheney. He was deputy Undersecretary of Defense under Reagan. He Co-authored with Paul Wolfowitz in 1992 Draft Defense Planning Guidance (DDPG) which called for U.S. military dominance over Europe and Asia. And for pre-emptive strikes against countries suspected of developing weapons of mass destruction (the draft provoked a lot of controversy which led them to rewrite it). He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.<sup>66</sup>

**Richard Perle:** The Prince of Darkness was Chairman, now a member, of the Defense Policy Board Department of Defense in the current Bush administration. He was the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security under Reagan, contributor to Jerusalem post. He was the chief architect of the "creative destruction" strategy to reshape the Middle East starting with the invasion of Iraq. He is connected to the American Enterprise Institute to the Public Policy Research, The Center of security Policy, and the Jewish Institute for National Security, The Foundation for Defense of Democracies.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid

<sup>65</sup> Ibid

<sup>66</sup> Ibid

<sup>67</sup> Ibid

**Norman Podhoretz:** An ex-Trotskyite, and long time editor of commentary, Podhoretz offered chances to rising Neo-conservatives such as Richard Pipes (The Harvard University soviet specialist, and top Reagan advisor); and his son Daniel Pipes current head of Middle East Studies Center, who's main concern is the rising threat of the Islamic world. He is linked to New American Century, Council on Foreign Relations.<sup>68</sup>

**Paul Weyrich:** He was the founding president of the Heritage Foundation, Chairman and CEO of the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation (President 1977 – 2002), He's the current national Chairman of coalitions for America.<sup>69</sup>

**James Woolsey:** He was the CIA director during the Clinton administration. He founded American for Victory over Terrorism, with William Bennet and Paul Bremer, Member of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, Council on Foreign Relations, as well as PNAC, National Institute for Public Policy.<sup>70</sup>

**Paul Wolfowitz:** He is currently Deputy Secretary of Defense. He was an Ambassador under Reagan, then under Secretary of Defense during the George H. W. Bush Presidency. He co-authored with Lewis Libby the *Draft Defense Planning Guidance* in 1992. He is associated with Jewish Institute of National Security Affairs, Project for the New American Century, and Council on Foreign Relations.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid

<sup>69</sup> Ibid

<sup>70</sup> Ibid

<sup>71</sup> Ibid

Other than those prominent neoconservatives there are tens of minor characters on Capitol Hill such as the Bush speech writers (Shattan, Mathew Scully, Peter Wehner, and David Frum who coauthored Richard Perle's book *An End to an Evil* ) and Cheney Speech writers (such as John McConnell) who were the students of Irving Kristol.<sup>72</sup>

All of the above "die hard hawks", form a closely knit society, and they belong to the same organizations (i.e. Project for New American Century and American Enterprise Institute our housed in the same building) focusing their energy on the same target : foreign affairs.

Many of them are related by blood such as Irving Kristol, his wife Gertrud Himmelfarb, and their son William Kristol. Norman Podhoretz is the father of John Podhoretz (a columnist at for the Murdoch owned New York Post, and the father in law Elliot Abrams. Richard Pipes is the father of Daniel Pipes. Alfred Wohlstetter is the father in law Richard Perle, and the college professor who influenced his student Paul Wolfowitz. Donald Kagan is the father of Robert Kagan. Robert's wife is no other than Victoria Nuland (deputy national security advisor to Cheney).<sup>73</sup>

The following chapter will demonstrate how this powerful group formulated its foreign policy views and implemented the through the government.

---

<sup>72</sup> Raimondo, 2002

<sup>73</sup> Lobe, 2003

## Chapter II

### Neoconservative Foreign Policy

*Ideas rule the world and its events. A revolution is the passing of an idea from theory to practice.*

*Giuseppe Mazzini 19<sup>th</sup> century  
Italian Nationalist*

#### **Evolution of Neoconservative Foreign Policy**

“Ideas influence policy when the principled or casual beliefs they embody provide road maps that increase actors clarity about goals or ends-means relationships, when they affect outcome of strategic situations in which there is no unique equilibrium, and when they become embedded in political institutions”<sup>74</sup>. The neoconservatives’ ideas definitely qualified, according to the mentioned conditions, to exert influence on the making of American foreign policy. In fact they have either influenced or directly formulated the U.S. foreign policy since the Reagan administration.

After the neocons disappointment with the dovish foreign policy of President Jimmy Carter, they supported Reagan in the hope that he would lead a hawkish policy against the Soviet Union. Several key neoconservative figures were appointed in the administration mostly in the foreign affairs (Such as Kierpatrick, Richard Perle, and Richard Pipes as mentioned previously).

Kierpatrick was Reagan’s foreign relations advisor and U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. She advocated support of right wing dictatorships in Third world counties to face leftist and social revolutions. Accordingly, the U.S. supported anticommunist dictatorships such as Pinochet’s in Chile, and racist white rulers in South Africa.

---

<sup>74</sup> Goldstein and Keohane, 1993, p. 297

The Neoconservatives pushed for an increase in military spending (The Heritage Foundation Provided the Reagan Administration with a blueprint for rising defense spending by 35 billion dollars.<sup>75</sup>)

This increase militarization was not only for confronting the USSR, but also for “defending regions of importance to influential foreign investors, especially those in the oil rich and financially lucrative Middle East”. This renewal of the cold war (the so called second cold war) is evidence of the institutionalization of a political program<sup>76</sup> and neocons success in influencing the foreign policy.

Never the less, by the end of Reagan’s second term, the neoconservatives lost their excitement towards him. Some like Podhoretz described Reagan as “Carter Clone”, ridiculing him for appeasing the USSR by attempting to reach weapon agreements, thus betraying the sacred anticommunist war, and falling for Gorbachev’s tricks<sup>77</sup>.

The cold war ended abruptly which lead critics to assume that the neoconservatives as a political intellectual movement ended as well. Fighting communism had been their main cause which they focused all their effort on. With the breakdown of the Soviet Union, it seemed like the neoconservatives had ran out of ideas to rally for.

Their post cold war rhetoric directly centered on creating

A new pax-Americana that claimed American dominion over the entire globe. [They] wanted to relinquish the empire and expand it, they wanted to make America the universal nation and restrict immigration to America; they identified America’s interests with Israel’s and resurrected the dual loyalty smears of the 1940’s. They celebrated the triumph of corporate

---

<sup>75</sup> Ansell, 1998, p. 193

<sup>76</sup> Ibid, p. 194

<sup>77</sup> Ibid, p. 64

capitalism and condemned the commercial culture it created; they celebrated the universality of American democracy and the imperialism of democratic ideology<sup>78</sup>.

Some references made by the Reagan administration to a "New World Order" raised the neocons hopes. However the Bush Sr. administration proved to be a disappointment since it favored the Traditionalists and Religious conservatives who tended to be more isolationists in their foreign policy. Yet several neocons were assigned to high positions such as Paul Wolfowitz (the Under Secretary of Defense), and William Kristol.

In 1990 the second Gulf War broke out and the United States played a major role in the war and in ending it. But, the ending was viewed by the neoconservatives such as Wolfowitz as too soon. They called for regime change and the removal of Saddam Hussein. Bush Sr. didn't advocate that move neither did Collin Powel, then the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during operation Dessert Storm.

At that point of history the United States was questioning its future foreign policy: How to act now, that it was the only super power. In 1992 Wolfowitz and his deputy Lewis 'Scooter' Libby supervised the drafting of a policy statement on American mission in the post cold war world, the *Defense Planning Guidance*. It was an internal set of military guidelines that are usually prepared every few years by the Defense Department. It was distributed to military leaders and civilian Defense Department heads to provide them with a geopolitical framework in order to assess their force level and budget requirements<sup>79</sup>, a 42 page classified document that was leaked to the press.

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid p.68

<sup>79</sup> Excerpts from 1992 draft (Defense Planning Guidance)  
[www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/wolf.htm](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/wolf.htm)

The key point that it discussed was the United States need to preserve its hegemonic status through preventing the emergence of a rival super power.

Our first objective is not prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, this is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate a global power. These regions include Western Europe, East Asia, the territory of former Soviet Union, and Southeast Asia<sup>80</sup>.

In order to achieve that, the document called on the administration to work towards establishing strong U.S. leadership, turning its attention to the non-defense interests of advanced industrial nations, and "maintain mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a large regional or global role"<sup>81</sup>.

Another objective listed was controlling regional conflicts, limiting international violence, encouraging the spread of democratic forms of government and open economic systems.

The draft proposed different scenarios where U.S. interests could be threatened by regional conflicts: "access to vital raw materials; primary Persian gulf oil; proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles; threats to U.S. citizens from terrorism or regional or local conflicts; and threats to U.S. society from narcotics trafficking"<sup>82</sup>.

Obvious trouble spots were Iraq and North Korea. Another topic that was pointed out was the nature of coalitions and the possibility of U.S. unilateral work if necessary. Coalitions "hold considerable promise for promoting collective action", but the U.S. "should expect future coalitions to be adhoc assemblies formed to deal with a particular crisis which may or may not

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid

<sup>81</sup> Ibid

<sup>82</sup> Ibid

continue after the end of that crisis. However, the United States should be postured to act independently when collective actions cannot be orchestrated”<sup>83</sup>.

Most importantly, the seeds of George W. Bush doctrine of pre-emption were first sowed in that draft, for it declared the United States would be prepared to preempt the use of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons by any other nation, even if the war didn't directly threat the U.S.<sup>84</sup>. This draft was rejected by Bush Sr. who asked for its remaking.

### **The Clinton Years**

Shortly afterwards the election of President Clinton took place which presented a major set back for the neocons as they were secluded from key political appointments. “The Clinton administration preferred a multilateral approach in dealing with emerging regional instability in the Balkans, Somalia, and Haiti. But this created an impression of hesitancy, delay, and some said weakness”<sup>85</sup>.

The Clinton Administration foreign policy clashed with the neocons' aspiration of the U.S. taking advantage of its position as the sole superpower. In the 1996 election year, William Kristol and Robert Kagan wrote an article in *Foreign affairs* “Towards a Neo Reaganite Foreign Policy”<sup>86</sup>, in which they proposed a different foreign policy. They blamed the conservatives for the current situation: “Foreign and defense policies presumed new political reality: an American public that is indifferent if not hostile, to foreign policy and commitments abroad, more interested in balancing the budget, than in leading

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid

<sup>84</sup> The war behind doors: analysis: 199 – first draft of a Grand strategy.

[www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/1992.htm](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/1992.htm)

<sup>85</sup> Clark, 2003, p.113

<sup>86</sup> Kagan and Kristol (1996)



the world, and more intent on cashing in the 'Peace dividend' than on spending to deter and fight future wars"<sup>87</sup>.

What was needed according to the authors, is the revival of Reagan's policies which called to end the cold war, increase the defense spending, and to have moral clarity and propose in U.S. foreign policy. "They championed American exceptionalism when it was deeply unfashionable, [and] refused to accept the limits on American power imposed by the domestic political realities that others assumed were fixed"<sup>88</sup>.

Thus they rejected the way U.S. was conducting its external affairs in the post cold war era, and proposed a new role: *Benevolent Hegemony*. "The objective of U.S. foreign policy should be to preserve and enhance that predominance by strengthening America's security supporting its friends, advancing its interests, and standing up for its principles around the world"<sup>89</sup>.

A Hegemon is "nothing more or less than a leader with preponderant influence and authority over all others its domain". The U.S. allies (Europe and Japan) would back this U.S. leadership, so instead of trying to reduce its power and influence, the U.S. should seek to increase it.

Kristol and Kagan suggested a broad outline for carrying this hegemony first to increase the defense budget (by 60 billion dollars each year), to insure U.S. military supremacy vital for U.S. role as the Benevolent Hegemon, which would enable it to face any possible threat in the future (threats rising from rogue states, such as Iran and China) since "it is cheaper to prevent a war than to fight one".

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid

<sup>88</sup> Ibid

<sup>89</sup> Ibid

Second the authors highlighted the importance of citizen involvement. They pointed out American alienated citizens and their damaging effects on the formulation of the foreign policy, thus the state should fill this gap, and insure the awareness, and involvement of its citizens.

And finally the U.S. foreign policy should enjoy "moral clarity" or clear cut goals such as spreading the American values around the world (i.e.: pressuring repressive regimes).

Consequently, the U.S. should not adopt Clinton's fixation on internal affairs *it is the economy stupid*, nor on the paleoconservatives approach to foreign policy, such as Buchanan's neo isolationism or as he phrases it "America first". Instead the United States should rise up to the responsibilities of its role as a world leader even if that meant "looking for monsters outside" and terminating them. The best candidates to carry out this neo Reaganite foreign policy, they suggested would be the Republicans.

The same year an article of a different kind appeared. A report prepared by the Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, Study Group on a New Israel strategy toward 2000 headed by Richard Pearle, Douglas Feith, and other intellectuals: *A Clean Break: A new strategy for securing the Realm*, appeared.

It was addressed to the new Israeli government of Benjamin Netanyahu, with key texts that would form a speech, as guidelines on how to deal with Israel challenges, and at the same time appeal to the U.S. government. It presented a form of a marketing strategy of their interests. It proposed a "clean break", an entirely "new intellectual foundation", based on three concepts: working with Jordan and Turkey to minimize threats, changing the relations

with the Palestinians, and forming a new basis for relations with the United States<sup>90</sup>.

This is achieved through several steps. First, Israel should adopt a new approach to peace, breaking from "Land for peace" strategy (the Oslo agreement, which has weakened Israel, and adopting a "Peace for Peace" or "Peace through strength" strategy (a rhetoric they promised would be well received by the United States).

Second, securing the north boarder of Israel is a must, Israel must *contain* Syria, rather than pursuing comprehensive peace" with it. This could be achieved through

Striking Syria's drug money and counterfeiting infrastructure in Lebanon all of which focus on Razi Qannan ... establish the precedent that Syrian territory is not immune to attacks emanating from Lebanon by Israeli proxy forces... Striking Syrian military targets in Lebanon, and should that prove insufficient, striking at selected targets in Syria proper<sup>91</sup>.

Third, Israel must move to a traditional balance of power by strengthening relations with Turkey and Jordan to contain Syria. It should remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and support the installation of Hashemite rule in it (according to their analysis, the Hashemite controlled Najaf would wean the Lebanese Shiites from Iran controlled Hezbollah, thus indirectly terminating Hizbollah) while distracting Syria through Lebanese opposition elements that call for Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon<sup>92</sup>.

Israel should change its relations with the Palestinians, limiting Arafat's grip on the authority, holding them accountable for security, and retain the right to pursue the Palestinian on their territory when necessary.

---

<sup>90</sup> A clean break: A new strategy for securing the realm,  
<http://www.israeleconomy.org/stratl.htm>

<sup>91</sup> Ibid

<sup>92</sup> Ibid

Fifth Israel should be based on "self reliance, maturity and mutuality were Israel would resemble the western philosophy and western democracy in the Middle East. It should be economically independent from the U.S (except in the area of defense which the drafters guaranteed American support of policies from key U.S congressionals such as Newt Gingrich speaker of the House).

Finally "Israel new agenda can signal a clean break by abandoning a policy which assumed exhaustion, and allowed strategic retreat by reestablishing the principle of *preemption* rather than retaliation alone by ceasing to absorb blows to the nation without response,"<sup>93</sup> which will only be achieved when Israel has a healthy strong independent economy.

A year later the project for New American century was established by a group of neoconservatives such as Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney and Paul Wolfowitz<sup>94</sup>. Their mission statement stated their support of U.S hegemony and militarization.

We aim to make the case and rally support for American global leadership... we seem to have forgotten the essential elements of Reagan's administration's success: a military that is strong and ready to meet both present and future challenges; a foreign policy that boldly and purposefully promotes American principles abroad and national leadership that accept the United States global responsibilities.

In January 26, 1998 a group of neoconservatives<sup>95</sup> prepared a letter to President Clinton, in which they demanded the removal of Saddam Hussein

---

<sup>93</sup> Ibid

<sup>94</sup> Elliott Abrams, Gary Bauer, William Bennet, Jeb Bush, Dick Cheney, Elliot Cohen, Medge Decker, Paula Dobriansky, Steve Forbes, Aaron Friedberg, Francis Fukuyama, Frank Gaffney, Fred Ikle, Donald Kagan, Zalmay Khalilzad, Lewis Libby, Norman Podhoretz, Dan Quale, Peter Rodman, Stephen Roseen, Henry Rowen, Donald Rumsfeld, Vin Weber, George Wiegel, and Paul Wolfowitz

<sup>95</sup> They are: Elliot Abrams, Richard Armitage, William Bennet, John Bolton, Paula Dobriansky, Francis Fukuyama, Robert Kagan, Zalmay Khalilzad, William Kristol, Richard Perle, Peter Rodman, Donald Rumsfeld, William Schneider, Vin Weber, Paul Wolfowitz, James Woolsey and Robert Zoellick

who threatened the Middle East and U.S interests. They pointed the U.S inefficiency in containing Iraq preventing it from manufacturing WMD.

Thus Saddam's removal should be the main focus of America foreign policy, even if the U.S was forced to act unilaterally since "American policy cannot continue to be crippled by a misguided insistence on unanimity in the U.N Security Council" thus classifying ending Saddam's regime and destroying the WMD as "the most fundamental national security interest" of the U.S council.<sup>96</sup>

In September 2000, few months before the presidency of George W. Bush, PNAC issued "Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century. They hoped it would "be a useful map for the Nation's immediate and future defense plans"<sup>97</sup>.

Its basic proposal was to expand the militarization of the U.S to postpone its status of the Hegemony for the longest period possible. "At present the United States faces no global rival. America's grand strategy should aim to preserve and extend this advantageous position as far into the future as possible."<sup>98</sup>.

The neoconservatives stated that, different than the cold war where the world was bipolar, strategic goal was containment of USSR, the main military mission was to deter soviet expansionism, their main threat were potential global wars and the main focus was Europe, the U.S post cold war should preserve a pax Americana, "secure and expand zones of democratic peace; deter

---

<sup>96</sup>[www.newamericancentury.org/iraqclintonletter.htm](http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqclintonletter.htm)

<sup>97</sup> Rebuilding America's Defenses, Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century PNAC, September 2000, p. iii

<sup>98</sup> Ibid, p. i

rise of new great power competitor; defend key regions, exploit transformation of war”, main competitor is East Asia.<sup>99</sup>

The document stressed that American world leadership relies on securing the American homeland, preserving European balance of power, guarding interests in Middle East, protecting international system from terrorist non-state actors. This would require strengthening and modernizing the military since it guarantees the “American geopolitical preeminence”<sup>100</sup>, advocating global missile defense deployment, space control, development of nuclear weapons, increase of military spending by 15-20 billion dollars, and the need for continuous army bases near Iraq, Saudi Arabia and in South Korea across the borders from North Korea<sup>101</sup>.

### **The Bush Presidency**

January 20, 2001 George W. Bush became president of the United States. His administration would prove to be the answer to the prayers of the neoconservatives. The members of his administration were: vice president Dick Cheney (Secretary of Defense under Bush Sr.), Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld (Secretary of Defense under Ford, Secretary of State Gen. Colin Powell, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Dr. Condoleezza Rice, Attorney General John Ashcroft, Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, Deputy Secretary of Defense Dr. Paul Wolfowitz, under Secretary of Defense Douglas Feith, Under Secretary of State John Bolton, Chairman of the Defense Policy Advisor Board Richard Pearle.

Several other neoconservatives were appointed in the administration such as Lewis Libby as Dick Cheney Chief of Staff; Zalmay Khalilzad as envoy

---

<sup>99</sup> *ibid* p:2

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid*, p. 28

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid*, p. 17-18

of the Pentagon (served as the envoy to Afghanistan); Elliot Abrams as senior director for Near East and North America Affairs, National Security Council; Elliot Cohen, Fred Ikle, Dan Quayle, Henry Rowen as members of the Defense Policy Board at the Department of Defense; Paula Dobriansky is under secretary for global affairs at Department of State; Peter Rodman as assistant secretary of defense for International Security Affairs, to name but a few.

It is worth mentioning that Bush had met many of his appointees before he became president back in 1998. He was tutored by neoconservatives, such as Cheney, Wolfowitz, Feith etc. as Paul O'Neil, the Treasury Secretary pointed out "over the next year and a half, others were called in, all of whom were part of a small neoconservative community"<sup>102</sup>

The first few months of Bush Jr. Presidency weren't very promising to the neoconservatives, leading his campaign as a "compassionate conservative", a "Uniter not a divider" and promising a "humble foreign policy". He was dubbed as "Governor Malaprop"<sup>103</sup> for his mistakes: "he called the Greeks 'Grecians'. He could not identify the leaders of Pakistan, India and Chechnya..."<sup>104</sup>

In these months "Bush seemed placidly content to be nothing more than un-Clinton. The maintenance of stability is far more attainable objective than the 'Idealistic' or 'Willsonian'... or for that matter, 'Reaganite'... ambition to change the word, especially, with the aim of making it "safe for democracy"<sup>105</sup>.

Then the event of September 11, a turning point in the 43<sup>rd</sup> president's policy took place. In his brief Address to the Nation that night, Bush gave a weak Statement (as he would for the next month) on why U.S was attacked:

---

<sup>102</sup> Suskind, p. 80

<sup>103</sup> Podhoretz 2002

<sup>104</sup> Corn, 2003, p. 14

<sup>105</sup> Podhoretz 2002

“America was targeted for attack because were the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world”. However two defining concepts were introduced: that of Evil, and more importantly, the fact that the United States “will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them” which will mark the beginning of George W. Bush doctrine.<sup>106</sup> .

This rhetoric was further emphasized in Bush’s Address to a joint session of Congress and the American people in which he identified Al Qaeda as the culprits behind 9/11 attacks. The reason behind their attack was that they hated the United States freedom. Bush had finally found his mission: “in our grief and Anger we have found our mission and our moment”.

The U.S was going to use every “necessary weapon of war” including cutting off the terrorist organization funding, pursuing the nation that harbor terrorists: “Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with U.S., or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward any nation that continues to harbor terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime”<sup>107</sup>. He emphasized the importance of moral clarity (a phrase used by Kagan and Kristol in their article *Towards a Neo-Reaganite foreign policy*) in the making of the U.S foreign policy.

After the war on Afghanistan (which will be discussed in the following chapter). In his state of the union Address, Bush stated the U.S will not end its war on terror with the fall of Taliban, it will pursue the “terrorists underworld - including groups like Hamas, Hizbollah, Islamic Jihad” and others around the world.

America *will* act in the face of growing threat by such regimes as Iraq, Iran and North Korea “states like these and their terrorist allies, constitute an

---

<sup>106</sup> <http://whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16>

<sup>107</sup> <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-80.html>



axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world”; The U.S. will *prevent* these regimes from sponsoring terror. In addition Bush pointed out that his budget included largest increase in defense in two decades<sup>108</sup>).

This rhetoric was supplemented by “Wilsonian idealism” provided by the Neocons. A good example of that would be a speech delivered by Wolfowitz in which he declared “there is a dangerous gap between the west and the Muslim world. We must bridge this gap... the larger war we face is the war of ideas- a challenge to be sure, but one that we must also win. It is a struggle over modernity and secularism, pluralism and democracy, real economic development.”<sup>109</sup>

Another key speech delivered by the president was at West Point, in which he declared U.S. pre-emptive policy for the first time:

Deterrance... the promise of massive retaliation against nations...means nothing against shadowy terrorist networks...containment is not possible.... We must take the battle to the enemy disrupt his plans, and confront the worst threats before they emerge...our security will require all Americans to be forward-looking and resolute, to be ready for preemptive action when necessary<sup>110</sup>.

The key feature was further enshrined in the U.S National Security strategy issued on September 2002 which constituted the basic Bush doctrine. It emphasized the global mission that the U.S was leading: “the war against terrorist organisations of global reach is a global enterprise of uncertain duration” which the U.S needed to act against before terrorists did, or else “History will judge harshly those who saw this coming danger but failed to act.”

Again Wilsonian idealism was combined with realpolitik: “the U.S National Security Strategy will be based on a distinctly American

---

<sup>108</sup> <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html> retrieved 3/15/2004

<sup>109</sup> Wolfowitz, 2002

<sup>110</sup> [www.whitehouse.gov/new/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/new/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html)

Internationalism that reflects the union of our values and our national interests”<sup>111</sup>. The U.S was going to work with its allies and protect them from the threat of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

A sketchy definition of terrorism was provided: “premeditated politically motivated act of violence perpetrated against innocents”<sup>112</sup> it also expressed U.S readiness to act unilaterally:

Defending the United States, the American people, and our interests at home and abroad by identifying and destroying the threat before it reaches our borders while the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm to our people and our country<sup>113</sup>

It recognized that the “best defense is a good offense” so it stressed homeland security and military build up. It spoke favorably of both China and Russia but targeted *Rogue states* (a term coined by Collin Powell in the early 90’s) such as Iran, Iraq and North Korea.

It was committed to a free democratic Palestine provided that it could control its terrorist organizations.<sup>114</sup> It also presented a defense for preemption

legal scholars and international Judaists often conditioned the legitimacy of preemption on the existence of imminent threat- most often a visible mobilization of armies, navies and air forces preparing to attack. We must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities of today’s adversaries<sup>115</sup>.

On the same day 41 PNAC leading neoconservative members signed a letter to President Bush in which they supported his campaign on terror and the states that harbored it.

---

<sup>111</sup> The National Security Strategy of the United States of America p:1 September 17,2002  
[www.whitehouse.gov](http://www.whitehouse.gov)

<sup>112</sup> Ibid, p. 5

<sup>113</sup> Ibid, p. 6

<sup>114</sup> Ibid, p. 9

<sup>115</sup> Ibid, p. 15

They proposed a strategy for the war. The U.S. must take “military action against Afghanistan” attack Ossama Bin Laden kill him and destroy his network. Second the administration must attack Iraq and remove Saddam regardless to whether a solid link was established linking him to the attacks of September 11 “failure to undertake such an effort will constitute an early and perhaps decisive surrender in the war on international terrorism”<sup>116</sup>.

Next the U.S. must attack Hizbollah in south Lebanon, and Iran and Syria must be pressured to stop their support of it or else the U.S. should consider actions against both countries. The U.S. should pressure the Palestinians, and fully support the Israelis since they are the most reliable regime in the Middle East. Finally the letter demanded an increase in the Defense budget. Meanwhile, the president had only vaguely pointed out the culprit behind the Sept. 11 attacks, but the neoconservatives were already pushing forward with their Grand Strategy to change the Middle East.

Preemption (which was first mentioned in the report prepared for Netanyahu’s strategy) is defined as “marked by the seizing of the initiative; initiated by oneself<sup>117</sup> has been highly controversial. Preemption might be endorsed in international law under article 51 of the U.N. charter.

However U.S. acts are rather defined as preventive (which is defined as depriving of power or hope of acting or succeeding<sup>118</sup>) which is against the international law and norms. Preemptive and preventive terms have been used interchangeably in the NSS (such as in the heading of the fifth chapter: Prevent Our Enemies from Threatening U.S., Our Allies, and Our Friends with Weapons of mass destruction).

---

<sup>116</sup> [http://: www.newamericancentury.org/bushletter](http://www.newamericancentury.org/bushletter)

<sup>117</sup> Heisborg 2003, p. 18

<sup>118</sup> *ibid* p. 17

This grand strategy supported “ two classes of sovereignty: the sovereignty of the United States, which takes precedence over international treaties and obligations, and the sovereignty of all other states, which is subject to the Bush doctrine<sup>119</sup> It also deprives it of “moral relativism”. States faced two options: either with the U.S. or against the U.S.; there was no third option.

Bush’s doctrine or revolution is not simply a result of circumstances and reactionary to 9/11. It has its roots in neoconservatives’ work pre-September 11 events, dating as far back as 1992 Wolfowitz first draft of a Grand Strategy in which he emphasized America’s need to pursue hegemony and military build up, what William Kristol described as being “prophetic”. The same rhetoric was repeated in Kristol and Kagan’s article *Towards a NeoReaganite Foreign Policy* and their view of Benevolent Hegemony, which were previously discussed.

Again, this rhetoric was highlighted in PNAC’s *Building America’s Defenses*. In addition to the hegemony and military buildup, it identified the *axis of evil* (coined by David Frum) being Iran, Iraq, and North Korea and viewed terrorism in the postmodern outlook as being a non state actor spreading across national boundaries.

The notion of *evil enemy* is not genuine either; it is similar to the *evil empire* formulated for Reagan. Podhoretz pointed out that most of Bush’s oratory was produced by his speech writers, but it didn’t really matter: “what counts nowadays are the words a president permits to be put in his mouth. In speaking those words he assumes responsibility for them, and thereby makes them his own as surely... well almost as surely... as if he were the original author”<sup>120</sup>.

---

<sup>119</sup> Soros, 2004, p. 11

<sup>120</sup> Podhoretz 2002

That is how the neoconservatives got their way in shaping foreign policy: they placed the words in the president's mouth. The neoconservatives are so far cheering the way things are going: the war on Iraq (which will be discussed later) has been one of their major fixations.

The U.S. unilateralism was also one of their demands, since they had a great aversion for international institutions such as the U.N. which Podhoretz defined as an "organization of despots, petty and grand", while Perle clapped in 2003 announcing *The Death of the U.N.* with the end of Saddam Hussein and the end "fantasy of the U.N. as the foundation of the new world order"<sup>121</sup>.

Those ideas were further detailed in a "manual of victory" presented by Perle and David Frum in their book *An End To Evil: How to Win a War on Terror*. It advised the U.S. administration on what should be done to counter terror.

They warned the U.S. from quitting the war on terror early, and encouraged it to go all the way to eradicating all terrorist organizations namely Hizbollah, Hamas, and Islamic Jihad.<sup>122</sup> War on terror is the defining mission for this generation. The U.S. has to respond strictly "weakness is provocative: that's one of Donald Rumsfeld's famous rules, and a decade of weakness in the Middle East proved Rumsfeld right"<sup>123</sup>.

They specified the traditional axis of evil constituting of Iran Iraq and North Korea. But they also added to the list Libya, Syria and Saudi Arabia<sup>124</sup>. They declared that the "distinction between Islamic terrorism against Israel, and

---

<sup>121</sup> Perle 2003

<sup>122</sup> Frum & Perle 2003, p. 4

<sup>123</sup> Ibid, p. 18

<sup>124</sup> Ibid, p. 97-98

Islamic terrorism against the United States and Europe on the other hand cannot be sustained”<sup>125</sup>.

Syria must be pressured to stop financing and harboring terrorist organizations. Saudi Arabia must be pressured for further compliance, or else it could be threatened by creating an uprising in its eastern Shiite, oil rich province, through supporting an independence movement, and denouncing it as an ally<sup>126</sup>. It constitutes a pivot in the axis of evil.

In addition they demanded that the U.N. amends its charter and “commit itself to the proposition that harboring and or financing terrorism in itself constitutes an article 51 act of aggression”<sup>127</sup>.

In the most recent State of Union Address, Bush, once more, pointed that the U.S. will attack terrorists and states sponsoring them. It identified the, by now cliché, axis of evil. They demanded that the Iran and North Korea remove their arsenals. Bush couldn't help crowing the fact that America's war on Iraq intimidated the rest of the countries, such as Libya, that has announced its dismantling of the WMD's that it presumably possesses “for diplomacy to be effective, words must be credible, and no one can now doubt the word of America.”

In addition he promised in his speech to pursue democracy in the Middle East “as long as the Middle East remains a place of tyranny and despair and anger, it will continue to produce men and movements that threaten the safety of America and our friends.” So America is pursuing a forward strategy of freedom in the greater Middle East. Ironically bush in the same speech rejects

---

<sup>125</sup> Ibid, p. 24

<sup>126</sup> Ibid, p. 141

<sup>127</sup> Ibid, p. 271

the idea that the U.S. of following an imperialistic foreign policy, announcing that he has “no desire to dominate no ambitions of empire”<sup>128</sup>

That was a basic overview of the neoconservatives’ Foreign policy agenda, and their role in formulation of the Bush doctrine. The following two chapters are case studies that would depict the neocons in action.

---

<sup>128</sup> [www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/200401/print/20040120-7.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/200401/print/20040120-7.html)

## Chapter III

### Case Study I: War on Afghanistan

*For what can be done against force without force  
Cicero (The letters to his friend)*

In the previous chapter the neoconservative ambitious agenda was demonstrated. However since their first appearance the neoconservatives had their hands constantly tied by consideration for international law and domestic pressure. They have also been obsessed with an outside Evil enemy whether the Red Devils (i.e. the communists), or currently the Green threat or militant Islam, following Machiavelli's advise "if no external threat exists one has to be manufactured."

The beginning of the twenty first century presented them with the life time golden opportunity to carry their expansionist policies. Bin Laden gave them the much needed excuse for waging their previously planned wars.

The attack on the World Trade Center on September 11 had been the push for U.S. snowballing, war waging, foreign policy starting with Afghanistan.

Before the war is discussed, some light should be shed on the geostrategic importance of Afghanistan since it is typically pictured as rugged mountains with cave dwellers. Afghanistan is a gateway to Eurasia (it is "all the territory east of Germany. This means Russia, the Mid East, china and parts of India<sup>129</sup>) and the Caspian region (Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and Azerbaijan).

This area has high potential value in oil and natural gas of more than \$5 Trillion. It's surrounded by two major powers: Russia and China. Thus as

---

<sup>129</sup> Vidal, 2002, p. 18



Zbigniew Brzezinski (a neoconservative Democrat who was Carter's National Security Advisor) noted "It follows that America's primary interest is to help ensure no other single power comes to control this geopolitical space and that the global community has unhindered financial and economic access to it"<sup>130</sup>.

In 1995 a Unocal (U.S. oil company) spokes person assessed the wealth of the Caspian region and proposed a pipeline from Turkmenistan to Afghanistan, to Pakistan and the Indian Oceanport of Karachi. This information was received with excitement as Madeline Albright commented "Working to mold the area's future is one of the most exiting things we can do"<sup>131</sup>. Thus U.S. militarization of the region began even before September 11<sup>132</sup>.

Brzezinski clearly envisaged that the "establishment, consolidation, and expansion of U.S. military hegemony over Eurasia through central Asia would require the unprecedented, open ended militarization of foreign policy, coupled with an unprecedented manufacture of domestic support and consensus or the militarization campaign" (it's interesting to note that after the war of Afghanistan the pipeline project was approved for execution. The U.S. envoy to Afghanistan, Zalmay Khalilzad was a Unocal employee, as well as the installed Afghanistan president).

During the cold war, Afghanistan was a hotspot witnessing the competition of U.S. and USSR. The CIA sponsored militant groups including Bin-Laden to combat the Soviet. After the war ended U.S. pulled out its forces without "cleaning the mess it left behind".

In the evening of September 11, the United States President delivered a speech in which he indicated that reason behind the attack was the hate of

---

<sup>130</sup> Brzezinski 1997, council on foreign relations study: American primacy it geostrategic imperatives

<sup>131</sup> Albright, The magazine, May 1998

<sup>132</sup> [www.iacenter.org/nowar\\_truth.htm](http://www.iacenter.org/nowar_truth.htm)

American freedom without specifying the culprit. But he stated that U.S. will not distinguish between terrorists and states that harbor them. Critics began to worry about how the administration, with its hawkish tendency, was going to respond.

Many believed that “given the opportunity to show force, the U.S. government would not likely honor contracts and compacts of the past. George W Bush’s planners and speech writers had already begun to write the document that would shape U.S. relations with the rest of the world and its own citizens”<sup>133</sup>.

These worries were confirmed. In the *Address to a Joint Session of Congress and American People* nine days later Bush unveiled his enemy; it was the Qaeda

A collection of loose terrorist organizations... it is to terror what the mafia is to crime. But its goal is not making money, its goal is remaking the world and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere.. [the terrorists] are recruited from their own nations and neighborhoods and brought to camps in places like Afghanistan... the leadership of Al-Qaeda has great influence in Afghanistan and supports the Taliban regime in controlling most of the country<sup>134</sup>.

Among the Qaeda goals is their intention to overthrow regimes in Muslim countries such as Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, and to drive Israel out of the Middle East. Thus Bush announced his demands on Taliban: “Deliver to United States authorities all the leaders of Al-Qaeda... close immediately and permanently every terrorist training camp in Afghanistan, and hand over every terrorist and every person in their support structure to appropriate authorities. Give the United States full access to terrorists training camps so it can make sure they are not longer operations”.

---

<sup>133</sup> Landau, 2003, p. 21

<sup>134</sup> <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>

Most important point of that speech was the announcement of a new global war. It was not on Nazis or Communists, it was on terror and terrorists, “the heirs of all the murderous Ideologies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century... they follow the path of fascism, Nazism and to totalitarianism”.

So the U.S. must declare its new global mission as President Bush put it “our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist organization of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated”<sup>135</sup>.

This speech was received with great enthusiasm at Capitol Hill. Planning the details of Invasion(s) began with the encouragement and cheering of the cabinet, notably Cheney, Rumsfeld, and Wolfowitz. Collin Powell was the only member to display unease with equating terrorists with the states harboring them (reflected in his comments to the media on September 12). As scheming for the war on Iraq started, he kept reminding the administration that Al Qaeda was the real threat all energy must be directed towards it.

#### **War on Afghanistan:**

“The neoconservatives believe that destruction produces creation. They believe that to smash and conquer is to be victorious... they believe that the United States has a real mission to destroy the forces of unrighteousness. The also believe – and that’s their greater illusion – that such a destruction will free the natural forces of freedom and democracy”<sup>136</sup>. This naïve belief in the U.S. ability to install artificial democratic system that is friendly to the United States would solve the problem of terrorism, encouraged them to push harder for war.

Thus the plan to invade Afghanistan, remove Taliban, and destroy Al Qaeda was executed. On October 7, 2001 U.S. and British forces raided

---

<sup>135</sup> Ibid

<sup>136</sup> Pfaff, 2003

Afghanistan, upon Taliban's refusal to hand in Bin Laden. Bush made public speeches vowing that "oppressed people of Afghanistan will know the generosity of America"<sup>137</sup> indicating his commitment to post war Afghanistan.

The Allied forces bombed Taliban and Qaeda targets, as well as civilian homes (similar to bombing of Iraqi weddings by mistake of course, a year later) using illegal weapons banned by the Geneva convention (such as razor bombs and p-pressure bombs, which were also used later in the war on Iraq).

The prisoners taken were also another major issue since the U.S refused to acknowledge them as prisoners of war (classifying them instead as unlawful combatants) thus refusing to apply the Geneva convention's laws concerning their human rights, and kept them in animal like conditions in cages in Guantanamo (a case repeated in Iraq such as the Abu Ghraib prison). In less than two months, Usama Bin Laden was still free, but the Taliban regime was replaced.

On the domestic arena, Bush urged the U.S congress to pass the USA PATRIOT Act (Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act) which enabled nonelected officials to tighten immigration procedures and legalize intrusion into personal privacy, including the probing of social organizations and their bank accounts, and the invasion of telephone and computer messaging.<sup>138</sup> Within a month the FBI detained around 1200 people denying them their rights, few who proved to have the remotest links to the September 11 attacks<sup>139</sup>.

Any American or afghan protests against U.S atrocities dimmed in the rising light of Bush who was "riding a wave of popularity that made even

---

<sup>137</sup> Corn, 2003, p. 159

<sup>138</sup> Landau, 2003, p. 2

<sup>139</sup> Ibid, p. 25

natural enemies wonder where they could pick up some Levi's and a pair of boots"<sup>140</sup>.

Afghanistan presented a quick victory and a greater motif for the Bush administration to continue planning the war on their *Axis of Evil*. However two aspects must be considered presented by the war on Afghanistan: the U.S. weak commitment to post war nation building, and its willingness to disregard international law, which was carried further in the war on Iraq.

**Post War Commitment:**

At the beginning of the war, Bush repeatedly announced America's intention in supporting Afghanistan. He declared that "America and our allies will do our part in the rebuilding of Afghanistan. We learned our lessons from the past. We will not leave until the mission is complete."

However, Bush fell short from keeping this promise. The country was unstable lacking security, with fundamentalist insurgency, theft and murder being a daily routine. The U.S. refused Karazai's demand for an increase in international peacekeeping forces (made of soldiers from 17 countries except the U.S.).

Initially, the U.S. promised a new "Marshall Plan" to rebuild the country. Collin Powell called for a meeting of donor countries in Tokyo which yielded a \$4.5 Dollars to be spread over five years. The U.S. donated four hundred million dollars for the first year, the bulk of which went to the building of a new Afghani army that would secure its interests.

Since then the money allocated to Afghanistan's reconstruction took smaller slices of the U.S. budget. The U.S. slowly withdrew from its non-military commitments. Most of the international donations were channeled

---

<sup>140</sup> Suskind, 2004, p.204

towards emergency relief rather than the process of nation building which leads to further dependence on foreign sources.

**International Law:**

One of the most concerning aspects of the neoconservatives is their unilateralist tendencies, their continuous push of the U.S. to act regardless to international law and its organizations, to pursue its interests.

The war on Afghanistan presented the first translation and consequence of this tendency during the Bush presidency. Even though there has been great controversy regarding this topic, nevertheless certain facts remain that cannot be overlooked.

Article 2 of the United Nations Charter imposes on members the binding obligation to settle disputes in a peaceful manner and prohibits the use, or threat of use of force against any other member state: "all states take no actions aimed at military intervention and occupation, forcible change in or understanding of the sociopolitical system of states, destabilization and overthrow of their governments and in particular, initiate no military action to that end under any pretext whatsoever and cease forthwith any such action already in progress".<sup>141</sup> Thus the claim that the war on Afghanistan was retaliation to the attack of September eleven is unjustifiable. Upon the 9/11 events the United Nations Security Council passed two resolutions: Resolution 1268 on the 12<sup>th</sup> of September 2001, and Resolution 1373 on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2001 (neither of which authorized the use of force).

Resolution 1373 affirmed Member State ability to take measures to "prevent and suppress terrorist attacks and to take action against the perpetrators

---

<sup>141</sup> Davidson, International law

of such acts". It rendered the U.N. responsive to threats from non-state actor<sup>142</sup>. However all acts could only be conducted within international law and international human rights framework.

Most proponents of the war use interpretation of article 51 of the U.N. charter to justify their acts. However Article 51, which defines member states right for self defense, specifies that the states can defend themselves when under attack and until security council takes necessary measures "nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security".

The U.S. not only neglected the laws of the United Nation's Charter, it also refused to abide by the rules of NATO. On September 12 NATO resolved that September 11 attacks were covered by article 5 of the Washington treaty, thus it is considered as an attack on all NATO members.

The members are supposed to act according to the decision of the North Atlantic Council. Yet the U.S. disregarded it and formed it own *coalition of the willing* with states such as England and Canada. In addition the U.S. overlooked the Geneva Convention regarding human rights bombarding civilians and treatment of prisoners of war.

In short the war on Afghanistan represents the tip of the iceberg of the neoconservative strategy on foreign policy. Their main focus, war on Iraq was soon to follow again demonstrating utter contempt to global society and international law, and instead following the Hobbesian rule *Might Makes Right*. The following chapter which is the second case study analyzes the war on Iraq

---

<sup>142</sup> Heisbourg, 2003

and proves the continuity of the pattern of behavior demonstrated in the war on Afghanistan.



## Chapter IV

### Case study II: War on Iraq

*There is deceit and cunning from these wars arise*

Confucius

Iraq has been a main concern in American foreign policy for more than half a century due to its geostrategic importance and the fact that it has the second largest oil reservoir in the world.

During the Reagan period the United States supported Saddam Hussein in his war against Iran, and “looked the other way” to Iraq’s use of poison gas, in addition to supplying Saddam with funding, military intelligence and weapons, the U.S emissary to Iraq was none other than Donald Rumsfeld<sup>143</sup>.

In 1990, shortly before invading Kuwait, Saddam met with U.S ambassador April Glaspie and informed her about his plan to invade Kuwait, (which had been drilling oil beneath Iraqi border and selling it at a steep price) the answer he got was that the U.S understood Iraqi’s position and that it regarded his future move of invading Kuwait as an Arab-Arab conflict, and that the U.S didn’t have security commitments to Kuwait.<sup>144</sup>

However upon the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, the U.S reacted differently than promised. It sided with Kuwait causing the defeat of Iraq. But the president Bush senior decided not to go all the way to Baghdad to impose regime change and left Saddam in power, a move that was highly discouraged by the neoconservatives (such as Wolfowitz). In a way Saddam represented unfinished business to the neoconservatives.

---

<sup>143</sup> Caldicot, 2003, p.134

<sup>144</sup> Caldicot, 2002, p.145

In 1992 Wolfowitz drafted the *Defense Planning Guidance* (discussed previously in Chapter 2) in which he emphasized the U.S. need of controlling the oil rich gulf and prohibiting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and pointed Iraq as one of the trouble spots.

Removing Saddam from power was again brought up by neoconservatives Richard Perle and Douglas Feith in *A Clean Break* a study presented to Benjamin Netanyahu (also discussed previously in chapter 2) in which they advocated Saddam's removal from power and replacing him with Hashemite monarchy to insure Israel's security.

In January 1998, in a letter written by PNAC members (including Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz and Woolsey) the neoconservatives urged President Clinton to take actions against Saddam Hussein and remove him from power even if it meant using military power, since he could no longer be contained and constituted a growing threat to the United States and its allies:

we are writing you because we are convinced that current American policy toward Iraq is not succeeding and that we may soon face threat in the Middle East more serious than any we have known since the end of the cold war...that strategy should aim, above all, at the removal of Saddam Hussein's regime from power. We stand ready to offer our full support in this difficult but necessary endeavor. The policy of 'containment' of Saddam Hussein has been steadily eroding over the past several months...our ability to ensure that Saddam Hussein is not producing weapons of mass destruction...has substantially diminished...the only acceptable strategy is one that eliminates the possibility that Iraq will be able to use or threaten to use weapons of mass destruction. In the near term, this means the willingness to undertake military action as diplomacy is clearly failing. In the long term, it means removing Saddam Hussein and his regime from power. That now needs to become the aim of American foreign policy...American policy cannot continue to be crippled by a misguided insistence on unanimity in the U.N. Security council.<sup>145</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqclintonletter.html>

Since 1991 the U.N. Security Council had adopted a series of resolutions on Iraq, obliging it to remove its weapons of mass destruction. It also imposed a monitoring system, a special commission "UNSCOM", through which inspectors insured Iraqi disarmament and managed to destroy most of Hussein's military capabilities. In 1999 Iraqi ceased cooperating with UNSCOM, thus was replaced with UNMOVIC which continued imposing the sanction on Iraq and sustained the oil for food program.<sup>146</sup>

However U.N. actions were deemed by the neoconservatives as ineffective. They continued pushing for regime change in Iraq. A month after their first letter to Clinton, neoconservative William Kristol and Robert Kagan, wrote on the ineffectiveness of the U.N. and U.S. policies of containment of Saddam and that "the only thing Saddam fears is the one thing that containment does not threaten his removal from power."<sup>147</sup>

Two months later in May 1998 PNAC wrote a letter to Newt Grinch (Speaker of the House) and Treat Lott (Senate Majority Leader) signed by seventeen neoconservatives including Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz and Perle since "the administration has failed to provide sound leadership...and Clintons administration's handling of the crisis with Iraq has left Saddam Hussein in a stronger position that when the crisis began".

They argued for their cause of Saddam Hussein's removal and explained that the increasing power of Hussein will lead to "an incalculable blow to American leadership and credibility" as well as endangering American citizens, troops and allies, and would "make Saddam the driving force of Middle East

---

<sup>146</sup> <http://www.eurolegal.org/mideast/iraqun.html>

<sup>147</sup> Kristol & Kagan, 1998

politic, including on such important matters as the Middle East peace progress”

148

### **Planning War on Iraq:**

During the Bush Jr. presidency the neoconservatives were able to carry their decade old plan for invading Iraq. In the first National Security Council meeting, ten days after the inauguration of George W. Bush, Condoleezza Rice presented the Agenda for the meeting. Iraqi’s destabilization of the Middle East was the first topic. George Tenet, the CIA director, presented “circumstantial evidence” pointing out suspicious activities of an Iraqi factory that could be producing WMD’S. At the end of the meeting Bush had asked Rumsfeld to examine U.S. military options, “examining how it might look” to use U.S. ground forces in the north and south of Iraq and how the armed forces could support groups inside the country who could help challenge Saddam Hussein”<sup>149</sup>.

The neoconservatives who were assigned to key position in the Bush administration did not waste time in pursuing their policies as this meeting, recounted by Former Secretary of Treasury Paul O’Neal, proves.

At this early date, the administration was showing signs of division between “Powell and his moderates at the State Department versus hard liners like Rumsfeld, Cheney and Wolfowitz, who were already planning the next war on Iraq and the shape of the post-Saddam country”.<sup>150</sup>

The September 11 attacks presented “the catastrophic and catalyzing event- like a new pearl harbor” which the neoconservatives have been waiting for as declared in the proposal for *Rebuilding America’s defenses in year 2000*.

---

<sup>148</sup> <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqiletter1998.html>

<sup>149</sup> Suskind 2004 p.74-75

<sup>150</sup> Ibid p.96

It made the neoconservative push for war on Iraq fiercer. Right the next day, September 12 2001, at an NSC meeting, Rumsfeld declared that the Pentagon had a ready plan to overthrow Saddam and that, "any initiative against world wide terrorism would surely, at some point... take the United States to Baghdad."<sup>151</sup>

Neoconservative fixation on toppling Saddam and waging war on Iraq had driven them to ignore the fact that Bin Laden (the terrorist behind September 11 as declared by the CIA) was situated in Afghanistan they pressed for war on Iraq as a priority, even though they lacked substantial evidence of Iraq's possession of WMD's or of Saddam's link to Al-Qaeda.

President Bush's speech on the night of the attack and declaration that the U.S. will "make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them" further encouraged the neoconservatives.

On September 20, in his "address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People" Bush declared that his war on terror only began in Qaeda but did not end there. It would extend to finding and destroying every terrorist organization of global reach.<sup>152</sup> The project for New American century had sent him a letter on the same day providing possible targets: Iraq, Hezbollah and Palestinian organizations. Iraq was the most urgent target "

it may be that Iraqi government provided assistance in some form to the recent attack on the United States but even if evidence does not link Iraq directly to the attack, any strategy aiming at the eradication of terrorism and its sponsors must include a determined effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq. Failure to undertake such an effort will constitute an early and perhaps decisive surrender in the war on international terrorism.<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> Ibid p.187

<sup>152</sup> <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920.8.html>

<sup>153</sup> <http://www.newamericancentury.org/bushletter.html>

One year later, in his State of Union Address, Bush pointed out the *axis of evil* that threatens the U.S. He identified Iraq as an anchor of this axis. Even though Bush kept declaring that he is considering all options in dealing with Iraq, his administration was working on the details of his war on Iraq.<sup>154</sup>

By June first signs of Bush's doctrine of preemption were reflected in his speech at Westpoint which crystallized in September in the National Security Strategy (previously discussed in chapter 2). The main danger to the U.S. lies in the combination radicalism and technology "where weak states and Rogue states would harbor and support terrorist organization with global reach and provide them with lethal weapons. Rogue states was one that brutalized its people, disregarded International law, threatened its neighbor, sought WMD's, sponsored international terrorism, and anti-American attitudes.

Iraq qualified as a rogue state.<sup>155</sup> Preemption was further stressed, based on Rumsfeld's "best defense is a good offense", the administration pushed for striking Iraq while it was able to, before Saddam grew too powerful to contain or defeat.

Neoconservatives were working hard to promote war on Iraq not just in the administration, but also on the public level. PNAC established a new group *the committee for the liberation of Iraq*. It met with Rice regularly to formulate a plan to educate U.S. citizens and funded the Iraqi National Congress headed by Ahmad Chalaby".<sup>156</sup> The American Enterprise Institute became influential on Capitol Hill (more than the Heritage foundation, which was very active during George W. Bush and favored multilateral approach).

---

<sup>154</sup> Corn, 2003, p. 205

<sup>155</sup> National Security Strategy p.14

<sup>156</sup> Pitt, 2003

Talk of war was on the rise, Bush in a speech at AEI. In February 2002 stated that the U.S. was going to use military force in Iraq if needed “we are prepared to disarm Iraq by force. Either way this danger will be removed.<sup>157</sup> Some neoconservatives had already planned post war Iraq such as Douglas Feith (Under Secretary of Defense). According to his vision, the U.S. after removing Saddam should commit to its duties in Iraq such as destroying all terrorist cells and WMD’s, safeguard Iraq territory and civil unity, finally to begin a process of reconstruction in Iraq.<sup>158</sup>

President Bush also aimed at achieving a coalition of the willing whose objective “was to confer legitimacy on any operation”. In November 20, 2002 Bush announced that the U.S. would lead a coalition of the willing (main power other than the U.S., being UK) in case Saddam refused to fully cooperate with the U.N. inspections. The coalition would face and destroy him, in case other nations declined to perform their job.<sup>159</sup>

#### **Bush and the U.N.**

The Bush administration used the United Nations to push for the war on Iraq as well. President Bush gave a speech at the United Nations General Assembly 12th September 2002 using the memory of 9/11 attack to add emotional effects to his speech. He demanded that the U.N. takes firm measures to stop Saddam atrocities towards his people, and to insure the destruction of his weapons of mass destruction

our greatest fear is that terrorists will find a shortcut to their mad ambitions when an outlaw regime supplies them with the technologies to kill on a massive scale. In one place, one regime we will find these dangers in their most lethal and aggressive forms...Saddam Hussein pursued weapons of mass murder even

---

<sup>157</sup> George Bush speech at AEI 27-2003 from [http://www.buzzle.com/editorials/2-27-2003-3636609\\_p/view](http://www.buzzle.com/editorials/2-27-2003-3636609_p/view)

<sup>158</sup> Douglas Feith, post war planning <http://www.defenselink.mil/policy/speech/Feb03html>

<sup>159</sup> <http://www.eurolegal.org/useuer/bbiraqwar.html>

when inspectors were in his country... the conduct of the Iraqi regime is a threat to the authority of the United Nations, and a threat to peace. Iraq has answered a decade of U.N. demands with a decade of defiance”<sup>160</sup>

Bush presented a draft of resolution 1441 which proposed that the Security Council delegate to the United States the decisions when and how to use force against Iraq.<sup>161</sup> This draft was rejected. After its amendment, resolution 1441 was passed on November 8, 2002 which dictated that the U.N. should declare its WMD's and allow U.N. inspection to proceed unhindered (UNMOVIC and IAEA).

This resolution did not authorize force against Iraq. It gave it a chance to comply with the U.N. However if Iraq failed to do so it will face serious consequences “the council has repeatedly warned Iraq that it will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations”.

Three months later United States was pushing harder for gaining approval in its war on Iraq. On the fifth of February Collin Powell gave a presentation at the U.N. in which he claimed that evidences gathered proved that Iraq was still concealing evidence of its weapons of mass destruction from the U.N.

Even though one week later the UNMOVIC briefing to the Security Council on February 14, 2003 informed the U.N. that no evidences of Iraq's WMD's were found<sup>162</sup> pointing to Iraq's improved cooperation. Yet on 17<sup>th</sup> of March 2003 United States, UK and Spain announced that they “reserve the right to take their own steps to secure the disarmament of Iraq”<sup>163</sup>.

---

<sup>160</sup> Presidents Remarks at the United Nations September 12, 2002  
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html>

<sup>161</sup> <http://www.eurolegal.org/mideast/iraqun.html>

<sup>162</sup> <http://www.eurolegal.org/mideast/iraqun.html>

<sup>163</sup> U.N. News Center 17-March 2003 UK, U.S. and Spain won't seek on draft resolution



Kofi Anaa announced the withdrawal of the inspection teams from Iraq since Agreement could not be reached at the Security Council (referring to the growing tension between the war parties U.S., UK and Spain versus France and Germany).

The U.S. had formed its coalition of the willing and decided to sidestep the United Nations and wage its war on Iraq. The U.S. attempted to justify its war according to resolution 1441. But resolution 1441 doesn't allow use of force against Iraq it only mentions "serious consequences" if Iraq doesn't oblige. "In the context of chapter 7 of the Charter of the United Nations, the expression serious consequence is not synonymous with, nor a warrant for the use of armed force. The recognized U.N. euphemism for the latter is taking "all necessary means" to secure compliance with the obligation in question.<sup>164</sup>

### **Bush Grand Strategy**

The U.S doctrine of preemptive war (or rather preventive war) has been proven illegal in the previous chapter. However, legal or not, the war on Iraq is a cornerstone in Bush's grand strategy for the Middle East.

A grand strategy is, as professor John Lewis Gaddis defines "a blue print from which policy follows. It envisions a country's mission, defines its interests and sets its priorities. Part of the Grand Strategy's grandeur lies in its durability. A single grand strategy can shape decades, even centuries of policy"<sup>165</sup> Gaddis argues that this Grand Strategy is only the third in modern American history. (First being Monroe's grand strategy and the second is Franklin D. Roosevelt's plan for post world war II).

---

<sup>164</sup>Black, The Times, 2003.

<sup>165</sup> George W. Bush Grand strategist 11 February 2004

[http://www.townhall.com/columnists/Tony\\_blankley/tb200440211.shtml](http://www.townhall.com/columnists/Tony_blankley/tb200440211.shtml)

Bush strategy for the Middle East focuses on a democratization of the Middle East as a mean to prevent terrorists and Rogue States from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and threatening the U.S. and its allies. This political reform of the Arab world will be carried by force if necessary regardless to the “outmoded international system”.<sup>166</sup>

War on Iraq is considered as only the first step in a thousand mile journey that the Bush administration has drawn for itself. This strategy reflects the high influence of the Neoconservatives. As William Kristol explains “the war that George Bush is talking about is a war against a brutal regime that has in its possession weapons of mass destruction.

But at a deeper level, it is a greater war, for the shaping of a new Middle East. It is a war that is intended to change the political culture of the entire region.

What happened on September 11, Kristol says, is that the Americans looked around and saw that the world is not what they thought it was. The world is a dangerous place. Therefore the Americans looked for a doctrine that would enable them to cope with this dangerous world. And the only doctrine they found was the neoconservative one<sup>167</sup>.

Former CIA director James Woolsey illustrated his extreme vision in one of his speeches in California College “the United States is engaged in fighting “world war IV” which will last considerably longer than either world wars I or II but hopefully not as long as the cold war”. The enemies he pointed out were rulers of Iran, “fascist” rulers of Iraq and Syria and groups like Al Qaeda, in addition to pro American rulers of Egypt and Saudi Arabia. He addressed those states declaring “we want you nervous, we want you to realize

---

<sup>166</sup> Ibid.

<sup>167</sup>Shavit, 2003

now, for the fourth time in 100 years, the country and its allies are on the march and that we are on the side of your people"<sup>168</sup>

Norman Podhoretz was the first to dub the project World War IV calling for regime change in the whole of the Middle East both pro and anti American regimes. He believes that the U.S. can "win this war and reform Islam provided that America has the stomach to impose a new political culture on the defeated parties".<sup>169</sup> The work of Perle and Frum an *End to Evil* is basically an executive plan or manual for the neoconservative project of a new Middle East.

It is ironic to note that the war on Iraq was dubbed "chicken hawk" war since most neoconservatives including Bush have ducked military service or avoided military combats (during Vietnam for example) they have never been on a battle ground such as Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, "Scooter" Libby, Paul Wolfowitz, John Bolton and Richard Perle. A chicken hawk is "generally male-who (1) tend to advocate military solutions to political problem and who have personally (2) declined to take advantage of a significant opportunity to serve in uniform during wartime"<sup>170</sup>.

The Bush administration provided two main arguments for their invasion. Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction that threatened the United States and its allies. They based this belief on circumstantial evidence that the United States collected of "suspicious activities" going on in certain factories and certain interceptions that the U.S. got hold of which indicated an Iraqi army officer giving commands to a lower ranking officer to delete all mention of

---

<sup>168</sup> Abunimeh, 2003

<sup>169</sup> Ibid

<sup>170</sup> landau 2003 p.129, 130

nerve gas. Despite Hans Blix, the Chief Weapons Inspector confirmation that Iraq did not continue to manufacture WMD's<sup>171</sup>.

Second charge was that Saddam sponsored terrorist organizations and had links to Al Qaeda. This claim was based on information that indicated Mohammad Atta (key figure and planner of September 11 attacks) met with Iraqi intelligence Officer in Prague in October 2001 which Richard Perle asserted to its credibility.<sup>172</sup> In September 2002, however, both Washington Post and New York Times quoted CIA Officials who described the information as unreliable<sup>173</sup>.

In addition, demonstrations around the world broke out "on February 2003, over eight million people marched on the streets of five continents against a war that had not yet begun."<sup>174</sup> Thus the U.S., using its unlawful doctrine of preemption, disregarding international law, lacking support of international community, using weak evidence gathered on Iraqi WMD's and Iraqi links to Al Qaeda, still declared war on Iraq.

#### **The War:**

At 5:34 am Baghdad time on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2003, the armed forces of United States and the United Kingdom waged its war, starting with air strikes followed by a ground invasion. After the Invasion the Security Council passed a second resolution 1483, which recognized the occupation of Iraq and provided legal basis for it. This represented a political success for the United States. It proved that it can have its way being the world super power override to International Law and use the United Nations at its whim.<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> [www.eurolegal.org/useur/bbiraqwar.html](http://www.eurolegal.org/useur/bbiraqwar.html)

<sup>172</sup> Corn 2003 p.216

<sup>173</sup> Ibid p.217

<sup>174</sup> Ali 2003 p.149

<sup>175</sup> soros p.57-58

The day to day events of the war that has been going on for a year and a half will not be discussed in detail since they are not the focus of this study. Nevertheless several issues will be pointed out.

For instance, the Nature of "coalition" that is supposed to represent international support of the Bush War. The sixteen countries of the coalition offer more of moral support than real contribution in forces. For example New Zealand, Norway and Denmark only sent engineers to Iraq. Azerbaijan, Hungary and Portugal contributed less than 200 soldiers each. The amount of troops sent by the rest of the countries (Netherlands, Italy, Denmark, Czech republic, Bulgaria, Australia, United Kingdom, Poland, Romania, Ukraine and Spain) amount to less than 21 thousand troops (many of which have withdrawn their troops) as opposed to the United States which has provided approximately one hundred thirty thousand armed soldiers.

In addition, the fact that the United States was able to ignore international law and norms and wage a war on Iraq, made it realize the feasibility of using unjustified force at its whim. In his state of the Union address, President George Bush gloated at that the fact that Libya, one of the countries on his list of evil regimes, had pledged to disclose and dismantle its weapons of mass destruction programs, as a result of the U.S. use of force. "nine months of these negotiations involving the United States and Great Brittan succeeded with Libya, while 12 years of diplomacy with Iraq did not. And one reason is clear: for diplomacy to be effective, words must be credible, and no one can doubt the word of America"<sup>176</sup>.

In this Address he reconfirmed his administration's mission of resisting terror and states that harbor it "as part of the offensive against terror, we are also

---

<sup>176</sup> state of union address <http://www.whitehouse.gov/new/releases/2004/01/print20040120-7.html>

confronting the regimes that harbor and support terrorists, and could supply them with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons as long as the Middle East remains a place of tyranny and despair and anger, it will continue to produce men and movements that threaten the safety of America and our friends. Thus America is pursuing a forward strategy of freedom in the greater Middle East”.

Bush also confirmed his next targets: the remaining axis of evil, Iran and South Korea. The war on Iraq was basically driven by the Hawks who were able to pursue any plan to insure American Hegemony.

The Iraqi security situation is highly unstable. The coalition forces failed to preserve Iraq’s valuable possessions such as museums. The infrastructure is ruined due to continuous bombing. the Iraqi resistance continues to carry daily attacks on the coalition forces as well as their Iraqi allies.

However the most unsettling event in the course of this war was the Iraqi prison Abu Ghraib Scandal, where outrageous torturing of the prisoners has been taking place, proved by pictures of abuse leaked to the media. These inhuman acts by U.S. soldiers caused international uproar against the United States and destroyed the moral image that the U.S. tried hard to establish, as being liberators and rescuers of the Iraqi people who have been long terrorized by Saddam Hussein.

This incident shattered whatever was left of United States excuses for waging the war as they proved that the only change introduced to Iraq was the nationality of the tyrant and not the nature. This has also negatively affected the Bush administration especially that they are preparing to run for reelection in the coming U.S. elections. Both Bush and the Neoconservatives popularity hit rock bottom.

Many demanded Rumsfeld's firing from office and even prosecution for being responsible for the acts of the U.S. army in Iraq. This incident in addition, to the high cost of the occupation (an approximate cost of 1 billion dollars per week), hastened the transfer of authority to Iraq's New Interim Government that took place on June 30, 2004.

It is interesting to note the nature of connections and background of this new Iraqi government. Prime Minister Iyad Allawi (the key position in the government) is a graduate from London University and has a history of military and CIA connections<sup>177</sup>. Minister of Defense Hazem Shaalan served as a Prime Minister for National Security. He was expelled from Iraq due to opposition to Saddam, managed real estate firms in the United Kingdom before the war, Deputy of Affairs in Baghdad. Barham Salih served as Kurdistan Regional Government Representative to the United States for ten years. Interior minister Falah Hassan Al Nakib, an activist opposer of Saddam in the exile, is a U.S. trained civil engineer. Foreign Minister Hoshyar Zebari had traveled world wide in opposition of Saddam calling for a new democratic Iraq before the war on Iraq.<sup>178</sup>

The U.S. was able to achieve one thing in this war an Iraqi administration that is on good terms, and protects the interests of the U.S. administration. Moreover, many of the post Saddam leaders such as Garner, Bremer, and Chalabi have neocons ties.

Rumsfeld appointed Jay Garner March 2003 as the director of the reconstruction and humanitarian assistance for post war Iraq. Garner, with his strong ties to Israel, and it's U.S. supporters, visited Israel as a member of the

---

<sup>177</sup> A look at Iraq's New Interims government. Associated press June 1, 2004  
[www.Guardian.com](http://www.Guardian.com)

<sup>178</sup> Ibid

Jewish Institute for the National Security Affairs, declaring his unfettered support of the state of Israel<sup>179</sup>.

Paul Bremer is another protégé of the neoconservatives in Washington. Bremer in 1996 wrote in the Wall Street Journal demanding preemptive strikes against Syrian, Iran and Libya.<sup>180</sup>

Another key person was Ahmad Chalabi an old companion of Perle and Wolfowitz. He was the head of the Iraqi National Congress, an opposition group formed in the exile. He enjoys high connections with the CIA, AIPAC (Israeli lobby in the U.S.) and JINSA.

Iraq proved to be way more difficult than first imagined. Aside from high number of soldiers that died in combat and high military expenditure, the U.S. is not able to afford the post war reconstruction bill by itself. The “go it alone” policy does not apply to this field.

Even before the war started, the neoconservatives wrote a PNAC statement to the Bush administration “Statement on Post War Iraq” in which they advocated the involvement multinational institutions such as NATO, and U.N. in rebuilding post war Iraq, while the U.S. committed itself to preserving security and providing the military forces required. It was important since “the successful disarming rebuilding and democratic reform of Iraq can contribute decisively to the democratization of the wider Middle East”<sup>181</sup>.

The United States secured a major presence in Iraq. A U.S. embassy will constitute of approximately 1000 Americans in the center of Baghdad, another 200 U.S. citizens will work in Iraqi ministries as advisors. In addition to the 135,000 U.S. soldiers that will also remain in Iraq.

---

<sup>179</sup> Robert Younis, neocons corner, Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, June 2003

<sup>180</sup> Ibid

<sup>181</sup> Statement on post war Iraq, 19 march 2003 <http://www.newamericancentury.org>



However, Neocons William Kristol and Robert Kagan admitted that Bush had “blundered” in Iraq<sup>182</sup>. Nevertheless, the neoconservatives said that no matter how messy the situation is, the U.S. should “stay the course in Iraq” rather than finding the nearest exit as the Paleoconservatives such as Pat Buchanan was preaching.

Weapons of mass destruction were never found. Hans Blix had previously concluded that the war was illegal to begin with since real evidence of WMD’s never existed. David Kay, the former Head of the U.S. weapons hunting team in Iraq, also concluded that it was highly unlikely that Saddam possessed any stockpiles to begin with<sup>183</sup>.

Add to that, no proof that strongly linked Al Qaeda to Saddam was found. The letters written by AbuMosab Al Zarqawi, an associate in Al Qaeda, that were uncovered by the U.S. intelligence, indicated that there had been a lack of preexisting cooperation between Al Qaeda and Saddam, and that Qaeda’s activity had escalated after the ousting of Saddam<sup>184</sup>.

Even though the two main reasons for vehemently advocating the war on Iraq were proven to be mere assumptions, the neoconservatives continued to pressure the U.S. administration to stay in Iraq. Perle blamed the CIA for its weak performance and asked for the resignation of its head as well as reforming the whole body. They focused there arguments on a new rhetoric: the humanitarian and moral causes for invading Iraq. Kristol and Kagan wrote in the Weekly Standard *The Right War for the Right Reasons* in which they claimed that although fear of WMD’s was a main reason for war, however “the

---

<sup>182</sup> Follman, 2004

<sup>183</sup> Rosenberg Heads Should Roll Over Iraq February 18 2004  
<http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/contentserver?pagename=thestar/layout/article.htm>

<sup>184</sup> Lobe, Jim Zarqawi Messages Delivers Mixed Messages for War Hawks, Interpress Service News Agency <http://www.ipsnews.net/inter.asp>. Retrieved on February 27, 2004

moral and humanitarian purpose provided a compelling reason for a war to remove Saddam”<sup>185</sup>.

Both authors also demanded an increase in the troops in Iraq. They argued that the chaos in Iraq resulted from the shortage of troops. This shortage is originally the consequence of the policies of previous U.S. administrations that forced cuts on the army. They also blamed Rumsfeld for not adequately planning the events of post war Iraq, and not heading their advice on the involvement of international actors as much as possible to handle the pressure of post war Iraq<sup>186</sup>.

Even after the Abu Ghraib scandal, the neocons had enough courage to defend the administration’s behavior claiming that “the U.S. should be judged by what it proclaims not by what it does”. This idealistic defense was supplemented by another defense of the necessity of jails such as Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib in the war against terrorism, as presented in an article published by the neoconservative American Enterprise Institute

the reasons to deny the Geneva status to terrorists extend beyond pure legal obligations ... It is also worth asking whether the strict limitations of Geneva makes sense in a war against terrorists ... Our only means for preventing future attacks, which could use WMD’s, is by acquiring information that allows for pre-emptive action. Once the attacks occur, as we learned on September 11, it’s too late. It makes little sense to deprive ourselves of an important, and legal, means to detect and prevent terrorist attacks while we are in a fight ...<sup>187</sup>

AEI further protested against the wave of “Anti-Semitism” that was sensed as a result of Abu Ghraib. Hints were made at a possible connection of Israel in the atrocities committed. The Head of the American contracting firm,

---

<sup>185</sup> Kristol and Kagan The Right War for the Right Reason The Weekly Standard February 27, 2004 Retrieved on March 15, 2004 From <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraq/20040217.htm>

<sup>186</sup> Kristol and Kagan Too Few Troops The Weekly Standard April 26, 2004 Vol. 009 issue 31

<sup>187</sup> John Yoo, American Enterprise Institute May 28, 2004, Terrorists Have No Geneva Rights From [www.aei.org](http://www.aei.org)

Jack London, implicated at Abu Ghraib, had close connections with Israel. He had visited Israel anti terror training camps in the occupied West Bank. He was presented by the minister of Defense Shaul Mofaz the Albert Einstein Technology award for "achievement in the field of defense and national security".

The purpose of the visit was to explore further potentials of cooperation. Part of the mission included training U.S. personnel by Israeli officers and introducing the trainees to a system known as the Resistance to Interrogation "R2I" which included methods of "hooding, sleep deprivation, time disorientation, depriving prisoners not only from dignity but from basic human needs"<sup>188</sup> practices that were used in Abu Ghraib.

The Guardian reported that "sexual humiliation of Iraqi prisoners at Abu Ghraib was not an invention of Maverick guards, but part of a system of ill treatment and degradation used by Special Forces soldiers that is now being disseminated among ordinary troops and contractors."<sup>189</sup> The theme of this kind of interrogation is derived from the work of the Israeli theorist Patai *The Arab Mind* which indicates that the best way to get to an Arab is through his sexuality and Honor. On the other hand, some neoconservatives such as Paul Wolfowitz, laid down there cards. Wolfowitz declared that the whole war on Iraq was for the oil (which was highly criticized by other neocons such as Kristol and Kagan). Wolfowitz stated in an interview with Vanity Fair that the weapons of mass destruction were an excuse for the bureaucracy, while the real reason was oil "for reasons that have a lot to do with the U.S. bureaucracy, we settled on the

---

<sup>188</sup> Abunimah, a Israel Link Possible in the U.S. Torture Techniques Daily Star May 11, 2004 [www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?](http://www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?)

<sup>189</sup> Ibid

one issue that everyone could agree on, weapons of mass destruction”<sup>190</sup>. He further explained that the reason for not attacking North Korea with its known arsenals, and warring on Iraq was simply that “the country swims in a sea of oil”.

This declaration came at a bad time for the administration as it was facing growing opposition from the people who realized they were deceived into paying for a war that was based on false claims.

The war has backfired on the neoconservatives as they seem to be enjoying less and less influence in the U.S. administration. Observers note that for example, the nomination of John Negroponte (a man with high connections with the U.N.) as the new ambassador to Iraq signaled that the U.S. administration was hoping for U.N. takeover in Iraq which totally opposes the neoconservative unilateralist tendencies.

In addition, the mandate given by Bush, to the United Nations special Envoy Lakhdar Brahimi, to hand pick the leadership of the interim government underlines the defeat of the neocons. Brahimi had already excluded Ahmed Chalabi, the neocons main candidate, for the leadership of the Iraqi government.

This represents the growing influence of the State Department and Collin Powell, who had been busy salvaging his reputation after the speech he delivered at the U.N. rallying for the war on Iraq. The Bush administration, needless to say, also suffered as polls carried indicated the declining popularity of Bush such as the Poll carried by New York Times which concluded that fifty eight percent of the American population now believes that the invasion had not been worth the loss in lives and resources.

---

<sup>190</sup> George Wright The Guardian, Wolfowitz Iraq War was About Oil June 4, 2003

In short the neoconservatives, after thirteen years of planning and rallying for the war on Iraq, had finally got what they wanted. They invaded Mesopotamia. But has it been as rewarding as they expected? The final chapter will answer this question as well as conclude this study.

## Chapter V

### Conclusion

Politics itself is a mass of lies, evasions  
folly, hatred and schizophrenia.  
George Orwell.

This study proved the great influence the neoconservatives enjoyed over foreign policy. This chapter will evaluate the outcomes of this influence in terms of its effect on international law, international institutions, American foreign policy, on the neoconservative popularity. However, before that is done, two factors that are claimed to affect the neoconservatives' opinions will be discussed: their links to the military-industrial complex; and their link to the State of Israel.

#### **Neoconservative's Link to Military-Industrial Complex.**

Several neoconservatives are linked to major corporates in the United States especially to the contracting, media, oil, and weapon companies. The importance of this link lies in the fact that those major corporations rally for their interests through exerting influence on policy formulation. This is achieved through hiring prominent politicians as their CEO's, members on their advisory boards, and consultants.

Wars are a rich source for obtaining contracts abroad. These contracts are gained through the connections that major corporations have "on the inside". The war on Iraq is not a different case. It has presented major opportunities for contracting and oil companies to add to their billions. It

has become one of the clearest examples ever of the influence of the military-industrial complex...The pentagon and its allies are close to achieving what they wanted all along. Control of the Nation of Iraq and its bounty which is the wealth and myriad form of power that flow from control of the world's second largest oil reserve<sup>191</sup>

---

<sup>191</sup> Herbert, 2003

The following are few of the prominent politicians:

**George Shultz:** The former secretary of state, and the chairman of the advisory board of the Committee For the Liberation of Iraq (a fiercely pro war group with close ties to the White House) which not only lobbied for removal of Saddam, but also for the reconstruction of Iraq. Shultz is on the board of directors of the Bechtel Group, the largest contractor in the U.S. and one of the finalists in the competition for contracts for rebuilding Iraq. Bechtel has also another insider: retired Marine Corps general who is a senior vice president of the company, and a member of the Defense Policy Board that was headed by Perle. The estimated worth of post war reconstruction contracts is 100 billion dollars. Bechtel had guaranteed its lions share in it.<sup>192</sup>

**Richard Perle:** Perl's link to the military-industrial complex goes a long way back. His first link/scandal was in 1983 when he received "substantial payments" to represent the interest of an Israeli weapons company. He came under fire from news papers since he was at the Department of Defense, his answer was that it did not constitute conflict of interest<sup>193</sup>.

He is the former chairman and chief executive officer of Hollinger Digital Inc.. The media management and investment arm of Hollinger International which is one of the biggest media companies in the world, that owns 400 news papers around the world including Israel (Jerusalem post) and co-publisher of neocons *The National Interest*.<sup>194</sup>

Perle's connection to the "merchant of death" of the weapon industry is also flourishing. In 1984 while he was an assistant secretary of Defense for International Security under Regan, he was a consultant to a Turkish hired

---

<sup>192</sup> Ibid

<sup>193</sup> Koopers, 2003.

<sup>194</sup> Raimondo, *The Neoconservative Personality*, 2004

lobbying firm and a director to FMC Turkish Joint Venture for building military equipment. The result: Perle at the time was a fierce proponent of aid to Turkey's military<sup>195</sup>. Perle is also an advisor to the Autonomy Corporation which sells advanced computer eavesdropping systems to intelligence agencies around the world<sup>196</sup>. He is the advisor to a major American satellite maker, Loral Space and Communications which is facing accusations of transferring rocket technology to China. However the link that had occupied the news headlines and resulted in Perle's resignation from his post as the chairman of The Advisory Defense Policy Board, is his advice to Global Crossing on how to persuade the U.S. Defense Department to drop its objections on American arms sale to China. He was also sighted in a meeting with Adnan Kashoggi to negotiate investment in companies dealing with technology and homeland security and defense<sup>197</sup>.

**James Woolsey** is a principle in the Paladin Group which specializes in domestic security.

**Dick Cheney**: was the chairman and chief executive Halliburton for 5 years one of the largest oil companies while still the chairman Cheney made 73 million dollars in business with Saddam while at the same time working with PNAC for ousting him in March 2003 Kellogg Brown and Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton, was awarded contracts to extinguish fire wells, the estimated increase in revenues was 30% (\$1.6 billion)<sup>198</sup>. Under his chairmanship from 1995-2000, Halliburton also became one of the largest contractors with the U.S.

---

<sup>195</sup> Leopold, *The Enterprising Hawk*, 2003

<sup>196</sup> Leigh, *The Guardian*, Pentagon Hawk link to U.K. Intelligence Company, 2003

<sup>197</sup> Hersh, *Lunch with the Chairman*, *New York Times*, 2003

<sup>198</sup> [www.eurolegal.org/useur/uspubpol.htm](http://www.eurolegal.org/useur/uspubpol.htm)



administration (Cheney organized a 1.1 billion dollar Pentagon contract for Halliburton to support military operations in the operations in the Balkans)<sup>199</sup>.

**Lynne Cheney:** was for years a board member of the Lockheed Martin. It is also closely link to Donald Rumsfeld (who is a member of Empower America, a pro star wars lobby)<sup>200</sup> Lockheed Martin carries a “big political footprint”. Along with other major arm companies (such as Ratheyon and Boeing). It has donated 6 million dollars in campaigning contributions during elections ear 2000.

The influence of the military complex grew after September 11, “The whole mindset of military spending changed on September 11. The most fundamental thing about defense spending is that threats drive defense spending. It’s now going to be easier to fund almost anything”<sup>201</sup>.

The military-industrial complex also exert influence through Research Institutes such as The Heritage Foundation (which promotes Arms Race and Star Wars), The American Enterprise Institute, Cato Institute, and The Center for Security Policy (which is funded by Lockheed Martin, Boeing, TRW...).

All of these institutions, form the neocons nerve center. This talk of conflict of interest is well founded since these particular leading neoconservatives do have a say on Policy Formulation, and have been striving for war. This is not to say that the profit is the only drive behind the neoconservative policy making but it does pose a considerable question on their incentives.

---

<sup>199</sup> Caldicot, 2002, p. 35

<sup>200</sup> Ibid p. 165

<sup>201</sup> Caldicot, 2002 p xix

**Dual Loyalties: Link to The State of Israel:** Neoconservatives are accused of having “Dual loyalties” to the United States and to Israel. They are labeled as *Likudiniks*. Originally, the neocons started out as a group of Jewish ex-liberals that focused on several issues of Jewish concern, their Guru was no other than Jewish Leo Strauss, who had written of the Jewish problems. However neocons today are not purely Jews. But advocacy if not loyalty to Israel is a definite feature of Neoconservatism.

The neoconservative agenda carried out in the Bush doctrine does justify such speculations. After all, as Max boot puts it, “The National Security Strategy of President Bush sounds as if it could have come straight out from the pages of “commentary”<sup>202</sup>.

All neocons can instantly name the enemies of Israel, and its quite a coincidence that they coincide with the enemies of Israel. The neoconservatives (as demonstrated in previous chapters) have rallied for Israeli interests some such as Perle, and Feith have carried out several studies on the methods that Israel can use to dominate the Middle East and improve its relations with the USA such as (such as Clean Break).

On September 12, 2001, a day after world trade center attacks, neoconservatives such as Wolfowitz and Bennet were already pushing for war on Iraq, as well as naming Iran, Syria, and Lebanon as enemies. Hizbollah, Hamas, Islamic Jihad, were instantly signaled out even before knowing the real perpetrators which poses a rational question: How can these three, relatively limited organizations whose real enemy is Israel rather than the U.S. carry out such a massive attack? The first answer that comes to mind is that they

---

<sup>202</sup> Buchanan, whosewar? *The American Conservative*, 2003

are the enemies of Israel. Neoconservatives reply to such accusations by labeling them anti-Semitic.

However some neoconservatives such as Podhoretz (who had labeled the war on terror World War IV which included war on Iran, Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine org...) point out the obvious connection between the Bush presidency and Israel, the Bush doctrine. "In addition to the rejection of moral relativism, the holding of states responsible for the terrorists they sponsor, and the assertion of a right to preemption, it now includes a fourth pillar: namely, the assimilation of Israel's war against terrorism into our own. All four pillars together now compromise The Bush Doctrine which thanks to this newest addition has become much more coherent than it was before, and consequently more solidly based"<sup>203</sup>. Bush declaring Sharon "a man of peace" does not help reject the idea.

A brief look at the current Bush administration, which is sometimes dubbed "Israeli occupied territory" as a joke, will also shed light on this issue. Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Lewis Libby, Douglas Feith are the first names to pop up (with their previously demonstrated connection to the state of Israel).

At the state department, John Bolton under secretary of arms control from AEI, and his assistant David Wurmser (coauthor of Clean Break) are the first names to come to mind. In vice president office, member of Washington Institute a prominent pro Israeli; Lobbyist John Hannah, is the deputy director of staff. Pro Israeli Elliot Abrams is the director of Middle East affairs in the National Security Staff.

Not to mention prominent members of the administration who are members of Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs such as Cheney,

---

<sup>203</sup> Podhoretz, In Praise of the Bush Doctrine, 2002

Bolton, Feith, Kirk Patrick, Woolsey, and Michel Ledeen.<sup>204</sup> This had lead critics to declare that

the issue we are dealing with in the Bush administration is dual loyalties. The double allegiance of these myriad officials at high and middle levels who can not distinguish U.S. interests from Israeli interests, who baldly promote the supposed identity of interests between United States and Israel....<sup>205</sup>

Again this is not to say that the neoconservatives are only driven by the ambition to preserve Israel. However, in the light of this evidence, the influence of the Military-Industrial complex and the relations to the State of Israel cannot be denied.

#### **The Effect of Neoconservatism on International Law and International System.**

The effect of applying this U.S. neoconservative foreign policy on the international law and international system is being greatly debated. Pessimists have declared the "death" of the U.N. charter (much to Perle Joy) and the end of "the grand attempt to subject the use of force to the rule of law"<sup>206</sup>. The United States decision to ignore international law and the United Nations and go ahead with its previously planned war, enhanced such beliefs.

The illegality of the war on Iraq, and the fact that U.N. issued a resolution after the occupation legitimizing it, demonstrate the Realpolitik views that might makes right, where the U.N. the executioner of International law , is bent to the whims of the world super power.

Furthermore, the division within the security council, such as the recent case between U.S.-U.K. on the one hand and France and Germany on the other,

---

<sup>204</sup> Christison, The Bush Administrations Dual Loyalties, 2002

<sup>205</sup> Ibid

<sup>206</sup> Glennon, Why The Security Council Failed, Foreign Affairs, May/ June 2003

paralyzes it and presents several questions on the efficiency of this body, at a time when its needed most, time of war.

However, optimists use the case of post war Iraq to prove that international interdependency cannot be eradicated. Invasions, and war might take the effort of one industrialized super power, but it takes international assistance to proceed with nation building and to guarantee basic human rights.

As for the effects of applying Neoconservative foreign policy on the international system, it is still mostly guessing on how the states will react. There are several scenarios presented.

First scenario is that the states targeted by Bush doctrine will act in compliance to American demands to avoid meeting the same fate of Iraq, such as the current behavior of the state of Libya. The other option would be that those states would seek to form alliances to counter measure Bush's strategy.<sup>207</sup> (Could the current Syrian, Iranian, North Korean improved relations be a manifestation of such a behavior?).

The third effect on the international system is that countries other than the United States would follow its foot steps and include preemption/ prevention in its doctrine, such as the new French six year defense bill adopted in November 2002. "[prevention] is the first step in the implementation of our defense strategy..."<sup>208</sup>. The implications of such a trend are dangerous with the world's nation reinvolving in arms race, and warring on each other based on their mere suspicions.

An end to multilateralism is feared to be a result of this policy since "the American action in Iraq has shaken the foundation of trust and mutual restraint

---

<sup>207</sup> Heisberg, 2003, p.84

<sup>208</sup> Ibid p 83

on which America's corporative efforts with other nations depends"<sup>209</sup>. "Old Europe" for example formed the "4 Nation Plan of Defense Corporation" in an attempt to counter balance the United States. U.S. Trans-Atlantic relation suffered greatly as a result of its war.

However neocons such as Robert Kagan do not regret it. In his *power and weakness* Kagan declares that "its time to stop pretending that Europeans and Americans share a common view of the world...on the all important question of power- The efficacy of power, the morality of power, the desirability of power- American and European perspectives are diverging...Europe is entering a post historical paradise of peace and relative prosperity..."<sup>210</sup>.

Human rights could be another victim of this U.S. policy. The U.S. had clearly shown contempt for Human Rights in its practices in the ironically labeled "Operation Iraqi Freedom", "The U.S. mobilization of Human Rights rhetoric in the Iraq crisis debases the discourse and practices of Human Rights Campaigning ")<sup>211</sup> It has again used Human Rights as an excuse and justification for its actions.

But on the other hand the United States has been the Hegemon for the past fifteen years, during which it had conducted its mini-wars around the globe, while the rest of the world remained intact, the war on Iraq could be another case, especially if Bush is not re-elected and his doctrine is not pursued.

### **Effect of Neoconservatism on American Foreign Policy**

The fact that neoconservatives influenced U.S. foreign policy has been proved beyond doubt, but the end result of applying neoconservative ideology

---

<sup>209</sup> Conett, How The Iraq War Will Affect the International System Project on Defense Alternative, 2004

<sup>210</sup> Kagan, Power and Weakness, Policy Review no 113 June 2002

<sup>211</sup> Ibid

on American foreign policy might not be what neoconservatives and others have expected.

The United States is not exactly pictured as the "Benevolent Hegemony" and "The Democratic Empire, the all time dream of the neoconservatives (also known as the "Democratic Imperialists"<sup>212</sup>) but it is definitely viewed in hegemonic terms. It is viewed as an Empire, the first after the downfall of the Roman Empire. "The extent of the U.S. global empire is almost incalculable...it has troops in the 70 percent of the world countries"<sup>213</sup> (i.e.: 135 countries). "America will strike any nation or any group that it deems dangerous, whenever and however it feels necessary, and regardless to provocation or lack thereof"<sup>214</sup>. The U.S. foreign policy had turned unilateralist, responding to neoconservatives' aversion to multilateral treaties which they view as a weakening factor on American hegemony.

The United States has refused sign or ratify Arms Control Accords or withdrew from them such as the Anti ballistic Missile Treaty, The Biological Weapons Convention, Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Convention on The Prohibition of Landmines, Small Arms and Chemical Weapons Convention. It has rejected the Kyoto Global Warming Accord, The International Criminal Court, and the Protocol on Child Soldiers knowing that the stand of the world super power can render most of these protocols, convention, etc...useless<sup>215</sup>.

Some theorists such as Robert Jervis explains U.S. tendency to become an Empire "Nations enjoying unrivaled global power have always defined their national interests in increasingly expensive terms"<sup>216</sup>.

---

<sup>212</sup> Morgan, A debate Over U.S. Empire Builds in Unexpected Circles, Washington Post, 2003

<sup>213</sup> Vance, The U.S Global Empire, 2004

<sup>214</sup> Bellah, The New American Empire, 2002

<sup>215</sup> [www.clw.org/control/bushunilateral.html](http://www.clw.org/control/bushunilateral.html)

<sup>216</sup> Jervis, The Compulsive Empire, Foreign Policy July Aug 2003 p 82(6)

This view countered by that of Immanuel Wallerstein who believes that the U.S. is in a state of Demise rather than Empire building .In his *The Eagle Has Crash landed*, Wallerstein points out that “the Hawks believe the United States should act as an imperial power for two reasons: First the Unites States will become increasingly marginalized...But hawk interpretations are wrong and will only contribute to the United states decline, transforming a gradual descent into a much more rapid and turbulent Fall<sup>217</sup> .

Wallerstein was one among many other theorists who believed that the United States was “fated to succumb to the Hegemon’s temptations” which eventually leads to its down fall. President Bush has definitely “succumbed” to his temptations forgetting his promise of a humble foreign policy, many believes that his “war policy marks the beginning of the end of America’s era of global dominance”<sup>218</sup>

Madline Albright, describes Bush’s decision on foreign policy. He decided to depart in fundamental ways, from the approach that has characterized U.S. foreign policy for more than half a century. Soon reliance on alliance had been replaced by redemption through preemption; the shock of force trumped the hard work of diplomacy and long-time relationships were redefined.” <sup>219</sup>

The result? Anti Americanism is on the rise world wide as indicated by polls conducted. However this is not the real concern of the Bush administration at the moment. The United States is stuck in the Iraqi Quagmire paying daily costs in American lives and dollars. It is still unstable to tell whether the Democratic experiment had succeeded.

---

<sup>217</sup> Wallerstein, I, *The Eagle Has Crash Landed*, Foreign Policy July-Aug 2002

<sup>218</sup> Layne, *The Cost of Empire*, *The American conservative* Oct, 2003

<sup>219</sup> Albright, M., *Bridges Bombs Or Bluster?* *Foreign Affairs* sept/oct 2003



The U.S. image as a liberator has been shattered, and replaced by that of an invader. Eventually it was forced to ask for the aid of the U.N. which was viewed by many as a political loss. Its relations with European countries are still tensed. For the first time in thirty years the U.S. does not monopolize the peace talks in the Arab Israeli conflict.

On the other hand the U.S. now control two strategic oil resources in Iraq and Eurasia. The U.S. proved that it is the world Hegemon able to act as it pleases rejecting restraints of international law. So was it worth the while? This question will be answered by the results of coming U.S. elections, the future U.S. policy and the reaction of the international system..

#### **The effect on the Popularity of Neoconservatism**

The neoconservatives who are currently being perceived as warmongers, had been under great scrutiny and attack as Iraq proved to be messier than expected, since they were the main advocates behind the war. Rumsfeld, the neocons highest ranking advocate in the bush administration, is under a lot of heat as a result of the events of the war

“In late may of last year, we neoconservatives were hailed as great visionaries ... now we are embattled both within the conservative movements and in the battle over post war planning” claimed neoconservative Kenneth Weinstein head of the Hudson Institute.

Many critics are joyfully cheering the “death of neoconservatives”. They have deceived the U.S. to war and now they are to suffer the consequences and be held responsible for their actions. Their collapse both in Washington (due to the strengthening of the State Department) and in Baghdad (the fact that Chalabi is facing accusations of espionage for the Iranians, could be an indicator). The WMD’s were mere fairy tails and so was Saddam’s link to Qaeda.

Patrick Buchanan cheered this downfall “The salad days of the neoconservatives which began with the president’s axis of evil address in January 2002 and lasted till the fall of Baghdad may be coming to an end. Indeed, its is likely that the neoconservatives will never again enjoy the celebrity and cachet in which they revealed in their romp to war on Iraq ...”<sup>220</sup> .

However these declarations might be a bit too hasty. After all things haven’t really changed bush is staying in Iraq. He has “adhered to the twin neoconservative themes of promoting democracy abroad and aggressively employing U.S. military power” “If [the Middle East] is abandoned to dictators and terrorist it will be a constant source of violence and a land exporting killers of increasing destructive powers attack America other free nations” he declared on June second 2004<sup>221</sup> . His support of Sharon did not change. He had “slapped the sanctions on Syria and pushed to isolate Iran<sup>222</sup> , which basically represents a neoconservative Agenda. Ledeen and other neocons had already started pressuring the administration to act on Iran’s lack of democracy and its nuclear activity<sup>223</sup> . The coming elections will highly determine whether the neoconservatives had managed to succeed or not.

Finally, this study has examined the conservative school with its different branches, traced the evolution of Neoconservatism and its foreign policy agenda, and demonstrated their influence on the formulation of the United States foreign policy and the results of this influence. However any thorough assessment of this influence is deemed to be premature, since the events are still unfolding at the time this thesis is being written.

---

<sup>220</sup> Buchanan, Is the Neoconservative Moment Over, June 16, 2003 the American conservative

<sup>221</sup> Heilbrunn, Rumors of the Neocons Demise are Greatly Exaggerated los Angeles times june 16 2004

<sup>222</sup> ibid

<sup>223</sup> Ledeen, Trouble for Tehran, 2004

## Bibliography

### Books:

Abrahams, Fred. (ET all) (2003). Hearts and minds: post-war civilian deaths in Baghdad caused by U.S. forces. *Human rights watch*. (vol.15, no.9) New York, N. Y.: Human Rights Watch.

Ali, T. (2003). *Bush in Babylon: the recolonization of Iraq*. London: Verso.

Ansell, A (1998). *Unraveling the right: the New Conservatism in American thoughts and politics*. Colorado: Westview Press.

Bacchus, W. (1997). *The price of American foreign policy: Congress, the Executive and International Affairs Funding*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University.

Berlet, C., & Lyons. M. (2000). *Right wing populism in America: too close for comfort*. New York: The Guilford Press

Berman, W. C. (1994). *America's Right Turn: from Nixon to Bush*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bugliosi, V. (2001). *The betrayal of America: how the Supreme Court undermined the Constitution and chose our president*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press/Nation

- Bush, G. W. (2001). *Our mission and our moment: President George W. Bush's Address to the nation: before a Joint Session of Congress, Washington, D.C., September 20, 2001.-Commemorative ed.* Washington, D.C.: White House.
- Caldicott, H. (2002). *The new nuclear danger: George W. Bush's military-industrial complex.* New York: New York Press.
- Clark, W. K. (2003). *Winning modern wars: Iraq terrorism, and the American empire.* New York, N.Y.: Public Affairs.
- Corn, D. (2001). *The lies of George W. Bush.* New York: Crown Publishers.
- Daalder, I. H., & Lindsey, J. M. (2003). *America unbound: the Bush revolution in foreign policy.* Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.
- Frum, D. (2003). *The right man: the surprise presidency of George W. Bush.* New York: Random House.
- Goldstein, J., & Robert Keohane (1993) *Ideas and Foreign Policy.* In International Relations Theory Viotti P., & Mark Kauppi (1999). Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Hainsworth, P. (Ed.). (2000). *The politics of the extreme right: from the margins to the mainstream.* London: Pinter.
- Kaplin, L. F., & Kristol, K. (2003). *The war over Iraq: Saddam's tyranny and America's mission.* San Francisco: Encounter Books.

- Kristol, I. (1995). *Neoconservatism: the autobiography of an idea*. Elephant Paperback Edition 1999, Chicago: Ivan R. DEF
- Hess, G. R. (2001). *Presidential decisions for war: Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
- Kaplan, D. (2001). *The accidental president: how 413 lawyers, 9 Supreme Court justices, and 5,963,110 (give or take a few) Floridians landed George W. Bush in the White House*. New York: William Morrow.
- Kellner, D. (2003). *From 9/11 to terror war: the dangers of the Bush legacy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield
- Khalil, R. (2003). *The Bush administration and Iraq: terrorism, oil or hegemony?*. Thesis Lebanese American University.
- Landau, S. (2003). *The pre-emptive empire: a guide to Bush's Kingdom*. London: Pluto Press.
- Lind, M. (1996). *Up from conservatism: why the Right is wrong for America*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Lind, M. (2003). *Made in Texas: George W. Bush and the southern takeover of American politics*. New York: Basic Books.

- Michaels, J. E. (1997). *The president's call: executive leadership from FDR to George Bush*. Pittsburgh, Pa: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Nash, G. (1996). *The conservative intellectual movement in America: since 1945*. Wilmington, Delaware: Intercollegiate Studies Institute.
- Nicholas, J. (2001). *Jews for Buchanan: did you hear the one about the left of the American presidency?*. New York: New Press.
- Perle, R. & David Frum (2003). *An End to Evil*. New York: Random House.
- Pitt, W. R. (2002). *War on Iraq: what team Bush doesn't want you to know*. New York, N.Y.: Context Books.
- Pitt, W.R. (2003). *The greatest sedition is silence: four years in America*. London: Pluto Press.
- Political staff of Washington post. *Deadlock: the inside story of America's closest election*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Rai, M. (2002). *War plan Iraq: ten reasons against war on Iraq*. London: Verso.
- Rampton, S. Stauber, J. C. (2003). *Weapons of mass deception: the uses of propaganda in Bush's war on Iraq*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Penguin.
- Rossiter, G. (1955). *Conservatism in America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Scheer, C., Laskimi, C., & Scheer, R. (2003). *The five biggest lies Bush told U.S. about Iraq*. New York: Aco-publication of Akashic Books [and] Seven Stories Press Books.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). *Talking politics: the substance of style from Abe to "W"*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Soros, G. (2004). *The bubble of American supremacy: correcting the misuse of American power*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Steinfels, P. (1980). *The neoconservatives: the men who are changing America's politics*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Stonecash, J. (2000). *Class and party in American politics*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Suskind, R. (2004). *The price of loyalty: George W. Bush, the White House, and the education of Paul O'Neil*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- .Trapper, J. (2001). *Down and dirty: the plot to steal the presidency*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Wheeler, J. C. (2002). *America's leaders: the war on terrorism*. Edina, Minn.: ABDO Pub. Co.

Vidal, G. (2002). *Dreaming war: blood for oil and the Cheney-Bush junta*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press/Nation Books.

**Online Journals:**

Albright, M. (2003). Bridges, bombs or bluster?. *Foreign Affairs*, (Sept-Oct 2003).

Retrieved on March 1, 2004. From ASAP.

Barnes, F (1992). They're back: Neocons for Clinton. *The New Republic Aug.3 1992*

v207n6 p.12 (2). Retrieved on January 15, 2004 from [http://](http://web4infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/802/119/45451240w4/purl=rcl_EA)

[web4infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/802/119/45451240w4/purl=rcl\\_EA](http://web4infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/802/119/45451240w4/purl=rcl_EA)

[IM\\_0.\\_A124665138d](http://web4infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/802/119/45451240w4/purl=rcl_EA)

Bellah, R., (2002). The New American Empire: The Likely Consequences of the Bush Doctrine. *Common Weal* Oct 25, 2002

Birth of a Bush doctrine? America's plan for the Middle East.: George Bush speech

on Iraq *The Economist (U.S.)*, March 1 2003 v366 i8313 pNA. Retrieved

March 1, 2004. From ASAP

Brinkley, A. (1994). The problem of American conservatism. *The American*

*Historical Review*, Vol. 99, No.2 (Apr., 1994), 409-429. Retrieved on March

1, 2004. From JSTOR

Buchanan, p., (2003) Is the Neoconservative Moment Over, June 16 , 2003 *The*

*American conservative* . Retrieved on April 1, 2004 from

[www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon.htm](http://www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon.htm)



Clark, k. Retrieved on April 1, 2004 from [www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon.htm](http://www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon.htm)

Commentary: A Bush-Sharon doctrine. *United Press International*, Feb 10, 2003  
p1008041 w6010. Retrieved on March 1, 2004. From ASAP.

Davis, C. (2003). Betrayal of trust: a former intelligence officer looks at how the U.S.  
was misled into supporting a pre-emptive war. *National Catholic Reporter*,  
Nov, 7, 2003 v40i3 p19 (1). Retrieved on March 1, 2004. From ASAP.

Gardner, R. N. (2003). Neither Bush nor the "jurisprudes". *The American Journal of  
International Law*, Vol, 97, No. 3 (Jul., 2003), 585-590. Retrieved on March  
1, 2004. From ASAP.

Heilbrunn, J. (1996). Neocons v. theocons: the new fault line on the right: religious  
right challenges neoconservatives. *The New Republic*, Dec30, 1996 v215 n72  
p20 (5). Retrieved on March 1, 2004. From ASAP

Heisbourg, F., *A work in Progress: The Bush Doctrine and its Consequences. The  
Washington Quarterly* Spring 2003

Joseph, L. B. (1982). Neoconservatism in contemporary political science: democratic  
theory and the party system. *The Journal of Politics*, Nov, 4 v44, No. 4.  
Pp955-982. Retrieved on March 1, 2004. From JSTOR

Jervis, R., The Compulsive Empire. *Foreign Policy* July Aug. 2003 p82(6)

Kagan, D. & William Kristol (1996) Towards a Neo Regeanite Foreign Policy.

*Foreign Policy* Retrieved on March 15, 2004 from  
[www.ceip.org/files/publications/foreignaffairs.asp?from=pubauthor](http://www.ceip.org/files/publications/foreignaffairs.asp?from=pubauthor)

Kagan R., (2002). Power and Weakness. *Policy Review* no 113 June 2002. Retrieved  
on March 17, 2003 from [www.policyreview.org/june02/kaganhtm](http://www.policyreview.org/june02/kaganhtm)

Kristol, I. (2003). The neoconservative persuasion. *The Weekly Standard Aug. 2003*  
*vol. 008 issue 47*. Retrieved on February 15, 2004 from [http://:  
www.weeklystandard.com/utilities/printerpreview.asp?idArticle=3000&R=9D](http://www.weeklystandard.com/utilities/printerpreview.asp?idArticle=3000&R=9D)

[7BE37](#)

Lafeber, W. (1984). The Reagan administration and revolutions in Central America.  
*Political Science Quarterly*, v99, No. 1. (Spring 1984), pp. 1-25. Retrieved on  
March 1, 2004 from JSTOR

Ledeer, M., (2004). Trouble From Tehran. *National Review Online* June 14, 2004

Lobe, J. (2003) *All in the Neocon family*. Retrieved on February 27, 2004

Lobe, J. The Right Weaves a Tangled but Effective Web. *IPS News*. Retrieved on  
February 27, 2004 from [www.ipsnews.net/interma.asp?idnews=21680](http://www.ipsnews.net/interma.asp?idnews=21680)

McLaughlin, J. (1986). What's new with the neos. *The Weekly Standard*. Retrieved on  
January 1, 2004 from [http://:  
web4.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/802/119/45451240w4/purl=rcl\\_EA  
IM\\_0.a4184325&dy](http://web4.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/802/119/45451240w4/purl=rcl_EA<br/>IM_0.a4184325&dy).

Marshall, J. M. (2003) Remaking the world: Bush and the neoconservatives. *Foreign Affairs*, Nov-Dec 2003 v82 i6 p142. Retrieved. On March 1, 2004. From ASAP.

Novak, M. (1992). Father of Neoconservatism: nowadays, the truest disciples of the liberal theologians Reinhold Neibuhr are conservatives. *National Review*, May 11, 1992, v 44 n9 p39 (3). Retrieved. On March 1, 2004. From ASAP.

Podhoertz, N. (2002). In praise of the Bush doctrine. *Commentary*, Sept 2002 v114 i2 p19 (10). Retrieved on March 1, 2004. From ASAP.

Ratner, S. R. (2002). Jus ad bellum and Jus in Bello after Sept 11. *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 96, No.4 (Oct 2002) pp.905-921. Retrieved. March 1, 2004. From JSTOR

Record, J. (2003). The Bush doctrine and war with Iraq. *Parameters*, Spring 2003 v33 ill p4 (18). Retrieved March 1, 2004. From ASAP.

Rubin, J. P. (2003) Stumbling into war. *Foreign Affairs*, (Sept-Oct 2003). Retrieved. March 1, 2004. From ASAP.

Sola, P., Danley, J. R., & De Vitis, J. (1986). Neo-conservatives as social Darwinists: implications for higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education*, v55, No.1. (Winter 1986), pp. 3-20. Retrieved. March 1, 2004. From JSTOR

Struve, W. (1965). Hans Zehrer as a neoconservative elite theorist. *The American Historical Review*, Jul 1965 v70, No. 4. pp1035-1057. Retrieved. March 1, 2004. From JSTOR.

Wallerstein, I., (2003) The Eagle Has Crash Landed, *Foreign Policy* July August 2002 Retrieved December 9, 2003

Williamson, C. (2001). What is Paleoconservatism? A round Table discussion with the editor of the Chronicles magazine. Retrieved on February 27, 2004 from [www.chroniclesmagazine.org/chronicles/january2001/0101roundtable.htm](http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/chronicles/january2001/0101roundtable.htm)

Wolfson, A. (2004). Conservatives and Neoconservatives. Retrieved on February 12, 2004 from [http:// www.thepublicinterest.com/current/article2.htm](http://www.thepublicinterest.com/current/article2.htm)

### Newspapers:

Abunimeh, A., The Misadventures of Neoconservatives *Chicago Tribune* Retrieved 15 April 2003

Heilbrunn, J., (2004). Rumors of the Neocons Demise are Greatly Exaggerated. *Los Angeles Times*, June 16, 2004-08-09

Herbert, B., Spoils of War *New York Times* April 10, 2003.

Hersh, S., (2003) Lunch with the Chairman, *New York Times* March 17, 2003

Krauthammer, C. (2001). The Bush doctrine: in American foreign policy, a new motto: don't ask, tell. *Time*, March 5, 2001 v157 i9 p42. Retrieved March 1, 2004. From ASAP

Kristol, W., and Robert Kagan: a great victory for Iraq, *The Washington Post*, February 26, 1998

Leigh, D. (2003) Pentagon Hawk Intelligence Company. *The Guardian*. March 21, 2003

Lewis, A. The sore winners. *The New York Times*, December 16, 1998.

Morgan, D., (2003) A Debate over U.S. Empire Builds in Unexpected Circles. *Washington Post*. August 10, 2004

Perle, R. Thank God for the Death of the U.N. *The Guardian*. March 21, 2003  
Retrieved on March 20, 2004

Pfaff, W., International Herald Tribune. August 23, 2003. Retrieved on February 13, 2004

Shavit, A., *Haáretz* Retrieved on April 15 2003 Retrieved From  
<http://www.ifamericansknew.org/usints/Arishavit.html>

Weinraub, B. (1985). On the right: long wait for foreign policy hero. *The New York Times*, July 12, 1985.

**Speeches:**

President Bush Address to the Nation, September 11, 2001. Retrieved on March 15, 2004, from <http://whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html>

President Bush Address to a Joint Session of Congress and American People, September 20, 2001. Retrieved on March 15, 2001 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-80.html>

President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point, June 1, 2002. Retrieved on March 15, 2004 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/new/releases/2002/06/20020601-3html>

President Bush Address to the Nation January 29, 2002 Retrieved on March 15, 2001 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>

Presidents Remarks at the United Nations September 12, 2002 Retrieved on March 10 2004 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html>

President Bush Address to the Nation. Retrieved on March 25, 2004 from [www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/200401/print/20040120-7.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/200401/print/20040120-7.html)

Wolfowitz, P. Bridging the Dangerous Gap between the West and the Muslim World  
2002. Retrieved on March 15, 2004 from  
[www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2002/s20020503-defensedef.html](http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2002/s20020503-defensedef.html)

### **Internet**

*A clean break: A new strategy for securing the realm.* Retrieved on March 15, 2004  
from [www.israeleconomy.org/stratl.htm](http://www.israeleconomy.org/stratl.htm)

Brzezinski, Z., 1997 council on foreign relations study: American primacy it  
geostrategic imperatives

Conett, C. (2003) How The Iraq War Will Affect The International System. *Project  
for New American Century.* Retrieved on March 23, 2004 from  
[www.comw.org/pdap0305br15.html](http://www.comw.org/pdap0305br15.html)

Davidson, G., *International Law: the Illegality of the war on Afghanistan.* Retrieved  
on March 23, 2004 from [http://: www.canadianliberty.bc.ca/liberty-U.S.-  
security/gail-davidsononwar-on-afghanistan.html](http://www.canadianliberty.bc.ca/liberty-U.S.-security/gail-davidsononwar-on-afghanistan.html)

*Defense Planning Guidance 1992* retrieved on March 15, 2004  
from [www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/wolf.htm](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/wolf.htm)

Leopold, J., *The enterprising Hawk.* Retrieved on march 13, 2004 from  
[www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/wolf.htm](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/wolf.htm)

*Letter to President Clinton*, PNAC. Retrieved on March 15, 2004. From <http://www.newamericancentury.org/Iraqclintonletter.htm>

Pitt, W., *The Project for The New American Century* Retrieved on February 25, 2003 from <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article1665.html>

Raimondo, J (2002). *Our Hijacked foreign Policy*. Retrieved on February 15, 2004

Raimondo, J (2004). *The Neoconservative Personality*. Jan 19, 2004. Retrieved on March 15, 2004 from [www.antiwar.com](http://www.antiwar.com)

*Letter to President Bush*, PNAC. Retrieved on March 15, 2004 from [www.newamericancentury.org/bushletter.htm](http://www.newamericancentury.org/bushletter.htm)

*Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century*, PNAC. Retrieved on March 15, 2004 [www.pnac.info](http://www.pnac.info)

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America September 17, 2002 [www.whitehouse.gov](http://www.whitehouse.gov)

The shadow men-; foreign policy: who are the neoconservatives and what is their real influence over American foreign policy?. *The Economist (U.S.)*, April 26 2003 v367 i8321 pNA. Retrieved on March 1, 2004. From ASAP.

*The war behind doors: analysis: 1992 – first draft of a Grand Strategy*. Retrieved on March 15, 2004 from [www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/1992.htm](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/1992.htm)



[www.aei.com](http://www.aei.com)

[www.ajc.org](http://www.ajc.org)

[www.aljazeeraah.info](http://www.aljazeeraah.info)

[www.antiwar.com](http://www.antiwar.com)

[www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org](http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org)

[www.csmonitor.com](http://www.csmonitor.com)

[www.csmonitor.com/specials/neocon/spheresofinfluence.html](http://www.csmonitor.com/specials/neocon/spheresofinfluence.html)

[www.electroniciraq.net](http://www.electroniciraq.net)

[www.en.wikipedia.org](http://www.en.wikipedia.org)

[www.eurolegal.com](http://www.eurolegal.com)

[www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon2.htm](http://www.eurolegal.org/useur/usneocon2.htm)

[www.iconservatives.com](http://www.iconservatives.com)

[www.jinsa.org](http://www.jinsa.org)

[www.newamericancentury.org](http://www.newamericancentury.org)

[www.philly.com](http://www.philly.com)

[www.pnac.info](http://www.pnac.info)

[www.truthout.org](http://www.truthout.org)

[www.whitehouse.org](http://www.whitehouse.org)