

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

N°:.....



DOMAIN: FOREIGN LANGUAGES
STREAM: ENGLISH LANGUAGE
OPTION:

**Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy as Case
Study: Iraq War**

**Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Master Degree in Civ/Lit**

Candidates

BOUHAFS Billel
BENZIR Houssam

Academic Year: 2017/2018

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

N°:



DOMAIN: FOREIGN LANGUAGES

STREAM: ENGLISH LANGUAGE

OPTION:

**Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy as Case
Study: Iraq War**

**Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Master Degree in Civ/Lit**

Candidates

**BOUHAFS Billel
BENZIR Houssam**

Board of Examiners

Mr. Bennaoui Youcef	University of M'sila	Chairperson
Mrs. Laouidji Karima	University of M'sila	Supervisor
Miss. Berkani Oumessaad	University of M'sila	Examiner

Academic Year: 2017/2018

Dedication

In the name of Allah, the most Merciful and the most Compassionate and the great Teacher and messenger, Mohammed (amounts of grants and bless), Who highly taught us the real meaning of life, I honorably dedicate this work to My parents, who have always been so lovely supportive, and never stop giving of themselves in countless ways and good examples have clearly enlightened the righteous path to work harder for the things I aspired to achieve.

My brothers and sisters, without forgetting all their children, particularly my dearest Ibrahim, Lina, and Maamoun, whom I cannot force my-self to stop loving.

It is also dedicated to my best colleagues: Houssam, Ismail, Yacub, and Mohammad, who have always been a constant source of support and encouragement during the challenges of my college life, especially my grooviest friend Tahar.

This thesis is dedicated to Nadia and her family members and all the people in my life who differently coloured my heart.

BILLEL

Dedication

Words are not enough to express my immense acknowledgements. I am grateful for my parents for their upbringing, sacrifice, education and support along the whole life especially my father, to whom I owe a great debt of gratitude and respect.

I would like also to express my thanks to all my family, brothers and sisters for their generous support they provide me throughout my entire life.

This thesis is dedicated to my best friends: Bilel, Sohayb, Smail, Azar, Hamza, Rachad, Mohamed, and Hamoudi who have always been a constant source of support and encouragement during the challenges of our educational career.

This thesis is for the little angels Sohayb, Riham, and Manar without forgetting Adem and Iyad.

Houssam

Acknowledgements

In the Name of Allah, the Most Merciful and the Most Compassionate

We would like to express our special thanks of gratitude to our supervisor Miss. Laiouidji for her patience and guidelines throughout the course of this thesis.

We are also thankful to all teachers of the English Department at M'sila University, particularly the members of the jury for their cordial support, valuable information and guidance which helped a lot to complete our university study.

Abstract

The foreign policy of a country must represent its internal moral character. Maintaining alliances with dictators and unfavorable regimes is therefore abhorrent to American Neoconservatism. In this way, this thesis seeks to investigate the portrayal of Neoconservatism as an ideology that has a deep impact on the American foreign policy and reveals the role of neoconservatives in the invasion of Iraq. This study aims at showing the foundation and the principles of neoconservatism, its relation to the American foreign policy makers, and the war of Iraq 2003. Qualitative approach has been adopted along this work with historical dimension. This research would be very helpful for students of western foreign policy and for everyone who seeks the reality of the Iraq war. The findings of this paper confirmed that the theory of neoconservatism has a great influence on the US foreign policy through its different administrations. It assured that the Bush administration took its decision to invade Iraq in 2003 based upon neoconservatives' assumptions.

List of Acronyms

AEI: The American Enterprise Institute

CCNY:City College of New York

CDM: The Coalition for a Democratic Majority

CIA:Central Intelligence Agency

CPD: The Committee on the Present Danger

D-OH:Department of Health

JINSA:Jewish Institute for National Security of America

KDP:Kurdistan Democratic Party

NATO:Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization

NED:National Endowment for Democracy

OIF:Office for International Freedom

OPEC:The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries

PNAC: The Project for a New American Century

PUK:Patriotic Union of Kurdistan

UN:United Nations

UNSCOM:United Nations Special Commission

US:United States

WDM:Weapons of Mass Destruction

Table of Contents

Dedication	I
Acknowledgements	III
Abstract	IV
List of Acronyms	V
Table of Contents	VII
General Introduction	1

Chapter One: “Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy”

1. The Appearance of Neoconservatism	6
2. The Two Major Leaders	7
2.1. Irving Kristol	7
2.2. Francis Fukuyama.....	8
3. The Four Principles of Neoconservatism	9
3.1. Regimes and Social Engineering	9
3.2. Democracy and Democratization	11
3.3. Benevolent Hegemony	13
3.4. International Organizations and Unilateralism	15
4. The Main Influences of Neoconservatives on US Foreign Policy.....	18
4.1. The CDM	18
4.2. Neoconservatives and the Czech Dissidents.....	19
4.3. Iranian Revolution and Neoconservatives policy	22
4.4. Palestine-Israeli Conflict	24

Chapter Two: “The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq”

1. The Main Reasons of the Invasion.....	29
1.1. Eliminating an Enemy of Israel	29
1.2. Intimidating Iran and North Korea	30
1.3. Establishing a Regional Alternative to Saudi Arabia	31
1.4. Redeeming the Hollow Victory of 1991.....	32
1.5. Igniting Democracy in the Middle East.....	33
1.6. Demonstrating Will to Use Decisive Force	34

2. The US-Iraqi Relations before the Invasion (1980-2003)	37
3. The End of the Relations	40
4. The Main Point of Disagreement: The Issue of Democracy.....	41
5. How the Invasion of 2003 Reflected the Agenda of Neoconservatives	43
General Conclusion	48
Works Cited	50
Abstract in Arabic	53

General Introduction

General Introduction

Neoconservatism in US foreign policy is a hotly contested subject, yet most scholars broadly agree on what it is and where it comes from. From a consensus that it first emerged around the 1960s, these scholars view neoconservatism through what we call the 3Ps approach, defining it as a particular group of people, an array of foreign policy preferences and ideological. Neoconservatives insisted from the start on a muscular anti-communist foreign policy and a critique of détente, arms control and the language of idealism, but they have proven willing to use the language of human rights when necessary. It undoubtedly helped various high-minded liberals like Michael Ignatieff and Paul Berman into supporting the invasion of Iraq. The Neoconservatives were the driving force in the George W. Bush administration's war in Iraq and in so doing went a long way towards forming US policy in the Middle East that has continued also in the administration of Obama.

The concept of neoconservatism has come to the forefront of political debate, unquestionably as an ideology, it has been widely discussed and debated since its first emergence by Irving Kristol. Till nowadays, this movement has been undertaken by many critics, politicians, and scholars. We can find this in Jack Hunter's article on June 23, 2011 "What's a Neoconservative?" in which he focuses on the difference between conservatives who believe in a strong national defense and neoconservatives who believe in policing the world under the guise of national defense, and on the impact of the neoconservatism foreign policy on the Iraq war.

Wide ranges of literature have been written about neoconservatism as an ideology, as a school, and as a foreign policy, and also about the relation between that school and the war on Iraq. For example, "*Neoconservatism and American Foreign Policy: A Critical Analysis*", written by Danny Cooper in 2011, this book examines the term of neoconservatism as an

General Introduction

ideology, and shows how relevant were the neoconservatives in US foreign policy, they have been an integral part of America's national life for several decades, and they were always preparing for the future. Besides this, the book explains neoconservative ideas and beliefs in a way that illuminates the neoconservative approach to American foreign policy.

Additional work, held by Muhammad Idrees Ahmad in 2014 entitled "*The Road to Iraq: The Making of a Neoconservative War*". This book includes a historical exploration about neoconservatives as the main players in the invasion of 2003, and how was the war sold to the decision makers under the influence of neoconservatives.

Neoconservatism reached its zenith as a school of thought when it became associated with the Iraq war. Although the war was largely considered a failure, it raised the profile of neoconservatism as a school of thought and also an ideology. This thesis is organized in such a manner conducive to framing that context by getting deeper in that concept, and to shed light on its relationship with the 2003 invasion of Iraq, in addition we are going to show that neoconservatism is in fact the order of the day for the Bush Administration's foreign policy staff.

We have some objectives by writing this work. They are as the following: To define neoconservatism and to take an overview of its history and criticism. To show how neoconservatism influenced administrations that drove them to adopt its principles to change the US foreign policy. To shed light on the neoconservatism and its relationship with the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

The importance of developing this work is to answer a specific set of questions that have arisen concerning neoconservatism and its relationship with US foreign policy and the invasion of Iraq in 2003. The questions are as the following: What is neoconservatism? What

General Introduction

impact had neoconservatism on US foreign policy and Iraq? What influence did that theory have on American foreign policy? Why to talk about neoconservatism in Bush presidency?.

This study is an attempt to reveal the ideology created by Irving Kristol and its impact on the American foreign policy, as the paramount responsibility of government that America's role as the world sole superpower, it is indispensable in establishing and maintaining global order, this work sheds lights on the history of neoconservatism, as well as to illustrate its role in spreading principles among administrations, leading to the major change in the US policy to invade Iraq .The findings of this research may be very helpful for those who are looking for the truth about the war of Iraq, it is hoped that this study would open up the eyes of politics students to the neoconservatism, and the reality of the department of state that helped planning and promoting the invasion of Iraq in 2003.

The methodological framework of this study is qualitative in essence, as it is the most appropriate given the chosen area of focus, it provides more exploration and analysis .This study aims to examine and ascertain the ideology of neoconservatives and its impact on US foreign policy relating it to the invasion of 2003. Historical approach is also used where events are more focused and related to historical periods. In addition to that, this study contains a case study to explain and show the contribution of neoconservatives in invading Iraq during the Bush administration.

Concerning the structure, this study is divided into two chapters : The first chapter that is entitled: Neoconservatism and US foreign policy, it gives information about the origins of neoconservatism and its appearance with its two main leaders Irvin Kristol and Francis Fukuyama, then the fourth principles and the main influences of neoconservatives on US foreign policy, such as the CDM, neoconservatives and the Czech dissidents,

General Introduction

neoconservatives as policymakers in Iranian revolution , and finally the Palestine-Israeli conflict.

The second chapter is entitled: The impact of neoconservatives on the invasion of Iraq, starting from the main reasons that were behind the invasion, moving to the relation between the United States and Iraq with the chief point of disagreement that was the issue of democracy, and finally how that invasion reflected the agenda of neoconservatives.

Chapter One

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

Neoconservatism is an ideology and a school of thought that started in the 1960's and dominated the different American administrations and became the back bone of its foreign policy agenda. The principles and the values of that school attracted a wide range of attention among historians and policy makers alike.

1. The Appearance of Neoconservatism

Neoconservatism has no simple definition, those who write about it adopt a number of approaches. It has been one of the most powerful and influential ideologies in global politics as a distinct political movement which emphasizes on military power, and a distinct ideology or persuasion in the aftermath of the cultural unrest in the United States during the late 1960s, by the experience of the New York intellectuals, their class position determines their explanation of society, which is no surprise, we see it every day (Bratton 12).

Neoconservatives interpreted the situation at the time as modern liberalism attacking its own foundation and moral integrity, in Kristol's words, "*Liberals were wrong, liberals are wrong, because they are liberals, what is wrong with liberalism is liberalism – a metaphysics and a mythology that is woefully blind to human and political reality*"(Mcginchey,2010). Socialism has failed, and then the solution was the persuasion of a non-secular liberal democracy. Neoconservatives claimed that liberals, especially those in the democratic party, had abandoned true liberalism, neoconservatives derived a unique priestly authority from a set of persuasive definitions of classic liberalism and conservatism. Neoconservatives began with the classic liberals respect for social scientific progress, method, and for individual liberty, self-government, and quality of opportunity, to this they added a conservative commitment to the preservation of a stable and tradition bound society, they hoped to secure from contemporary liberals and traditional conservatives both the moral and the technical high ground .American minds had become so open, early neoconservatives sought to reorient the

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

United States domestic politics, without necessarily being religious themselves, they wanted to be free, neoconservatives believed that ideas rule the world, this is a core part of their belief system and the reason that every effort must be made to understand the ideas and beliefs of neoconservatives themselves, they are neither pure liberals idealists nor unqualified foreign policy realists, they are more than a little unique. Robert Singh argued “*Neoconservatism challenges idealism and realism alike, drawing on each while rejecting elements of both*” (Cooper, 2009).

Notably, their main function is to eloquently show how correct the state is, if you put your ideas in practice, well it is repression time, they were not exactly like the public scientists they have been intellectual elites whose communication was directed to the public, their social science represented a more objective and therefore better approach to social problems neoconservatism has been the only intellectual movement in recent American politics to successfully unite theory and practice.

2. Neoconservatism Major Leaders

2.1. Irving Kristol

Irving William Kristol (born Jan. 20, 1920, died Sept. 18, 2009), he grew up in Brooklyn and he was a member of the City College of New York (CCNY). Kristol is an American essayist, editor, and publisher, best known as an intellectual founder and leader of the neoconservative movement in the United States. At CCNY, he was harshly anti-communism and a member of the Trotskyist Young People's Socialist League. One of his best pieces of writing is *The Public Interest*, by which he criticized liberal projects of social reform. In addition, he had founded two important magazines *Encounter* and the *National Interest*. His writing influenced under Reagan presidency while it was the base of Reagan Revolution through the neo-conservatism ideas.

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

After Kristol contrasted the Utopian hopes of Great Society, a new term has come announce a policy of democracy promotion in U.S. foreign policy, which got the support of many neoconservatives. Moreover, Kristol was against liberal conservatism because he states that they did not think realistically about the human nature in their social program. Although they have a good intentions in advocating liberty and equality, but Kristol suggest that the welfare system produced a permanent underclass and bred destructive social pathologies. In this way, Kristol gave, in shape of neoconservatism movement, a new and wider conservatism, that characterized by its political victories and made America a more potent political force (Gewen, 2009).

2.2. Francis Fukuyama

Francis Fukuyama is an American writer and political theorist, born in 27 October 1952. He got his Bachelor from Cornell University where he was a student of the Allan Bloom who teaches political philosophy. Fukuyama completed his Ph.D. in political science at the University of Harvard. Then he continued his course until he becomes a State Department official.

Fukuyama has published prominent books on the history of America, *The End of History and the Last Man* in 1992, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity and Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. Fukuyama as neoconservatives has written extensively about various components, including democratization, international political economy and the role of culture and social capital in modern economic life.

Although he was long considered as a significant figure in neoconservatism, Fukuyama later drop out from this movement and even he criticized the neoconservatives and Bush policies through his book *Neoconservative Legacy* 2006. As well as, he opposed US invasion

of Iraq, nevertheless he was once a signer of Kristol's letter to W.Bush that recommend to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq (Sampaolo, 2008).

Fukuyama is now the Bernard L. Schwartz Professor of International Political Economy and Director of the International Development Program at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies of Johns Hopkins University, located in Washington, DC.

3. Neoconservatism Four Principles

3.1. Regimes & Social Engineering

In 1964, liberal voters had managed to secure the election of a NewDeal Democrat – Lyndon Johnson–,he aimed to resolve fundamental problems in American society through his 'Great Society' program and the 'War on Poverty'.

Neoconservatism critics react against what they perceived as left-wing social engineering; increasingly they had founded the journal *The Public Interest*.Fukuyama states that Kristol suggested it might be these policies themselves that were causing the apparently widespread social breakdown (Fukuyama, 2006: 19).

The intellectual students gathered in Washington in 1970,they discussed the suggestion of Kristol where Allan Bloom adopt the idea of regime from his teacher Leo Strauss. In this concept,Fukuyama stated that, "*a regime is not in the modern way, as a set of visible formal institutions, but rather as a way of life in which formal political institutions and informal habits constantly shape one another*". (25) Or, it is the form and the structure of a society determines the attitudes and outlook of its citizens and vice versa.

Allan Bloom argued that a belief in the subjectivity of reason had spread in American society as well as contemporary liberal values. Thus, Bloom, and his fellow neo-conservatives believed that contemporary Americans were being transformed by habits, cultures and

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

policies that divided and corroded the 'American character' and this was dividing and damaging American society (Bloom 2003).

Here, the concept of regime becomes the big interest of neoconservatism, they saw that by fixing it and changing the public perception, most of social problems can be resolved. Over time, they decided to apply the theory of regime on foreign policy believing in the ability of forcing changes to the governmental structures and institutions of other nations.

Neoconservatives typically advocate the promotion of democracy and promotion of American national interest in international affairs, including by means of military force to stand against the undemocratic regimes. During Ronald Reagan's presidency, the group was able to start one of the first implementations of the regime change program. Much of his interest has to be focused on putting an end to Nicaragua's communist government. In 1983, the policy of regime change was put into practice to overthrow communism in Central America.

During Bush's presidency, the neoconservatives become closer more than ever to the foreign policy arguing that the promotion of democracy overseas and regime change is necessary for super power nation like the United States. Bush's target was the Middle East for example, he began calling for regime change in Iraq.

But it is remarkable that there is a contradiction. On one hand the neoconservatives were against social engineering then they wanted a regime change in other countries in which itself aimed to social engineering. Raad and Mohamedi argued that, "*the administration's true objective was something other than regimes change for the sake of liberation or security. One likely alternative objective may have been the securing of valuable resources, such as oil*" (Alkadiri and Mohamedi 20-27).

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

Fukuyama has another point of view concerning the conflict between the two principles. According to him, *“This could not have been a failure of underlying principle, since a consistent neoconservative theme...had been skepticism about the prospects of social engineering. Rather, proponents of the war seem to have forgotten their own principles in the heat of their advocacy of the war”* (Fukuyama 7). He argued that there was only a lack of persuasion from the neoconservatives while in reality the two principles are complementary.

3.2. Democracy & Democratization

With the collapse of the former communist and authoritarian regimes in Eastern and Central Europe and Latin America many heralded the triumph of liberal democracy. More than ever democracy has become the ideology of the age. Few countries disavow democracy in principle; and for a while it seemed that fewer countries than in the past betrayed it in practice (Parry1).

According to Parry, the end of the cold war and after the fall of communism, it had given an opportunity for democracy to be seemed as suitable political system and virtually every country in the world proclaims itself to be a democratic, that affect the America’s foreign policy later. Parry also points out that:

The collapse of authoritarian political regimes was accompanied by the collapse of authoritarian economic institutions. The most dramatic example was, of course, provided by the Marxist-Leninist autocracies, where the dissolution of command economies was both a cause and a consequence of the collapse of political dictatorship. Elsewhere the trend was less dramatic but still noticeable: the 1980s was the decade of privatization and economic deregulation (9).

The triumph of liberal politics was accompanied by the triumph of liberal economics. On the other hand, Francis Fukuyama said, *“believers in Marxist-Leninism may still exist”* in places like Managua, Pyongyang, and Cambridge, Massachusetts, but overall liberal democracy has triumphed.

It is undeniable that the United States is the most dominate power in the world since there were no longer challengers to their hegemonic position. In terms of the USA can attend to the

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

world's security needs, it used this advantage to get involved in the international issues. Also, it has used the power to apply the regime change on other nations and spread democracy.

The 1980 saw the apparent triumph of democracy as a system of government. Within the pluralist democracies of Western Europe the best organized and best supported opponents of democracy, the communists, began to fade away: the French communists experienced a catastrophic fall in popular support; the Italian party completed its transformation into a reformist social democratic institution; the Marxist-Leninist movements of some smaller European countries, such as Holland, were overwhelmed by new radical movements, like feminism and environmentalism. (8)

Parry sees that the triumph of democracy becomes clear around the world. But, the liberal democracies cannot congratulate themselves only after they examine their own democratic credential everywhere and especially on the dependent countries from communism, in this context democratization can be defined as a process by which the strong countries aimed to expand democracy within a state.

It is immensely difficult to reconstitute a complex and autonomous associational life; neoconservatives argue that going to a war in order to democratize is big fault. This is because the citizenry will receive the war as a threat to their livelihoods. Thus they rather to stress economically for creating peace as Pool argues that we cannot understand the limits of democratization in the Middle East without an understanding of how the economies of that region have fitted the wider world capitalist order.

Huntington agrees that the United States is the world's premier democratic country, and the more democratic states are existed elsewhere in the world, the more beneficial environment world to American interest in general as well it affect the future of democracy in America in particular. However, Huntington prefers the transition to democracy to be gradual one when he suggests the contestation before the political participation in order to minimize the violence. Huntington explains that is necessary to define the national identity of the country and create effective institutions of authority. This is before going to the political participation.

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

Also Huntington view that there is a problem within the process of democratization, he said that, "*the ability of the United States to affect the development of democracy else-where is limited. There is little that the United States or any other foreign country can do to alter the basic cultural tradition and social structure of an-other society or to promote compromise among groups of that society that have been killing each other*"(Huntington218).

The critics of Huntington may be true to some extent, but not all of these should be interpreted as a problematic for the process of democratization. Democracy is simply symbol of peace, in opposite the non democratic countries consider as a threat for others like Americans so the necessary to spread liberal values or democratization is inevitable.

3.3. Benevolent Hegemony

The United States used the cause of security to justify the two first principles, democratization and regime change. For instance, the president W.Bush argued that promoting democracy in other countries, "*is the urgent requirement of our nation's security*". As well as the neoconservatives believe that there is a morality behind the intervention in foreign policy. The view of supporting the good and fight the evil around the world is American's duty due to its unchallenged power, by which push her become benevolent hegemony.

The concept of Benevolent Hegemony can be divided into two parts, on one hand Benevolent can refer to the group of principles that America was characterized by, for example defending the good and the belief of the necessary to preserve the human rights around the world. On the other hand, Hegemony as Salvatore Babones described, it is the leadership and unipolarity of the United States after the end of the cold war.

Similarly, Kaganvoiced that, "*the truth is that the benevolent hegemony exercised by the United States is good for a vast portion of the world's population.*"(Draper26).The previous

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

idea was clearly illustrated in the financial aid of the United States that was given to the democratic republic of Congo and in the East Timor what made a great contribution in making the idea that America has the ability to protect and keep in peace the rest of the world widely spread and accepted. Moreover, Huntington(1996) emphasized upon the point of America hold the balance among the nations when he maintained that,"*A world without U.S. primacy will be a world with more violence and disorder and less democracy and economic growth than a world where the United States continues to have more influence than any other country shaping global affairs*" (Huntington,217).

The strong nations as Russia, China and France tend to reduce the dominance of United States. On one side, for the sake of minimizing at the maximum the America's hegemonism, China attempted to find common ground with Russia, the latter "*can similarly be expected to search for opportunities to weaken U.S. political, diplomatic and military preponderance in the world.*" (Kagan and Kristol 21). On the other side, an ally such as France was ready and prepared to give a hand to Russia and China in their planning that aimed to reduce and weaken the American hegemonism, "*viewing a unified Europe as a check on American power and using the UN Security Council as an arena for forging diplomatic roadblocks, along with China and Russia, against effective U.S. -led international action.*"(Ibid).

Nevertheless, there were many efforts to reduce the United States power and to achieve the multipolarity, the United States was tactical and strategic enough to maintain its place within the world, this idea was shared and defended by Wohlforth (as cited in kagan and Kristol. 22) who reported that it will be exceptionally troublesome for different countries to pick on the United States precisely in light of the fact that it is so intense. In addition, as a matter of example, in the case of Iraq both of Russia and France sought only for economic gains and neglected solving the real problem of Iraq by fact that they lack the enough means to do so. On the other hand, regarding the America's power and moral background its main aim was to

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

defend the international order against the president Saddam Hussein, which provided another prove of the American benevolence.

If we went through the statistics of the murdered in the 20 century, we will face the truth that approximately over 200 million people were killed by their own governments, more than they were killed by outside countries. In this context, Fukuyama declared that, *“it is simply unacceptable for the richest and most powerful country in human history to be indifferent to the plight of countries that not only lack its human and social resources but are moving steadily backward in their standards of living.”* (Fukuyama141). According to him, the United States is the suitable nation that it could provide stability and security to those individuals.

Maintaining worldwide peace and security is one of the main purposes of the United Nations. Another goal is protecting the human right wherever the individual is situated. Thus, the UN led to the intervention in international affairs, for instance the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, it has become evident that the war against terrorist the world should fight-one with no contested frontiers. In this context, many argue that the United States is using human rights and freedom as justifications for its own benefits. Furthermore, it debates that it only seeks to generate its values abroad in order to incorporate other countries into the American led world order.

The neoconservatives believed that no one can deny the role of the United States as pioneer and as hegemonic power that it was the centre of a system for spreading democratic institutions and protecting the human rights across the globe.

3.4. International Organizations & Unilateralism

International organizations and unilateralism or the belief that international organizations can be disregarded and that the US can act unilaterally. In another meaning it is the idea that

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

international organizations and international law should be disregarded and overlooked and that America should instead be willing to act alone to achieve its goals.

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 amplified the assertion of American exceptionalism. This amplification has resulted in the influence that the neoconservatives have gained from Bush administration. Even if their program does not fully materialize, nevertheless the "neo-conservatives" have favored the articulation between the material capacities of the empire and its ambitions of domination of the international order. Therefore September 11, 2001 is a major event, because it allowed decision-makers to benefit from the support of the population to implement a proactive foreign policy, which affirms the dominant role of the United States on the international scene.

The 2002 National Security Strategy set out The Bush Doctrine, that The US policy makers believe that their country's responsibility is to promote American values to ensure international security and prosperity, and assert unchallengeable military superiority around the globe, the resolution to act unilaterally if it is necessary. This supreme responsibility is then translated, if necessary, by unilateral actions. The Doctrine also aimed to pursue preventive war in case it serves the American interest. The operation in Iraq is the typical example. September 11, 2001 was therefore the revelation of the imperial power of the United States.

In light of the terrorist attacks of September 11, Neo-conservatives claimed that new threats could be fought only through preventive action, even if the nature and certainty of the threat were unclear. Unilateralism and pre-emptivity are not new features of American foreign policy, Bush. W argued that:

The United States has long maintained the option of preemptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to our national security. The greater the threat, the greater is the risk of inaction— and the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves, even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy's attack. To forestall or prevent hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act pre-

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

emptively.(The national security strategy of the United States of America¹⁵).

Bush as Neo-conservative believed that the greater threat is the risk of remaining passive and the stronger decision is the argument for deciding preventive actions to defend America, even if there are uncertainties about the timing and location of enemy attacks. To counter and prevent such acts of hostility from our adversaries, the United States will act, if necessary, preventively.

Neoconservatives agreed that the advantage that America afforded to itself to act unilaterally, it cannot be generalized to other countries because of their belief that America characterized by high degree of morality as we have already explained in the third principle. Neoconservatives additionally believed that the international organizations and the United Nations are weak while they stated numerous reasons. Kagan and Daalder brought significant argument on the frustration of the UN's Council Security, as they describe it, "*is a recipe for indecision and inaction- and increased insecurity.*"(Kagan and Ivo 21).They depend in their view on the fact that there are two members within the council oppose everything concern the US. Thus, the council is divided and indecisive that let to failing act with efficiency if it is necessary.On the other hand, realist claimed that multilateralism is the best way to achieve the global objectives, even America would benefit from working multilaterally if it used its soft power. This means United States tried to win the admiration of other nations through acting with good values rather than choosing military means.But, neoconservatives see that creating allies will provide many problems. One is each state would support its own interest, therefore it almost impossible to reach a combined goal. In this way, they supported US unilateralism and see that the UN as well as the other organizations will only weaken the American power by respecting their meaningless laws.

4. The Main Influences of Neoconservatives on US Foreign Policy:

4.1. The CDM:

Neoconservatives joined a variety of political organizations, including the coalition for a democratic majority (CDM) and the committee on the present danger to communicate their world view, (CDM) was created to reverse the direction the democratic party took in 1972, a diverse group that included many of the neoconservatives, attempted to start a civil war for the soul of democratic party. Among the founders were Lyndon B. Johnson, Norman Podhoretz, his wife Midge Decter, and Jeane Kirkpatrick, there were also some of the founders, like social democrat Penn Kemble, who would never venture anywhere near the republican party.

The group declared a rejection of the people and institutions on which the democratic party had built its electoral strength, they promoted an emphasis on law and order and rejected foreign policy isolationism and defeatism, they believed that the United States bears a special responsibility towards international threats seeking for peace and democracy, as a foreign policy and an active resistance to repression and totalitarianism (Michael, 2012:18).

Four years later, more than thirteen neoconservatives (CDM) members were among the founding members of the committee on the present danger (CPD), an educational group that criticized the American defense policies, especially arms control efforts, (CPD) was a collection of academics, public officials, leaders of politics, who feared that United States was becoming satisfied towards the Soviet Union, and the Salt 2 treaty would arrange Soviet nuclear superiority. (CDM) had some hopes for Jimmy Carter and accepted him after Scoop Jackson was out of the primary race, but Carter who ran as a centrist was indebted to the McGovern, and hired Paul Wolfowitz among the (CDM) hawks, among many disappointments two events in particular alienated the neoconservatives from Carter and the

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

Democrats. The first was in the early days of Carter's presidency when he appointed Paul Warnke to lead the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and Salt negotiations, Warnke embodied the complete opposite viewpoint as the (CDM) crowd 68, the second event came in January 1980 when Carter invited the (CDM) leaders to a White House meeting, as he needed to reconcile party interests before the election, the meeting went badly from the beginning, "Carter did not even understand who we were, Wattenberg writes of the event. His briefing memo had said that we were interested in human rights. Carter went on a doubt a difficult human rights situation in Ecuador (Ecuador!) perhaps we could help there". After Carter had left, Vice President Walter Mondale gave the hawkish speech Carter had given (19).

As political activists and intellectuals, neoconservatives were suited to succeed in their efforts to affect the public policy debate, they were so familiar with the organizational techniques that enabled them to communicate and spread their vision and ideas to the public, Norman Podhoretz said that, "The neoconservatives shape the climate of opinion by which in turn our governors are governed. Because of their much success, and access of their ideas, they had much success" (20).

4.2. Iranian Revolution and Neoconservatives policy:

Prior to the Iranian Revolution, many events occurred between the United States and Iran from time to time, but they did not affect their relations, until 1979 that saw a transformation from the past to the present, and it was the period of Islamic Revolution in Iran that had a great impact on United States and Iran's ties, it was like a turning point in the history of US neoconservatives who started to dominate and influence US foreign policy, the United States had excessive power over the Iranian government, that led to anti-American sentiment in Iran.

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

In the late of 1978, there was no problem with the deficiency of basic human rights in Iran, and when the Islamic Revolution started in 1979, president Carter the champion of human rights traveled to Iran and said, “ *Iran is an island of stability in one of the more troubled areas of the world, this is a great tribute to you, your Majesty, and to your leadership and to the respect, admiration and love which your people give to you, there is no leader in the world for whom i feel such deep gratitude and personal friendship as the Shah* ” (Wise, 2011: 05) .

Although the peak of the revolution was in 1979, some events occurred throughout the mid of twentieth century, during this era, Iran experienced a harsh economic, urban overcrowding, monetary inflation, corrupt electoral process and leaders, and a large gap in the distribution of wealth, because of the growing discontentment in Iran, three main revolutionary factions spoke out in opposition to the Shah: women, students, and religious reformers (05). Their main goal was to overthrow the Shah’s repressive regime, and undermine Mohammad Reza’s authority, revolutionaries from women and students organizations merged with the revolutionary religious opposition, which was led by Khomeini, who wished to remove Muhammad Reza from power and establish a government that would benefit the Iranian public and Islam, not a Shah .Thus, Khomeini promised that he and the religious reformers would not rule Iran directly, according to the Khomeini, the government had four jobs: Enforce Muslim Law, destroy corruption and establish rights for the oppressed, eradicate laws that had been created by false governments, and prevent foreign nations from intervening in Islamic societies. Many Iranians were killed during this revolution by the Shah’s military.

US under the influence of neoconservatives supported the Shah with military aid and equipment to keep him in power, Khomeini was opposed for many reasons. First of all, if Khomeini came to power, he would limit or eradicate western influence in Iranian policies and relations because this promise was one of his primary goals, which means Iranian-US

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

relationship would be different from the American relationship with the Shah, American and neoconservative leaders feared price increases and a lack of oil availability, another reason that US opposed Khomeini government was because the communist party (Tudeh) in Iran supported the revolutionary movement. Tudeh had been banned by Mohammad Reza, but members were willing to work with Khomeini if he established a new Iranian government, neoconservatives saw this communist party as a threat that might spread the Soviet sphere of influence, American and neoconservative leaders considered it their duty to contain Soviet influence and maintain control over Iran. AT the beginning of 1979, the US continually sent messages of support to Mohammad Reza. Moreover, on January 4, 1979, the US sent General Robert E. Huyser, Commander in Chief of the US-European Command to Iran, this joint military force was directed by the neoconservatives, the purpose of Huyser's mission was to stabilize the Iranian military and encourage the Iranian military to support the Shah's government (06) .

Furthermore, the US chose Huyser for this mission because the Shah was in need of reestablishing control over his country, Huyser was chosen for many reasons: He was a friend of the Shah, he had previously worked to strengthen the Iranian military, and he had been the overseer of the US weaponry sales to Iran. The revolutionaries continued to spread among Iranian cities, towards the end of Huyser's mission, he realized that Muhammad Reza's government would fail and Khomeini's forces would take over Iran. As a result, Huyser who feared for his safety returned to Washington and advised US leaders to communicate with Khomeini.

Therefore, on January 16, 1979, the Shah and his family left Iran, and 4.5 million Iranian citizens flooded the city streets in celebration, when Khomeini announced his return to Iran, a senior diplomat from America was beaten by a mob of revolutionaries. As a result, neoconservatives demanded from the American citizens in Iran to leave the country or remain

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

in safety zones. On January, Khomeini returned to Iran after almost fifteen years of exile, on February 12, he officially took power . Khomeini and his leaders identified the US as a nation with selfish motives. Thus,after the conclusion of the 1979 Islamic Revolution, American-Iranian relations went downhill, Khomeini knew that US and neoconservatives opposed his revolution, so he opposed most positive relations with America (07) .

4.3. Neoconservatives and Czech Dissidents:

The belief of creating a universal democracy and spreading peace all over the world was one of the most important goals and aspects of the neoconservatives vision concerning the international relations, the debate over the impactof American neoconservatives is progressivelycontroversial in US and Europe ,like all the post-communist European states, the Czech Republic had a moderately consistent pro-American foreign policy, the former Czech dissidents seem to represent the most pro-American sector of the Czech political elite. There were some dissidents Under communism who developed an affinity for the United States as a symbol of democracy, the United States held the main symbolic role in opposition to the Soviet Union, and it was with this image in the voice of America and Radio Free Europe . One interviewee noted that since 1965 he followed the American press courtesy of the United States embassy in Prague, which welcomed Czech citizens to its reading room and provided information, the dissident elite made out of America as a model for democracy and how their countries could return as democratic states. The desire for democracy around the world, based on the belief that democracy is a universal value, and also considered the foundation for Americanneoconservatism, which tends to push for a harder application of this policy (Schaller 47).

Therefore, the dissident elite had shown his desire to sympathize with individuals in a same place in other regimes, and it was clear apparent in the former dissident' vocal support

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

for the endemic Cuban and North Korean democrats, which led to conflicts at the European Union level, a speech by former Ambassador to the US, Alexandr Vondra, showed how personal experiences lead to sympathy with North Korea citizens:

We do have some common experiences with my country, which had its own bitter totalitarian experiences where we struggled to bring it down. Many of my fellow citizens paid for the depravity of the communist dictatorship with exile, imprisonment and some with their life. I have had my own experiences with freedom fighting and i was fortunate enough to spend only two months in a communist prison. I mention this disturbing fact because i think it illustrates a political experience comparable with that of present -day North Korea (48).

Moreover, the Former Czech dissident's feeling and his strong empathy towards the oppressed democratic opposition in totalitarian authorities, shows that he would be against all such regimes, that is to say he would support and encourage political and military actions all over the world , which considered by the US neoconservatives as a major aspect and among their main principles, and alsoby other few sectors of the population in the US and Europe . It is so true that Czech dissident and US neoconservatives were immensely different from each other, but both of them were looking for a universal democracy and how to spread peace in the world as a guarantee of human rights and security (48).

In addition to that, tearing resistanceto the Soviet Union and the US policy of detente,had a great influence on US neoconservatism movement and its origins, early neoconservatives were mugged by reality in Irving Kristol' words, and turned to support a hard-line approach to the Soviet Union, in a same way many of the early Czech dissidents community supported socialism, later generations were certainly anti-Soviet and supported a hard-line approach by the US and Western Europe in the Cold War, one interviewee said that , “ *If you understand the logic of the totalitarian system, it can be overcome, but not from within . You need international support and the assistance of a strong authority from the outside, without Ronald Reagan and his explicit rhetoric, nothing would change in Russia*” (Vaclav, 1990). It

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

can be easily argued that this particular foreign policy of the neoconservatives would have been supported by those who fought against communist regime.

To sum up, Czech dissidence and neoconservatism had many similarities and both influenced each other, they emphasized on the return of morality to politics, especially since the fall of communism and the establishment of democracy in Central Europe. Furthermore, the use of power and strong military in order to spread democracy has come into focus, particularly in light of NATO's Central European expansion, "*An army will always remain an unequivocal expression of the scared will to live in freedom, to defend freedom and to engage in joint efforts in order to ensure freedom for others as well*" (Valcav). The combination of anti-Soviet history and a deep seeded belief in the importance of democracy in securing human rights raised an expectation of similar discourses between American neoconservatives and Czech former dissidents (Schaller 49) .

4.4. Palestine-Israeli Conflict:

There were many different opinions about the conflict between Palestine and Israel, this issue gained mostly the interest of all countries in different places of the world, especially the Arab countries, their attitudes and views towards the conflict reflected the relations between both countries, some of them were ignorant and they were not satisfied, while others supported and encouraged Israel for its intervention in Palestine like the so called neoconservatives of United States, who had a very clear understanding and a critical influence on the Middle East, they had formulated and solidified a hawkish policy that preferred the Israeli right wing, and rejected any political rights for the Palestinians, their goal was to strengthen the US militarily and politically .

Neoconservatives believed that Israel was a mighty barrier to the Soviet Union inroad in the Middle East, that is to say Israel would kink the expansion of the Soviet Union, that is

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

why it supported Israel's intervention in Palestine, and it has always played an important role in neoconservatives thinking and program. However, the Palestinians were viewed during the Cold War as tools of the Soviets and are still viewed as a threat to Israel's existence. Deputy Secretary of defense Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle were the two strong neoconservative supporters of Israel, Wolfowitz and Perle were the mentors of Douglas Feith, who served under Wolfowitz as undersecretary of defense for policy, Wolfowitz was described by one source inside the administration of Bush as over the top crazy when it comes to Israel, Perle is much more an open book, his support for right wing Israel positions goes back to the 1970s, when he worked as a Senate staffer, and his position on the Defense Policy Board gave him a venue for pro-Israeli and anti-Palestinian advocacy with this administration, he displayed a graphic allotting all of Palestine to Israel and labeling Jordan as Palestine (Christison 43).

Furthermore, Douglas Feith believed that the Palestinians have no legal rights in Palestine, and believed that the only legitimate location for a Palestine state is Jordan. In 1996 Feith and Perle were among several authors of a strategy paper for Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu, entitled *A Clean Break*, a policy document that explained a new approach to solve Israel's security problems in the Middle East and promoting a peace process with an emphasis on Western values, certain parts of that policy were rejected by Netanyahu, the authors argued for dismantling Arafat's exclusive grip on Palestine society, and an aggressive persuasion of Syria and Iraq, including the removal of Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, and the containment of Syria by engaging in proxy warfare and highlighting its possession of weapons of mass destruction. There were another pro-Israeli neoconservative who played influential roles in this policy, William Kristol, editor of the conservative magazine *The Weekly Standard*, is a founder and present chairman of the project for a New American Century (PNAC), formed in 1997 to promote the advancement of US power around the world (44).

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

Additionally, the appearance of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) provided a strong right wing supporters of Israel, among its scholars Perle, neocon founder Irving Kristol, former Reagan administration official Michael Ledeen, and Reagan 's UN ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick 26, and also the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), may be the most important organization, that defined its principle purpose as to inform the American defense and foreign affairs community about the important role Israel can play in bolstering democratic interests in the Mediterranean and the Middle East(44) .

Therefore, on March 2001, the United States vetoed a Security Council resolution calling for a UN observer force to protect Palestinians in the occupied territories, four European countries, including Britain and France, had attempted to formulate a compromise aimed at avoiding US veto, but the effort failed, the United States insisted on imposing four conditions : No mention of Israel settlements, no use of the wordsiegeto describe Israel 's actions in the occupied territories, no reference to the Fourth Geneva Convention regulating an occupying power's conduct towards an occupied civilian population, and no mention of the land for peace principle embodied in UN Resolution 242. The Bush administration justified its veto on the ground that, because the 1993 Oslo agreement was a bilateral accord between Palestinians and Israelis, other outside involvement in issues under negotiation would constitute interference prejudging the outcome of negotiations .

Thus, the Europeans operated on the basis that because Israel was the occupying force and the Palestinians the occupied population, a resolution accurately defining the situation on the ground was a necessary point of leverage against Israel's total dominant of the Palestinians . These differences highlighted the real reason for the failure of US policy since the peace process began, the Bush administration's position recreated the myopia of the Clinton administration, which had formulated policy throughout the seven years of the Oslo process on the basis that the sides had equal negotiating leverage, because the administration's real

Neoconservatism and US Foreign Policy

focus has always been elsewhere, preparing for war on Iraq, managing its occupation of Iraq, and attempting to transform the Middle East, the Bush administration and the neoconservative team never developed a strategy for resolving the conflict (45).

By shedding light on the history and the principles of neoconservatism and giving an idea about its main leaders. The reader would be able to a certain extent to provide an explanation for the different decisions that were taking by the different American administrations, among them the war against Iraq.

Chapter Two

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

The American war against Iraq was of great concern for all the humanity because the big debate that preceded that war and also the mass destruction and the number of civilian casualties that happened. The main focus was concerned with the role played by the neoconservatives.

1- The Main Reasons of the Invasion

1.1. Eliminating an Enemy of Israel

Eliminating an enemy of Israel was an important aim behind the invasion of 2003, the personal and ideological relations of prominent neocoservatives to the state of Israel and especially the Likud Party were matters of fact and have been much ramarked upon, it is also true that George W.Bush arguably has been the most pro-Israel American president since the foundation of Israel in 1948, it does not mean that the Bush White House engaged in this war to serve Israel's security, that administration war supporters, especially the president and the neoconservatives, believed that eliminating an anemy of Israel, was a great advantage profferedby (OIF). *“The neocons were American nationalists who believed it was always in America’s interest to help Israel succeed over its enemies”* (Mulloy 84). *“They never claimed that the United States needed to sacrifice some interest of its own for the sake of Israel’s well being. To them, the assertion of closely related interests and identical values was an artical of faith that secured Israel’s protection and provided the United States with its only democratic ally in the Middle East”*(Ibid).

The neoconservativesbelieved that the United States and Israel hadthe same interests toward the Middle East, particularly when it comesto the war on terror, that defined by the Bush White House: Made little practical or strategic distinction among al-Qaeda, Hamas, and Hezbollah, or for that matter between the US campaign against al-Qaeda and Israeli counter-

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

terrorist operations in the West Bank, Gaza, and southern Lebanon. The 9/11 attacks in US, were sure enough for the Israel prime minister Ariel Sharon to declare that Israel's war with Hamas and Hezbollah in Palestine was just like America's war against those who committed the 9/11 attacks, Sharon put Israel in the place as the declaration of Bush administration over the war on terror, there was no proof in the White House, that showed any differentiation between Palestinian and al-Qaeda terrorism than it did between Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein (84).

1.2. Intimidating Iran and North Korea

The supporters of the war, including the neoconservatives, who were the most dominant ones, believed that knocking off one axis of evil authority would scare Iran and North Korea, and then unconstraining their plan to acquire nuclear weapons. (OIF) would show a believable demonstration to Tehran and Pyongyang, that is to say what could happen to the two rogue nations, if they continued their program in acquiring nuclear weapons, The implicit in this belief was confidence that the United States could achieve a swift and decisive victory in Iraq, followed by minimal US force deployments in that country, just after Saddam Hussein had been removed from power and before the emergence of a protracted insurgency in Iraq, Frum and Perle declared that by overthrowing Saddam, *"We gave other potential enemies a vivid and compelling demonstration of America's ability to win a swift and total victory over significant enemy forces with minimal US casualties. The overthrowing American victory in the battle of Baghdad stamped a powerful impression upon the minds of the rulers of Tehran and Pyongyang"* (Mulloy 80) .

It was seemingly presumed that the two rogue nations Iran and North Korea, especially Tehran and Pyongyang could be intimidated, even though both had established reputations of stern defiance in response to attempted external coercion. War proponents seemingly

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

dismissed the possibility that (OIF) might scare Iran and North Korea into accelerating their drive for nuclear weapon's capacity. Indeed, the very fact that American's conventional military supremacy encouraged rogue state interest in neutralizing that supremacy, via possession of a nuclear deterrent escaped those who believed the road to a nuclear disarmed Iran and North Korea ran through Baghdad, it can be assumed that neither Pyongyang nor Tehran, were discouraged by America's descent into a protracted war in Iraq, that sapped US military power and promised to exert Iraq syndrome on subsequent US use of force as had the Vietnam syndrome before it (80) .

1.3. Establishing a Regional Alternative to Saudi Arabia

Before the Iranian revolution of 1979, the United States depended on the twin pillars of Iran and Saudi Arabia in order to unfreeze its oil interests in the Persian Gulf, the oil inflated after the defeat of the Shah and the coming of Khomeini. Twelve years later, neoconservatives's aim was to put Iraq as a democracy state and an alternative in the sake of US security in the Persian Gulf, so it would be as a replacement to Saudi Arabia which Wolfowitz, Perle, and others believed that was the main source for terrorism, many of the 9/11 Hijackers were Saudi nationals, the 9/11 attacks had menaced and sabotaged the half century old security bargain between the United States and Saudi Arabia, US military protection as an exchange for admission to Persian Gulf oil at reasonable prices, if Islamist terrorism would like Bush and Rice's declaration, so Saudi Arabia is a major part of the problem, and it surely becomes too hard when showing no reflection towards the Saudi monarchy's corruption. Moreover, Saudi Arabia was among the three states that recognized the Taliban as a government of Afghanistan, even though it had no relation with terrorism (Mulloy 82).

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

For neoconservatives, operation Iraqi freedom offered an opportunity to groom a new Persian Gulf strategic partner, as an insurance policy against the political uncertainties surrounding the future US-Saudi relationship, while freeing the United States to take a less tolerant and more demanding attitude towards the House of Saud, the assumption was that Iraqis would be so grateful for their liberation from Saddam Hussein, that they would happily agree to the establishment of their country as a regional surrogate for US strategic interests. Such a client state might even be persuaded to recognize Israel, withdraw from (OPEC), and permit the establishment of US military bases on Iraqi soil as a means of containing the expansion of Iranian power and influence in the region (83).

1.4. Redeeming the Hollow Victory of 1991

Redeeming the hollow victory of 1991 was also one of the major reasons that led to war against Iraq, Saddam Hussein supplied the critical continuity on the Iraq side, while both Bushes (father and son), Dick Cheney, Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice, and Paul Wolfowitz avoided war with Iraq by the late of twentieth century, the 1991 Gulf War was a hollow victory, as neoconservatives viewed it, and it was a strong feeling, including those who moved into the George W. Bush administration, most of them considered the sensational military triumph presented by operation Desert Storm would arouse Saddam Hussein's internal overthrow, but the Iraqi dictator kept his dominance, withstanding the United States and the international community. Saddam Hussein with his policy was an obstacle to American foreign policy, which means the limitation of US conventional military domination, also evidence, that American administration lacked the political will to defeat their opponents (Draper 173).

Saddam's survival, and especially his implication in 1993 plot to assassinate George H.W. Bush during the former president's visit to Kuwait, meant that it had been a mistake not to

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

have marched on to Baghdad, Saddam Hussein's destruction became a family matter, in 1998 the younger Bush told a friend, "*Dad made a mistake in not going into Iraq when he had an approval rating in the nineties. If i'm ever in that situation, I'll use it, I'll spend my political capital*" (173). During the 2000 presidential election campaign, the younger Bush told PBS's Jim Lehrer, "*I'm just as frustrated as many Americans are that Saddam still lives. I will tell you this : If we catch him developing weapons of mass destruction in any way, shape, or form, I'll deal with him in a way he won't like*". During the war of 1991, neoconservatives were against what the administration of Clinton did with Saddam Hussein, they wanted to take Iraq's leader down, the invasion of 2003 on Iraq saw a publication of a book, talked about the neoconservatives and how they viewed the Middle East, as a great project to practise their beliefs and principles, it also focused on the impact of neoconservatives on the invasion and the main role they played during the war, Lawrence Kaplan and William Kristol were the so famous neoconservatives during Bush and Clinton administration's, who called for war against Iraq. On July 30, 2001, the former (CIA) officer and the neoconservative author Reuel Marc Gerecht declared Bush administration's Iraq policy in the influential neoconservative journal, *THE Weekly Standard*, in one of its essays titled : *The Cowering Superpower*, Gerecht announced, "*From the spring of 1996, the Clinton administration's Iraq policy was in meltdown ; under the Bush administration, it has completely liquefied. . .It would be better to see the administration start explaining how we will live with Saddam and his nuclear weapons than to see senior Bush officials, in the manner of the Clintonites, fib to themselves and the public*" (Gerecht 29).

1.5. Igniting Democracy in the Middle East

Neoconservatives and the Bush administration national security decision makers, wanted to arouse the political transformation of the Middle East, starting from the establishment of democracy in Iraq, Wolfowitz and other neoconservatives, believed that Iraq was in need to

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

democracy before the 9/11 attacks, whereas Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld's condensation was how to remove Saddam Hussein from power and change his regime, rather than focusing on establishing a nation with a democratic governance, they did not believe in using US military power to remake the world in America's image. In short, they were not, to use current American political science jargon, democratic imperialists, but rather traditional nationalists. On February 2003, George W. Bush had shown his supporting to war against Iraq in the Enterprise institute speech, and again on March 17, addressing the nation in which Saddam Hussein was obliged to leave the country in two days, he said, "*We believe the Iraqi people are desiring and capable of human liberty. And when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation*" (New York Times, 2003 :15). Bush wanted to spread democracy instead of dictatorship, he took Japan as an example to the US foreign policy success in igniting democracy, so that would change Iraq from an assaulter into a peaceful country, and would unafraid global security, neoconservatives and Bush believed that terrorism had its origins from the Arab world, so democratization would affect the Arab nations and reduce terrorism. On September 7, 2003, Bush denounced in a televised address to the nation:

In Iraq, we are helping. .. To build a decent and democratic society at the center of the Middle East. .. The Middle East will either become a place of progress and peace, or it will be an exporter of violence and terror that takes more lives in America and in other free nations. The triumph of democracy and tolerance in Iraq, in Afghanistan and beyond would be a grave setback for international terrorism. The terrorists thrive on the support of tyrants and the resentments of oppressed peoples. When tyrants fall, and resentment gives way to hope, men and women in every culture reject the ideologies of terror, and turn to the pursuits of peace. Everywhere that freedom takes hold, terror will retreat (Transcript of pres, 2003: 16).

1.6. Demonstrating Will to Use Decisive Force

In 2001, after the 9/11 attacks many neoconservatives entered the George W. Bush administration, and tried to push their leader for war against Iraq, they were not quenched

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

because of the disproportion between United States military supremacy and how to use it aggressively to serve American interests and values, they disturbed that :

The United States, the world's dominant power on whom the maintenance of international peace and the support of liberal democratic principles depends, will shrink from its responsibilities and in a fit of absent-mindedness, or parsimony, or indifference allow the international order that it created and sustained to collapse. Our present danger is one of declining military strength, flagging will and confusion about our world (Kagan and Kristol 4).

Neoconservatives were against post-cold war cuts in defense disbursing, especially after the Soviet Union demise, and viewed it as an obstruction to the expansion of US power in the world, they believed that the Weinberger-Powell doctrine prohibited the use of force and military supremacy just in political circumstances. For them, the doctrine was a formula for calming that opposed their brliefs and principles, they critisized the way in which the Gulf War of 1991 was finished, and Saddam Hussein stood in power as a leader of the country, David Frum and Richard Perle said, “*Saddam had survived ; therefore we had lost.*” Neoconservatives also reprobated Clinton administraion's hesitant in using military force against Somalia, Haiti, and the Balkans, they preferred forcible government with military power change in Baghdad before the 9/11 attacks and decried the Clinton White House for its manner in dealing with Saddam Hussein.

Moreover, neoconservatives believed that the use of force by US in the Vietnam War had a strong impact on America's strategic reputation, and it would boost enemies like Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden, that is to say they would not believe in America's superpower and consider it as a gutless one, that would empower their countries, in Richard M. Nixon's famous characterization, *A pitiful, helpless giant*. The military power of US could not pass the volition to use it, and because of it Vietnam could defeat US in the Vietnam War, when United States run out of Lebanon and Somalia, Iraq offered a low-cost opportunity to demonstrate the credibility of American power, to strengthen deterrence by putting other

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

actual and aspiring rogue states on notice, that the United States invited military destruction. Neoconservatives viewed allies, alliances, and particularly the United Nation as burden on US use of force, all of them were against the military power of the United States, like the 1999 NATO war with Serbia over Kosovo, neoconservatives believed that the Soviet Union's demise diminished the strategic value of allies, now the United States could act alone and therefore should act alone unless there were allies available free of political charge. There was a belief that the American power was inherently legitimate, in a book titled, *The War over Iraq*, Kaplan and Kristol reprobated former vice president Al Gore for characterizing the Bush's commitment to American preeminence as glorifying the nation of dominance, "Well," They asked, "*What's wrong with dominance in the service of sound principles and high ideals ?*" (Kaplan and Kristol 112).

Therefore, for neoconservatives US military action against Iraq did not necessitate any international legitimization from (NATO) and (UN) authorization, the invasion of Iraq would exhibit the credibility of US military supremacy to America's enemies, and also America's friends and allies, many of whom did not support the US military action against Iraq, that the United States would not allow its military action to be forced by allied view with no international legitimization, from the beginning of the invasion Bush administration declared that in the end, it would take military supremacy against Baghdad with or without the United Nations, (NATO), and other institutional approval. Vice president Dick Cheney did not accept the idea of demanding the authorization from the United Nation, America's friends and allies could either follow or stay away.

Notably, the issue of political will gained more interest especially when (OIF) descended into an extended war, and then the will to victory became a replacement war aim for that of eliminating Iraq's nonexistent (WMD) menace, the former president George H. Bush believed that Iraq was a test of American will. Obviously, if the United States unconstrained its

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

commitment to Iraq, atrocious things would happen, and the main dangerous threat was the expansion of Iranian power and its influence in the Middle East that was among neoconservatives plan to practise their beliefs and principles .

2- The US-Iraqi Relations before the Invasion (1980-2003)

US-Iraqi relations have waned during the twentieth and early twenty first centuries, starting from thier zenith in 1950 to their nadir between 1990 and 2003, the united States placed its relationship with Iraq in a position secondary to other regional interests, chiefly oil and the fight against the spread of communism, US leaders played an important role and helped Saddam Hussein to establish a dictatorship government, many interviews and documents of the former US policymakers showed that US intervned in differents issues, they also supported the Iraqi leader in his insensate acts, that happened during Ronald Reagan and George H W.Bush administrations .US sent military aid to Iraq including poisonous chemicals and deadly biological viruses, like Anthrax and Bubonic plague, because of this the Iraqi leader became more powerful and independent in his inhuman deeds.

On March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein assaulted a kurdish city of Halabja in the northern part of Iraq Kurdistan region, he used chemical gas to fight his own population, the act listed many casualties and more than 5000 people were killed, most of them were civilians, including Women, Children, and Men, US leaders decried what Saddam Hussein did and they considered them as inhuman acts. However, it should not be forgotten that US supported Saddam to create a dictatorship country and the Iraqi leader received good support in military perspectives, also war strategics and tactics from United States, Frank C. Carlucci who was the US secratary of defense, considered what supplied to Iraq as a general order of battle information, not operational intelligence, and he said *“I certainly have no knowledge of US participation in preparing battle and strike packages, Curlucci also emphasized that he had*

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

not anticipated that Iraq would use chemical weapons” (Patrick, 2002 : 1). Even though, the United States did not support Saddam Hussein’s deeds against the Kurdish city of Halabja, when he used chemical gas, and because of this the US-Iraqi ties started to decrease especially when Ronald Reagan decided to change US policy in the Middle East, including Iraq, as an attempt to secure the region (Ahmad 103).

Moreover, the 1990-2003 relations or the occupation era as it was called should be taken into account, because of its great impact on both sides and their relations, during this period US-Iraqi ties began to restore and many events occurred, that ended by the invasion of 2003, before attacking Kuwait the US ambassador April Glaspie went to Baghdad for a meeting with Saddam Hussein, in which April told the Iraqi leader that her country was looking for better relations with Iraq and denounced that, “ *We have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflict, like your border disagreement with Kuwait. Even though, the United States may not have intended to give Iraq a green light, but that is effectively what it did*” (104). Saddam Hussein did not expect the United States’s reaction towards the invasion of Kuwait and he thought that US will not intervene between the two neighbors, the Iraqi leader kept in mind that the international community and US will not intervene and support Kuwait when he uses military force and attacks his neighbors, especially when Margaret Tutwiler declared in a speech of the state department on July 1990 that, “*We do not have Special defense or security commitments to Kuwait*” (Karsh and Freedman, 2002 : 269-270). In contrast, US promised Kuwait secretly that they will help and save the country from Saddam’s invasion. Before the attacks and after knowing that the Iraqi leader was about to invade the northern part of Kuwait, Bush sent a telegram message to Saddam Hussein, in which he informed him that US was against using military force in his conflict with Kuwait.

Immediately following the invasion of Kuwait, US decided to supervise a new foreign policy towards Iraq, that is to say US did not like Saddam Hussein’s acts, especially when he

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

opposed the United Nations Security Council resolutions, and also when he refused the inspectors to enter the weapon storage of Iraq during Clinton administration. In 1993, the former president George Bush rescued an assassination in Kuwait, when he went for a visit and this was followed by US bombs in Baghdad. In 1994 the Iraqi leader pushed his army towards Kuwait, which led US to transfer military aid to Kuwait as a reaction for its disagreement, and it admonished Iraq to not attack Kuwait. (Freedman, 1991:1) In addition to that, US prevented Saddam Hussein from fly-zones in northern and southern part of Iraq, seeking for how to break Saddam's government and keep him away from the international community. By the end of 1997, Saddam Hussein responded to US and disallowed the United States weapon inspectors who contributed in a United Nations inspection team (UNSCOM), to continue their search mission in Iraq, US did not accept this at all and they threatened Iraq by using power because of Saddam's acts towards the United Nations inspection team, the main factor that led US to avoid war against Iraq was the support of the Saudis, when Saudi Arabia declared in 1998 that they would prohibit US to use their country as a base for attacking Iraq, so it was too difficult for US to invade Iraq without using Saudi Arabia's air space, the Saudis justified their decision that the invasion would injure just the civilians, all these acts that mentioned above affected the US-Iraqi relations negatively.

Another thing that should be taken into account, was the 9/11 attacks in New York and Washington, the attacks had a great impact on US-Iraqi ties that later on considered Iraq as an enemy of US, the former president George W. Bush declared that, *“ On September the 11th, 2001, our nation was confronted by a new kind of war. See, we're at war. This is a war. This isn't a single isolated incident. We are now in the first war of the 21st century. And it's a different kind of war than we're used to. I explain part of the difference is the fact that the battlefield is now here at home ”* (CCN, 2002 : 1).

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

However, there were some among the US head of states and congress who denied what the majority believed about the 9/11 attacks, Dennis Kucinich, MA, U.S. Representative (D-OH), declared on his website that, “ *We have seen that there has been nothing but a trail of lies that led the United States into its involvement in Iraq. That Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11. Iraq had nothing to do with Al Qaeda's role in 9/11, nor with the anthrax attack upon this country. Iraq had neither the intention nor the capability of attacking the United States*” (Ahmad 107).

3- The End of the Relations

After the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, the United States had joined an alliance against Hussein in which 22 nations had taken part. Needless to repeat that Iraq had good relations with United States under most of the presidency of Saddam Hussein, as he was against the communist ideology of the Soviet Union and that was in favor of the US. Additionally, Hussein had worked for the (CIA) for a long period and the United States had used Hussein for their national interests. But, the relations between the two countries did not stay warm forever, as Iraq had invaded Kuwait in 1990. After that period everything had changed, the friendly relations had turned to hostility, and After Iraq's invasion of Kuwait the internationally community wanted to take measures under the United Nations Charter as Hussein had used force against an other country in the region, which violated the international law. According to Article 1/1 of the United Nations Charter stipulates that all states are equal on the legal bases. States in order to maintain international peace and security, to prevent and remove all threats to the peace and for suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of peace all states should refrain from threat or use of force.

Furthermore, Article 2/3 requires all states to settle their dispute in peaceful, means not to endanger international security. Another crucial point of Article 1/2 is to develop friendly relations among nations and this should be based on respect to the principle of equal rights

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

and self-determination of peoples, and also to take further convenient measures to enforce universal peace. That is why all states should respect the territorial integrity and political independency and self-determination of other states. If any state does not comply with the (UN) Charter then the Security Council will take necessary measures for the sake of maintaining the international peace and security. Besides this, in article 2/3 of the United Nations Charter it says that all states shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered. The international community answered Kuwait's invasion by Iraq and all Hussein's allies had stood against him in this situation, although Hussein thought that the United States would not react against him, because he thought that the speech of the U.S. ambassadress was giving him another green light like for the Occupation of Iran a few years earlier. Just one day after Kuwait's occupation the United Nations Security Council condemned Iraq's invasion and demanded its immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Kuwait. Apparently, the Soviet Union the main arms supplier to Iraq called for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait's territory, so after the invasion of Kuwait Iraq was entirely isolated and was alone, there were no allies around Saddam Hussein (Ahmad 107-108).

To sum up, The Iraqi-US alliance came in fact to an end at 2 AM. August 2, 1990 while 100, 000 Iraqi troops backed by 300 tanks invaded Kuwait. Not surprising, that Iraq's best ally had turned to its enemy.

4-The Main Point of Disagreement: The Issue of Democracy

The twentieth century saw the appearance of the United states as a superpower in the world, US wanted to impose its political systems and ideologies elsewhere including the Middle East in order to secure the world and spreading peace all over the world, as being the great power and dominant state, one of its ideologies was the issue of democracy, the former

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

president William J. Clinton declared that, “*ultimately, the best strategy to ensure our security and to build a durable peace is to support the advance of democracy elsewhere. Democracies don’t attack each other. They make better trading partners and partners in diplomacy*” (Markakis 9) .

Obviously, US leaders especially the neoconservatives believed that the issue of democracy would pursuit hegemony over the world starting by the Middle East, and particularly Iraq and its dictator leader Saddam Hussein who was against their beliefs and did not support their attempts to spread democracy. Martin Indyk, special assistant to the president for Near East and South Asian affaires and the policy’s main architect anounced that, “*dual containment does not mean duplicate containment... each regime presents differents challenges to our interests, and we developed policies to deal with the specific cases*” (143). So the Clinton administration’s aim was how to remove Saddam Hussein from power and how to establish a democratic government in Iraq beyond all kinds of tyranny that were during Saddam’s authority in 1996. Many neoconservatives such as Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Paula Dobriansky, Elliot Abrams, Zalmaym Khalizad, and Richard Perle stated in a public letter to president Clinton that :

the policy of containment of Saddam Hussein has been steadily eroding over the past several months ... 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 a willingness to undertake military action as diplomacy is clearly failing. In the long term, it means removing Saddam and his regime from power. That new needs to become the aim of American foreign policy (144).

Democratisation was the main purpose of US policy towards Iraq since Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1991, US congress argued that there should be a policy of the United states to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, to promote the emergence of a democratic government and to replace that regime, Clinton administration offered \$ 5.000.000 as an assistance to spread democracy in Iraq, including the

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

northern part of Kurdistan, but Saddam Hussein showed his disagreement, and he refused Clinton's assistance, Yanire Voller stated that, "*regime change in Iraq was to take place through domestic opposition groups. The designated groups included the PUK Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, KDP Kurdistan Democratic Party, in addition to the Iraqi National Accord, the movement for constitutional monarchy and the Shiite Supreme Concil for Islamic Revolution in Iraq*"(145) .

Notably, these movements depended on Iraqi territory proper, either in Kurdistan region in the north or in exil abroad, the (NED) also contributed in this. Between 1991 and 2003, the Media gained \$ 260.000 from the (NED) in order to publish projects related to Iraq, and \$ 430.000 for projects that published components, before the invasion of 2003, there were 27 radio stations that broadcasted in Iraq. However, promoting democracy in Saddam's regime was not the main aim of the American administration, behind this there was the desire of neoconservatives to practise hegemony in the country and spread their beliefs in the Middle East, which were ignored by Saddam Hussein, that is to say he knew that promoting democracy in his country by neoconservatives and other American leaders was not their main aim as they declared and showed to the world, that is why he did not accept their efforts and assistances in promoting democracy, that can be considered as one of the main points of disagreement since 1991 to 2003 between both countries and their relations (145).

5- How the Invasion of 2003 Reflected the Agenda of Neoconservatives

The main purpose of US foreign policy under the influence of neoconservatives was to change the world for the better, as Leo Strauss who was an early neoconservative thought leader, believed that opposing tyranny and spreading democracy was the duty of all the free nations like the United States, that was among its core beliefs. Since the United States was considered as the most powerful in the world and the international order, it was responsible

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

to save other countries and promote democracy with using power if necessary, especially in the Middle East and Saddam 's regime that threatened US economic and political interests before the invasion of 2003(Stewart,2014 : 10).

Notably, neoconservatives reinforced the Bush administration to view the whole world in terms of good versus evil, and using force and military power when necessary, which resulted the invasion of 2003. They were public intellectuals who published extensively on foreign policy and explained their ideology concerning the nature of the world, and they showed the important role of America inside it. In other words, they shared their own vision to the world and what was going on in other countries especially in Iraq prior to the 9/11 attacks, their ideology was absolutely disposed in the eyes of President George W. Bush, Vice President Cheney, and Secretary Rumsfeld, they always tried to push their beliefs and principles on non-neoconservatives policymakers. Their ideology and their influence on US foreign policy after 9/11 attacks gained more interests from many intellectuals, Stefan Halper and Jonathan Clarke asseverated:

The situation of unending war in which we find ourselves results in large part from the fact that the policies adopted after 9/11, the initial strike against the Taliban aside, were hardly specific to that event. Unlike the policy of containment that evolved in direct response to Soviet moves in Central and Eastern Europe and involved radical new thinking on the part of those involved, the post 9/11 policy was in fact grounded in an ideology that existed well before the terror attacks and that in a stroke of opportunistic daring by its progenitors, has emerged as the new orthodoxy. The paper trail is unambiguous. Minds were already made up. A preexisting ideological agenda was taken off the shelf, dusted off, and relabeled as the response to terror.... In neo-conservative eyes, the Iraq war was not about terrorism.

It was about the pivotal relationship between Saddam Hussein and the assertion of U.S. power. Hussein provided, in effect, the opportunity to clarify America's global objectives and moral obligations. His continued survival in power was a metaphor for all that had gone wrong with U.S. foreign policy since the Soviet collapse in the sense that the first Bush administration's Real politic and Clinton's wishful liberalism had left the Iraqi dictator in power. Iraq was now the arena in which to

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

demonstrate the crucial tenets of neo-conservative doctrine: military preemption, regime change, the merits of exporting democracy, and a vision of U.S. power that is “fully engaged and never apologetic (15).

The neoconservative strategy had six core propositions that defined its persuasion, the first is that evil is real, and the second is for evil to prevail require only one thing, the third one is that the purpose of America defines its ideals, So for neoconservatives US values and strategic interests were related to each other, and the main important one was how to promote democracy in the world. The fourth proposition is an appreciation for authority, they despised liberal democrats who did not support the war in Vietnam and succumbed to political correctness at home, the fifth is that after the Vietnam war and especially when US witnessed a dire crisis because of the war, they still had the will to defeat the Soviet Union in the Cold War, despite of the deception in Vietnam, the last one is that the antidote to crisis is leadership as showed by Ronald Reagan’s determination to win the cold war once and for all (Bacevich 73).

Moreover, the neoconservative agenda was supported by different administrations that guided the United States in the Cold war and before the invasion of 2003 in Iraq, starting from the first George W. B administration that was populated by many dominant neoconservatives, such as the deputy secretary of defense and the head of defense Policy Board and many others, all of them could change the policy of Georg W. Bush especially after the 9/11 attacks that followed by the invasion of 2003, tyranny and terrorism were considered unhuman acts or moral evils that the United States should fight them in the Middle East, wherever there is an issue of democracy US should intervene and defend the peace against threats from terrorists and tyrants like what happened in Iraq, also they prevented any rogue state from acquiring weapons of mass destruction the impact of neoconservatives and their strategy was clear in mostly all the American leaders and their speeches, they could adopt their strategy in US foreign policy (Stewart 17-18).

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

Furthermore, neoconservatives found the 9/11 attacks as an opportunity to provide more explanation for their principles and beliefs, as a result the former president George W. Bush gave a great interest to them and their strategy especially in the Middle East and Iraq, they could transform Bush into a foreign policy president, so that Bush appreciated the vision of neoconservatives to the world and the great role of America to intervene in any issue with the use of power if necessary. Additionally, Wolfowitz and Rumsfeld believed that Iraq was the most dangerous thing in national security, neoconservatives in the Bush administration started to relate the acts of al Qaeda with Saddam's regime to enter in a war with Iraq. In contrast, Colin Powell the secretary of state did not support what Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz viewed, and asked the administration to focus just on al Qaeda, but his opinion did not get more interest by American leaders because of the great influence of neoconservatives. The 9/11 translated the neoconservative ideology into established US foreign policy, by the time George W. Bush and other officials in his administration gave an order to US military forces to invade Iraq, they painted a picture for the Iraqi dictator and it was depicted as a Hitler with weapons of mass destruction (20-23) .

Additionally, the Bush administration based its decision to invade Iraq upon neoconservatives assumptions, the first one was that the Iraqi leader wanted to acquire nuclear weapons and especially his use of chemical and biological weapons against Kuwait in 1991, the second assumption was that Saddam Hussein had links with al Qaeda and had something to do with 9/11. The third assumption was that, invading Iraq would bring rapid and peaceful democratization, with these assumptions democracy would replace dictatorship in the Middle East as neoconservatives aimed (51).

To sum up, the Bush administration declared war against Iraq to validate neoconservative thoughts and beliefs, the United States finally moved to assert the full measure of its global military hegemony, and the dream of neoconservatives came into true in 2003, when the

The Impact of Neoconservatives on the Invasion of Iraq

invasion dismantled Saddam Hussein's regime from power and defeated his tyranny that led to establish a democratic political system in Baghdad.

General Conclusion

In this paper, we have dealt with neoconservatism and US foreign policy: Iraq war as a case study, using the finding modeling (General-To-Specific) during the process, we tried to find out the impact of the neoconservatives and their ideology on US foreign policy especially the invasion of 2003 against Iraq and their main influences on America and outside, starting from the 1970s till the beginning of the 21th century, many administrations took into account their beliefs and principles because they were analogous with their aims and intentions . In addition to that, the above research, we have dealt with shows in details the great contribution of neoconservatives in Iraq war and how they pushed the Bush administration to declare war against Iraq, which aimed to change Saddam Hussein's regime.

We have defined the term of neoconservatism and how it appeared with its two main leaders Irvin Kristol and Francis Fukuyama, then we gave an evaluate of neoconservatives foreign policy agenda which means their four principles. The first, starting from the Straussian notion of the regime, that the foreign policy of a country must be in the image of the values which characterize it, and the neoconservatives were systematically pessimistic with regard to social policies. The second is the belief that spreading democracy around the globe will provide peace and will be beneficial to all nations. The third gives the United States special responsibilities because of its unequalled power in the world and considers that they must use it for moral purposes. Finally, the fourth principle brings them closer to the realists because of their skepticism towards international institutions and law. Following the fourth principles, we explained the main influences of neoconservatives in US foreign policy such as the CDM, that was created for the soul of democratic party. The Czech dissidents and neoconservatives had many similarities and both influenced each other, they emphasized on the use of power and strong military in order to spread democracy. The Iranian Revolution and neoconservatives policy that saw the intervention of neoconservatives supported the Shah

General conclusion

against Khomeini. The Palestine-Israeli conflict, this issue gained the interests of neoconservatives also, without developing a strategy for resolving the conflict.

Moreover, we have detailed the main reasons of the invasion of 2003, in which the ideology of neoconservatives with its leaders played an important role. The study also explains the relation between the United States and Iraq prior to the war, and how it ended with the chief point of disagreement which was the issue of democracy under the influence of neoconservatives. Finally, how the invasion of 2003 reflected the agenda of neoconservatives, they could push Bush to declare war against Iraq, to assert the full measure of his global military hegemony.

It can be concluded that the ideology of neoconservatives or the persuasion as most of the critics defined, it could influence many administrations in America during their presence, especially the Bush administration, they finally reached their main goal when Bush declared the war against Iraq, that was a part of the hegemonic puzzle. The invasion of 2003 could validate neoconservatives beliefs and thoughts, and put their principles into practice, they could successfully unite theory and practice.

This research was conducted regarding the questions asked earlier in the introduction. It had a limited sources, most of them discussed neoconservatism and its relation with the Middle East in general, not with a specific country. Our exploration of the topic can be just an opening for a further study of the subject matter, critics suggested that neoconservatives could not continue their domination over US foreign policy after the invasion of 2003, especially with the coming of Barack Hussein Obama.

Works Cited

Works Cited

Secondary Sources

Books

Bacevich, Andrew J. *The New American Militarism: How Americans are Seduced by War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Bloom, Allan . *Closing of the American Mind*. Simon and Schuster,2008.

Cooper, Danny. *Neoconservatism and American Foreign Policy : Artical Analysis*.July, 2009.

Draper , Robert . *Dead Certain : The Presidency of George W. Bush*.2008.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The end of history and the last man*. Simon and Schuster, 2006.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Simon and Schuster, 1996.

Kagan, Robert, and Ivo H. Daalder. *America and the Use of Force: Sources of Legitimacy*. Bridging the Foreign Policy Divide. Routledge, 2009.

Kagan, Robert, and William Kristol.*Present Dangers: Crisis and Opportunity in American Foreign and Defense Policy*. Encounter Books, 2000.

Kagan, Robert.*The Benevolent Empire*. Foreign Policy, 1998.

Kaplan, Lawrence and william, Kristol.*War over Iraq: Saddam's Tyranny and America's Mission*. Barnes & Noble, 2003.

Parry, Geraint, and Michael Moran. *Democracy and democratization*. Taylor & Francis, 2004.

Works Cited

Articles

Ahmad,Paiman.“US-Iraqi Relations 1945-2003.”*International Journal Business* , 2014 .

Alkadiri,Raad,and FaredMohamedi. "World Oil Markets and the Invasion of Iraq." *Middle East Report* 33.2; ISSU 227 (2003): 20-27.

Bratton, Noble .“Rise ofNeoconservatism ”.

Bush, George W. “The national security strategy of the United States of America”. *Executive Office of the President Washington Dc.* Sep 17, 2002.

“Bush’s Speech on Iraq: Saddam Hussein and His Sons Must Leave.” *New York Times*, 18 March, 2003.

“Bush: We Will Do What Is Necessary.” *Transcript of Pres. George W.Bush’s address to the nation*, 7September 2003, *Washington Post*, 8 September 2003.

Christison,Khthleen. “All Those Old Issues: George W .Bush and the Palestinain-IsraeliConflict .” pp. 43-45.

Gerecht, Reuel Marc. “A Cowering Superpower.”*The weekly standard*, 28 Sept. 2001.

Karsh. E andFreedman. “The Saddam Hussein Reader: selectionsfromLeadingWriters on Iraq.” *New York: Thunder’sMouth Press*, 2002. (269-270)

Kristol, William and Robert, Kagan. “Introduction: National InterestandGlobalResponsibility.” *In Kagan and Kristol*, Present Dangers, 4.

McGlinchey, Stephen. “ Neoconservatismand American Foreign Policy.”*Academia.edu*,2010.

Mulloy, D.J. “ A Review of Jeffery Record. Wantingwar: Why the Bush Administration Invaded Iraq.” *Terrorism and Political violence*, vol. 23,no. 4, 2011.

Works Cited

Patrick, E.Tyler. "New York Times Officers Say US Aided Iraq in War despite Use of Gas," 2002.

"President Bush Speaks on Presidential Security." *CCN*, 2002.

Schaller, Jeni. "Neoconservatives Among Us? A Study of Former Dissidents' Discourse." *perspectives*, No.25, 1 Dec .2005.43-62.

Václav, Havel, "Address to Joint Session of US Congress." 1990.

Wise, Krysta. "Islamic Revolution of 1979: The Downfall of American-Iranian Relations." *Southern Illinois University Carbondale*, 2011. 5-7.

Dissertations

Markakis, Dionysius. "*US Democracy Promotion in the Middle East: The Pursuit of Hegemony ?*". Thesis. Department of the International Relations of the London School of Economics for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 2012 .

Michael, Francis. "*The Weekly Standard Magazine and US Foreign Policy 1995-2005*". Thesis. Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages, University of Oslo, 2012.

William Joseph Stewart. "*How Ideology Became Policy: The U.S. War in Iraq and the Role of Neo-conservatism*". Thesis. Department of Graduate Liberal Studies, Duke University , 2014.

ملخص

بما أن السياسة الخارجية لأي بلد يجب أن تمثل طابعها الأخلاقي الداخلي، بالتالي فالحفاظ على تحالفات مع الديكتاتوريين والأنظمة غير المواتية يبعث على الكره تجاه المحافظين الجدد للولايات المتحدة. في هذا السياق، تسعى هذه المذكرة إلى التحقيق في صورة المحافظين الجدد كأيدولوجية لها تأثير عميق على السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية و إبراز دورهم في غزو العراق. كما تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى إظهار أسس ومبادئ المحافظين الجدد ، وعلاقتها بالمسؤولين عن السياسة الأمريكية في الخارج و علاقتها بحرب العراق في ٢٠٠٣. و قد تم اعتماد نهج النوعية خلال هذا العمل تزامنا مع الأبعاد التاريخية. سيكون هذا البحث مفيداً جداً لطلاب السياسة الخارجية الغربية ولجميع الذين يسعون إلى معرفة حقيقة حرب العراق. أكدت نتائج هذه المذكرة أن نظرية المحافظين الجدد لها تأثير كبير على السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية من خلال إدارتها المختلفة، وأكدت أن إدارة بوش اتخذت قرارها بغزو العراق في عام ٢٠٠٣ بناء على افتراض المحافظين الجدد.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المحافظين الجدد، إدارة بوش، غزو العراق، السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية.

Abstract

The foreign policy of a country must represent its internal moral character. Maintaining alliances with dictators and unfavorable regimes is therefore abhorrent to American Neoconservatism. In this way, this thesis seeks to investigate the portrayal of Neoconservatism as an ideology that has a deep impact on the American foreign policy and reveals the role of neoconservatives in the invasion of Iraq. This study aims at showing the foundation and the principles of neoconservatism, its relation to the American foreign policy makers, and the war of Iraq ٢٠٠٣. Qualitative approach has been adopted along this work with historical dimension. This research would be very helpful for students of western foreign policy and for everyone who seeks the reality of the Iraq war. The findings of this paper confirmed that the theory of neoconservatism has a great influence on the US foreign policy through its different administrations. It assured that the Bush administration took its decision to invade Iraq in ٢٠٠٣ based upon neoconservatives' assumptions.

Key words: Neoconservatism, Bush Administration, the invasion of Iraq, US foreign policy