

146281

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE
MIDDLE EAST
IN REFERENCE TO THE
PNAC

Thesis submitted to the
Institute of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

International Relations

by

146281

Kadir Efeler

Fatih University

June 2004

Copyright © Kadir Efele

All Rights Reserved, 2004







This work is aimed at explaining the basic dynamics of American foreign policy following September 11, and its consequences on the international system.

The Dissertation of Kadir Efeler

is approved by:

Dç.Dr. Lütfullah Karaman (advisor)


Assoc. Prof. Bülent Aras


Dç. Dr. Hızır Murat Köse


June 2004

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.
2. The study will try to analyze the understanding of the ideological orientation of Bush Policy after September 11 attacks and its consequences.
 - i) The thesis describes the relations between Neo-Conservatist groups and Bush administration.
 - ii) In the thesis, we try to show how international system we have after the terrorist attack in the U.S and language it created for some rogue sub-systems.

Kadir Efele

June, 2004



ABSTRACT

KADİR EFELER

June 2004

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST IN REFERENCE TO THE PNAC

This work is aimed at explaining the basic dynamic of the American foreign policy following September 11, and reflecting upon it. Efforts will be spent to describe the process by which the neo-conservatives have obtained an influential position within the Bush administration. The basic components of a process of this kind are the philosophy behind American foreign policy following September 11, the structure of the mechanism for decision-making, the way security started to be perceived, and the effects of these on the Middle East policies of the U.S.A. The international system following September 11 has been based on the perception of security in terms of liberal economy and realist-idealist theory. The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon marked the beginning of the process from which the new system evolved. It was called the system of Democratic Peace and was formed by means of American hegemony. With that in mind, the basic argument of this work is centred on the question of how the Middle East has led to place the most importance on the 'Democratic Peace' by justifying it. Another important point is to understand the nature of and reasons behind the fight of the U.S.A. against terrorism.

Key Words:

Unilateralism

Preventive War

American National Strategy

Neo-conservatism

Terrorism

Democracy

KISA ÖZET

PNAC BAĞLAMINDA AMERİKA’NIN ORTADOĞU DIŞ POLİTİKASI

Bu çalışmanın amacı 11 Eylül sonrası yeni oluşmakta olan uluslararası sistem içerisinde Amerikan dış politikasının temel parametrelerini ve bu parametrelerin Amerika’nın Ortadoğu Dış politikasına yansımalarını açıklamaya çalışmaktır. Bu çaba içerisinde Amerika’da Bush yönetimi zamanında dış politikada etkin hale gelen yeni- muhafazakârların dış politika üzerinde nasıl etkin hale geldikleri ve Amerika dış politikasına nasıl bir etkide buldukları ele alınacaktır. Bu süreç içerisinde ele alınmaya çalışılan temel inceleme konuları 11’Eylül sonrası Amerikan dış politikasının felsefi temeli, karar mekanizmasını oluşturan birimlerin tanımsal yapısı, 11’Eylül sonrası güvenlik algılamaları ve bunların Amerikan Ortadoğu politikasındaki etkileri olarak belirtilebilir. 11’Eylül sonrası uluslararası sistem liberal ekonomi ve realist-idealist teori bağlamındaki güvenlik algılaması üzerine bina edilmektedir. Aslında, milenyumla birlikte yeni oluşmakta olan uluslararası sistem bir geçiş aşamasındadır. 11’ Eylül olayları ile birlikte, Dünya Ticaret merkezinde ve Pentagonda meydana gelen terörist saldırılar yeni sistemin adını koymaya yönelik girişimlerin başlangıcı oldu. Yeni oluşmakta olan uluslararası sistemin yeni adı, Amerikan hegemonyası çerçevesinde Demokratik Barış sistemi olarak ifade edildi. Bu çerçevede, çalışmanın asıl tezi, Ortadoğu bölgesinin ‘Demokratik Barışa’ dayalı tek taraflı Amerika önderliğindeki uluslararası sistemi (Yeni Amerikan Yüzyılı Projesi) nasıl meşru ve çekici hale getirdiği argüman üzerinde yoğunlaşmaktadır. Çalışmada esas olarak ele alınan konu temel olarak yukarıda anlatılanların ışığında, ABD’nin terörle mücadele de Ortadoğu da yaptığı savaşın nedenlerini anlama çabası olacaktır.

LIST OF CONTENT

Approval Page	I
Author Declarations	II
Abstract	III
Kısa Özet	IV
List of Contents	V
List of Abbreviation	VII
Acknowledgements	VII
Introduction	1
I- Ideological Orientations of Bush's Policies	3
1-1 American National Strategy after the Bush Administration	18
1-1-1 Unilateralism	24
1-1-2 Regime Change, Democracy and Emancipation	26
1-1-3 Preventive War	28
1-1-4 Weapons of Mass Destruction	32
1-1-5 Terrorism	33
1-2 Globalization, Security and American Approach: A New Trend in the Global Security	36

II. The Analysis of Old and New American Foreign Policy toward the Middle East	47
2-1 General Outlook on Middle Eastern Conditions & Their Relevance to US Foreign Policy	48
2-2 A Closer Look at the American Attitude towards the Israel - Palestine Problem	64
2-2-1 The Existential Problem of Palestine & Israel	70
2-2-2 The Problem Facing Israel in Terms of The Neighbouring Countries	76
2-2-3 Economic Problems and the Palestinian Refugees	82
2-3 New America versus New Israel and New Palestine: Road Map	89
III Why Does America Wage War Against Iraq	94
3-1 War under the Name of Preventive War for Emancipation for World	103
3-1-1-Human Rights and A Rogue Regime	106
3-1-2- Danger in Iraq: The fear of Weapons of Mass Destruction	114
3-1-3 Terrorism: The New Face of Menace	122
Conclusion	127
Bibliography	130

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PNAC	Project for the New American Century
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
QUARTED	(The UN, US, EU and Russia)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
U.S. A	United State America
CNN	Cable News Network
NSS	National Security Strategy
WTC	World Trade Center
MEPI	Middle East Partnership Initiative
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
PLO	Liberation Organization of Palestine.
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency
ANAR	Ankara Sosyal Arařtırmalar Merkezi
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolutions
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
UNMOVIC	United Monitoring, Verification and Inspections Commission
MKO	Mujahedin-el-Khalq Organization

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very indebted to my supervisor Lutfullah Karaman for his help in completing this thesis. Without his guidance and encouragement, this study wouldn't have been completed. He showed trust, and patience that led me to be successful. He is a very special scientist, and very productive not only for himself but also for his students. His academic advice and criticism will be a guide for me in the future. Also, I would like to express my thanks to Bülent Aras and his kindness in reviewing this study. He helped guide through this year in my dual adventure of thesis-writing. Their comments were very important. And I owe special thanks to Hızır Murta Köse for his support and encouragement. I would like to express my gratitude, to Gokhan Bacık for responding to me, by email, to my friends who helped me to have material, and my family for their support and great patience. Also I would like to express many thanks to my friends Yasin, Yusuf and Mustafa, who have invested so much in helping me and encouraging me.

INTRODUCTION

The terrorist attacks on the U.S.A. in 2001 were considered to be the political start of the millennium. These should have been taken seriously. After all, these attacks were directed toward the U.S, who had claimed to be the superpower in the past decade. Many different groups had organized attacks of similar kind. The reason why attacks had been organized in this way stems from the fact that countries in the region where terrorists belonged did not act in accordance with their promises.

The realist approach had to accept the governmental structure in the Middle East that was socially non-democratic but bureaucratically democratic. The end of the Cold War period and the effects of globalization have caused the region to be described as a problematic area in terms of politics.

The new millennium requires two major qualities: stability and political legitimacy. Security has soon come to be associated with legitimacy and stability. However, the Middle East was definitely devoid of these two major qualities. The concepts of identity, values, norms and sub-cultures have already started to challenge the realist perception that had been formed during the Cold War. Challenges of that kind tended to increase the quality of democracy in countries known as democratic. Whereas terrorism and violence emerged in countries that were not fully democratic. The violence side of challenges has found expression in September 11. As it was told before, it is quite important that attacks were directed against the U.S.A. The fact that they have managed to attack the most powerful country could as refer to possible dangers to other less powerful countries. What matters was the fact of security.

The basic question was connected with how security should be understood in a free and democratic world. By which instruments would security work? Only a couple of countries within the international community were against the process of democratisation. There has always been a question of whether security could be made to work by democratisation or based on the pretext of democratisation.

Some countries tended to defend the idea of getting democratised, whereas some tended to prefer the idea of democratising. The basic line of argument was connected with the level of performance that a non-democratic country will have showed to get democratised. The September 11 events coincide with the period of time during which international relations were leading to the discussions of that kind. This situation has given a perfect chance to the groups competing with each other, so that; one of them could exercise their ideologies. They were consisted of neo-conservatives. They had the sheer idea that some anti-democratic groups would launch terrorist attacks, and they could as well use the Middle East to their own advantage. The Middle East was such an appropriate place that one group could well claim to organize the world in a new way. Ideological and cultural differences, economic resources within the region taken together placed huge importance on its position. New techniques were necessary to try so that the possibility of an anti-democratic group getting powerful enough to control the region could have been stopped. If a group of this kind was not taken seriously, it could as well mean to the U.S.A. the end of the world. Urgent steps must have been taken at once. The neo-conservatives had the mere idea that it is only America that could stop the danger, because America has the necessary resources to put an end to the danger.

CHAPTER I

IDEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS OF BUSH'S POLICIES

September the 11 has definitely caused American Foreign affairs to undergo a fairly large number of changes. Various critics have expressed countless opinions about it. Some took a change of that kind to be a sign of the end for America; some have apparently approved the idea that it was a symbol of American colonization the rest of the world. Also, a different group did not hesitate to interpret it as the act of American Foreign Affairs, as a result of its being controlled by a single group of neo-cons. Post sept. 11, with the political aim of turning the rest of the world into a servant of America.

Looking at the dynamics of the political change in America, following the September 11, the notions of democracy that were given meaning with the concepts of justice and freedom, and of the policy of unilaterality-that is best understood with the concept of pre-emptive intervention have started to play a key role. A fairly large number of critics, especially those with an anti-war stance, tend to think that America is controlled by the neo-conservativisms. However, looking at the American foreign policy orientation mechanism, it becomes apparent that it is not true.

The American foreign policy-making mechanism is carried out by the following agents in the government: the president, the State Department, the Ministry of Defence, the Secretary of National Security, the vice-President, intelligence agencies, think-tank organizations, the media and the public opinion. The most active organization of foreign affairs is run by the Department of State. Another important

organization, the Ministry of Defence, carries out a close relationship between the army and the government, consisting of a group of civilians that are familiar with the army. The Secretary of National Security is assigned with playing the role of a coordinating between the various foreign policy institutions. The main frame of structure in foreign affairs is constructed by these three segments in the government; however, the final decision is ultimately left to the President. For that very reason, speaking of the American Presidency, Neustadt states that “it is not a business of the amateurs¹.” Ends and means are based on the way human consciousness works, although in the political course of events the ends are based on the means. The effort to understand the foreign policy mechanism described above will surely be enough to help to analyse the course that the American foreign policy has taken since September 11.

The historical course of American foreign policy is based on two main approaches: the realist and the idealist. The realist approach is comprised of a-) classic realists, b) the hawks. The dynamics of the idealist approach goes as far back as Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Paine. Another important figure of this approach in American history is Woodrow Wilson. The new expression that is in use nowadays for this approach is the theory of democratic peace. Anybody that is interested in an approach of that kind would give the most importance to the process of democratising the rest of the world that is based on the concepts of freedom and justice. In fact, this approach is split in two different notions: global idealists and militant Wilsonists. With that in mind, a new group started to flourish amongst the

¹ Richard E. Neustadt, *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents*, (New York: The Free Press, 1990) p. 20

militant Wilsonists in the 1970s, is called the neo-conservatists. As a matter of fact, this new group is nearer to the militant Wilsonists, but they tend to base their notions on the shared values of the global idealists and the militant Wilsonists.

Looking at the structure of the foreign policy in the course of Bush administration, instead of a of decision-making mechanism based on a single group working out theories about issues on the agenda, it is with a three-fold structure that is designed to run the decision-making mechanism. Bush was giving the following explanation for a structure of this kind: “A distinctly American internationalism” that consists of “idealism, without illusions; confidence, without conceit; Realism, in the service of American ideals”.² “Bush’s explanation was quite correct and actually was brilliantly describing *the* think-tank groups’ contribution to the mechanism of decision-making in the course of his administration.

During the Bush administration, the Secretary of the State Department Colin Powell, and the National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, have played the role that is representing the classic realism. Powell is correlated with the notion of ‘exit strategy’ that has long been attributed to him. It is a kind of foreign policy that has been defended by passionate, carefulness and consists of the public members and the allies considering the national benefits in the first place. This strategy would imply that war has been a necessary step to take; however, it has been the last resort. Powell also saw more virtue in multilateral efforts and agreements; he was the only

² William Kristol and Robert Kagan, , ‘George Bush, A Distinctly American Internationalisms’ *The Weekly Standart* / 7 November 29, 1999 , p. 6

member of the Bush team to endorse the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty³. Also, Powell had the idea that the policy of containment would serve their needs best, with which Rice also agrees. And also he believes the idea that American success is that in every instance America matches military force to political objective⁴. Rice, adviser of the Defence, gave voice to her ideas in an article that had appeared before Bush was selected the President which could threaten America in terms of security was not the kind of states that were based on dictatorships but such great powers as Russia and China. Rice's opinion about the act of stopping dangers existing on the integration level was as follows: America's pursuit of the national interest will create conditions that promote freedom, free markets, and peace. It has become pursuit of national interests after World War II to led a more prosperous and democratic world. According to Rice, this could happen again⁵.

Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defence, and Dick Cheney, the vice President, represent the group called the hawk realists in the foreign policy mechanism. What is essential for Rumsfeld is the kind of tactic that would eventually destroy America's enemies and strengthen the America that is playing a key role in the international arena, encouraging the allies to trust America. Rumsfeld's best argument to be powerful is "leaning forward," which is the preferable strategy to be powerful. It means the willingness to be aggressive, to take risks. In a different sense it is to want to go out and kill bad guys⁶. Nevertheless, Rumsfeld would not stop to think about

³ Ivo H. Daalder & James M Lindsay, *America Unbound*, (Washington, Brookings Institution Press, 2003) p. 46

⁴ Colin Powell, "U.S Force: Challenges Aheads" , *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 71, No: 5 (Winter 1992/1993) p. 39

⁵ Condoleezza Rice, 'Campaign 2000: Promoting the National Interest', *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2000, p. 44

⁶ Evan Thomas, "Rumsfeld's War" , *Newsweek*, September 16, 2002

approving of the act of following unilateral policies and ignoring the role of the allies. Rumsfeld thinks that dictatorships would stand a chance of being replaced with democratic governments. In his opinion, the general public perception of security has changed a lot since the end of the Cold War, and America is expected to face a surprising danger in the future. This surprising danger would most likely be caused by the upsetting countries or by terrorists. Cheney would agree with this; besides, it was he who had placed the most emphasis on the fact of terrorism following the September 11.

Paul Wolfowitz, the vice-Secretary of Department of Defense; Douglas Feith, one of the counsellors working for Rumsfeld; Lewis Libby, the assistant of Cheney and John Bolton, one of the counsellors that is working in the State Department comprise the group called neo-conservatists in foreign policy . In their opinions, any country or institution that is ready to accept American values is good but the rest are bad. The main reason why they have an opinion of that kind stems from the following passage:

“It is America’s honour and gift to be a nation of nations, whose people and aspirations touch every nation on the face of the earth. From universal dreams of freedom, equality, and prosperity, America became a country that melded many different cultures, ideas, perspectives, and talents — giving us a rich diversity that continues to make us strong today⁷.”

They would think that the world following the Cold War is full of threats and for that reason, the rest of the world needed to be constructed on the basis of

⁷ Colin L. Powell, “American Internationalism: U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda”, *Electronic journal of the U.S. Department of State*, Volume 8, Number 1, August 2003

American ideals, “because other countries would have managed to do it in a free way⁸.”

As a matter of fact, considering American history in detail, it becomes obvious that discourses of this kind have been frequently put forward by the realists and liberalists. Both groups have put common emphasis on the moral values for the foreign policy. Albeit the neo-conservatists were not holding a strong position in the administration, the fact that they used think tanks and the media to their advantages made them appear important for the orientation of American Foreign Policy. The reason that the neo-conservatists started to play a key role during the Bush administration was because PNAC was founded in 1997, though its beginnings were humble with a permanent staff of only two people.

At the first strategy of Bush administration, the Middle East was not high on the agenda of foreign policy; the top item on the agenda was the units of the region that would be formed in the Middle East following September 11. This idea cannot be defined as a conspiracy theory. The important thing that was meant here is that some notions of foreign policy before September 11 directed the American policies towards different subjects following September 11. When Bush was the candidate for the presidency, he supported the development of an anti-missile defence system, and withdrawal from a number of multilateral treaties⁹. After he became the president of the U.S, the agreement with Russia about anti-ballistic missiles was nullified, and no agreement was reached concerning the China-Kyoto protocol. In fact, approaches of

⁸ Tony Judt, ‘The Way We Live Now’, *The New York Review of Books*, March 27, 2003, p. 5

⁹ Kaufman Purcell, “U.S. Foreign Policy since September 11th and its Impact on Latin America”, *Pent*, 6 September 2002, <http://www.farn.org.ar/informacion/ci/novedades0306.html> (24 December 2003)

this kind were representing the groups of realist-idealists as well as realists in the administration. Actually before September 11 members of the Bush administration, except for the neo-conservatists, did not tend to consider the Middle East and Iraq. In fact, Bush had not hold much hope by September 11 that establishing an independent state of Palestine would provide the Middle East with peace and order. In general, he signalled that if elected, his approach to foreign policy would be less ambitious, and his goals, less grandiose, than those of his predecessor¹⁰.

The occurrence of September 11 caused a large number of changes to happen in American foreign policy and it places the Middle East on the agenda for the first time. Following September 11, rather than pursuing a role in every international conflict or crisis, the Bush administration indicated its intention to reserve US energies for issues that materially affected US interests or else were sufficiently serious to threaten international peace¹¹.

To stop giving explanations for this change to locate the importance of PNAC, a think-tank institution was established in 1997, which would definitely help to clarify the changes of post-September 11. PNAC was established in 1997 based on the belief that the American leadership would be benefiting both America and the rest of the world. A number of critics – politicians, academicians, and editors – gave a press conference in 1997. Participants in this press conference claimed that the foreign policy during the Clinton administration had been unsuccessful and insufficient. Their intent was to change American foreign policy radically. In their

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 10

¹¹ David Hastings Dunn, "Myth motivation and 'Misuderestimations' The Bush Administration and Iraq" *International Affair*, 9/2 2003, p. 280

opinions, in the past, the success of America would be based on the following point: a military that is strong and ready to meet both present and future challenges; a foreign policy that boldly and purposefully promotes American principles abroad; and national leadership that accepts the United States' global responsibilities¹². To make America regain the position of leadership and maintain it, PNAC made the following recommendations:

- to increase defence expenditures significantly if we are to carry out our global responsibilities today and modernize our armed forces for the future;
- to strengthen our ties to democratic allies and to challenge regimes hostile to our interests and values;
- to promote the cause of political and economic freedom abroad;
- to accept responsibility for America's unique role in preserving and extending an international order friendly to our security, our prosperity, and our principles¹³.

What was interesting about the press conference was the fact that it had been signed by such important people as Elliott Abrams, Gary Bauer, William J. Bennett, Jeb Bush, Dick Cheney, Eliot A. Cohen, Midge Decter, Paula Dobriansky, Steve Forbes, Aaron Friedberg, Francis Fukuyama, Frank Gaffney, Fred C. Ikle, Donald Kagan, Zalmay Khalilzad, I. Lewis Libby, Norman Podhoretz, Dan Quayle, Peter W. Rodman, Stephen P. Rosen, Henry S. Rowen, Donald Rumsfeld, Vin Weber, George Weigel, and Paul Wolfowitz. This list would make it obvious to see that the neo-conservatists constitute a larger portion, representing the notions just mentioned above.

¹² Statement of purpose, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>. (9 December 2003)

¹³ Ibid.

Members of PNAC sent a letter to the president Clinton in 1998 saying that: “We are writing to you because we are convinced that current American policy toward Iraq is not succeeding”, and they continued as: “we may soon face a threat in the Middle East more serious than any we have known since the end of the Cold War¹⁴”. Following the act of putting forth their opinions, they described the basic dynamics of the new policy that Clinton should have had to follow as: “We urge you to articulate this aim” and “its Administration's attention to implementing a strategy for removing Saddam's regime from power”¹⁵ This will require cooperation between diplomatic, political and military efforts. The group consisting of a couple of different names such as Newt Gingrich and Trent Lott – the continuation of the three-fold structure still available - sent the next letter as well. U.S. policy should have as its explicit goal removing Saddam Hussein's regime from power and establishing a peaceful and democratic Iraq in its place. Recognizing this goal will not be achieved easily. But the alternative is to leave the initiative to Saddam, who will continue to strengthen his position at home and in the region¹⁶. Members of PNAC also sent another letter to the president for Milosevic¹⁷.

Members of PNAC gave another press conference about the Taiwan defence accompanying with Heritage in 1999. The letter made the following point:

“The United States should also make clear that while it is prepared to accept any resolution regarding Taiwan's future status to which both sides voluntarily agree, the future of Taiwan must reflect the will of the people of Taiwan as expressed through their duly elected government. If the people of Taiwan do not want to be united with the

¹⁴Letter to President Clinton on Iraq, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Letter to Ginrich and Lott on Iraq, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>

¹⁷ Letter to the Milosevic <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>

mainland until China becomes a democracy, the United States has a moral obligation and strategic imperative to honour that determination¹⁸.

And they concluded that they should not co-operate with Taiwan. All of these three letters were placing importance on finding a way to solve problems taking democratic and free approaches to them. Opinions of this kind did not change a lot when Bush came to power.

Members of PNAC circulated a new letter following September 11, saying that they approved of the new policies of the Bush administration. To agree with the Secretary of State that U.S. policy must aim not only at finding the people responsible for this incident, but must also target those “other groups out there that mean us no good” and “that have conducted attacks previously against U.S. personnel, U.S. interests and our allies”¹⁹. What was interesting about this letter was the fact that they gave advice under five headlines. They approved of the military operation on Afghanistan that was aimed at destroying Usame Bin Laden and Taliban. They agree with Secretary of State Powell’s recent statement regarding Saddam Hussein as “one of the leading terrorists on the surface of the Earth.”

It may be “that the Iraqi government provided assistance in some form to the recent attack on the United States²⁰”, and this region has the ability of producing new Saddam Hussains. They supported the idea of dethroning Saddam for the good of Iraq, giving support to the opposing groups in Iraq and approved of the military operation. With this in mind, they tended to consider Hezbollah as a terrorist group; propagating

¹⁸Statement on the Defense of Taiwan,

<http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>

¹⁹ Statement of Principle, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>

²⁰ Letter to Bush, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/Bushletter.htm>

administration should demand that Iran and Syria immediately cease all military, financial, and political support for Hezbollah and its operations. Should Iran and Syria refuse to comply, the administration should consider appropriate measures of retaliation against these known state sponsors of terrorism²¹. They were in the opinion that Israel is a country that has been fighting against terrorism in pursuit of protecting democracy, and additionally unless Palestinians did not put an end to giving support to terrorist groups, they would better be left without help. Finally, however much the military expenditures would cost to stop terrorism existing, it would not matter much.

Members of PNAC distributed a report of strategy designed for reconstruction of American defence system in 2000. In terms of the information in this report, the conclusion had been reached that the world after the 1990s had notions different than the world during the Cold War period had had.

	Cold War	21st Century
Security system	Bipolar	Unipolar
Strategic goal	Contain Soviet Union	Preserve <i>Pax Americana</i>
Main military mission(s)	Deter Soviet expansionism	Secure and expand zones of democratic peace; deter rise of new great-power competitor; defend key regions; exploit transformation of war
Main military threat(s)	Potential global war across many theaters	Potential theater wars spread across globe
Focus of strategic competition	Europe	East Asia

²¹ Ibid.

During the cold war security system was bipolar. Whereas, in the new millennium the system was unipolar²².

The strategic goal in the former period was to contain Soviet Union, while the goal is to preserve Pax Americana in the new millennium. On the other hand, the main military mission was to deter Soviet expansionism during the cold war, whereas to secure and expand zones of democratic peace, deter rise of new great-power competitor, defend key regions and exploit transformation of war was the main military mission in the new millennium. During the cold war main military threat was potential global war across many theatres, but potential global wars spread across the globe in the new millennium according to neo- conservatist group in PNAC. The focus of strategies competition was on Europe during the cold war, while it has been on East Asia in the new millennium.

Members of PNAC had been happy about the successful era of America in the last century: “This is no paradox; it is the inevitable consequence of the failure to match military means to geopolitical ends²³.” In their opinions, the basic problem facing the USA today was the question of how to maintain the international security: today the task is to preserve an international security environment conducive to American interests and ideals. After September 11 the task is to secure and expand “the zone of democratic peace” and to preserve international security conducive to American interests and ideals. And a statement over to new great power competitors

²² Rebuilding American Defence,
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>

²³ Ibid. ,p. 1

to deter them, and the defend key is regions of Europe, East Asia, and preserve American pre-eminence through the developing technology war transformation²⁴”. On the other hand, while there is nowadays an increased number of more tense dangers facing America than they had been during the Cold War period but at the same time maintaining its positions of being a leader, America spends less than 3 percent of its gross domestic product on national defence, less than at any time since before World War II – in other words, since before the United States established itself as the world’s leading power²⁵. To speak about it more precisely, it would not today be imaginable for America to act the way that a country with a strong position of leadership would normally have acted. Cutting down on the military expenditures had caused a lot of problems. Across all services, units are reporting degraded readiness, spare parts and personnel shortages, postponed and simplified training regimens, and many other problems. Army divisions were given a “C-4” rating, (It has been never seen anymore)²⁶. However, such anti-American countries as Iran, Iraq and North Korea were rushing to develop ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons as a deterrent to American intervention in regions they seek to dominate²⁷. The report was saying that it would not be possible to make a particular region in the world more secure and safer without needing the leadership of the USA. The most obvious evidences of a claim of this kind were, of course, the Bosnian and Gulf (Kuwaiti) wars.

²⁴ Ibid. , pp. 3-4

²⁵ Ibid. , p. 5

²⁶ Ibid. , p 4

²⁷ Ibid. , pp. 5-6

PNAC was most active in establishing strong relationships with different institutions of think-tank and with the media. The other institutions that it was connected with were closely linked with the administration. Members of PNAC were reluctant to spread the power of America all around the world but they were not sure enough to decide how to get the process started. September 11 gave them a chance to make a start. This had better be taken as the sign of interpreting the course of events successfully rather than as a conspiracy theory. What would definitely stop us thinking of it as a conspiracy theory would be the fact that American history has had similar policies.

Members of PNAC in the Bush administration have been comprised of conservatives. On the other side are the conservative's internationalists. They stand ready to employ American influence to help in shaping a stable world order and promote fundamental American principles. Internationalists regard military force as an instrument of foreign policy to be called upon when necessary to achieve our goals²⁸. Bush has had similar opinions; he argued about the Clinton administration that the army had lost its power, for instance. He thought that the American armed forces have an irreplaceable role in the world. "They give confidence to our allies; deter the aggression of our enemies; and allow our nation to shape a stable peace" for the sake of people "undermined by back-to-back deployments, poor pay, shortages of spare parts and equipment, and rapidly declining readiness²⁹". However, the armed forces must be used to the advantage of humanity. As Lincoln had noted, the

²⁸ Robert Kagan and William Kristol, *Present Dangers*, (California, Encounter Books, 2000) p. 23

²⁹ George W. Bush, "A Period of Consequences", *The Citadel*,
http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/program/news99/92399_defense.htm

principles expressed by “the Declaration gave liberty not alone to the people of this country but home to world for all future time³⁰.”

A group in the PNAC Members whom they called the Neo-Conservatists tended to think of the process of globalization as a situation in which there is a clear sense, of course, in which nations today, - especially those in the zone of order – are increasingly connected in the realms of economics, mass communications, and culture. “Military power has not become globalized, but rather more concentrated in one nation³¹”. According to neo-conservatists America has “the command of its own fortunes”. It would be tragic indeed if we did not use this extraordinary historical moment to promote the ideas at the heart of our national enterprise and, by so doing, take the steps that will ensure stability and the steady growth of freedom throughout the world³².

On the other side, the Neo-Conservatists (A Group in PNAC) approved of the notion of principled democracy for the foreign policy. Paul Wolfowitz, a member of this group, for instance thought of: 1) Strengthening the liberal democratic- free market consensus, including the global free-trade regime, with the goal of making the status quo attractive to all comers to the extent possible, 2) Maintaining and strengthening the alliance structure of the liberal democratic states, including NATO, and the bilateral alliance the U.S has in other parts of the world. 3-) Dealing effectively with the rogue states and minor disturbers of the international order. 4)

³⁰Kagan and Kristol, op. cit. p. 31

³¹ Ibid. , p. 41

³² Ibid. , p. 35

Maintaining the U.S leadership role including its military pre-eminence. This is a necessary underpinning of the global democratic consensus³³.

In sum, the philosophy behind the American foreign policy which gets the PNAC's mentality as a reference. following September 11 is that it is tempting for any superpower to use its might in pursuit of purely national goals; this temptation is especially strong for the people of the United States. International Prosperity, the excitement of new technologies, burgeoning world trade, the spread of American free market ideals and democratic values around the global – all of these might make it easy for Americans to regard their nation's status as the last superpower as a virtual licence to pursue pure self-interest at every turn³⁴.

1-1 American National Strategy after the Bush Administration

September 11 led the present administration to change American foreign policy. The attitude of the Bush administration towards September 11 represents a reversal of, or at least a dramatic departure from, the position he himself took during the 2000 election campaign³⁵. Following September 11, The American Foreign Policy was defined as the purpose of preserving liberty: “Neither protectionist nor expansionist, American internationalism seeks to preserve liberty and to promote opportunity, human dignity, freedom, prosperity, and peace, both at home and abroad³⁶”, and American internationalism will transform idealism to realism by this way.

³³ Ibid. , p. 334

³⁴ Richard Butler, *Saddam Defiant*, (London, Weindenfeld&Nicolson,2000)p. 256

³⁵ Edward Rhodes, “The Imperial Logic of Bush's Liberal Agenda”, *Survival*, 2003, 45: 131-154, p. 140

³⁶ Kim R. Holmes, “American Unternationalism”, *U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda*, August 2003, p. ,10

The general perception of the American Foreign Policy took on a new shape following September 11. Instead of big-scale countries, terrorist groups operating in a lot of countries and additionally 'bandit states' that have helped the terrorist groups have been centred around for the American Foreign Policy and the national definition of security³⁷. However, the most important change has been the new way that terrorism was reflected on the American Foreign Policy. The fact of terrorism was not considered to be a typical threat to America. Bush was saying once: "these terrorists kill not merely to end lives, but to disrupt and end a way of life"³⁸.

This was meant to be a war of different systems, not a war of civilizations. Attacks on America were meant to be a war against the system. The reason why the new administration was led to think that way was that American vulnerability was in some ways the world's vulnerability. "If such horror could befall the sole remaining superpower, then no one is immune"³⁹. In American view, a nation is secure while it is not in danger of having to "sacrifice core values if it wishes to avoid war, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war"⁴⁰. In an article, Robert Kagan and Willian Kristol attempted to describe the danger facing America as: It has no name. It is not to be found in any single strategic adversary. It does not fit neatly under the heading of "international terrorism" or "rogue state" "or ethnic"...danger is about our role in the world⁴¹. The new kind of danger facing America was a threat to the new world order actually. Bush was stating that: "People have seen their kind

³⁷ Hakan Tunç, *Amerikanın Irak Savaşı*, (Istanbul: Harmony Publishing., 2004,) p. 80

³⁸ George W. Bush, "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People", Washington, D.C (September 20,2001(www.whitehouse.gov/news/reaalse/2001/09/20010920-8.htm).

³⁹ Shibley Telhami, *The Stakes: Aamerica in theMmiddle East*, (Cambridge: Westview Press, 2004). P.

6

⁴⁰ David Lake, *American Foreign Policy in its Security*, (Princeton: Princeton university Pres, 1999)

p. 20

⁴¹ Kagan and Kristol, op, cit. , p. 4

before” (might see in the future) “by abandoning every value except the will to power-they follow in the path of fascism, and Nazism, and totalitarianism”⁴².

A new need arose to think over the notions of order, security, transformation and getting to be free. What led the administration to have an opinion of this kind was the sheer fact that attacks were aimed at the USA, representing the system. A global system of shared power may also be justifiable only if America is the dominant or senior partner, in order for benevolence to remain the underlying force in world affairs⁴³. The administration strongly held the belief that America should be paying a fairly great deal of attention to the matter at hand and should respond actively. Because America is great power and great power measures the risks to recall the idiom “when you have a hammer, all problems start to look like nails⁴⁴.” A new responsibility was starting to face America: it had fallen to the United States not only to win the war against Germany and Japan, but to create both “a vital international economy” and “an international moral order” that would together spread American political and economic principles- and in the process avoid the catastrophe of a third world war⁴⁵.

And eventually Bush had defined the parameters of his own administration: and this parameters helps us to redefine the worlds new shape, Bush's message to the world, first delivered on September 20, 2001, was this: "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists." Either you stand with civilization and good (us), or with

⁴² George W. Bush, op. cit. , September 20, 2001

⁴³ Steven Scholossstein, *The End of American Century*, (Chicago: Congdon & Weed, Inc, 1989,) p. 462

⁴⁴ Robert Kagan, of *Paradise and Power*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003) p. 27

⁴⁵ Kagan and Kristol, op. cit. , p. 10

barbarism and evil (them). And to those nations that choose wrongly, beware”⁴⁶. A statement of that kind was placing a huge amount of importance on a strong fact: the world had been divided into two different poles – the zone of order and the zone of turbulence. The zone of order was representing the west and democratic countries. Zone of war or anarchic is represented by old colonized region. Bush’s explanations indicated that the new American Foreign Policy would be given a new shape in accordance with America’s interests and principles, since September 11 had been aimed at destroying the system. Above all else, the events of 11 September 2001 dramatically highlighted the vulnerability of the United States and the other Western democracies to violent attack from what used to be called the Third World. As a number of observers pointed out, this was the first direct violent attack on the territory of the West from the Islamic world since the siege of Vienna in 1683⁴⁷.

According to the way that the Bush Administration was willing to think, “warlike intervention by the civilized powers,” “would contribute directly to the peace of the world”⁴⁸. The zone of peace represented the western democratic countries. Zone of War or anarchic is represented by old colonized region. Most political scientists believed that the colonized regions – the “dark” places, the “uncivilized”, and the “barbaric” areas of the world- did not belong to the society of states”⁴⁹. As a matter of fact, the problem was political. Martin Wight, for instance, was reporting: “the questions of relations with barbarians were a political problem

⁴⁶ Michael Hirsh, “Bush and the World”, *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2002, p. 18

⁴⁷ Steve Simon and Daniel Benjamin, “America and the New Terrorism”, *Survival*, Vol. 42, No. 1, Spring 2000, p. 66

⁴⁸ Kagan and Kristol, op. cit. , p. 23

⁴⁹ Brian C. Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998,) p. 125

forming a bridge between international relations and colonial administrations”⁵⁰. Anything had been meant to stop a region of disorder continuing to exist and to replace it with order as such, and to introduce peace, order and justice to the regions of that kind so that they could get involved in the process by which the system works. The President Bush made it clear saying:

Our Nation’s cause has always been larger than our Nation’s defence. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace, a peace that favours liberty. We will defend the peace against the threats from terrorists and tyrants. And we will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent.... Building this just peace is ... America’s duty.⁵¹

The present administration was not willing to consider the order of the world as unipolar. Paul Wolfowitz, for instance, had the following idea: Moreover, if today’s world is indeed “unipolar “, it is not so much because the United States- in that much-overworked phrase, “the sole remaining superpower”- can dominate other in the way that Rome, for example, dominated its world for centuries. It stems more from the fact that all of the economically powerful countries in the world are America’s allies.⁵²

The United States is the leader and the dominant member of that alliance, but it is “an alliance of democratic countries, not a collection of satellites responding without questioning a superpower’s will”⁵³. However, the new American administration insisted that they should not ignore the fact that: Scholar and policy makers tend to cite historical examples to show “how failure to maintain adequate

⁵⁰ Martin Wight, *International Theory: The Three Traditions*, (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1992), p. 50

⁵¹ R. Holmes, op. cit. , p. 5

⁵² <http://www.yale.edu/strattech/92dpg.html>

⁵³ Kagan and Kristol, op. cit. , p. 317

armed forces strength has led to an aggressive war”⁵⁴. Past experiences have shown that: And one of the most obvious examples of this is the fact that Saudi Arabia had sent forth a group of soldiers following the invasion of Iraq. Saudi Arabia rejected the elder president Bush’s offer to send a fighter squadron to help defend the kingdom immediately after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. “Only after Defence Cheney travelled to Riyadh” and assured King “Fadh that the administration would send hundreds of thousands of U.S troops. The lesson was clear: if America leads, others will follow”⁵⁵.

Strategies concerning the national security used to be based on national values. However, the kind of strategies that America has developed since September 11 are based on the world. The document that was published in 2002 regarding strategies of different kinds meant, by and large, a systematic plan. According to this document:

The great struggles of the twentieth century between liberty and totalitarianism ended with a decisive victory for the forces of freedom. In the twenty-first century, only nations that share a commitment to protecting basic human rights and guaranteeing political and economic freedom will be able to unleash the potential of their people and assure their future prosperity⁵⁶.

In sum, the present American policy has its origins to the interventionism of Presidents William McKinley and Teddy Roosevelt and more recently to the interventionism and rollback strategy of the Reagan administration. Conservative internationalism stands firmly behind the nation-state as the main actor in global

⁵⁴ Michael D. Wallace, “Armaments and Escalation: Two Competing Hypotheses”, *International Studies Quarterly*, 26. (March 1982), pp. 45 (37-56)

⁵⁵ Ivo H. Daalder and James M Lindsay, *America Unbound*. (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2003) p. 44

⁵⁶ The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. 2002, Washington, D.C, September 2002. www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.Pdf;

affairs and rejects notions that globalization and multidimensional international engagement are creating new foundations for multilateral governance⁵⁷.

America should have been less vulnerable and more resistant to the new danger, because America has now meant the heart of democracy and democracies. Which throughout history have been the effective targets of terrorist attacks, because democratic systems must “play by the rules” and thus cannot respond in comparable fashion to terrorist attacks. A quick look at terrorism in a democratic system such as the United States offers insights into patterns of terrorism and response characteristic of many democracies today⁵⁸. Up to this point, it is tried to describe the way that the new administration tended to regard the foreign policy. From now on, the study will focus on the technique of the new administration for being successful in the foreign policy and on the reasons given for it.

1-1-1 Unilateralism

In terms of realist philosophy, with its attendant balance-of-power politics, great power, deterrence, containment are no longer applicable in a unipolar world characterized by major power imbalances between the United States and all other nations⁵⁹. The neo-conservativists did not have different opinions about it. In their opinions, as long as leadership is shared, “very little will happen because no one actor will be willing to shoulder the costs and the responsibilities”⁶⁰.

⁵⁷ Tom Barry, “Bush Administration is Not Isolationist”, *Common Dreams*, July 20, 2001, <http://www.commondreams.org/views01/0720-05.htm>.

⁵⁸ Cindy C. Combs, *Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century*, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2003) p. 9

⁵⁹ Barry, Op. cit. , Bush Administration is Not Isolationist

⁶⁰ Robert Jervis, “Understanding the Bush Doctrine”, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol: 118. No: 3, 2003 p. , 375

They gave the examples of Bosnia and Yugoslavia for it. In the Bush doctrine, there are no universal norms or rules governing all states. “On the contrary, order can be maintained only if the dominant power behaves quite differently from the others”⁶¹. In stressing that the United States is building coalitions in the plural rather than an alliance (the mission determines the coalition, in Rumsfeld’s phrase), American leaders “have made it clear that they will forego the participation of any particular country rather than compromise”⁶². The attitude of America towards the neo-conservativists was not strange actually; it is possible to see attitudes of that kind having been spread at different points in history. It is possible to notice a similar attitude even recently. When in the wake of the overthrow of Saddam, Chirac declares: “We are no longer in an era where one or two countries control the fate of another country,” he describes the world as he would like it to be, not as it is⁶³.

Wolfowitz had once stated in a speech that: “America intends to keep, military strengths beyond challenge—thereby making the destabilizing arms races of other eras pointless, and limiting rivalries to pursuits of peace”⁶⁴.” What Wolfowitz said is not a simple statement. Reading between the lines, it gets obvious that a sentence of that kind is intended to organize the American army in a way that would ultimately stop any nation resisting to America. America had already indicated in a number of ways that it could be made true. The US initiated the 1999 Balkan War under the aegis of NATO, without reference to the United Nations Security Council. The Clinton administration had already flouted the UN when it launched a bombing

⁶¹ Jervis, op. cit., p. 378

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Karen DeYoung, “Chirac Moves To Repair United States Ties.” *Washington Post*, 16 April 2003.

⁶⁴ Graduation Exercise,” *New York Times*, 8 March 1992

campaign against Iraq in December 1998 with the support of Britain and Kuwait. Madeleine Albright, saying: "If we have to use force, it is because we are America. We stand all. We see farther into the future"⁶⁵."

A few years ago, this mechanism was triggered when IAEA inspectors detected possible diversion being undertaken by North Korea in conjunction with one to its nuclear reactors. The established procedures were followed, leading to a report by the Board of Governors to the Security Council. But the Security Council refused to act because one permanent member, China, she indicated that she would veto any such action on the basis of her close relationship with North Korea⁶⁶.

At present the United States faces no global rival. America's grand strategy should aim to preserve and extend this advantageous position as far into the future as possible. Up to now, they have been deterred by the capability and global presence of American military power⁶⁷.

1-1-2 Regime Change, Democracy and Emancipation

Another political approach that the Bush administration has tended to take is to take action to change the regime. The first step came with the substantial extension of war aims announced by Bush in his State of the Union address on 29 January 2002. Reaffirming that their war on terror, Bush announced that, "in addition to directly attacking terrorist networks, our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of

⁶⁵ C Rice, "Campaign 2000--Promoting the National Interest", *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2000 (online edition), www.foreignpolicy2000.org

⁶⁶ Butler, op. cit. , p. 250

⁶⁷ Project for the New American Century, "Rebuilding America's Defences" (September 2000), www.newamericancentury.org, p1.)

mass destruction, and named Iran, Iraq and North Korea as an axis of evil⁶⁸.” Cheney was able to express the reason why the regime should be changed by saying: “we will work to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with chemical, biological or nuclear weapons” or let “them to provide those weapons to terrorists⁶⁹”.

The question that we started to ask ourselves following such explanations above is as to whether America has friendly relationships with the kind of countries that America has nowadays insisted to make changes about their regimes, and as to why America gave support to totalitarian countries of that kind. Or was the only important thing economic-based co-operation? Of course not. The United States has in the “past worked with right-wing dictatorships as bulwark against communist aggression or against radical Muslim Fundamental fundamentalism”⁷⁰. Looking at the changes about the system, it is logical to conclude that America should not have co-operated with countries of this kind. The sheer reason is that they have permanently been giving help to the terrorist groups. The strategic motive in regime changes implies a fairly clear restraint pattern: no weapon technology should fall into the hands of a potential enemy or be useful later against the supplier’s regional interests⁷¹. On the other hand, what is true with regard to the containment of Iraq is also the case with regard to America’s towards the Middle East as a whole.

⁶⁸ ‘The President’s State of the Union Address’, 29 January 2002, www.whitehouse.gov

⁶⁹ Ritz Carlton “Remarks by the Vice President to the Council on Foreign Relations” February 15, 2002, , Washington, DC, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/vicepresident/news-speeches/speeches/vp20020215.html>,

⁷⁰ Kagan and Kristol, op. cit. , p. 17

⁷¹ Brzoska and Pearson , op. cit. , pp. 1-2

America's traditional tolerance of illiberal regimes is seen to have failed to protect the US from radical Islam⁷².

The National Security Strategy of the U.S. says that:

The great struggles of the twentieth century between liberty and totalitarianism ended with a decisive victory for the forces of freedom—and a single sustainable model for national success: freedom, democracy, and free enterprise.”... “make the world not just safer but better,”.. “path [that] is not America's alone. It is open to all⁷³.”

The reason that America tended to interpret the process of democratization this way stems from the perception that the foreign policy is based on the interior policy. The act of a State oppressing the public would mean putting an end to its relationships with the international arena.

Before the war, Bush declared that when Saddam was overthrown other regimes support for terror will be tolerated. “Without this outside support for terrorism, Palestinians who are working for democracy will be in a better position to choose leaders who strive for peace⁷⁴” he said. Looked from this perspective, new administration aim or goal to believe the idea of democracy promote the values of democracy which creating individual liberties within the social constrains of societies will provide the political equality of human development⁷⁵.

1-1-3 Preventive War

⁷² Dunn, op. cit. , p. 292

⁷³ NSS, op. cit. , p. 5

⁷⁴ Philip Gordon, “Bush's Middle East Vision,” *Survival* 45 (Spring 2003), pp. 155–165.

⁷⁵ Adel Safty, *Democracy and Government* (Istanbul: BUP 2003) pp. 238-243-255

In the past century America's strategy was like the cold war strategy of deterrence and containment. Sometimes she uses them, but the new problems cause to find different strategies. Deterrence, which is defined as the retaliation threat against nations, cannot be used against the terrorist networks because they have no nations or citizenship. Also containment can't be used because the dictators who have weapons of destruction can give the weapons by using the missiles or provide to terrorist allies secretly. Wesley Clark also tried to explain the meaning and its importance in here:

Nations and alliances should move early to deal with crises while they are still ambiguous and can be dealt with more easily, for delay raises both the costs and risks. Early action is the objective to which statesmen and military leaders should resort⁷⁶.

Bush's opinions about this subject are as follows: "We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best". In his opinion, If America wait for threats" (or danger) to entirely materialise, America will have been waited for the pines. But the war on terror will not be won on the defensive. "We must take the battle to the enemy, disrupt his plans, and confront the worst threats before they emerge⁷⁷."

Robert Cooper, a career British diplomat who is now a senior European Union official, writes in *The Breaking of Nations* that ,

the War of the Spanish Succession, was a preventative war. No one attacked Britain; but if Britain had allowed the two countries to unite it would by then have been unable to deal with an attack from the resulting superpower⁷⁸."

⁷⁶ Max Boot, "The Bush Doctrine Lives", *The Weekly Standard*, 02/16/2004, Volume 9, Issue 22

⁷⁷ 'Remarks by the President at the Exercise of the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York', 1 June 2002, www.whitehouse.gov

⁷⁸ Max Boot, *The Bush Doctrine Lives*, *The Weekly Standard*, 02/16/2004, Volume 009, Issue 22

The new administration thought that. "In the new world, the only path to peace and security is the path of action" and "the greater is the risk of inaction"⁷⁹. Deterrence is largely a decision level theory that considers short-term factors as critical in war initiation and war prevention. The mainstream deterrence theory contends that the possession and deployment of adequate weapons (whether conventional or nuclear) and the credible communication of their use would deter an aggressor from challenging the status quo military⁸⁰. Therefore,

Bush Doctrine is not entirely a bad thing. It's not only our friends who are worried. So are our enemies. This helps explain Muammar Qaddafi's sudden willingness to give up his WMD arsenal, lest he too wind up in a spider hole trying to evade Delta Force. This may also explain the Iranian mullahs' willingness to accept greater international scrutiny of their nuclear program⁸¹.

The fear of terrorism that poses a danger to the fabric of society nowadays is quite different: "These tactics are not protectionist. They are strategic. Strategy is the only language" of "challenge to America is becoming clear". "It was so once. It can be so again"⁸². The kind of tactics that the terrorists were trying was not typical for wars; they preferred to try different tactics and it has become obvious enough to decide what to do. Preventive strategies must have been made use of: "Abandoning the nuclear deterrent might very well raise the attractions of conventional war to an

⁷⁹ "President's Words," "Free People Will Keep the Peace of the World," *New York Times*, 27 February 2003

⁸⁰ T.V. Paul, *Asymmetric conflict: War Initiation by Weaker Powers*. (Cambridge: University Press, 1994,) p. 7

⁸¹ Max Boot, "The Bush Doctrine Lives", *The Weekly Standard*, 02/16/2004, Volume 009, Issue 22

⁸² Steven Schollosstein, *The End of American Century*, (Chicago: Congdon&Weed, Inc, 1989)pp. 466-74-79

aggressor”. If the odds of war go up a lot, and the degree “damage limitation” improves only moderately, the switch is a bad bargain”⁸³.

Authoritarian governments are expected to aggress against others if given the power and the opportunity. By this reasoning, democracies must be eternally vigilant against them, and may even sometimes feel the need *to* “engage in pre-emptive or preventive (defensively motivated) war against them⁸⁴”. Preventive wars were not a new tactic in the course of historical events; it has been tried over and over again. The preventive strategy has been supported by the doctrine of right war in terms of international laws, and been thought to have originated from the thoughts of Hugo Grotius:

It will awful to kill him who is preparing to kill. “ In a similar vein Thomas More asserted, “If any foreign prince takes up arms and prepares to invade their land, they immediately attack him in full force outside their own borders. “In America, Elihu Root, who proclaimed in 1914 “the right of every sovereign state to protect itself by preventing a condition of affairs in which it will be too late to protect itself⁸⁵”.

Israel had tried that tactic in Israel’s war against Palestine in 1967. The Bush administration held the belief that this kind of tactic would be necessary to try if they wanted to win the war against terrorism. According to Boot, many critics and even some supporters of the Bush administration have fostered the illusion that pre-emption means large-scale *military* actions on the model of Afghanistan or Iraq period⁸⁶. And, that was wrong because the pre-emption strategy was not only

⁸³ Bruss Russet, *Controlling the Sword: The Democratic Governance of National Security*, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1990), p. 68

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* , p. 129-30

⁸⁵ Lawrence F. Kaplan, William Kristol, *The WAR On Iraq*, (California: Encounter Books, 2003) p.

85

⁸⁶ Max Boot, *The Bush Doctrine Lives*, *The Weekly standard*, 02/16/2004, Volume 009, Issue 22 p. 2

military, it also could put away all the economic, politic and sociological risks by using again economic, politic, sociological pre-emption strategy before they occur.

1-1-4 Weapons of Mass Destruction

In the new millennium, one of the events that have the biggest effect is the reflection that Soviet Union left behind after its collapse. The security of the large arsenal of nuclear materials and of chemical and biological materials in the former Soviet Union is unclear. Current international and national controls are inadequate. "A consequence of the end of cold war has been the fragmentation of the countries"⁸⁷. Nowadays some countries are excessively arming. If you prepare for war you will get war. Is the preparation for war, as expressed in the accumulation of weapons or arms races, a major factor in the occurrence and exacerbation of wars⁸⁸.

The weak states used to use weapons of that kind to their own advantage and that would never cause any problem. States of this kind made use of weapons for a number of reasons: a-) to justify their own methods, b-) to pose a danger to other countries. They could have given weapons to the terrorist groups even if they had not been able to use them, which was the most dangerous thing. Cheney put this fact into the following words: What if Osama bin Laden had a nuclear bomb, or biological weapons? "As unfathomable as this was, it could have been so much worse if they had weapons of mass destruction," he told an aide⁸⁹.

⁸⁷ Fred Halliday, *Two Hours that Shook the World*, (London: Saqi Books 2002) p . 178

⁸⁸ Pearson, op. cit. , p. 4

⁸⁹ Suzanne Goldenberg and Julian Borger in Washington, "How Cheney's revelation led towards the point of no return," *The Guardian* ,Friday January 17, 2003,

The president Bush didn't have a different idea: As Bush said in his West Point address of 1 June 2002:

Today our enemies see weapons of mass destruction as weapons of choice. For rogue states these weapons are tools of intimidation and military aggression against their neighbours. These weapons may also allow these states to attempt to blackmail the U.S. and our allies to prevent us from deterring or repelling the aggressive behaviour of rogue states. Such states also see these weapons as their best means of overcoming the conventional superiority of the U.S.⁹⁰

America was withdrawing its support from some international agreements on the grounds considering the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty does nothing to gain these goals, In the eyes of neo-conservatist; it does not stop proliferation, especially to renegade regimes... it offers only words and false hopes and high intentions with no guarantees whatever. They fight against the spread of nuclear weapons, but they could not think of the way to lead them away with unwise treaties⁹¹.

Speaking of these agreements, Bush was trying to express that:

it does not recognize the present or point us to the future. It enshrines the past. No treaty that prevents us from addressing today's threats, that prohibits us from pursuing promising technology to defend ourselves, our friends and our allies, is in our interests or in the interests of world peace⁹².

1-1-5 Terrorism

The main actors that are part of the international system have by and large, made definitions of terrorism, and the process of defining terrorism in a particular

⁹⁰ White House, *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction* (Washington,DC: December 2002)

⁹¹ Kristol, 'Kagan, op. cit., "George Bush: A Distinctly American. Internationalism"

⁹² Bush Calls for Nuclear Cuts, Missile Defence Development, Dispatches High Level Delegation to Consult with Allies, 01 May 2001, <http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/arms/stories/01050177.htm>

way serves them well. Defining terrorism works in connection with the amount of importance that they place on terrorism.

In the general sense of the word, terrorism defined as a synthesis of war and threat, a dramatization of the most proscribed kind of violence - that which is perpetrated on innocent victims - played before an audience in the hope of creating a mood of fear, for political purposes⁹³. According to David Fromkin, an ordinary murderer who kills someone because he wants that particular individual to be dead, but a "terrorist will shoot somebody even though it is a matter of complete indifference to him whether that person lives or dies"⁹⁴. Frederick Hacker suggested three categories of persons who commit terrorism: "crazies, criminals, and crusaders. Crusaders, according to Hacker, seek not personal gain, but prestige and power for a collective cause" in Hacker's assessment⁹⁵

Modern terrorists are, for the most part, fanatics whose sense of reality is distorted. They operate under the assumptions that they, and alone, know the truth and are therefore the sole arbiters of what is right and what is wrong. They believe "themselves to be moralists, to whom ordinary law does not apply, because immoral persons create the law in existence for immoral purposes"⁹⁶. The war in Afghanistan profoundly affected Bin Laden, in what he viewed as a spiritual rather than a political or military context. In an interview with CNN, he stated: "

I have benefited so greatly from the jihad in Afghanistan that it would be impossible for me to gain such a benefit from any other

⁹³ Combs, op .cit. , p. 10

⁹⁴ David Fromkin, "The Strategy of Terror", *Foreign Affairs* , 53(july1975)p. 25

⁹⁵ Frederick J. Hacker, "*Crusader, Criminals, Craizes: Terror and Terrorism in Our Time* (New York: Norton,1976) pp. 8-9

⁹⁶ Combs, op. cit. , p. 61

chance... What we benefited from most was [that] the glory and myth of the superpower was destroyed not only in my mind, but also in [the minds] of all *Muslims*⁹⁷.

Consider the case with the individual who commits terrorism as a member of a fanatic religious group, as a rule offering their own version of reality, as well as a promise of reward for conformity to the norms of that reality has passed away⁹⁸. The following statements of Bush showed the extent to which the administration was decisive to put an end to terrorism:

Today, we have launched the first strike on the financial foundation of the global terror network We will direct every resource at our command to win the war against terrorists; every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence. We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them against each other, rout them out of their safe hiding places, and bring them to justice⁹⁹.

While U.S. policies, citizens and interests are prime targets for international terrorism in 2000, approximately 47% of all terrorist incidents worldwide were committed against U.S. citizens or property according to the U.S. Department of State — the vast majority of those acts took place on foreign soil¹⁰⁰.

As a result, the new administration had their way to deal with terrorism, terrorists and to react to them. The Bush administration thought that terrorist attacks were treated as crimes rather than acts of war¹⁰¹. However, perception of this kind would, in Cheney's opinion, leads to a different discussion. It encouraged people like

⁹⁷ "Bin Laden Interview With Peter Bergen and Peter Annett", May 1997, CNN.

⁹⁸ Combs, op.cit. , p. 62

⁹⁹ Jimmy Gurulé, "The Global Effort to Stop Terrorist Financing," *U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda*, Vo: 8, No:1, August 2003 p. 21

¹⁰⁰ Raphael F. Perl, "Updated September 12, 2001, Terrorism, the Future, and U.S. Foreign Policy", *CRS Order Code* , IB95112, Issue Brief for Congress

¹⁰¹ Daalder and Lindsay, op. cit. , p. 82

Osama bin Laden, as I say, to launch repeated strikes against the United States, and “our people overseas and here at home, with the view that he could, in fact, do so with impunity and now he knows different”¹⁰². Some tended to think that the Bush strategy had already come to an end following the war against Afghanistan. But this was not the case. In other words, many expected that the focus has now shifted from overt military operations to more covert law enforcement activities¹⁰³.

1-2 Globalization, Security and American Approach: A New Trend in the Global Security

After globalization started to have sense in international system, the concept of security caused a dispute about international system so it was wanted to be modifying the property of it again. The discussion’s basic subject was the structure that was created for security would be. That means the question was about who the subject of security. It constructed a new system to form new dynamics. A fairly large number of definitions were made concerning globalization. Some thinkers have the opinion that “globalization is a shift away from a purely state-centric politics to a new and more complex form multilayered global politics”¹⁰⁴. Some tend to think of it in terms of a myth or a continuation of a tendency that has existed a long time. In sum, globalisation is a complex process that works as a consequence of political and economical effects. It forms a basis for the new international system.

Globalization is meant to centre on the modern policies, changing the fabric of society. In constructing this new fabric for society, economics and politics play a key

¹⁰² Dick Cheney, NBC’s *Meet the Press*, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2003.
<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/cheneymeetthepress.htm>

¹⁰³ Daalder and Lindsay, op. cit., p. 117

¹⁰⁴ David Held & Anthony McGrew, *Globalization/Anti-Globalization*, (Cambridge: Polity, 2002.), p. 130.

role. For example, globalization causes the sum of economic sources to be possessed by the public, and that ultimately brings about changes in different functions of the State. It is possible to claim that the surface of the earth has turned into a town as a result of the advanced technology and modes of production. The process of turning the world into a town becomes faster by means of electronic devices of telecommunication by means of globalization.

A group of actors have started to appear in the present world that is not possible to recognize. They have been constantly gaining power and prestige as long as globalization is popular. Institutions of this kind that are trans-national have the power to impose constraints on governments and the states. The amount of power that each state has changes considerably. As Susan Strange, a political economist, identifies four power structures in the contemporary world- security, production, finance, knowledge.

Only first, security and that to a decreasing extent, is monopolized by states. The other three are impersonal structure that affect states, multinational companies and individuals in ways that human agency, states included, finds it hard to control¹⁰⁵.

This was largely influenced by the fact of economy being globalized. To accept the notion of the politics controlling and organizing economics, a concept of global economics appears in relation to globalization, which requires that political intervention should be world-wide. That marks the start of all the discussions about security. Although September 11 was meant to be a terrorist attack, getting to the fact it had an ideological dimension, as far as the operations are concerned. On September 11, attacks were launched on the trade centre, the administration centre

¹⁰⁵ Halliday, op. cit. , p. 183

and a military headquarters. These three different places taken together would make us realize that attacks have been aimed at a systematically ideological level. If that were the case, it would not be logical to think of the attacks being aimed at America only. These attacks that were aimed at the system would have had to be of typical against the system. These actors could only have been called 'terrorists'. International terror emerged as post-modern actor within the war zone whose aim is to attack the peace zone¹⁰⁶.

The question that needs the most examination on the relationship between the case and globalization is; "with security is why does a military and economically less powerful (state=power) initiate war against a relatively strong state"¹⁰⁷. September 11 had been carried out by the kind of actors that were outside the State more than by the anti-American forces. Reasons alone mentioned above, 11 September 2001 will stand as a major turning point in world history - the first time in modern history that political opponents of the West from the Third World successfully attacked the territory of the leading Western power¹⁰⁸. That did happen, because globalization did happen. Now it is comprehended that old centre power of system which (was and is being) state is in decline and new centre of power try to displace states by means of globalizing world. Thus alone the attack evidence witnessed in U.S is enough to suggest that world could be very different from (what was and) is now¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰⁶ Bulent Aras, "Terror, The International System and Turkey" *Insight Turkey*, Vol: 6, No: 1 2004, p. 130

¹⁰⁷ Paul, op. cit., p. 3

¹⁰⁸ Adrew Cottey, "A New Era in World Politics?", *Alternatives journal* (Vol.1 No.3, Fall 2002, <http://alternativesjournal.net/volume1/number3/andrevcottey.htm>)

¹⁰⁹ Paul Hirst, *War and Power in the 21st Century*, (Oxford: Polity 2001) p. 104

Actually, terrorism had started to be an item on the agenda of the USA and the rest of the world in the 1990s. Discussions of that kind started to exist as a result of globalization. Following September 11, terrorism and security have become high on the agenda of the international system. Although security and terrorism were not taken to constitute a global threat, terrorism had already started to take on a new shape. As can be understood easily, globalisation added a new dimension to terrorism. Terrorism turned out to be a global-scale issue while it used to be defined in terms of local measures. And those that launched attacks came to be known as the actors outside the system. A new development had come into existence since 1648, when the system of international states was founded. Terrorists were rebelling against the secular structure of the state and against the systematically formed perception. A religious and ideological message was given, being aimed at destroying the hopes for the system continuing to exist.

September 11 have brought with it consequences that affected the whole world by means of the methods used and the amount of destruction caused by it. These operations are of the great importance due to the huge effects that they have caused to the global system and to its units. The most important cause, the growth of global communication in the twentieth century, “of global economic and cultural institutions and the rapid rise in the number of international institutions of all sorts, has led to a large number of transactions and contacts which take little account of state sovereignty¹¹⁰”. The advanced technology would make the situation more difficult to understand. Terrorists do not need to be present in the country that they

¹¹⁰ K.R. Dark and A. L. Hariss, *The New World and the New World Order*. (New York: Martin's Press, 1996)p. 134

have planned to attack in advance. Or only one member of terrorists could do the job more easily. Cyber and terrorist activities would have given terrorists a chance of not having to be in the country that they aimed at attacking. “i.e., in 1997, a child in Massachusetts had managed to stop the Worcester airports from serving for about 6 hours; in 1998 a young man in Switzerland had managed to stop a device used by the institution 911 running¹¹¹. Looked from the point of view of the main actors working for the system, the act of the states outside the system having close relationships with terrorists will be quite complicated to understand. In addition, as a consequence of globalization, terrorists would be able to produce weapons of mass destruction by means of the countries just mentioned above.

September 11 did lead America to “find new ways to respond to the new enemy, organizing the public consciousness as a means of political, ideological and military challenge¹¹²”. The USA has decided to co-operate with other nations to fight against terrorism; furthermore, although a decision of this kind was militarily intended to destroy terrorist groups, the USA politically sought ways to get other nations to supporting America. That was a strategy of security based on freedom. The USA expressed the strategy in 2002 as:

We will defend the peace by fighting terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers. We will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent¹¹³.

¹¹¹ Frank J. Cilluffo, “Cyber Attack: the National protection Plan and its Privacy Implication”, *Center for Strategic & International studies*, 1 February 2001, p. 3

¹¹² Ümit Özdağ, “Terrorism, Küresel Güvenlik, ve Türkiye”, *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol: 2, No:19, 2001, p. 6

¹¹³ NSS, op. cit. , p. 8

As a matter of fact, America was well aware that she would have serious problems in turn. The following statement in the same document gives enough proof about it: “Now, shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to our shores for less than it costs to purchase a single tank¹¹⁴.”

Accepting a strategy of that kind, America indicated that they would stop following the kind of policies of peace since the start of the century. There is a good chance that some changes in the international system have led America to make a decision of that kind. One of them could be taken, for example, as the challenge and existence of the trans-national actors against the mechanism that they were part of. “The war against terrorists of global reach is a global enterprise of uncertain duration. America will help nations that need our assistance in combating terror”¹¹⁵. If that had not been done, the case would have gone worse because the enemy did not show any sign of what they would likely do and quite a large deal of efforts would have had to be spent to learn about the enemy. The enemy is not a single political regime or person or religion or ideology. The enemy is terrorism premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against innocents. “And through globalization the nature of terrorism is drawn to tease out its repressed meaning and to create diversity in place of unity”¹¹⁶. So, to control the world is being governed by American leadership. Americans and people of the world priority will be first to “disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations of global reach and attack their

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ NSS, op. Cit, p. 11

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

leadership; command, control, and communications; material support; and finances¹¹⁷”.

From an American point of view, acting alone means acting in the manner that America consider best. Solely with this philosophy, however, a single country would not be able to establish a global state of peace. For this to happen, America would have to co-operate with other nations as well. After all, the kind of co-operation that America would approve of would not be disadvantages of America. The published document of strategy says:

As we defend the peace, we will also take advantage of an historic opportunity to preserve the peace. Today, the international community has the best chance since the rise of the nation state in the seventeenth century to build a world where great powers compete in peace instead of continually prepare for war¹¹⁸.

To achieve these goals, the United States will:

- champion aspirations for human dignity;
- strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against us and our friends;
- work with others to defuse regional conflicts;
- prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends, with weapons of mass destruction;
- ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade;
- expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy;
- develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power; and

¹¹⁷Gary Day, *Class*, (London: Routledge 2001) p. 200

¹¹⁸ NSS, Op. Cit. , p. 10

- transform America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century¹¹⁹.

Bush had the opinion of taking actions together for the global state of peace. The reason was that it was a serious problem concerning the whole of humanity; for that reason, the humanity should have handled it at once. Bush expressed his opinions about this issue in a speech in 2002: "Some worry that it is somehow undiplomatically or impolite to speak the language of right and wrong. I disagree. Different circumstances require different methods, but not different moralities."¹²⁰. Actually the case was quite different. America had already been founded upon the kind of values that the humanity has always acknowledged. Therefore, the United States must defend liberty and justice because these principles are right and true for all people everywhere. American own history is a long struggle to live up to their ideals. As a result of the last century, America "is not just a stronger, but is a freer and had been a just society in the eyes of many"¹²¹.

Looking at the explanations of the American government,

Individuals and groups are not the only perpetrators of terrorism. Political leaders have used terrorism as an instrument of both domestic and foreign policy for centuries. From the time when centralized governments were first organized, rulers resorted to the use of terror tactics to subdue their subjects and to spread confusion and chaos among their enemies. At least three levels of internal state terrorism have been identified as useful gradations understanding the scope of terrorism practiced by the state. During its rule of less than 4 years, the state's systemic terrorism was responsible for over 1 million deaths¹²².

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, Bush Statement

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 15- 17

¹²² Combs, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-73

Therefore, in the war against global terrorism, America will never forget that terrorism is ultimately fighting for American democratic values and way of life. “Freedom and fear are at war, and there will be no quick or easy end to this conflict. Redefining existing ones in ways that challenge to the way of the twenty-first century¹²³”.

However, according to decision making group, using the old methods for security that was based on freedom would not cause America and the rest of the world anything but only suffering. Administration regards the history that deterrence can fail; and some experience in the cold war during the cold war led them to believe that some enemies cannot be deterred¹²⁴. The Bush Administration tends to suggest that the perfect examples of this would be Saddam, Taliban and Milosovic. Different methods were used to stop these terrorist leaders acting, but things turned out to be unsuccessful. And innocent people are still continuing to die.

According to the security strategy, “The war on terrorism is not a clash of civilizations. It does, however, reveal the clash inside a civilization, a battle for the future of the Muslim world. This is a struggle of ideas and this is an area where America must excel”¹²⁵. The administration had it in theory only. Islamic countries for the most part gave support to the military activities of the USA army in Afghanistan and Iraq. This was not a war between two civilizations. On the contrary, it was meant to integrate one civilization with the other one. However, it remained that the position of America being a leader would have had to be accepted to make this strategy work smoothly and successful. The reason was plain enough that USA

¹²³ NSS, op.cit. , p. 35

¹²⁴ Ibid. , p. 40

¹²⁵ Ibid.

had all the resources of finance and think-tank and the USA was the only country that could have taken the responsibility.

Ultimately, the foundation of American strength is at home. It is in the skills of our people, the dynamism of our economy, and the resilience of our institutions. A diverse, modern society has inherent, ambitious, entrepreneurial energy. Our strength comes from what we do with that energy. That is where our national security begins¹²⁶.

After September 11, American new government especially Bush, expressed border where American security begins in NSS. NSS expressed freedom and human dignity. Such as an items are inalienable for the American security where security border begins. And also NSS showed us that American new administration regards globalization after the terrorist attacks process, as “the shortening of distance and the deepening of interdependence have been transformed the world into a new neighbourhood¹²⁷” which bound our security to American security or American security is our security. Items expressed here would indicate that American strategy has been new and more importantly universal. American strategy is profoundly worldly: its use is “bound up with ownership, authority, power and the imposition of force”¹²⁸. Bush regards NSS as a result of terrorist attacks in the globalized world and its exposition or expressions lead us to think of the new American security is a policy of “Gnostic Politics” which leads to continues warfare¹²⁹. There can be no peace, because the dream (the dream of the freedom of human dignity under the treat of global terror) has not been translated into reality in the globalized world. Through “such self –fulfilling prophecy” the NSS south to confront the global terror “by

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Nelson Mandela, *Our Global Neighbourhood*, (New York: Oxford University Pres 1995) p. 42

¹²⁸ Raman Peter, *Widdowson , Contemporary Literaru Theory*, (Kentucky: UPK 1993) p. 191

¹²⁹ Eric Voeglin, *The New Science of politics*, (Chicago : UFCP 1952) pp. ,171-175

embarking on a grandiose new project to police to police the world¹³⁰”. As Powell said, “America cannot escape the history because America is the best hope of the earth”. America’s armed forces. “Part of the fabric of U.S Values –freedom, democracy”, human dignity which ones now under the global threat¹³¹



¹³⁰ Chalmers Jhonsons, *The Sorrow of Empire*, (New York: Metropolitan 2004)p. 21

¹³¹ Colin Powell, “U:S Force: Challenges Aheads” , *Foreign Affair*, Vol. 71, No.: 5 (Winter 1992/1993)pp. 31-32

CHAPTER II

THE ANALYSIS AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD THE MIDDLE EAST

What Hoskins says about the Middle East is: "no segment of the earth's surface has so greater significance in, international affairs than that which binds together the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa, bringing into juxtaposition not only people of the eastern hemisphere but also western hemisphere as well.¹³²". The Middle East is, by definition, a place of trouble. Some experts tend to describe it as an area including North Africa, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, whereas other experts tend to regard it as being comprised of the Mediterranean, the Black Sea, the Iranian Gulf, and the Red Sea. The difficulties of defining the Middle East exactly stem from the strange qualities that the area has got, Jhone Robert's opinion about this issue is that it has a two-sided quality: "The Middle East is an illusionary paradise. Think of a place where the most important city is described as the city of peace, whereas its reputation is constantly ruined by numerous battles¹³³." Within the international systems, the M.E is strange location. In spite of its rich resources of oil, it is economically, politically, and socially underdeveloped; at the same time, it has always been a strategically crucial place for grand forces. One of them had been American force. In accordance with the main argument of the thesis, I will focus on the main reasons for American policies on the area after September 11, instead of dealing with the general characteristics of American economic and political relations with the Middle East.

¹³² Hoskins, Halford L., "Changing of the Guard in the Middle East." *Current History*, (February 1967), p. 65.

¹³³ Jhone Roberts, "Visions and Mirages: The Middle East in a New Era". *MERIA*, (1995,11)) P.30

2-1 General Outlook on Middle Eastern Conditions & Their Relevance to US Foreign Policy

During the Cold War period, the USA looked for ways to make sure that Israel was safe from dangers, to stop the USSR from being influential on the area, to ensure the oil market is working well. However, a policy of that kind was replaced by the fight against terrorism and fundamentalism¹³⁴. Today the whole of American foreign policy is focused on the area because it poses the greatest threats to the USA interests. Paul Wolwitz could well express a threat of this kind. Ideologies stopped to exist in the west as well as in Russia but it is only in the Muslim world that a revolutionary notion, at least for now, is very much on the defensive. The area was not popular with democratic tendencies because of the situation that the area had constantly been, and there were huge discrepancies between the public and the status quo.

Discrepancies of that kind only added to the amount of terrorist and radical groups in the area. But the kind of political and social organization that the USA would have approved of was based on democracy. Today the USA has the kind of problems in the region, that is originally connected with a democratic organization.

The problems in the Middle East bear great resemblance to those in Europe of the 17th century. Origins of these conflicts are not strategic just as they had been in Atlantic and in the West; rather, they are based on religious and ideological reasons. The actual problem is centred on the existence and legality of the other¹³⁵.

The Middle East is an area where the USA army has been located longest over the last 30 years. The reason why the USA army followed a policy of that kind stems

¹³⁴ Şanlı bahadır Koç, "İyi Kötü ve Çirkin: Amerika'nın Orta Doğu Politikaları", *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol: 2, No: 21, 2002, p. 5

¹³⁵ Henry Kissinger, *Amerikanın Dış Politikaya İhtiyacı Var mı?*, tran., Tayfun Evyapan. (Ankara: Metu Pres, 2001)p. 17

from the fact that anything that could potentially form a unified threat in the area in the next 25 years would probably threaten the USA security.

The kind of things that could pose a great threat in the area to the USA are: 1) The legality of the governments and policies being blocked 2) the public would be passive in terms of politics in the countries with wealthy oil and therefore the government would stop applying social prosperity projects based on the pretexts such as over-population and the fall of the oil prices 3) economical backwardness 4) a great portion of the young population that is not employed 5) the absence of a middle class that could play the role of a social and political leader 6) Israel was considered to be the reason why the Arabic countries were instable, fragmented, dependent and underdeveloped 7) the fact of radical ideologies existing 8) the young people could only be interested in the political Islam because they were not allowed to get involved in politics as a whole¹³⁶.

To some extent, these elements of threat are based on socio-political pretexts. In fact, what gave birth to terrorism was a similar pretext. When September 11 is analysed in detail, the following conclusion will most likely be attained. Terrorists launched an attack on the international system that the USA has been representing for ages. At this point, the first thing that the USA would have had to do is to find the reasons for September 11. The Bush Administration gave the reason for it in a way in which failures were attributed to political and economic resources: These are not the failures of a culture or a religion. These are the failures of political and economic

¹³⁶ Aalmay Khalilzad, "Source of Conflict in the Near Middle East, Source of Conflict in the 21st Century", *RAND* 1998, p. 175.

doctrines¹³⁷. And the American government came to the conclusion that it was caused by the lack of democratic consciousness.

These countries could only manage to start the movement of Islamism over the last 30 years. This was a political movement that had democratic qualities in terms of its origins but had no connection whatsoever with democracy in terms of its goals. Some reasons caused the support that society had been giving to it to get lost. The fear of violence spread over the middle class, which blocked the way to democracy¹³⁸.

On September 11, the attacks were aimed at the police of the new world order (Pentagon), the economical symbol (World Trade Centre), and the ideological symbol (Congress)¹³⁹. Therefore, the USA had been left with the only option: to think of anything that could start once again terrorist attacks. Today the Middle East means to terrorist groups a home. The whole business of the Bush Administration was focused on stopping terrorist activities in the area. The USA could as well cooperate with Israel. Following September 11, it just happened this way. Israel was the single country that had a long past full of experiences of fighting against terrorism. The main reason for terrorists to attack the USA was, on the other hand, the support that the USA had been giving to Israel. The USA had to act very carefully. Does America have to continue with its main approach to Israel during the Cold War period? What would the situation and attitudes of the neighbouring countries be if the USA continued to have an attitude of that kind. In the past, the USA had some common points as well as some different opinions with Israel.

¹³⁷ Endowment for Democracy United States Chamber of Commerce Washington, D.C. 11:05 A.M. EST <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/11/200311106-2.html>

¹³⁸ Soli Özel, "Democracy and Middle East", journal of TEMPO, http://www.tempodergisi.com.tr/toplum_politika/00774/ (1 May 2004)

¹³⁹ Bülent Aras, *Küresel Dönüşüm, Radikal Yaklaşımlar*, (Q-Matris, İstanbul, 2004) p. 73

Once on one occasion, after the Israelis bombed PLO headquarters outside Tunis in 1985, the Administration initially praised the action as a blow against terrorism, although it later tempered that reaction by expressions of concern for the territorial integrity of Tunisia, a long-standing U.S. friend¹⁴⁰.

However, indeed America needed or hoped to “build alliances with some Islamic country to counterbalance communism¹⁴¹.” Now, following September 11, the USA felt the need to check its connections with its strategic partners in terms of maintaining an order and stopping terrorist activities in the area. Saudi Arabia was one of these most important countries. Saudi Arabia has had a strategically important location that the USA could use for its policies. It did not sound logical to interfere with Saudi Arabia based on the fact that it had weak points in terms of democracy. During the Clinton administration, a good deal of tension had been caused between these two countries because of insufficient emphasis on democracy and the human rights. On the one hand, the tension caused the relations with Saudi Arabia to get worse during the period of time when Laden, representing Saudi Arabia, accused Saudi Arabia of providing the USA army with an area of land to locate in; on the other hand, it worked to the advantage of terrorists. Saudi Arabia was the kind of country with which the USA had to have positive relationships because of its position within the organization of the Gulf Corporation, and of the need to check the transportation of oil properly in the area. If terrorist groups had gotten the public to supporting themselves, the prospect for the oil in the area would not be good. That was quite clear to see:

¹⁴⁰ Clyde R. Mark, *Congressional Research Service ~ The Library of Congress, Congressional, Israeli-United States Relations*, April 13, 2003. Summary.

¹⁴¹ Favaz Gerges, “Islam and Muslim in the Mind of America: Influences on the Making Of the U.S Policy”, *Journal of Paletsine Studies*. Vol 26: 2, Winter 1997

Why has the Saudi government taken the lead in recognizing and funding the Taliban government of Afghanistan, which is entwined with bin Laden's al Qaeda organization? The answer is: The bin Laden problem is deeply embedded both in Saudi religious and dynastic politics and in an effort by Iraq and Syria to shift the balance of power in the Middle East¹⁴².

The USA had to have strong relationships with Saudi Arabia in order to win the war against terrorism, because Usame bin Laden, one of the most important dangerous people-probably the most dangerous one- for interests of the USA around the world is of Saudi origin. It is evident in CIA documents that Laden still holds significant power in, Saudi Arabia; though he is powerful in other countries as well, Saudi Arabia remains his base for all relations. He sees that from Bosnia-Herzegovina to the Philippines intended to portray an Islamic global community everywhere under assault, the author turns to his main obsession: the justification by some Saudi Islamic scholars of the American military presence in Saudi Arabia. He does not at first mention the country, and he seldom takes up any Saudi leader by name. The style is courteous to the Saudi rulers, because "bin Laden does not wish to betray his connection with Riyadh, any more than his Saudi friends wish it to be revealed",¹⁴³.

On the other hand, Bin Laden's connection with Afghanistan, Sudan, the Yemen, Qatar and Syria and the attitude of these countries towards Saudi Arabia has consequently intensified the importance of the position that Saudi Arabia has been

¹⁴² David Wurmser, "The Saudi Connection," *Weekly Standard*, 10/29/2001, Volume 007, Issue 07, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/content/public/articles/000/000/000/393rwyib.asp?pg=1> (4 April 2004)

¹⁴³ Stephen Schwartz, "The Ladenese Epistle", *The Weekly Standard*, 10/29/2001, Volume 007, Issue 07, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/content/public/articles/000/000/000/396jlqvy.asp> (2 May 2004)

holding against terrorism. Some of these countries were a home for groups that were competing either for the Arabic leadership or for the Islamic leadership. For this reason, the position that Saudi Arabia would possibly have held would definitely be of great importance to these countries. The operations of the USA in Afghanistan and in Iraq, the brutal events happening in Palestine, and the fact that American women soldiers in Saudi Arabia are assigned with the duty of protecting Saudi Arabia while women in Saudi Arabia are not allowed to drive a car are essentially the factors that have had negative effects on the public opinion about the Saudi government. In Aras' opinion, "these incidents were not for the good of Saudi Arabia: incidents of this kind have been eroding the legality of the Saudi government"¹⁴⁴. On the basis of incidents just mentioned above, the U.S.A. should be careful about its strategic policies on Saudi Arabia in terms of both democracy and the human rights.

Another reason that the U.S.A has had to check its policies on the Middle East following September 11 was weapons of mass destruction. The fact that terrorists have had a chance of obtaining weapons of mass destruction as the tendency towards globalizm gets popular and as the technological development keeps existing will doubtless not draw a nice picture that the U.S.A. could like. All the countries that are described as bandit by the Americans have got WMD. What is worse is the claim that these countries are co-operating with terrorists. What can possibly be the reasons that countries in the area have had to produce WMD that threatened the U.S.A., which have caused the organizations and the process of peace not to work? In the Middle East, there are strong regional encouragements to spread – at least to the point of developing the capability to rapidly manufacture and use some form of

¹⁴⁴ Aras, op. cit. , " Küresel Dönüşüm, Radikal Yaklaşımlar, p. 188.

weapon of mass destruction. The destructive effects of weapon of mass destruction are used for not only for military targets but for civilians. In some respects, international security had experienced the dangers of these weapons especially after the Iran-Iraq War and the Gulf War, which resulted in the rebellion of Shiites and Kurds in Middle East.

American foreign policy makers perceived some probable threat in Middle East, which will might create a world catastrophe, such as the scenarios below.

1. Arms race with neighbours: Algeria-Libya-Morocco, Egypt-Israel-Syria, Iran-Iraq-Southern Gulf.
2. Inability to know the future enemy, characterize risk.
3. The “greater Middle East” — growing overlap of arms races listed above, plus impact of India-Pakistan arms race.
4. Deterrence and safeguards: No way to know the scale of the efforts of key threats and other major regional actors.
5. Intimidation
6. Alternative to expensive conventional investments
7. Compensate for conventional weakness and cost of conventional weapons.
8. Limit or attack US and others outside power projection options
9. Create existential threat force arms control; react to absence of meaningful arms control regimes.
10. Momentum of arms race/respond to proliferation elsewhere state, proxy, or private terrorism.

11. Exploit lack of effective civil and critical facility defense and anti-tactical ballistic missile defence capabilities.
12. Proliferation already shapes the regional military balance in ways that affect both the peacetime balance of power and influence, the structure of regional deterrence, and options for future war fighting:
13. Israel relies on nuclear weapons, deterrence, and “soft strike” pre-emption.
14. Iran has chemical and probably biological weapons, nuclear effort continues.
15. Iraq’s massive pre-Gulf War efforts gave it a major “break out” effort the moment UN and US containment efforts ceased and may give a successor some break out capability in spite of the Iraq War.
16. Syria has significant chemical warfare capabilities and will soon acquire significant biological capabilities
17. Algerian and Egyptian efforts uncertain. Libyan chemical effort continues
18. Saudi Arabia is studying options as a result of its CSS-2 replacement planning.
19. Terrorists, extremists, and “proxies” are also making efforts to acquire such capabilities.

Thus in turn, has already created the following unstable mix of possible combinations of adversaries and contingencies:

20. Iran versus Iraq
21. Iraq versus Southern Gulf, US, and/or Israel
22. Israel versus Syria
23. Iran versus Southern Gulf, US, and/or Israel
24. Libyan and Algerian wild cards

25. Vestigial Yemeni use of gas
26. Egypt joins the club after arms control efforts fail, and finds itself involved against Iraq or dragged into confrontation with Israel.
27. There are a number of war fighting options where proliferation could affect the balance: covert-indirect, unconventional warfare, “terrorism”, Surprise attack to support conventional war fighting
28. Iran-Iraq and Gulf Wars have demonstrated missiles and weapons of mass destruction will be used, and that escalation can be unpredictable.
29. Israeli actions in 1967 and attack on Osirak. Egyptian and Syrian attack on Israel in 1973, demonstrate regional focus on surprise and pre-emption.
30. Iraq has already demonstrated regional concern with launch on warning, launch under attack options.
31. Syria probably has some option of this kind.
32. Concentration of population and leadership in single or a few urban areas makes existential attacks possible and attractive.
33. Covert, terrorist, and proxy attacks are increasingly possible, particularly using biological weapons.
34. Employment is unlikely to be irrational or reckless, but restraint in attacking civilian targets or mass employment against armed forces may be limited. Regimes also take existential risks in escalating if they feel they are likely to lose power¹⁴⁵.

However, the kind of policy that the U.S.A. tended to follow on WMD in the area has been considered to be unjust by some countries. The reason for a claim of this kind lies in the pretext that the U.S.A has been following a hard policy of

¹⁴⁵ Anthony H. Cordesman Arleigh A. Burke, “The Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East” *Center for Strategic and International Studies*, 15 March 2004, http://www.csis.org/burke/mb/me_wmd_mideast.pdf

tolerating Israel about WMD, whereas the U.S.A. has been imposing international laws on other countries and forcing them to stop producing WMD and to destroy the available WMD. However, a pretext of that kind has not been considered to be fair by the American government. The American government held the belief that Israel has not been using WMD, in spite of the fact that Israel has got WMD. Israel was surrounded by a number of countries that would destroy it. Weapons of that kind could well be used to deter the enemy from attacking Israel. They were meant to secure the prospect for Israel. On the other hand, the case with other countries was completely different. They did not feel the need to secure themselves from a number of countries that could perhaps be labelled as the enemy. After all, Israel had not signed any international document regarding the use of WMD, while some countries had signed particular documents promising that they would never use WMD.

Any investigation that could be conducted today about the amount of WMD in the Middle East would say that the international peace and security could stop existing at any moment. To conclude that the U.S.A. is the kind of country that will be damaged most seriously by such threats is normal, based on the fact that the U.S.A. is the most powerful country in the world. The main reason that the U.S.A. went to war with Iraq, stems from the state of Iraq possessing WMD. The U.S.A. had constantly been announcing that the operation would not be limited to Iraq only. Actually, this announcement had been made for political reasons and any country could as well interpret the way they liked to. The Libyan leader Qaddafi announced in 2004 that he would definitely stop the production of WMD in Libya. The moment when Libya has made its decision is of great importance. Libya was afraid that Libya could be the next country against which the U.S.A. would potentially start a war

against. Following September 11, the U.S.A. increased its measures to prevent the leakage of information by the illegal groups that have possibly been used to produce WMD. This placed great emphasis on the quality of intelligence agencies working harder and made connections between a numbers of countries using his political influence, made it possible to reveal secret efforts to produce WMD¹⁴⁶. As a consequence of the act of Libya admitting to have had WMD, Pakistan, Iran and Syria started to show signs of involving in the process of disarmament. The message that the U.S.A. had always tried to find ways to deliver had actually been understood by the subjects.

Middle East can be seen main port for energy needed for the economy of the world, especially for developed countries and America. At this point economical situation of the area is main determining concept of American policies about the region. Peace, regional stability, and the flow of energy exports, trade, and investment are under threat of instability of the region that has occurred after invasion of Iraq by coalition powers leaded of USA. Security problems don't affect only stability of region but also global energy supplies and global economy. Perhaps world's only superpower-America- tried to supply stability of region for its interests. But, this condition that has occurred in Iraq created major new security problems in nations like Iran, and Syria. When looked at the economic structure in the Middle East, it becomes clear to see that the area has not got the kind of economic structure that could possibly go together with the global structure of economy. The economic situation in the Middle East tends to be far from a liberal understanding of it, being controlled strictly by the government. Up to March 2003, a great deal of economic

¹⁴⁶ Kibaroglu, op. cit. , p. 117

sources used to be controlled by the government in Iraq¹⁴⁷. The production of oil in Iraq that was leading the economic situation in the country has been affected negatively as a result of embarks, under-developed technological equipment. Experts on economics keep saying that Iraq would now need 50 – 60 Million \$ to produce as much oil as before the war.

Another country that has based its wealth on oil sources in the main is Saudi Arabia. Due to the recent fall of the oil prices, “Saudi Arabia has had to make the process of privatisation work faster than ever and to cut down on the infra-structure-related expenditures, in order that economical discrepancies would soon stop existing¹⁴⁸”. Saudi Arabia could well be argued to have had a period of time during which economic indicators were not good enough, if not to the extent to which Iraq suffered. The following facts would appear after a careful analysis of the area.

Population growth sometimes exceeds 3% annually and often exceeds or equals real economic growth. True development normally requires 2% more annual growth than population growth. “Statism” means many jobs are frustrating disguised unemployment or underemployment. Education is slipping in quality and economic relevance; real job experience is dropping as a training tool, and Islamic education tends to have little economic value. Real per capita income declined by well over 25% during the 1980s. The situation has improved since 1991, but there is still little real growth¹⁴⁹.

The region is failing to draw on investment to finance the maintenance and improvement of its infrastructure. Risk assessment is mixed and often negative. Several countries also have serious debt problems. Middle East productivity dropped

¹⁴⁷ Tayyar Arı, *Irak, İran ve ABD. Onleyici Savaş: Petrol ve Hegomanya*, (Istanbul, Alfa, 2003) p., 119

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Anthony H. Cordesman Arleigh A. Burke, *Stability and Instability in the Middle East* 05/15/0 Center for Strategic and International Studies, http://www.csis.org/burke/mees/stab_instab_meonly.pdf

by around 6%, East Asian productivity rose by 54%. The region is failing to draw on investment to finance the maintenance and improvement of its infrastructure¹⁵⁰. These problems cause serious political challenges. Over the last few 10 years, Jordan, Morocco, and Qatar have already made the first change in their regime. It is that Saudi Arabia is in the process of transition. And USA displayed new concept for these changes. Indeed, it doesn't need to be sign-posted, but Great Middle East Project of USA will become main way of change in the region. Now, It will easy to see what problems will be brought for region. The fact of instability inside the country has led to civil conflict that remains a serious problem in Algeria. Iran and Syria will probably defend themselves for changes. More broadly, "there are major demographic and economic forces for political change, sometimes interacting with Islamism and other ideological pressures¹⁵¹".

The U.S.A. got aware of the fact that it had to check its policies on the Middle East, re-examining the results of September 11. And the U.S.A. had already shown signs of changes that it would make about its policies. For this reason, Middle East Partnership has been founded. The Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI) is a Presidential initiative founded to support economic, political, and educational reform efforts in the Middle East and champion opportunity for all people of the region, especially women and youth.

The initiative strives to link Arab, U.S., and global private sector businesses, non-governmental organizations, civil society elements, and governments together to develop innovative policies and programs that support reform in the region. Four

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

main characteristics and reforms that MEPI is centred around. Reforms in economy, politics, and education and women rights are main important characteristics of MEPI. MEPI supports 1) region-wide economic and employment growth that private sector expansion and entrepreneurship would be expected to perform. 2) the idea of a public place where democracy could well work, the people could have a chance to get involve in governance, and they show respect for the rule of law. 3) the kind of educational system that would ultimately enable al students to have enough knowledge so that they could stand on their own feet in the market. 4) to give support to the kind of economical, political and educational organizations that would give women equal rights. It looks very beneficial to explain the following points in sequence:

- Assistance to Arab members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to help them comply with their commitments and technical assistance on WTO criteria to aspiring WTO members in the region
- The U.S. -Middle East Partnership Initiative will provide a framework and funding for the U.S. to work together with governments and people in the Arab world to expand economic, political and educational opportunities for all.
- New Department of Commerce Special American Business Internship Training scholarships, which will provide internships in American companies, and also will focus on developing networks and training opportunities for women entrepreneurs from the Middle East.
- Through mechanisms such as the Middle East Democracy Fund, assistance to non-governmental organizations and individuals from across the political spectrum working for political reform. Support for establishment of more NGOs, independent media outlets, polling organizations, think tanks, and business associations -- groups that create the foundation for a vibrant democracy¹⁵².

¹⁵² U.S. -Middle East Partnership Initiative, Washington, DC , December 12, 2002, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2002/15923.htm> (July, 2002)

Rice, writing for Washington Post, states that Europe began process of democratisation after World War II. Today America and his allies must commit us to a long-term transformation in another part of the world:

The Middle East: A region of 22 countries with a combined population of 300 million, the Middle East has a combined GDP less than that of Spain, population 40 million. It is held back by what leading Arab intellectuals call a political and economic "freedom deficit." In many quarters a sense of hopelessness provides a fertile ground for ideologies of hatred that persuade people to forsake university educations, careers and families and aspire instead to blow themselves up -- taking as many innocent lives with them as possible¹⁵³.

There occurred some signals of danger and effects of these signals. For example,

except in sub-Saharan Africa, growth in per capita income was the lowest in the world.. At an annual growth rate of 0.5% annually, if such trends continue in the future, it will take the average Arab citizen 140 years to double his or her income, while other regions are set to achieve that level in a matter of less than 10 years.¹⁵⁴

The President Bush spoke of the subject that the region has been suffering from the lack of human rights abuses "In many Middle Eastern countries, poverty is deep and it is spreading, women lack rights and are denied schooling. Whole societies remain stagnant while the world moves ahead" Actually these were quite correct explanations for the situation. In Rice's opinion, these statistics were constantly causing a disorder to the region and it was posing a great threat to the U.S.A. Once again, Bush held that: "They allied themselves with the Soviet bloc and with international terrorism. Dictators in Iraq and Syria promised the restoration of

¹⁵³ Condoleezza Rice, "Transforming the Middle east," *Washington Post*, August 7, 2003

¹⁵⁴ *Releases theFirst Arab Human Development Report, UNDP*

<http://www.undp.org/rbas/ahdr/ahdr1/presskit1/EnglishPressKit.pdf>

national honor, a return to ancient glories. They've left instead a legacy of torture, oppression, misery, and ruin”¹⁵⁵.

Rice thought of what should be done as co-operation with the kind of countries for democratisation: “Our task is to work with those in the Middle East who seek progress toward greater democracy, tolerance, prosperity and freedom¹⁵⁶.” Cheney did not have a different notion; rather, he took a more systematic approach to the matter at hand: Our choice is not between a unipolar world and a multipolar world. Our choice is for a just, free and a democratic world¹⁵⁷. Also, Powell did not have different opinions, claiming to co-operate with the Middle East countries: “Any approach to the Middle East that ignores its political, economic and educational development will be built upon sand. America wants to align itself with the people of the Middle East.”¹⁵⁸ From now on, everything was about the kind of policy that should be followed so that the Middle East could be made to serve American purposes once again.

However, according to Rice, the job of transforming the Middle East into a far advanced civilization would not be easy: “The transformation of the Middle East will not be easy, and it will take time. It will require the broad engagement of America, Europe and all free nations, working in full partnership with those in the

¹⁵⁵ op. cit. ,D.C. 11:05 A.M. EST

¹⁵⁶ Rice, op. cit. , “Transforming the Middle East”

¹⁵⁷ Dick Cheney, “The Greater Middle East — The Bush Administration's Perspective”, *The Globalist*, <http://www.theglobalist.com/DBweb/StoryId.aspx?StoryId=3754> (11 June 2004)

¹⁵⁸ U.S. Launches Initiative to Promote Democracy in Middle East, <http://www.islamonline.net/English/News/2002-12/12/article16.shtml>. (10 May 2004)

region who share our belief in the power of human freedom¹⁵⁹”. Bush and his government wanted to reorder the international system over Middle East so as “to promote the non-violent settlement of disputes and to guarantee the security of all nations, large and small¹⁶⁰.” To do this,

International law has effected to states’ legal principles about human rights through history have connection with liberal democracy and it tried raise of level of activity of these principles all advanced capitalist industrial states have been, since world II, democratic (thought not all democratic states are economically advanced); most of them have also been part of the American “hegemonic” alliance system (which has also included undemocratic and economically less-developed countries¹⁶¹).

And now on it’s the time for execution of the similar systematical property in the Middle East .Nevertheless Present American Administration gives the meaning to this policy such that .According to Administration the transformation of the Middle East on this way should obtain a very safe world system as by the leadership of America and there were two ways for execution this policy or should be said obligations. To solve the Israili-Palestanien problem and to form a modern and democratic administration in Iraq. By the following topics this subject will be mentioned in details.

2-2. A Closer Look at the American Attitude towards the Israel - Palestine Problem

The policy of the U.S.A. on Israel has been decided upon the way things kept happening throughout the history: “nation do not have permanent enemies; nor do

¹⁵⁹ Transforming The middle east By Condoleezza Rice *Washington Post, Opinion August 7, 2003*

¹⁶⁰ K.R. Dark and A. L. Hariss, *The New World and the New World Order*. (New York: Martin’s Press, 1996)p. 131

¹⁶¹ Russet, Op. cit. , *Controlling the Sword: The Democratic Governance of National Security*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990) p. 122

they permanent friends. They have only permanent interest¹⁶²”. The Bush administration wanted to be indifferent to the Israel – Palestine conflict at the start. However, September 11 placed great emphasis on the Israel – Palestine problem. The approach to it after September 11 basically has been of the roadmap. The roadmap has had four different sides. The basic suggestion of the U.S.A. was that the Palestinians should be willing to regard the new government based on liberty, freedom and democracy, and terrorism and violence should end, the Israeli state should be regarded as legal and safe. American new administration Israel – Palestine conflict as political.

The U.S.A. was well aware that it could have solved one of the most difficult problems between the Middle East and the international system, once the U.S.A. happened to manage to do it. A problem of this kind was not restricted to these two countries only; it was a problem of the whole region.

U.S.-Israeli relations have evolved from an initial American policy of sympathy and support for the creation of a Jewish homeland in 1948 to an unusual partnership that links a small but militarily powerful Israel, dependent on the United States for its economic and military strength, with the U.S. superpower trying to balance competing interests in the region¹⁶³. Although America did not regard the existence of Israel as a good enough reason for establishing a state of its own in 1918, America tended to change its beliefs about it later. The U.S.A. has taken the side of Israel – more precisely bet on Israel – since 1948. However, that never meant that the

¹⁶² Henry Jhon ,*Temple*, (Londra: Parlesmon 1784-1865) p. 10

¹⁶³ Clyde R. Mark, “ Israeli-United States Relations” *Congressional Research Service ~ The Library of Congress, Congressional*, 14, 2003., Summary

Palestinian side was always ignored. But, most Israelis and Israeli supporters have wanted the United States to favour only Israeli positions.

Past U.S. arms transfers to Arab countries have been striking examples of friction in Israeli-U.S. relations, not only because they underscore the difference in attitudes toward Arab countries, but because Israel perceived arms transfers to Arabs as threatening its security¹⁶⁴.

Israel had the belief that it was only Israel that has been the supporter of American Policies in the region. Israel had the opinion that countries in the region had always regarded America as a colonizer, and therefore co-operated with the U.S.S.R, fighting against the West all the time. Israel had always wanted to improve its relationships with the U.S.A. USA and Israel relationships from the mid-1960s through the early 1990s have significantly focused on military alliance. And, it has been seen 3 main categories or characteristics in this relationship:

Shared threat perceptions and common security interests.- Institutionalisation in the relationship, and the resulting ability to ride-out short term policy disagreements in some areas; Symmetry and burden sharing: Israeli reciprocity and support for American objectives in the region¹⁶⁵.

American policies on the region since 1971 remained, by and large, the same. However, the fact remains that the U.S.A. wanted the two sides to start peace negotiations. For that to happen, the Carter-initiative for Camp David process was viewed by some in Israel as creating U.S. pressures on Israel to withdraw from occupied territories and to take risks for the sake of peace with Egypt¹⁶⁶. However, following the collapse of the Shah of Iran and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the late 1970s, the strategic links increased further.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Gerald M. Steinberg, Israel and the United States: Can the Special Relationship Survive the new Strategic Environment, *MERIA* Vol: 2. No: 4 - November 1998

¹⁶⁶ Mark, op. cit., p. 4

During the Reagan administration, the Cold War intensified, and the United States searched for reliable, stable allies in the region. As a result, Israel was elevated to the status of a "strategic asset," rather than simply a very junior partner¹⁶⁷.

President Reagan's personal support for Israel and the compatibility between Israeli and Reagan perspectives on terrorism, security cooperation, and the Soviet threat, led to dramatic improvements in bilateral relations¹⁶⁸. On the other hand, the U.S.A. was sure that the Cold War would soon end. The U.S.A. might have had to think over its policies on countries in the region, including Israel. Secretary of State James Baker told an audience on May 22, 1989, that Israel should abandon its expansionist policies, a remark many took as a signal that the pro-Israel Reagan years were over¹⁶⁹.

Israel had, for some reason, started to get worried about its relations regarding the U.S.A. Sharon accused the Bush Administration of appeasing the Palestinians at Israel's expense in a bid for Arab support for the U.S. anti-terror campaign. However, as long as the changing factors in the regions were concerned. "The White House said the remark was unacceptable¹⁷⁰". The Arab-Israel conflict rarely, if ever, materially damaged U.S. interests during the 1980s. "The 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the 1985 Jordan-PLO agreement had seemed to... administration to provide opportunities for diplomatic efforts¹⁷¹". When the U.S.A. realized that things did not work properly, policymakers came to the conclusion that if the regional

¹⁶⁷ Steinberg, op. cit. , "p. 5

¹⁶⁸ Mark, op. cit. , p. 4.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Barry Rubin, "U.S. Policy in the Intifadah Era", *MERIA*, Internet Edition, <http://meria.idc.ac.il/us-policy/data1988.html>,

forces admitted to take necessary steps, they could possibly make progress. Or else, the U.S.A. would not have the opportunity to stop the deadlock existing.

The U.S.A had already started the Iraq war in the region, which could probably cause trouble in the long run. The U.S.A. had never had such an operation in the region. Also, the Iraq war was not composed of real war elements only. The Israelis as well as the Arabs had the need to for help from the U.S.A. in order to apply post-war policies on Iraq. Some critics in the U.S.A. gave their opinion that the U.S.A. had to think over its policies on Israel: Colonial powers have taken Arab lands under their control. And, Palestine is one of these lands. From this perspective, colonial powers thought to use to Israeli as apparatus of their politics for their interests. If the U.S.A. had followed pro-Israeli policies during the Iraq war, it would have had similar advantages and interests that previously England and some other European countries had had.

During the Clinton administration, the U.S.A. happened to play the major role for the Israel – Palestine conflict. The peace process reflected the image of the U.S.A. as the architect of the global peace. Peace talks that had started during the Clinton administration provided America with new directions in the region, but did not bring happiness in terms of solutions. However, the fact remained that the U.S.A. was in pursuit of peace in the region; therefore, the Bush administration is still continuing with peace talks.

The Bush administration had relatively different notions of the matter. The administration did not tend to regard the matter as the Israel – Palestine conflict. They thought that there are two sides to the problem: anti-Americanism and support

to the international terrorism. Support to Israel was causing the American influence on the Arabic nations to disappear. The problem was centrally connected with Israel's neighbouring countries; however, generally it was related to even the whole Europe. The Bush administration was well aware of this fact and Bush spoke about a Palestinian state in a speech made on the 24th of June 2002, which added a new dimension to the problem. The problem of Palestinian state is to be solved systematically only; its solution is bound to radical changes about its position for the international system¹⁷².

The fact of two nations, the Israelis and the Palestinians, being in peace would bring peace and stability to Middle East, at least would bring the biggest chance to supply these senses. At this point America's aim should be to supply agreement with in the terms of Road Map peace process. "This conflict could no longer shelter Autocratic Arab Governments for transformation and they can not avoid pressures for change. "The West would no longer have to coddle dictators in Syria or avoid pushing for reform in Egypt because of their key role in peace negotiations¹⁷³."

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is critical because of the amount of human suffering, because of America's close relationship with the state of Israel and some Arab states, and because of that region's importance to other global priorities of the United States. There can be no peace for either side without freedom for both sides. America stands committed to an independent and democratic Palestine, living beside Israel in peace and security¹⁷⁴.

¹⁷² Aras, op. cit. , "Küresel Yaklaşımlar", p. 180.

¹⁷³ Ronald Asmus, "Let's Get Serious About Democracy in the Greater Middle East:" http://www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/showArticle3.cfm?article_id=9149&topicID=56 (11 May 2004)

¹⁷⁴ NSS, op. cit. , P. 22

In order to understand the subject matter of study more easily, it would be better to get to know about the Israel – Palestine conflict before attempting to explain the reason why American policy on Israel is so important.

2-2-1 The Existential Problem of Palestine & Israel

The main reason for this conflict, as Karaman has put it, is the fact that Palestinians have been living in bad conditions that have consequently made them unable to use their basic rights, since 1948 when their country was torn apart. In spite of the international initiatives, they have not shown progress yet¹⁷⁵. Israel has seen the conflict in terms of occupying an area of land where they could well dwell in safely and have their religious practices.

When the British mandate came to an end, Jewish settler minority, forming about %35 of Palestine's total and owning only about %7 of its total area called for establishment of Jewish state in Palestine¹⁷⁶. But, today it has come to a point that Palestinian settlers have the same parallel form as Jewish side from the beginning

When Israel declared its independence, the West Bank was occupied by Jordan, Gazze by Egypt. But, it did not take time for Israel to have stunning victory in 1967 and following occupation in the native land of of Palestine in the west Bank, Gaza, Sinia to transform the those land to the land of Jewish people. The conquest of this land also transformed the “generation of Zionist pioneers¹⁷⁷”, who were in origin in , to the new generation of Jews to in the new occupied territory who will have been born to live new culture created here to be a nation originated in these land. The

¹⁷⁵ Lütfullah Karaman, *Filistin Sorunu*, (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık: 1991) p. 259

¹⁷⁶ Mahmoud Mi' Ari, “Attitudes of Palestines Toward Normalization with Israel”, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.36, No. 3(May, 1999), 339-348. p. 341

¹⁷⁷ Dimitris Keridis, “Europe and Israel: what went wrong?”, *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol: 2, No: 4 (winter 2004), p. 141

greatest importance was the fact the Palestinians being a refugee in 1967. Israel had occupied the homes of some people where they stayed, as being a nation, through the very long history “which meant that all the Palestinians were now a refugee”.¹⁷⁸

Ahmed Hasan, the Iraqi president in 1975, described the way that the Arabs and Palestinians tended to perceive the post-war (1967-1973 war) situation as two-fold: our position is based on two fundamental considerations. The first is that the Zionist entity, in view of its nature and its organic links with imperialism, and in the view of its nature and its organic links with imperialism, and in the view the of the fact that it fulfils the function of imperialism’s agent in this sensitive region can not be aggressive and expansionistic¹⁷⁹. This declaration was a clear sign of the way the neighbouring states tended to conceive of the existence of Israel and settlement. The Palestinians and Arabs tended to regard the conflict as stemming from the system. The fact that Israel had the full equipment of arms while Palestine did not is enough to prove Palestinians right in their opinions. The case was different that it seemed to be. The fact that the USA and some western countries have given some kind of help to Israel caused some Arabic countries to support the Palestinians. This was caused by the belief that; on the other hand, Arabs tended to think of the existence of Israel as a means for the imperial forces to be used against Arabic countries.

The fact that an Israeli state was founded would possibly give the west a chance of making the problem of Jews an integral part of the

¹⁷⁸ Ali Balcı, “Filistin Savaş ve Barış Arasında”, *Dünya Çatışma Bölgeleri*, (Ankara: Nobel, 2004) p. 41

¹⁷⁹ Speech by Iraqi President Ahmad Hassan Al-Bark on the Anniversary of the July 17, 1968 Revolution, Baghdad, July, 1975. , *Journal of Palestine Studies*, *Falestine Studies*, Vol . 5, No. 1/2 Autumn, 1975-Winter 1976, 255-300

Middle East, just as they had tried the similar tactic – to use the Christians to create a conflict with the Jews in the Europe¹⁸⁰.

Israel always had a policy of conflict up to the 1990s. The secret policy that Israel kept on following during this period had always been the expansionist policy intended to secure the public. This policy had not been limited to only to Israel; a policy of that kind forced Israel to treat as members of a ghetto by settling new residents in new places that Israel happened to occupy¹⁸¹.

The Cold War had always caused feelings of fierce to arise between Israelis and Arabs. The situation has changed after the collapse of the USSR, the getting closer of some Arabic countries to the west, and Israel wanted to co-operate with some of the regional and non-regional countries to integrate with the global economy. The first negotiations of peace were held in Madrid as a result of mutual getting closer and the incitements of non-regional forces. However, these negotiations did not bring much satisfaction for the future. Israel gave the impression that they were trying another tactic for the war rather than they were really in pursuit of peace. Calling for full Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since June 1967,

in implementation of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, reaffirmed by the Madrid Conference of 1991 and the land for peace principle; and for Israel's acceptance of an independent Palestinian State, with East Jerusalem as its capital, in return for the establishment of normal relations in the context of a comprehensive peace with Israel¹⁸².

¹⁸⁰ Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik*, (İstanbul: Küre Yayınları,2002) p. 380

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² Ibid.

The Madrid Conference constituted a remarkable attempt to stop the war. A number of Arabic countries had come together. Actually, the negotiations between these two people had given the impression that they were of the negotiations between Israelis and Arabs. One of the important steps that made it possible to set up peace in the area was taken in 1993 by the president of PLO, Arafat, to call for a solution to the problems in a peaceful way after he told the minister of Israeli foreign affairs that he agreed to the conditions of the UN. On the 13th of September 1993, the agreement of Oslo was signed after Israel agreed that PLO was the legal representative of the Palestinians.

A Palestinian state would have been founded within 5 years in the West Bank and Gaza and the Palestinian government would have been responsible to deal with security, education, health-care in the area. In 1996, Israeli armed forces withdrew completely from the West Bank, with the exception of al-Halil. The fact that Israel evacuated 80% of the places mentioned above in 1998 as part of the second phase helped the situation to get better. The fact that Israel refused to accept the borderlines drawn in 1967, continued to regard Jerusalem as the capital, and made new areas of land along the West Bank available for settlement caused the positive attitude towards the peace to disappear. The consequence of the Oslo process is:

demographic and political shift in Israel toward the ideological and religious-nationalist right. These elements, defying history and democratic values, support permanent, quasi-colonial domination of Palestinians¹⁸³.

¹⁸³ Philip C. Willox, "Report on Israeli Settlement", *Middle East Peace*, Vo: 11 No: 7, 2001, p. 2.; <http://www.fmep.org>

The attempts to mediate between the two sides in Camp David and Cairo did not produce results; therefore, the Palestinians resumed the Intifada in September 2000. Because the amount of violence between the two sides had an increasing trend, an international community was formed to find ways for permanent peace.

The document that is known as the Mitchell report, published at the end of April 2001, indicated that the lack of trust of the sides for each other was in the main the greatest concern, therefore, the riots of any kind must be stopped at once, the negotiations must be resumed, and each side must trust one another. This report did not succeed to bring happiness to the both sides; on the contrary, it caused violence to spread rapidly. The Palestine administration had the opinion that the reasons why negotiations of peace did not work were as follows: only try to explain why the latest U.S. proposals, fail to meet the needs for a permanent peace. As it stands now, the United States' proposal would 1) divide a Palestinian state into three separate political units connected and divided by Jewish-only and Arab-only roads and endanger the Palestinian state's viability; 2) divide Palestinian Jerusalem into a number of unconnected islands that would be separate from each other and from the rest of Palestine; 3) force Palestinians to give in the right of return of Palestinian refugees¹⁸⁴.

Although negotiations of peace did not bring happiness to the Palestinians, they worked for the Israelis. It is likely to face a frame such as this when considering the period of time during which negotiations of peace were held. Israel did not use to be known as a nation-state for its local area and for the international system by many

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

nations up to the 1990s. But using negotiations of peace and the new international system to its own advantage led to the gaining prestige and a legal status in the area after the 1990s. September 11 and the international system led negotiations of peace to another position. September 11, terrorist attacks have very an important role on Middle East policies especially Palestine-Israel conflict policy. USA focused on the region after these attacks, because they thought that the source of this attack was this region this conflict.

And also they strongly believed that in order to fight against terrorism, they should find solutions to this conflict. One month after the terrorist attacks Bush called people's attention to this issue as below:

The idea of a Palestinian state has always been part of a vision, so long as the right of Israel to exist is respected.” And the general public opinion about the matter at hand was that: A two state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will only be achieved through an end to violence and terrorism, when the Palestinian people have a leadership acting decisively against terror and willing able to build a practicing democracy based on tolerance and liberty, and through Israeli's readiness to do what is necessary for a democratic Palestinian state to be established, and a clear, unambiguous acceptance by both parties of the goal of a negotiated settlement as described below¹⁸⁵.

The present situation was quite different than that which negotiations of peace had created in 1991. If Israel and Palestine had been able to make use of the roadmap, the Palestinian state would have come to existence and probably the danger to the Israeli security would have stopped to exist. The problem concerning the two sides had already taken on an international shape. This point is beginning of solution for Palestinian (with including many arguments in its body), even it's confrontation point for Israel with in international system. From now on the problem between two nations is not a problem security and life problem between two nations this is a problem whole Arab World's problem (at least not for Governments but for Nations)

¹⁸⁵ Full text of Middle East 'road map", <http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/0508/p25s01-wome.html>

for making peace with international system and confrontation to the world. And this is giving back the rights of Palestinians by America which seized the Palestinians rights by Israel. That is two-sided righteous concordance.

2-2-2 The Problem Facing Israel in Terms of The Neighbouring Countries

The 1967 war ended with Israel occupying territory of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria¹⁸⁶. Looked from the point of view of Syria, the problem is focused on the fact of Golan Hills that had been occupied by the Israeli forces in 1967. From the point of view of Lebanon, the problem was that Israel had withdrawn from the south Lebanon according to the Security Council Resolution 425, and Israel left the region of security and gave up dropping bombs on some villages in the south Lebanon. In the years 2000, Lebanon warned “it would not guarantee security for northern Israel unless Israel also withdrew from the Golan and worked to resolve the refugee issue¹⁸⁷”. Syria had a similar complaint. Syria thought that Israel should have withdrawn fully from the area. However, Israel would not do anything until the legal state of Galon Hills being obvious and definite.

The actual problem amongst the three was the fact that a portion of Syrian population within Lebanon borderlines and Syria would be giving help to Hizballah that had been located in the memorial area. Hizballah have had opportunities to launch missile attacks on Israel with the aid of Syria. On the other hand, Israel responded to the activities of Hizballah and supported the idea of a group of Christian militants controlling the region of security in Lebanon. In sum, the occupation of the Galon Hills and events of that kind in Lebanon stopped negotiations of peace going fine and any possible economic agreements

¹⁸⁶ Carol Migdalovitz, “The Middle East Peace Talks”, *CRS*, Order Code IB91137, p. , 1

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2

flourishing¹⁸⁸. Although the United States considers the Golan Heights to be occupied territory subject to negotiation and Israeli withdrawal, it sympathized with the Israeli concern that Syrian control of the Heights prior to 1967 provided Syria with a tactical and strategic advantage used to threaten Israel's security¹⁸⁹.

From the point of view of Jordan, the problem was of economical and political. First of all, 45% of the population in Jordan is of the Palestinians. Jordan insisted that Israel should acknowledge the Palestinian rights and get a peaceful relationship with Syria. The future of the Palestinians was of great importance to the Jordan administration. Wars between the two countries ended by means of the Washington declaration in 1994. It was not important that the war had ended formally. It should have been the kind of peace that the public would have approved of. In May 1997, a Jordan soldier had killed Israeli students, "which led to the resign of the prime minister of Jordan, who was known for his support to the peace process¹⁹⁰". Also a specific event had been evident in history almost 50 years ago when King Abdullah tried to sign a separate peace treaty with Israel in 1951 and he was assassinated suddenly¹⁹¹". These agreements of peace between Jordan and Israel showed signs of the public being not interested in it as a result of the situation that the Palestinians were in.

Although Iraq did not have borders alongside Israel, it was Iraq that had had enormous problems with Israel apart from the Palestinians. At the height of the crisis he provoked in 1990, "Iraqi President Saddam Husayn offered to withdraw from

¹⁸⁸ Ali Çarkoğlu, Mine Eder Kemal Kirişçi, *Türkiye ve Ordoğu'da Bölgesel İşbirliği* (İstanbul: Tesev, 1998), p. 153

¹⁸⁹ Mark, op. cit. , p. Summary

¹⁹⁰ Çarkoğlu, op. cit. P. , 152

¹⁹¹ Joseph Nye, *Understanding the International Conflict*, (New York: Longman, 1997) p. 153

Kuwait if Israel withdrew from Arab territories it occupied¹⁹².” Saddam Hussain had managed to get sufficient support by describing the situation in Jarusalem and Palestine as painful. But the main point is Saddam could use the Israel Problem easily as a political material . Palestanien Refugees take place as co-reactor by Saddam’s Policy Making Process.During Iraq War, Saddam Huseyin could accomplish to get enough support by putting forward the Palestenien’s situation and Kudus’ statement.

The fact that the Saddam regime had originally socialist tendencies and made it look like an Islamic system of government after playing some political tricks on the Palestinians made it obvious that the Israel Palestine conflict would continue to be used by the politicians to their advantage as long as the Palestinians did not retain a state of their own. Iraq had always given support to Arafat and suicide bombs; Arafat, on the other hand, had always been on Iraq’s side during the Gulf war. Its most likely to face the fact that Saddam used the Palestine Israel conflict to justify his aggressive policies on the neighbouring countries and his regime.

Saddam’s this attitude apparently caused the other countries in the area to have negative attitudes towards Israel. If they had not taken negative approaches to Israel, some critics argued, they would have lost the quality of being an authority on the public. Turkey is one of the perfect examples of this situation. In the 1990s, Turkey did not hesitate to express its approval of the Palestinians whereas Turkey was apparently acting together with Israel. If Turkey had taken decisions the other way around, Turkey would not have managed to please the groups of people gathering in the streets to express their disapproval of the Israeli occupation.

Israel would think that the countries in the region had the problem of security: these countries were co-operating with terrorist groups to fight against Israel.

¹⁹² Migdalovitz. op. cit. , p. 1

One cannot easily downplay this achievement by Hizballah, since throughout the 1990s it had remained almost the sole group in any Arab state committed to implementing an armed struggle against Israel. It would be argued that Hizballah achieved what no other Arab country or army had been able to do: oust Israel from Arab territory without the Arab side committing to any concession¹⁹³.

As an Islamist movement seeking influence and power within Lebanon in order to transform Lebanese society, however,

Hizballah's victory brought it serious problems and decisions about its future. After all, it was the long, successful struggle against Israel that maintained the group, bolstered its standing within the Shi'ite community, and made it strong in Lebanon's public opinion and political system. The same factor gave it foreign support, especially from Iran and Syria¹⁹⁴.

Beyond terror, the main strategic threat from Iran centred on the development of long-range ballistic missiles and WMD warheads. Iran has pursued a vigorous program to acquire missile technology and components from Russia, China, and North Korea. The Shihab 3 missile, which was tested in July 1998, will have a range of 1300 kilometres, placing Israel, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and U.S. bases within range¹⁹⁵. Iran was constantly producing nuclear weapons and selling them to the Palestinian government so that the Palestinians could possibly pose a great danger to Israel. However, Israel was most concerned with the fact that since 1991 Iran always tended to take negative approaches to the process of peace and Iran was the only

¹⁹³ Eyal Zisser, Hizballah, "New Course or Continued Warfare", *MERIA* Vol: 4, No: 3, 2000. P. 22

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ Steinberg, op. cit. , P. 23

country expressing its disapproval of Israeli expansion in Jerusalem and in Palestine¹⁹⁶.

Iran had a different notion of Israel in Aras' opinion, an expert on the Middle East, claiming that Iran posed a great danger to the Israel:

Israel aimed at stopping the kind of Islamic vision that Iran approved of from spreading over the rest of the world, at stopping Iran being influential in the region by finding new ways to do business, at justifying its position in the region by getting some countries to supporting itself on the northern borders of the Middle East, at making sure that the Jewish minority around Iran is safe – which Israel had to set up close relationships with Baku and Tiflis in order to surround Iran¹⁹⁷.

Iran was virtually located outside the borders of the international system; therefore, the USA put many economic embarks on Iran. Iran held the belief that the reason why the USA put economic embarks on Iran stems from a-) Iran did not approve of Israeli policies on Palestine, b-) the Zionist regime provoked such policies to stop the area having a stable course of events¹⁹⁸. They argue that the reason for this is that Islamic revolution in Iran is perceived as an important obstacle harming the interests of global Zionism.

Israel had problematic relationships with Saudi Arabia. Israel does not geographically have borderlines with Saudi Arabia. Israel had already occupied the secondarily important and holy city for all Muslims in Jerusalem. The primarily important and holy city was placed within the borderlines of Saudi Arabia. A situation of that kind eventually forced Saudi Arabia to be careful about Israeli policies. Saudi Arabia had followed a more logical policy on Israel in comparison

¹⁹⁶ Bülent Aras, *Ortadoğu ve Türkiye* (İstanbul: Q-Matris, 2004), P. 44

¹⁹⁷ Bülent Aras, *Küresel Dönüşüm, Radikal Yaklaşımlar*, (İstanbul: Q-Matris, 2004, P. 13

¹⁹⁸ IRNA, 1708 GTM, 26 Ocak 1999.

with the other countries. Saudi Arabia tended to establish friendly relationships with the USA so that Saudi Arabia could have a different political body in opposition to the Jewish political body in the USA. In sum, Saudi Arabia saw the Israel – Palestine conflict as the sheer reason why the Middle East was so instable: “Saudi Arabia had the tendency towards regarding the Israel - Palestine conflict as an important reason for the quality of the Middle East being instable¹⁹⁹”. Saudi Arabia’s approach was of great importance to the international system as long as its determining role in the oil market is considered to be a fact. As a matter of fact we might see other examples on the other countries in the region like Emirates(U.A.E). According to an a questionnaire hold in,

UAE when respondents were asked about the source of major threats to UAE national security, a majority selected Israel, despite the geographic distance between the two countries. the consequence of the Gulf crisis, and the start of peace talks between the Arabs and the Jews state. The country that is next most likely to be seen as a threat to UAE national security is the United States, and in this instance there is difference associated with levels of support for religious groups²⁰⁰.

Egypt is another country that has problematic relationships with Israel. Egypt is the only nation that has managed to solve a great deal of problems that it used to have with Israel in the last three decades. However, the fact that the Palestinian state does not exist is creating tension between the two countries.

Egypt has the fear that political Islam and fundamental terror would increase incredibly. The fact that the Israeli state was founded but the Palestinian people do

¹⁹⁹ Gewdat Bahgat, “Basra Körfezi ve İsrail: Geçmişe ve Geleceğe Bakış”, *Avrasya Dosyası*, Vol: 9, No: 4, 2003, P. 139

²⁰⁰ David Garnham, Mark Tessler, *Democracy , war, peace in the Middle East*, (Indiana: Indiana University Press. / 995) p. 101

not have a fixed area of territory has always caused troubles to Egypt and some Arabic countries. From the point of view of Egypt and some moderate Arabic countries, the basic reason for the problem is two fold: a-) The particular way Israel tends to follow its policy on Palestine, b-) the fact that a fundamentalist Islamic group has not come into existence that could stop the situation in Palestine getting worse in which nobody is willing to take the responsibility of ruling, that could be identified as Arabic-Islamic by both the Arabic and Palestinian people²⁰¹. Egypt has had more doubts that the situation is unlikely to improve, after the USA ignored Arafat following September 11 and the Palestinian state has not still come into existence. As a conclusion, Israel-Palestinian problem has an impasse statement, because this region surrounded by multi-sided neighbours. And this impasse statement causes negative effects for The Region's country and the Region's integrations with the international system

2-2-3 Economic Problems and the Palestinian Refugees

Palestine "Jewish immigration and land acquisition lay at the heart of the communal tensions in Palestine²⁰²". The Israelis aimed at stopping the process of constructing an Arabic-Palestinian state by occupying the Arabic towns and cities and at transferring a large portion of the Arabic population to the neighbouring Arabic countries so that Jews could as well settle in these cities. The Israeli public opinion was that the process of constructing an Israeli state and making it possible for the Israeli people to lead their lives happily would only have been possible if the plan just mentioned above had been put into practice. Actually an idea of that kind does not sound logical. The PLO is a clear example of this argument. The PLO has been a gift that the refugees have given to the international system and to Israel who were in other countries and had a strong desire to find a home where they could lead

²⁰¹ Alper Şen, "11 Eylül Sonrasında Mısır ve Orta Doğu Radikal İslam Hareketi", *Stratejik Analiz*, No: 21, 2002, P. 66

²⁰² William L. Cleveland, *Modern Middle East* .(Boulder: Westview Pres, 1994) p. 236

an independent life²⁰³. The previous President of the USA had already been aware of the importance of the matter. Clinton once said:

I think there can be no genuine resolution to the conflict without a sovereign, viable, Palestinian state that accommodates Israel's security requirements and the demographic realities. A solution will have to be found for the Palestinian refugees who have suffered a great deal—particularly some of them²⁰⁴.

The fact that Israel forced the Palestinians out of the occupied places where Israel would have used to provide Jews with the opportunity of housing, has added a new dimension to the Israel – Palestine conflict. The problem caused by the refugees was a major factor that stopped the process of peace. The Palestinian refugees were frequently used by the politicians of the countries where the refugees lived on the pretext of peace talks. Millions of Palestinians are living and working in other Arab countries as Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Algeria and others in today. Indeed, Palestine problem is all Arabs' problem. They think, Israel doesn't just want to have lands of Palestine. It had Jerusalem and it wants to have all Arab's lands. Because of that, these all of the Arabic countries give place to Palestinians and they had felt same annoyance when İsrail occupied lands of Palestine.

There were a number of things that made it possible to use the matter politically. Firstly, the Palestinian refugees were suffering a lot. The Palestinian refugees living in different parts of the world have different problems. For instance, according to the statistics of UNRWA there are 374.440 Palestinians living in Lebanon, who are unlikely to find a nice job. The problem of Palestinian refugees

²⁰³ Marwan Bishari, Filistin/ İsrail: Barış veya İrkçılık.(İstanbul Kitap Yayınevi, 2003)p.,47

²⁰⁴ Wilcox, op. cit. , p. 3

has taken on a different meaning after the Black September that happened in Jordan in 1970, the occupation of Israel over Lebanon in 1982, the act of Kuwait forcing the Palestinians out of the country, the negative approaches that the Iraqi people took regarding the Palestinian refugees in Iraq following the last Iraq invasion. The Palestinian problem should have been taken seriously. Different resources say that there are 5-6 million Palestinian refugees in the World²⁰⁵.

As the problem of the refugees continued to create problems between Israel and other countries, the actual problem was caused by their legal status. The Palestinian refugees had come face to face with an international legal difficulty.

Today it is UNRWA that could help the Palestinian refugees; however, they are far from doing it really because their influence is limited. Edward Said has said about UNRWA that. In spite of the national consciousness that the Palestinian people tend to exhibit, UNRWA plays the role of a father providing food, clothes, healthcare, and training²⁰⁶.

The solution to the problem of Palestinian refugees is bound to the act of refugees returning to their own country if they want to. However, the Israeli state held the belief that the right of return would only belong to the kind of refugees being a citizen of the country that they would return to.

On the one hand, the mass of the Palestinian Arab residents in the territories that were to come under Israeli rule, designated by the 1947 UN Partition Plan to become citizens of the Jewish State, nearly three quarters of a million 1948 Palestinian refugees and their descendants, and some 40,000 of the approximately

²⁰⁵ Murat Yılmaz, "Filistin'de İnsan hakları İhlalleri ve Duvar Gerçeği", *Kudüs*, No: 4, 2004, p. 86

²⁰⁶ Edward Said, *Filistin Sorunu*, tran, Alev Alatlı, (Istanbul: Pınar Yayınları, 1985) p. 94

160,000 who remained in Israel and their descendants were (classified by the Absentees Property Law, 1950 as absentees' On the other hand, every person throughout the world recognized by the State of Israel as a 'Jew' was proclaimed by the Law of Return to be a potential citizen. The classification of the Palestinian refugees as 'absentees', as non-persons, as persons who effectively did not exist in the view of this law, entailed the nullification of all rights to property, residence and citizenship in Israel:

Their rights were vested by the stipulation of the said law in the Custodian of Absentees Property and subsequently transferred through the Development Authority to exclusive Jewish settlement, cultivation and development instead²⁰⁷. On the other hand, when looked from the international laws, the resolution 194 of the UN gave the refugees to return to their homeland freely.

The problem of Palestinian refugees was not only connected to the Arabic world, and their sufferings would be enough to make the rest of the world take a negative approach to Israel. For example, Turkish people trust the Palestinian people and take their side, the surveys by ANAR and by the Centre for the European studies at the University of Bogazici²⁰⁸.

The economic situation that exists in the area has had a great effect on the Palestine and Israel conflict. The lack of cultural and political needs would not pose a serious threat to the human life; however, the lack of economic needs would make the situation even worse for the human beings. The present situation of the

²⁰⁷ Uri Davis, "Palestine Refugees at the Crossroad of 1996 Permanent Status Negotiations", <http://www.shaml.org/publications/monos/mono1-2.htm> (17 April 2004)

²⁰⁸ Bülent Aras, *Küresel Dönüşüm Radikal Yaklaşımlar*, (Istanbul: Q-Matris, 2004)p. 87

Palestinian economy is bad enough. This stabilization and development of government services and institutions depends on two central factors:

Regional political stability, dependent upon the continuation of the Peace Process and eventually the establishment of an independent Palestinian state; and 2) For example, without the power to decide trade policy, the Palestinian economy must continue to rely on Israel for the majority of its imports and exports. This puts Palestinian trade at a great disadvantage since prices for both imports and exports must filter through Israeli-controlled policies²⁰⁹.

Economic discrepancies exist between Israel and Palestine, making it all the more difficult to pave the way for a peaceful area.

WBG imports a total of \$3.2 billion, \$2.4 billion or 75% of which is imported from Israel (all figures are for 1998).¹ WBG exports a total of about \$730 million, with close to \$700 million or 96% exported to Israel. WBG has a GDP of \$4.25 billion (about 5% of that of Israel) and a GNP of about \$5 billion²¹⁰.

As long as the amount of income per person is concerned, WBG reports that the Palestinians are 10 times behind the Israelis. The fact that the Palestinian economy cannot be integrated with the Israeli economy makes the situation even worse. The economic situation was getting better for the Israeli side only because of the Israeli settlement and possession. A policy of that kind would only have produced negative results. Actually the Israeli settlement stopped the accumulation of capital and investment in the infrastructure, which would be expected to integrate economies of the two sides.

²⁰⁹Caroline Efrati, Factors of Growth in the Palestinian Economy, <http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/maxpages/faculty/gmbonham/2000-Fall-IR-Projects/Website-Group/ICN/Copy%20of%20ICNweb/efrati2.htm>

²¹⁰ Maurice Schiff, "Trade Policy and Labor Services: Final Status Options for the West Bank and Gaza" *The World Bank report*, February 2004, <ftp://repec.iza.org/RePEc/Discussionpaper/dp1029.pdf> (10 February 2003)

In 1993, what faced the Palestinian economy was the lack of production modes rather than the expected amount of demand; insufficient capital, employment and out-of-date technological equipment²¹¹. Israel needed to find an economically strong partner to pave the way for a peaceful area and to stop the area being controlled by radical groups. 1) in order to have a strong economic partnership, you must have a strong economic partner; and 2) the weak economic status of the Palestinian Territories creates fertile ground for fundamentalism²¹². After the occupation in 1967 economies of territories have been depended on Israel and later Israel get a chance to get new strategy to use economy for fighting²¹³.

However, Israel had gained fame for acting the other way around:

in 1967, Israel had started a new policy of imposing tariffs on the West Bank. That meant the act of importing non-Israeli products into Palestine would be checked at the customs: while importing Israeli products into Palestine would not be checked at the customs. That decreased the prices of Israeli products while increasing the prices of non-Israeli products, which forced the Palestinians to buy the Israeli products. The fact that the Palestinians would have means for production only made the situation gets worse²¹⁴.

The report that the World Bank published regarding the economical situation in Palestine says;

Palestinian gross national income per capita has fallen to nearly half of what it was two years ago. More than half the work force is unemployed, and the incidence of severe malnutrition has risen. The

²¹¹ M İbrahim Turhan, *Filistin Çıkmazdan Çözümüne*, (İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2003)p. 393

²¹² Muhammed Z. Yakan, "From War to Peace: Obstacles, Prospects. Implimentation of the Middle East Peace Process," *Israel Affair* 3, (Spring/summer 1997)p. 148

²¹³ Don Peretz, "Intifadeh: The Palestine Uprising", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol :66, No: 5 (Summer 1998)p. 971

²¹⁴ Efrati, op. cit. , p. 309

main cause of the Palestinian economic crisis is closure the imposition by the Government of Israel of restrictions on the movement of Palestinian people and goods across borders and within the West Bank and Gaza, the report says²¹⁵.

According to the report, the tendency of the economical values to declining suddenly continued to exist in the second year of the Intifada. The amount of income per person has been half of what it used to be two years ago. 50% of the people that could well work are unemployed. Physical damage resulting from the conflict amounted to US\$728 million by the end of August 2002. Between June 2000 and June 2002, Palestinian exports declined by almost a half, and imports by a third. Investment shrunk from an estimated US\$1.5 billion in 1999 to a mere US\$140 million last year. Overall national income losses in just over two years have reached US\$5.4 billion equivalent of one full year of national income prior to the intifada²¹⁶. When getting a look to the report, It is seen that Israel – Palestine conflict getting worse about economic and humanitarian situation. The most open example is shown in report by this information: According to 50% of the Palestinian people are not employed and have to live on only 2\$ a day.

The report says once again about an establishment of political progress:

An agreed framework for political progress remains indispensable to re-establish the conditions for the resumption of economic and social development in both Israel and the Palestinian territories,” adds Roberts. “This poses many challenges to the three main groups: the Palestinian Authority, the donors, and the Government of Israel²¹⁷.”

²¹⁵“ Assesses the Economic and Social Damage Caused by the Current Conflict” *World Bank Releases Report on Palestinian Economic Crisis*, 5 March 2003.

<http://usinfo.state.gov/regional/nea/summit/text2003/0305econ.htm>, (3 April 2004)

²¹⁶ Op. Cit. , *World Bank Releases Report on Palestinian Economic Crisis*, 2003.

²¹⁷ Ibid.

Despite the geographical area that Israel-Palestine conflict has occurred and still going on is small scale, its political results are affecting all world. Yet the repercussions of developments in and attitudes toward this small piece of southern Syria have reverberated throughout the Middle East and the world at large, shaping regional and Great Power relationships, influencing U.S and European domestic politics, generating five wars, creating over 1 million refugees, and producing misunderstanding and bitterness among the various parties involved²¹⁸.

2-3 New America versus New Israel and New Palestine: Road Map

America believed that Palestine- Israel conflict must be solved in order to bring the democracy to the Middle East by fighting to terrorism and to supply stability in the Middle East. The strategy that America used to solve the conflict between Palestine - Israel depended on the road map which was prepared with the supervision of United Nations .The road map policy's aim summarized by America was that the settlement will resolve the Israel-Palestinian conflict, and end the occupation that began in 1967, based on the foundations on the Madrid Conference, the principle of land for peace, UNSCRs 242, 338 and 1397, agreements previously reached by the parties, and the initiative of Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah - endorsed by the Beirut Arab League Summit - calling for acceptance of Israel as a neighbour living in peace and security, in the context of a comprehensive settlement²¹⁹. Although there were some special changes in the road map, it seems like the total of peace plans which were put forward in 1990s. But the point that attracts attention in the road map is that

²¹⁸ William L. Cleveland, *Modern Middle East* , (Boulder: Westview Pres, 1994)p. 222

²¹⁹ Op. Cit. , Middle East Road Map

it was prepared with the supervision of United Nations and inspectors are spaced to the both sides which have problems to supply the peace.. In the first part stopping terrorism, making Palestine life normal and building new establishments Palestinian won't have any connection with terrorists and will prepare some establishments in order to have a government. Also Palestine wouldn't do anything which provokes Israel or it would inform about that situation. Israel would help Palestine about that subject. Another thing Israel has to do is that it wouldn't establish new housing places: "Israel will accept independent Palestinian which would regard the security of Israel with respect to democratic understanding and peaceful solution alongside Israel²²⁰."

Boucher said it is Palestinian people's choice to select their next prime minister through representatives in the Palestinian Legislative Council. However, he added that the candidates will definitely be solving the problems in one way or another:

The United States hopes that whoever is chosen will be given "the political power and the control of the security forces and of the finances of the Palestinian Authority to stop terrorist organizations." Boucher said when the Palestinians have a democratic government and establishments US wants to work with them. "And so, we want to treat them as best we can in their governing process; let them make the decisions, and make clear that we're prepared to work with them if they're prepared to take their responsibility."²²¹

The second stage was about establishing a Palestinian state which has provisional borderlines and is built on a new constitution. As has been noted before, this goal can be achieved when the Palestinian people have leadership acting decisively against terror, willing and able to build a practicing democracy based on

²²⁰ Ibid.

²²¹ Ibid.

tolerance and liberty. It was told that everything would be done quartet he two sides in order to pass that phase. If Palestine reform civil institutions and security structures Quartet (UN, US, Russia, UN) and the broader international community will support it to establish a state²²². Its main aims are comprehensive security performance and effective security cooperation which are continual, building institutions and making Palestinian's life normal. establishing prime minister office. political reform's consolidation, creating a state which has provisional borders. The most important process of that phase would be that Palestina should put in an orderly the election. Because the elections were very important for Palestina's government to become an association. The Quartet that prepared the report will decide that the sides can pass the third phase or not whether they did the necessities the of second phase or not.

Phase III., that phase's goals will be connection of institutions' working of stability and reform, continuation of Palestinian security practices, realizing consultations of Israel and Palestinian for the aim of constant statute agreement in 2005. At the end of that process, this ends the occupation that began in 1967, and includes an agreed, just, fair. and realistic solution to the refugee issue. and a negotiated resolution on the status.

America's opinion on the subject of to Palestine, Israel and the Arab world is that they can all live side by side in peace. People living there, should save the road map because it has gathered everybody. The Arab and Israeli think the same way

²²² Ibid.

with other nations about Palestine. So there is a road map. Peace is very difficult with terrorist events but Palestine has to do everything to stop terrorism²²³.

Having a look at the success of the road map to supply peace, it was obvious that it was different from peace meetings in the region. The first point that strikes is that the responsibilities were equal for level and time. It wasn't the same before. Although the sides have undertaken the promises, they waited for each other to take the first step. But the road map was different. Although that plan was prepared by Quartet, the main pushing power was the US to apply its strong support; it will have the opportunity to smooth relations in that region because of the war in Iraq. Israel knows that America won't compensate for the politics so it seems to do its responsibilities. In analyzing the last actions of Israel, it is evident that Israel is trying to acquire more time to apply the road map. The main question is the mode against Israel, which the road map and US will assume after September 11 to be successful. According to some news in press, Sharon prepared 100 changes about plan to present US. There isn't a very important situation about peace meetings to be successful until 2004. The US knows that, so it presses to both sides in order to apply the road map. The new cordial view about applying the road map and the image of that view in the eyes of other governments in that region is more important than success and continuation of road map. If the road map gets successful US's position will be very important to Israel. Israel will have a chance to solve security problem. It is a fact which is told by experts. Solution of Israel security problem will be very beneficial for the US.

²²³ Op.cit. ,Grossman, "Interview by Rachid Jaafar of Abu Dhabi Television"

If the Middle East becomes democratic the U.S will make use of it. The regimes that become democratic will have the opportunity to be close to US and have positive relations. US will find solutions about Palestine- Israel conflict and that will help it not to have close relations so the anti-Americanism will decrease. And this will lead to the increase in corporation between US and region's countries. With the increasing of being democratic some civil societies such as in US. can arise and contribute to secular order to develop. The main important thing is that success about the Palestine- Israel conflict will give an opportunity to remove anti-Americanism that had been feeding terrorism. If terrorism is removed. a large group of rivals of the US will be eliminated as well. In short, the success of the US in this area will solve a political problem which is very important in the regional, religious, ideological, and international areas the struggle with terrorism will not only be an inspiration but also be source of demoralization, because of the loss of big ammunition for terrorists. As a result, It can be say that the problem in the region is a problem that matters to the system's institutional structure. Institutional changes in the structural changes of systematic problems' positive solution will cause a positive impact on the whole system. The positive result of Palestine –Israel problem that US is interested to reach is the systematic contribution to which will help being democratic wave. Abd israil filistin konusunda çözüm bularak israil ile eskisi gibi yakın diolok kurma gerekesimini aza indirecek ve uzun dönemde kendisine karşı oluşmuş anti amerikaniz harekâtının önünü alacaktır. Bu ise ABD ise bölge ülkeleri arasında ki işbirliğinin artıştan sebebiyet verecektir. By raising democracy in the region there would be a social society like ABD type and this helps to devolop a secular system .But the main point is if America should solve Palestenien-Israel problem , America should have the opportunity of remove the Anti-American ideology which this ideology causes and feeding terror or easy staff for terrorism.And Also if terror should be removed by America, America should have a big trump against competitors over the way of preeminance.This policy is very important for legitimate the war on the sight of Nations of Middle East and for providing stability in the region after war.

CHAPTER III

WHY DOES AMERICA WAGE WAR AGAINST IRAQ

At the end of cold war US was named as a superpower by the other regional and big powers. In fact US have been the superpower after it blew up the atomic bomb to Hiroshima in 1945 and frayed Japan. But there was a power that can challenging during the cold war, Soviet Union. So the period of cold war was named as bipolar world. This situation leads us to think the bipolar of the cold war; in other words, the polarization between Western Block countries and Eastern Block countries. As knowing US is the leader of western block. Soviet Union is the leader of eastern block. Block organization of west is NATO and block organization of east is Varsov Pact. At that system if there is a serious tension between the two blocks, universal organization or the neutral governments which are out of the block have the role of peacemaking. When we look at the history we can see applications of this system. When there was a serious tension between the bipolar at the time of cold war, sometimes United Nations and sometimes New Independent countries had the role of peacemaking. At the end of the Cold War, the U.S.A. was called the superpower by various countries. Actually, it is the year 1945 that has marked the quality of the U.S.A. being the superpower when the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. However, during the cold war period, a source of power was still alive that could pose a threat to the U.S.A.: the U.S.S.R. for this reason, the cold war period has come to be known as the bipolar world.

Because of the quality of the international system being bipolar, relations between the countries have been based on security worries. The struggle for power between bi-polar is at the core of international relations²²⁴. The amount of the whole contribution of the bipolar international system was based on the mutual effect of the two powerful countries. In other words, it was based on general balance of power Balance of power. Basically, varying amounts of power, each one striving to maximize its own power, there is a tendency for the entire system to be in balance²²⁵. The main argument of the balance of power to provide the international system with an order is to “preserve the security and independence of big power²²⁶” Thus, the resolution of the U.N. 24 would be enacted. “All members should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, or political independence of any state²²⁷”. The competition of the two powerful countries has stopped one side from dominating the other side.

The collapse of the U.S.S.R. made a remarkable change in the international system and the U.S.A. has had a great chance of establishing an overall domination on the earth by using the situation in the Middle East to its own advantage. Actually, the U.S.A. had to establish its hegemony on the earth because it had previously been described as ‘the superpower’ and all it has done is to act accordingly²²⁸. US’s economic and military power would rule the world which wasn’t same after the

²²⁴ Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kappani, *International relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism*, (New York: Mcmillian Publishing, 1987) p. 34

²²⁵ F Orgnaski, *World Politics*, (New York: 1958), p. 273

²²⁶ R. Berridge, *International Politics: State Conflict Since 1945*, (New York, 1987), p. 148

²²⁷ The United Nations the European Year Book vo.: 10 , 1991, p. 9

²²⁸ Robert H. Scrine, “ Beyond the Cold War: Emerging International Relations in the 1990s”, *International Affair*, no. 2 1990, p. 25

WWII.²²⁹ In the, first century Roman Senator asked to Augustus to assume imperial powers of the administration for public good so after the cold war international system ask the United States to assume the central role in a new world way²³⁰. The way that the president of America called his project the new world order was a political slogan and marked the end of the old system. But it did not manage to make anything come true.

The Iraq war had caused the new world order. Saddam Hussein was one of the first leaders to understand the notion of the new world order. In his opinion, the invasion of Kuwait was a sign of the dominant power in the Gulf²³¹. In other words, when the bipolar system of soviet finished, Iraq wanted to be a powerful Arab country²³²

Iraq has always been a place of conflict for great power units in history because of its geographic and natural resources, a meeting point for various cultures. Today it is still regarded as a place where great power units wish to occupy. One of the most basic arguments about Iraq stems from the way it is governed. The argument is intended to criticize the mechanism of Saddam regime and the way he tended to apply policies. In fact, looking at the past policies of Saddam, this is quite difficult to prove wrong. By refusing to follow the international laws, Iraq had invaded Iran; initiating war that would exacerbate relationships between Iran, and its Gulf

²²⁹ Stanley Hoffman, "A New World and its Troubles", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol: No: 69, no. 4, 1990, pp. 120-121

²³⁰ Antonio Negri, *Empire*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 2000) p. 197

²³¹ Don Peretz, *The Middle East Today*, (New York: Praeger, 1988) p. 455

²³² Richard K. Herrmann "The middle east and new world order." *International Security*, Vol. 16, no. 2. 1991 p. 51

neighbours²³³. Iraq had already started to claim for areas of land in Kuwait since 1973. When in 1979 Saddam Hussein had come to the throne, Iraq had had a more aggressive attitude. In 1990, Saddam made an incident happen which he had never been expected of. For the first time, an Arabic country had attacked another Arabic country. There was no doubt that “any aggression against Iraq will be confronted by Muslims everywhere”²³⁴. Some Muslim thinkers would not have an opinion of that kind: Some wahhabi authorities would say “if Iraq has occupied Kuwait, America has occupied Saudi Arabia. The real enemy is not Iraq. It is the west”²³⁵.

A country that is considered to be a candidate for the most advanced and wealthy country in the middle east wasted its resources for armament and challenged the U.S.A. with which it had for long years co-operated to prepare for the wars financially in the past²³⁶. How could Iraq buy weapons? It was not a powerful country before the war. Iraq used to produce 5% of oil all over the world. However, by means of close relationships with the west during the war, it managed to produce as much oil as Saudi Arabia following the war²³⁷. All these mean that Iraq had started a war against the U.S.A. when it had gone to war with Kuwait. The U.S.A. interpreted the invasion of Kuwait as the fact that Iraq would not listen to the new world order and as the first post-cold war²³⁸. In the reason why the U.S.A. had tended to interpret it this way stems from the fear that Iraq and the Middle East would be out of control. It could as well give a chance to China and Europe to use

²³³ Ibid.

²³⁴ “Islam Diveded”, *The economist*, 22 September 1990”, p. 47

²³⁵ Judith Caesar, “Rumblings Under the Throne: Saudi Arabian Politics”, *The Nation* 251:21,762.

²³⁶ Kenneth M. Polak, “ Next Stop Baghdad?” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol: 8, no: 2, 2002, p. 85

²³⁷ Christine Moss helms, *Iraq*, (Washington: Brooking Isntitution, 1984,) p. 196

²³⁸ Fred Halliday, “The Gulf War and its Aftermath. First Reflections”, *International Affair*, 67, no. 2 1991. p. 223

the situation to their own advantage in opposition to Washington.²³⁹ In American view, it is unavoidable “as the power of state increase, it seek to extend its territorial control or its domination of international economy.”²⁴⁰

The U.S.A had destroyed communism at the end of the cold war and claimed to establish democratic regimes all over the world. However, the fact of Iraq invading Kuwait had made the new position of America after the cold war period seems less important. The kind of regime that Iraq was governed by means of, its attempts to be a leader for Arabic countries, and its efforts to hide WMD, taken together, made America pay special attention to Iraq.

Had Iraq succeeded, its widespread popular support across the region probably would have increased further; it very likely would have become the hegomon of the Arab Mashriq, supported by Jordan, Palestine and able to bend Saudi Arabia and the other into problematical world²⁴¹.

The fact of Iraq invading Kuwait had caused the two allied countries to get separated from each other. The U.S.A. could as well take seriously Saddam Hussein who had caused millions of people to die in the 1980s, and could pacify it so that it could no longer pose a danger to Israel. The impression that Iraq was potentially able to pose a great danger was intended to make the western countries believe that Iraq could well be occupied²⁴². US understood it was time to that the aggression against the Kuwait was to be portrayed as aggression all state and peoples²⁴³. The U.S.A. had

²³⁹ Kemal Inat, *Dünya Çatışma Bölgeleri*, (Ankara: Nobel, 2004) p. 7

²⁴⁰ Robert Gilpin, *War & Change in World politics*, (New York: Cambridge University pres 1995)p .106

²⁴¹ Michael C. Hudson, *Middle East Dilemma*, (London, Tauris Publisher,1998)p. 14

²⁴² Tayyar Arı, *Irak, İran ve ABD*,(İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 2003) p. 444

²⁴³ Neil Renwick, *American's World Identity*, (New York: Macmillan, 2000)p. 187

managed to pacify Iraq soon after the invasion in 1991. But the U.S.A. had not dethroned Saddam Hussein. The reason was that the war had been intended to put an end to the Iraqi invasion. to make the area of gulf secure. to make sure that American people were alive²⁴⁴. and the war was aimed at destroying the Iraqi government. However, the presence of the Baath regime had always played a role that worked to the advantage of the U.S.A. because it always justified the American armament and attacks on the region²⁴⁵. On the other hand, the immediate collapse of the Saddam regime could produce results that some allied countries of Iraq would not be happy with.

Having the idea that Saddam aimed at weakening the pro-west countries in the region, as the United States move toward implimenting a policy of regime change in Iraq. the economic and politic difficulties for Jordan and ecs. shoulde be compound²⁴⁶.

The U.S.A. had made a decision called 'surrounding' in order to stop it from posing a danger to the international system any more. It comprised of the following qualities:

- 1) Strict control of the U.N. resolutions on Iraq
- 2) Ensuring gun use
- 3) Supporting the opposing sides contrary to the Iraqi central

²⁴⁴ Freedman, op. cit. , p. 195

²⁴⁵ Noam Chomsky, *Kuşatma Altında Irak*, (İstanbul: Everest Yayınları. , 2001), p. 59

²⁴⁶ David, Schenker, *Dancing with Saddam*, (New York: Lexington Books, 2003)p. 115

Making sure that Iraq would obey the rules concerning the secure area and the area where no airplane is allowed to fly on either northern or southern parts of the country²⁴⁷.

The plans of the U.S.A. have not quite come off, although Iraq was, to a certain degree, made to follow rules of disarmament and stopping to produce WMD. That would have caused lots of problems to Iraq in the future. On the other hand, the fact of the U.S.A. putting embarks on Iraq has gradually led the public to think highly of Saddam. Some reports said that unclear water and malnutrition has brought out the toll of human suffering, which gained Saddam some supporters only²⁴⁸.

Some critics tended to think that Saddam would not be able to pose a great danger because of the restricted use of economic resources²⁴⁹.

There have been lots of discussion about the embarks. Some claimed that Iraq would still sell oil in spite of embarks. They had the opinion that Iraq could produce as much oil a day as 100.000 barrels and the major company that bought these amounts of oil was a Russian company²⁵⁰.

Another important strategy that the U.S.A. tried to pacify Iraq regime was to support the kind of groups that opposed Saddam²⁵¹. The reason that the U.S.A. had given for this policy was based on the pretext that the public was discriminated

²⁴⁷ New Iraqi Covert "Weapons Projects Discovered" *The Middle East* (January 1999), p. 14

²⁴⁸ Eric Herring, "Between Iraq and Hard Place: A critique of the British Government's Narrative on UN Economic Sanction," September 1999, www.cam.ac.uk/societies/casi/conf99/doc/herring.html

²⁴⁹ Daniel Byman, "After the storm: U.S Policy Toward Iraq since 1991", *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol: No.4 2000, p. 495

²⁵⁰ David Storey, "Boarder Russian Oil Tanker in Gulf is Detained", *Reuters* February 3, 2000

²⁵¹ Karen Brutens, "In pursuit of Pax Americana", *Russian Social Science Review*, vol. 41, no.3, 2000, p. 46

against each other. All commercial people from the first class in Iraq, all of them are partners of Saddam. The U.S.A. made efforts to help and reinforce opposite groups.

This kind of policy was intended to establish close relationships with them so that the U.S.A. could easily appoint one of them as the new government when the Saddam government falls apart. The Iraq liberation act in 1997 could as well be a perfect example of such American policies.

The congress's resolution was aimed at providing these groups with military materials, helping them to run their own television and radio channels²⁵². Another important decision to dethrone Saddam was the act of transferring 97 Million \$ to the Iraqi national congress in 1998. These groups would co-operate with CIA²⁵³.

The American air raids worked actually so that even occasionally Iraq had to give up some its activities. The fact of some people being killed caused the Iraqi people to have a negative attitude towards the U.S.A. On the other hand, air raids of this kind caused the U.S.A. to get a bad reputation because the U.S.A. was accused of stopping to follow the international rules²⁵⁴.

Accusations often worked. Iraq was not able to stop the U.S.A from continuing with air raids; however, Iraq could as well persuade other countries not to provide America with places for airplanes. That was not a great problem to the U.S.A. When other countries did not allow the U.S.A. to use their military airports, the U.S.A. was using the military airport in the island of Guam²⁵⁵.

²⁵² Daniel Byman, "Proceed with Caution: U.S. Support for the Iraqi Opposition" *The Washington Quarterly*, Summer 1999, p. 24

²⁵³ "Slippery Saddam", *The Economist* (10 October 1998), p. 44

²⁵⁴ Robin Wright, "America's Iraq policy: How did It Come to This". *The Washington Quarterly*, Summer, 1998, p. 63

²⁵⁵ Michael W. Isherwood, "U.S. Strategic Options for Iraq: Easier Said than Done", *The Washington Quarterly*, spring, 2002, p. 146

England had sent planes to make sure that the Iraqi regime could continue to exist. The most advanced chemical weapons had “been provided by the overdeveloped industrial countries so that Kurds could well be killed²⁵⁶”.

It would be far from the truth to say that the U.S.A. was either successful or unsuccessful in terms of the outcome of its policies in the 1990s. Up to September 11, America was not sure enough to say that it wanted such things to happen. It won't be wrong to regard the American policy on the region up to September 11. American policy makers need to recognize that the only box into which sanctions put Iraqis is coffins²⁵⁷. As a result of this incident, the U.S.A. had only made it possible for Saddam to continue to exist more powerfully than ever²⁵⁸. To sum the period of time through 1990 to 2003 it is seen to conclude that the only thing that the “U.S.A. has accomplished apart from ruining the Iraqi people instead of the Iraqi government,” is that the “U.S.A. has had a chance of imposing its Dual Containment policy on Iraq at the same time as the” Iraqi government was continuing to exist²⁵⁹.

The U.S.A. tended to ignore the fact that despotic power, involves the extraction of resource from society without consent and the arbitrary but deployment of violence to facilitate the state's survival²⁶⁰. Society in Iraq, dominated by flexible networks of patronage and violence that were used to reshape Iraqi society in the

²⁵⁶ Mesut Çaşın, “Körfez Savaşı'nın Stratejik Sonuçları”, *Avrasya Dosyası*, Vol. 1. no. 2, Summer 1997, p. 225

²⁵⁷ F.Gregory Gause, “Getting It Backward on Iraq”. *Foreign Affairs*, mayi June.2001, P. 56

²⁵⁸ Stephen Zunes, “ Foreign Policy by Catharsis: the Failure of U.S Policy Toward Iraq”, *Arab Studies Quaterly*, vol:23, No: 4, 2001 Fall, 2001, p. 75

²⁵⁹ Paolo Ruspini, Iraq and the strategy of Dual containment”, *Defence Analysis*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 1997. p. 93

²⁶⁰ Michael Mann, *The autonomous power of the State*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), p. 5

image of Saddam and his regime²⁶¹. The U.S.A. would perhaps have had to think to deal with a country whose governmental infrastructure and civil society were largely broken during the Bathist dictatorship.²⁶² But, the first step was to have a full influence on Iraq. This would be a wholesale nation- building effort, aiming to change the values that have underpinned the last 35 years of Iraqi life²⁶³.

3-1 War under the Name of Preventive War for Emancipation for World

After Kosovo, many Chinese commentators conclude that US has adopted an offensive-oriented “neo-imperialist.” “neo-interventionist” strategy, capitalizing on its preponderant power to expand, perpetuate, and impose worldwide hegemony²⁶⁴.

In the opinion of many international critics about to experience such a process in which those who challenged Western hegemony were punished by Western powers.

The democratically elected prime minister of Iran, Muhammed Mossaegd, was overthrown in a coup backed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in 1953. His “crime” was the nationalization of the oil companies. Saddam Hussein of Iraq challenged the west when his Forces invaded Kuwait and occupied it on 2 August 1990²⁶⁵.

First of all, it is needed to realize the way the American government tended to perceive its wars with other countries ,when America has intervened, it has done so

²⁶¹ Charles Tripp, *A History of Iraq*, (Cambridge: University Press, 2000), p. 26

²⁶² Toby Dodge, “US Intervention and Possible Iraqi Futures”. *Survival Quarterly*, Vol: 45. No: 3. 2003

²⁶³ “Iraq After Saddam, the quagmire of political reconstruction”, *ISSS* , Comment. vol: 8, no.:4. May 2002

²⁶⁴ Yong Deng, “Is There a US Global Strategy?” Prepared for the Conference, “The Global Role of PRC”, July 21-23, 2000, Hotel Edgewater, Seattle, Washington, USA., <http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/papers/deng00.pdf>(10 May 2004)

²⁶⁵ Tareq Y. Ismail and Jacqueline S. Ismael, *The Gulf War and the New World Order*, (Gainesville: University Press of America, 1994) p. 56

reluctantly and stayed only as long as necessary. Later, seek to leave countries better than they were before. "American internationalism: promoting freedom, democracy and development²⁶⁶." It did not have different notions of a war against Iraq: liberating Iraq will not only produce democracy there, but it will also encourage democracy in the rest of the Middle East²⁶⁷.

In 2003, Iraq started to be considered to be the kind of country with which it was impossible to agree, and did not approach to admit the rules imposed on it²⁶⁸. This war has caused a different understanding to arise in comparison with the ex-gulf war. Bush said: "In this era of warfare, we can target a regime, not a nation²⁶⁹". Many critics agreed that that was the main reason for the short term hot or hard war.

During the Bush administration, the most active group in the government was called the neo-conservatives. This group did not tend to have a positive attitude towards embarks and the containment policy on the Saddam regime. In their opinion, Saddam was still alive in site of the all embarks on the country, and he set an example to the groups that opposed the new world order.

On the other hand, embarks on the area caused many people to die and stopped the U.S.A. from gaining a low politic powerful position. Opinions of that kind were triggered on September 11, and the U.S.A. had already decided to be done with the job. The reasons why the administration launched attacks on Iraq are as follows:

²⁶⁶ Holmes, op. cit. , p. 6

²⁶⁷ Robert Jervis, "Understanding the Bush Doctrine". *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol:118, No: 3 · Fall 2003, p. 365

²⁶⁸ Çaşın, op. cit. , p. 225

²⁶⁹ George W. Bush, "Speech on Progress in Operation Iraqi Freedom. April 16,2003, www.whitehouse.gov/news/release/2003/04/200304166-9html

Laden and Taliban regard America as their enemies, and encourage Iraq against America; and the illegal activities of Iraq and the neighbouring countries that ruined the public.

Wolfowitz said: "The truth is that for reasons that have a lot to do with the U.S. government bureaucracy we settled" upon the basic issue which "everyone could agree on which was weapons of mass destruction as the core reason, but -- hold on one second"²⁷⁰.

Cheney's opinion was also that:

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies, and against us. And there is no doubt that his aggressive regional ambitions will lead him into future confrontations with his neighbours²⁷¹.

Bush had similar opinions as well: Iraq has made several attempts to buy high-strength aluminium tubes used to enrich uranium for a nuclear weapon. Should Iraq acquire fissile material, it would be able to build a nuclear weapon within a year²⁷². America would have had to go to war with Iraq if it had wanted to protect itself.

Fareed Zakaria says that US has been the best of international order for a long time. "For much of the twentieth century, America embraced international cooperation not out of fear and vulnerability but from a position of confidence and strength." "When

²⁷⁰ Paul Wolfowitz "Interview with Sam Tanenhaus of Vanity Fair" Friday, May 9, 2003, <http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2003/tr20030509-depsecdef0223.html> (11 April 2004)

²⁷¹ Dick Cheney, "Vice President Speaks at VFW 103rd National Convention", August 26, 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/08/20020826.html> (12 April 2004)

²⁷² George W. Bush, Remarks, "President's Remarks at the United Nations General Assembly" New York, September 12, 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html>

America was even more powerful than it is today – by some measures it had fifty percent of world output – it put into place a series of measures designed to rebuild its adversaries, institutionalize international cooperation on dozens of global issues, and alleviate poverty. It is said that some regards America like “the new Leviathan, benign master of all it surveys, constrained by none, drawing its legitimacy by right of power²⁷³.”

3-1-1-Human Rights and A Rogue Regime

Saddam Hussein had decided his policies in 1968 upon the central government that would oppress the society and the minorities. Family members and his relatives were assigned to the central government and various departments. Religion was a means by which Saddam Hussein kept people under his own control. The amount of money that the government made out of oil production was spent to found a perfect mechanism so that every bit of life and government could be under control. Saddam Hussein and his regime continued to,

refer to an October 1995 undemocratic "referendum" on his presidency, in which he received 99.96 percent of the vote. This "referendum" included neither secret ballots nor opposing candidates, and many credible reports indicated that voters feared possible reprisal for a dissenting vote²⁷⁴.

In 2002, Cheney argued that the public opinion was approving of a regime reform, when he had returned from the Middle East. The Bush administration's "theory of victory" is built around the notion that Saddam is a brutal dictator.

²⁷³ Julian Lindley-French, "U.S. The New Leviathan?" *Institute for Security Studies Newsletter*, No. 3–4, September 2002.

²⁷⁴ Department of State Human Rights Reports for Iraq, 2000, February 2001, <http://www.humanrights-usa.net/reports/iraq.html>

despised by many of his own people, whose rule is based on fear rather than loyalty”.

This makes his regime brittle, vulnerable to a sharp rap from the outside²⁷⁵.

The Bush administration “believe a significant number of Saddam’s army commanders and units will either refuse to fight or will assist allied troops in toppling the Baghdad regime²⁷⁶.” One important person Richard Perle said that: “

I don’t believe we have to defeat Saddam’s army. I think Saddam’s army will defeat Saddam.” “Saddam’s army barely fought for him a decade ago; now, at about a third the size it was then and far less formidably equipped, it faces an American military that is stronger than ever²⁷⁷.”

The reason why the American government tended to think this way stems from the bad way the Iraqi government treated people and low-rank officials. According to various opposition groups, government officials reportedly executed Republican Guard Brigadier General Abd al-Karim al-Dulaymi and between 25 and 38 other Republican Guard officers on suspicion of disloyalty during the year²⁷⁸.

America thought that the war would be quite easy, but Iraqi soldiers had a different idea. Some of them had the opinion that “let our streets be our jungles; let our buildings be our swamps²⁷⁹.”

The Bush administration based the military operation on the pretext that the Saddam regime would not care about the human rights anyway. The Saddam regime

²⁷⁵ Carl Kaysen, Steven E. Miller, Martin B. Malin, William D. Nordhaus, and John D. Steinbruner, “War with Iraq”, *American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, ISBN#: 0-87724-036-1, 2002

²⁷⁶ Rowan Scarborough, “War in Iraq Seen as Quick Win,” *Washington Times*, 18 September 2002.

²⁷⁷ David Remnik, “Us and Them,” *New Yorker*, 23 September 2002. <http://www.newyorker.com> (11 April 2004)

²⁷⁸ op. cit. , Department of State Human Rights Reports for Iraq, 2000.

²⁷⁹ Scott Peterson, “Iraq Prepares for Urban Warfare,” *Christian Science Monitor*, 4 October 2002.

could as well be described as a dictatorship and anything that could possibly be done must have been done by permission of the leader.

The police were both cowed by the widespread lawless and completely incapable largely of taking bribe, directing traffic, and backing up Saddam's thugs who maintained law and order with brute and arbitrary force.²⁸⁰ In June 2000, a former Iraqi general reportedly received a videotape of security forces raping a female family member. He subsequently received a telephone call from an intelligence agent who stated that another female relative was being held and warned him to stop speaking out against the Iraqi Government²⁸¹.

Some reports (human rights report) claimed that being a member of an opposing political party would cost the member's life. There is a pervasive fear of death for any act or expression of dissent and that there are recurrent reports of the use of the death penalty for such offences as "insulting" the President or the Ba'th Party²⁸². Claims of that kind were made as a reason for the war, government continue to committee such crime because of suspect of disloyalty to government. In 1998 and 1999, the Government killed a number of leading Shi'a clerics, prompting the former Special Reporter in 1999 to express his concern to the government that the killings might be part of a systematic attack by government officials on the independent leadership of the Shi'a Muslim community²⁸³.

Richard Hass thought that a country would have had to take some responsibilities if she had wanted to be independent.

²⁸⁰ Daalder and Lindsay, op. cit. , P. 152

²⁸¹ Saddam Hussein's Repression of the Iraqi People,
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect4.html>

²⁸² Op.cit . ,Department of State Human Rights Reports for Iraq, 2000.

²⁸³ Saddam Hussein's Repression of the Iraqi People,
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect4.html>

Sovereignty entails obligations. One is not to massacre your own people. Another is not to support terrorism in any way. If a government fails to meet these obligations, then it forfeits some of the normal advantages of sovereignty, including the right to be left alone inside your own territory²⁸⁴."

During the war, one hundred fifty- three children between the ages of 1 and 13 were killed for various reasons. Such was horror of this particular report that the first Bush administration had refused to release it, fearing that it would call into question the administration's failure to oust Saddam after Desert storm²⁸⁵.

Anything that the Saddam regime did in the region cannot be considered to be nice. According to Amnesty International Report 1995, there were some disappeared and information about 25 Feyli Kurds Ala'uddin Molaei al-Haydari and his nephew and 30 relatives who were arrested and sent to Iran by force. Also hundred thousands of Shi'a Muslims, Kurds and Arabs were sent to Iran by force. Lots of males were kept in Iraq. 100,000 Kurds disappeared problem at the period of 1988-89 "Anfal Operations" was left unresolved. Look at the Amnesty International Reports that is previous. It is thought that 625 Kuwaiti and some nationals who were arrested at the possession of Kuwaiti in 1990-91 are kept in Iraq. It was reported that 43 out of the 625 died, but that couldn't be verified independently²⁸⁶.

According to Iraq Report on Human Rights Practices for 1997 the government couldn't give information about the disappearances of Aziz al-Sayyid Jassem, Sayyid

²⁸⁴ Lesley McCulloch, No political will to solve the problems in Aceh, May 28, 2002 <http://www.asiaobserver.com/Indonesia-story1.htm>

²⁸⁵ Lawrence F. Kaplan, William Kristol, *The WAR On Iraq*, (California, Encounter Books, 2003) pp. 17-18-20 -21

²⁸⁶ op. cit. ,Amnesty International Report 1995,

Muhammad Sadeq Muhammad Ridha al-Qazwini, Mazin Abd al-Munim al-Samarra'i, the six al-Hashimi brothers, the four al-Sheibani brothers, and numerous persons of Iranian descent or Shi'a religious belief which were between 1980-1990. The report concludes that few of these victims became targets of the regime for anything they had allegedly done. Rather, they were arrested as "hostages" in order to force a relative who may have escaped abroad to surrender, because of their family link to a political opponent, or simply for their ethnic origin²⁸⁷.

According to Amnesty International, female prisoner are,

“hung upside down from the feet during menstruation. Objects have also been inserted into the vagines of young women, causing the hymen to break”. Amnesty International reports that when the security services torture women, interrogators routinely force the women’s children to stay in the room and watch their mothers being debased²⁸⁸.

There were many other accusations directed against the Saddam government. According to Journalist Mark Bowden, “Saddam’s own son Uday has boasted that “he and his bother Qusay were taken by their father to Iraqi Prisons to watch torture and executions as part of a made more difficult process²⁸⁹”. According to Department of State Human Rights Reports for Iraq Uday Hussein wanted the country's national soccer team to be tortured for a year. For example, three soccer players who lost an October game in the Asian Cup quarter finals reportedly were whipped and detained for three days. A former Iraqi international soccer player

²⁸⁷“Iraq Report on Human Rights Practices for 1997 ”, *The Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor*, January 30, 1998, U.S. Department of State, <http://www.kdp.pp.se/hrri.html>

²⁸⁸ Op.cit. , Kaplan, Kristol, p. 9

²⁸⁹ Ibid. ,

stated in August 1999 that he and his team-mates were tortured on Uday Hussein's orders for not winning matches²⁹⁰.

.According to Department of State Human Rights Reports for Iraq, 2000, defectors were killed by government. For instance Safiyah Hassan was killed because she reviewed the government because government killed her husband and two sons. Her husband and sons had been senior government officials; however, the brothers defected to Jordan in 1996. The Government offered the men immunity if they returned to the country; however, upon their return government agents killed them and their father²⁹¹.

According to Iraq Report on Human Rights Practices for 1997 the punishment of cutting hand or foot, cauterizing were imposed widely. There are lots of examples in Baghdad, Mosul, Basra. For instance the hands of two people were cut by Diyala criminal court because they were found guilty of stealing carpets from a mosque.

In some cases victims were later shown on television; one such case was that of 'Ali 'Ubaid 'Abed 'Ali, whose right hand was amputated and forehead branded in September following his conviction for theft. Some army deserters had their ears severed in military hospitals, allegedly without the use of anaesthetic or in other appalling conditions. Hassan 'Ali Kadhim and Khaz'al 'Abed Mansur, whose ears were severed in al-Nasiriyya in September, reportedly died subsequently from infection. Others were reported to have died through haemorrhaging²⁹².

According to Amnesty International Annual Report 2000:Iraq there were some army officers who were punished by capital punishment because government thought

²⁹⁰ Department of State Human Rights Reports for Iraq, 2000, Released by the U.S. Department of State in February 2001, <http://www.humanrights-usa.net/reports/iraq.html>

²⁹¹ Ibid.

²⁹² "Iraq Report on Human Rights Practices for 1997", *The Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor*, January 30, 1998, U.S. Department of State, <http://www.kdp.pp.se/hrri.html> (21 March 2004)

that they were helping the Iraq opposition to overturn it. For example Mohammad Jabbar al-Rubay'i an army officer in the Special Forces He had reportedly been detained in the Military Intelligence Prison for about two years. His body was handed over to his family for burial but without any religious ceremony. He had allegedly been accused of planning to flee the country²⁹³. Amnesty International (2001)-A 25 year old woman known as Haydar was beheaded in the street without charge or trial at the end of December after her husband, suspected by the authorities of involvement in Islamist armed activities, fled the country. Men beckoning to the Saddam Fidayeen took Um Haydar from her house in al-karada district, in front of her children and mother –in-love. Two men held her arms and a third pulled her head from behind and beheaded her in front of the residents. The beheading was also witnessed by the ruling Ba'ath in the area.²⁹⁴

According to department of human rights reports for Iraq government says that they have some rules for girls obligatory education but there is no information about that situation .Even the Special Reporter and some human right groups claim that the government don't mind rights and children.

Government officials taking children from minority groups hostage in order to intimidate their families to leave cities and regions where the regime wishes to create a Sunni Arab majority²⁹⁵ .

²⁹³ Amnesty International Annual Report 2000: Iraq
<http://www.web.amnesty.org/web/ar2000web.nsf/countries/24fe8ccc9d037845802568f200552932?OpenDocument> (20 May 2004)

²⁹⁴ "Saddam Huseyin: Crimes and human rights abuses, a report on human cost of Saddam's policies." *Foreign policy office & coomewalth office*, http://www.csst-queca.com/pdf/Saddam_Human_rights.pdf, (11 December 2003)

²⁹⁵ op. cit. ,Department of State Human Rights Reports for Iraq, 2000

The American government claimed that Iraq would not allow people to think and express their opinions freely. The American government had a fairly large number of documents to prove the point right. The Iraqi Government, the Ba'th Party, or persons close to Saddam Hussein own all print and broadcast media, and operate them as propaganda outlets. They generally do not report opposing points of view that are expressed either domestically or abroad²⁹⁶.

According to Amnesty International Annual Report, at the first days of October in 1990s, they arrested Dr. Hassem Hassan but it is still unknown that where he is.

He was reportedly on his way to Jordan when he was arrested on the Iraqi side of the border by plainclothes security men. Dr Hassan had written numerous articles in newspapers. Before his arrest he had reportedly been stripped of his membership of both the Iraqi Journalists' Union and the Iraqi Writers' Union because he had criticized government policies in his writing²⁹⁷.

Some officials that were severely affected by what they had done in terms of bad treatments and human right abuses:

My health is very affected by my experience. I have become so thin and I am now psychologically tortured by the memories. My mind is tired and I am tired all of the time. I want to go abroad where it is calm and I can live quietly. I have tried to kill myself and still feel that I could. One time I touched electricity to kill myself. When I heard my mother crying I stopped. I am desperate. I cannot work, I cannot think and I am confused. My mother took me to a psychiatrist, but it did not help. I live in fear everyday that they will come back for me. I hear them. I cannot believe that I am really free. I have psychological enemies that I cannot describe or explain. They follow me. I have never married and cannot marry. I should

²⁹⁶ "Saddam Hussein's Repression of the Iraqi People",
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect4.html>
²⁹⁷ op. cit. ,Amnesty International Annual Report 2000: Iraq

not expose another person to my terrors and I cannot afford a wife and family²⁹⁸.

3-1-2- Danger in Iraq: The fear of Weapons of Mass Destruction

The president Bush said in a speech at the end of May: "Protecting America's homeland and citizens from the threat of weapons of mass destruction is one of our Nation's important national security challenges." Today, more nations possess world's least-responsible states for whom terror and blackmail are a way of life²⁹⁹."

Saddam Hussein is a man that had ordered some chemical weapons to be used against his own people and some neighbouring countries. Saddam Hussein launched a large-scale chemical weapon attack against Iraq's "Kurdish population in the late 1980s, killing thousands" Saddam Hussein continues his efforts to develop chemical weapons³⁰⁰. On the other hand, Arab government is afraid of Hussein because he wants to lash out his neighbours and has no choice in order to survive³⁰¹. Iraq did not allow the U.N. officials to detect the weapons, and constantly developed means to procure WMD since 1998³⁰². According to the report prepared by the U.S.A.

²⁹⁸ Southern Iraq: Human Rights Abuses and Views on Justice, Reconstruction and Government, Physicians for Human Rights. September 18, 2003, <http://www.phrusa.org/research/iraq/docs/iraqsurvey.pdf> (1 May 2004)

²⁹⁹ Statement by the President, "Domestic Preparedness Against Weapons of Mass Destruction", May 8, 2001, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/05/20010508.html>

³⁰⁰ Saddam Hussein's Development of Weapons of Mass Destruction, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect3.html>

³⁰¹ Philip Smucker, "As U.S. Talks Up Iraq Threat, Gulf States Stifle a Yawn," *Christian Science Monitor*, 20 September 2002.

³⁰² George Tenet, "Worldwide Threat- Converging Denger in a Post 9/11 world", Senate Office Building, Washington, d.c. Time: 9:37 a.m. Tuesday, March 9, 2004, http://www.ceip.org/files/projects/npp/pdf/Testimony/tenet_3_04_04.pdf (5 April 2004)

state of defence in 2001, Iraq held the belief that it had to have nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles to have influence on the region³⁰³.

Saddam uses nuclear weapons for Israel or biological weapons attack against the United States, gasses to his citizens or attack in ethnic cleansing against the Kurds .won't history look back on the failure to remove him as a grievous error? Won't people wish that Saddam had been stopped, much as people lament the failure to stop Hitler in the 1930s³⁰⁴.

International Institute for Strategic Studies showed a new report on September 9, 2002 concludes that Saddam Hussein could build a nuclear bomb within months if he were able to obtain fissile material³⁰⁵. Some opponents of the Iraqi regime that had had to leave Iraq in advance report that Saddam Hussein in 1998 gave order to get the program connected with WMD to started after forcing the U.N. detectors out of the country³⁰⁶. Some American administrators thought that Saddam Hussein has made the case against himself. President Bush himself makes this point in his preface to his new national security strategy: "History will judge harshly those who saw the coming danger but failed to act³⁰⁷."

He has broken every pledge he made to the United Nations and the world since his invasion of Kuwait was rolled back in 1991. Sixteen times the United Nations Security Council has passed resolutions designed to ensure that Iraq does not pose a threat to international peace and security. Saddam Hussein has violated every one of these 16 resolutions -- not once, but many times.³⁰⁸

³⁰³ Anthony Cordesman, "If We Fight Iraq: Iraq and Weapons of Mass Destruction", *CS/ISS*, 2002

³⁰⁴ 11Richard Cohen, "Hitler and Bad History," *Washington Post*, 24 September 2002.

³⁰⁵ Saddam Hussein's Development of Weapons of Mass Destruction, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect3.html>

³⁰⁶ Anthony Cordesman, Arleigh Bruke, "Weapon of Mass Dstructions In the Middle East." *C/ISS*
³⁰⁷ op. cit. , p. 2

³⁰⁸ President Discusses Growing Danger posed by Saddam Hussein's Regime, September 14, 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020914.html> (2 April 2004)

Sixteen United Nations Security Council Resolutions were created to be sure that Iraq is not a threat for international security and peace. but Saddam Hussein hasn't obeyed to them. Saddam had to finish the press on people of Iraq but hen hasn't obeyed any of the decess. These resolutions are as follows:

UNSCR 678 - November 29, 1990

- Iraq must comply fully with UNSCR 660 (regarding Iraq's illegal invasion of Kuwait) "and all subsequent relevant resolutions."
- Authorizes UN Member States "to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area."

UNSCR 686 - March 2, 1991

- Iraq must release prisoners detained during the Gulf War.
- Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War.
- Iraq must accept liability under international law for damages from its illegal invasion of Kuwait.

UNSCR 687 - April 3, 1991

- Iraq must "unconditionally accept" the destruction, removal or rendering harmless "under international supervision" of all "chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities."
- Iraq must "unconditionally agree not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear-weapons-usable material" or any research, development or manufacturing facilities.
- Iraq must "unconditionally accept" the destruction, removal or rendering harmless "under international supervision" of all "ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 KM and related major parts and repair and production facilities."
- Iraq must not "use, develop, construct or acquire" any weapons of mass destruction.

- Iraq must reaffirm its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

- Creates the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) to verify the elimination of Iraq's chemical and biological weapons programs and mandated that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) verify elimination of Iraq's nuclear weapons program.

- Iraq must declare fully its weapons of mass destruction programs.

- Iraq must not commit or support terrorism, or allow terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq.

- Iraq must cooperate in accounting for the missing and dead Kuwaitis and others.

- Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War.

UNSCR 688 - April 5, 1991

- "Condemns" repression of Iraqi civilian population, "the consequences of which threaten international peace and security."

- Iraq must immediately end repression of its civilian population.

- Iraq must allow immediate access to international humanitarian organizations to those in need of assistance.

UNSCR 707 - August 15, 1991

- "Condemns" Iraq's "serious violation" of UNSCR 687.

- "Further condemns" Iraq's non-compliance with IAEA and its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

- Iraq must halt nuclear activities of all kinds until the Security Council deems Iraq in full compliance.

- Iraq must make a full, final and complete disclosure of all aspects of its weapons of mass destruction and missile programs.

- Iraq must allow UN and IAEA inspectors immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

- Iraq must cease attempts to conceal or move weapons of mass destruction, and related materials and facilities.

- Iraq must allow UN and IAEA inspectors to conduct inspection flights throughout Iraq.

- Iraq must provide transportation, medical and logistical support for UN and IAEA inspectors.

UNSCR 715 - October 11, 1991

- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA inspectors.

UNSCR 949 - October 15, 1994

- "Condemns" Iraq's recent military deployments toward Kuwait.
- Iraq must not utilize its military or other forces in a hostile manner to threaten its neighbors or UN operations in Iraq.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors.
- Iraq must not enhance its military capability in southern Iraq.

UNSCR 1051 - March 27, 1996

- Iraq must report shipments of dual-use items related to weapons of mass destruction to the UN and IAEA.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1060 - June 12, 1996

- "Deplores" Iraq's refusal to allow access to UN inspectors and Iraq's "clear violations" of previous UN resolutions.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access. .

UNSCR 1134 - October 23, 1997

- "Condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to allow access" to UN inspectors, which constitutes a "flagrant violation" of UNSCR 687, 707, 715, and 1060.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.
- Iraq must give immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom UN inspectors want to interview.

UNSCR 1137 - November 12, 1997

- "Condemns the continued violations by Iraq" of previous UN resolutions, including its "implicit threat to the safety of" aircraft operated by UN inspectors and its tampering with UN inspector monitoring equipment.
- Reaffirms Iraq's responsibility to ensure the safety of UN inspectors.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1154 - March 2, 1998

- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access, and notes that any violation would have the "severest consequences for Iraq."

UNSCR 1194 - September 9, 1998

- "Condemns the decision by Iraq of 5 August 1998 to suspend cooperation with" UN and IAEA inspectors, which constitutes "a totally unacceptable contravention" of its obligations under UNSCR 687, 707, 715, 1060, 1115, and 1154.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA weapons inspectors, and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1205 - November 5, 1998

- "Condemns the decision by Iraq of 31 October 1998 to cease cooperation" with UN inspectors as "a flagrant violation" of UNSCR 687 and other resolutions.
- Iraq must provide "immediate, complete and unconditional cooperation" with UN and IAEA inspectors.

UNSCR 1284 - December 17, 1999

- Created the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspections Commission (UNMOVIC) to replace previous weapon inspection team (UNSCOM).
- Iraq must allow UNMOVIC "immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access" to Iraqi officials and facilities.
- Iraq must fulfil its commitment to return Gulf War prisoners.

- Calls on Iraq to distribute humanitarian goods and medical supplies to its people and address the needs of vulnerable Iraqis without discrimination³⁰⁹.

Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri who is Iraqi defector claimed that,he saw 20 hidden facilities which are used for chemical, nuclear and biological weapons In 2001. Mr. Saeed said Iraq used companies to purchase equipment with the blessing of the United Nations - and then secretly used the equipment for their weapons programs. Iraq actually produced two to four times the amount of most agents, including anthrax and botulinim toxin, than it had declared³¹⁰.

Albeit there are some people claiming that Iraq has been in the process of producing WMD, on the contract, some people tend to think neutralized Iraq's nuclear program. "Experts confiscated its weapon usable material. they destroyed, removed or rendered harmless all its facilities and equipment relevant to nuclear weapons production³¹¹" A year after the war began, Americans are questioning why the administration went to war in Iraq when Iraq was not an imminent threat, when it had no nuclear weapons, no persuasive links to al Qaeda, no connection to the terrorist attacks of September 11, and no stockpiles of chemical or biological weapons³¹²."

The American government supports its rightfulness with respect to Iraq, and should not be in hurry. There are some questions that waits for answers. For example

³⁰⁹Saddam Hussein's Defiance of United Nations Resolutions.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect2.html> (10 2003 December)

³¹⁰ op. cit. , "Saddam Hussein's Development of Weapons of Mass Destruction"

³¹¹ Mohamed El Baradei, "Inspections Are the Key," *Washington Post*, 21 October 2002

³¹² William Kristol, "About Those Iraqi Weapons", *The Weekly Standart*, 05/31/2004, Vol: 9,

Kennedy and Dean are sure that Saddam had no weapon in March 2003 and Bush's administration hasn't said anything about what he's found and thinks is true about Iraqi WMD. the Pentagon said that 2 member of army were in Baghdad to find nerve agents in last week. the soldiers saw a shell on Baghdad street and than they tried to prevent the danger but it exploded, spilled its poison. the poison was developed by Nazis and Saddam used it which has deadly poison.Saddam used it against Kurds in Halabjah in 1988.It seems that the shell has been made priour to first Gulf War and Saddam didn't leave his munitions after the Gulf War arsenal. Also if the terrorists didn't know there is sarin in the bomb, because it doesn't have any obvious marking, it can cause a lot of that kind of shells³¹³.

Daniel Benjamin has explained the bad scenario that concerns to Saddam's chemical and biological agents' inventories. At the complex time of war, lots of this material might be liberated quickly by security service industrious and soon-to-be-unemployed scientists. It is known a market is ready for unconventional weapons and they will have no trouble to find costumers. Even with U.S. Special Forces combing the country, the collapse of the Iraqi regime could prove to be the greatest proliferation disaster in history. The beneficiaries will be terrorists who have no interest in the weapons for their deterrent value; they will just want to use them³¹⁴.

In spite of the possibility that Saddam might not have the amount of weapons that could pose a great danger, Bush stated "America must not ignore the threat gathering against us. Facing clear evidence of peril, it cannot wait for the final proof

³¹³ Ibid.

³¹⁴ Daniel Benjamin, "In the Fog of War, A Greater Threat," *Washington Post*, 31 October 2002.

-- the smoking gun -- that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud³¹⁵”. Bush claimed that there will be much more definite evidences in the future that Iraq had used weapons of destruction against the people. Bush said: “Intelligence throughout the decade showed they had a weapons programme. I am absolutely convinced with time we’ll find out that did have weapons programme³¹⁶.”

The U.S.A. could not find what it had looked for in Iraq at the end of the war. That would not matter anyway. Some American critics claimed that the operation was based on some kind of clues and they were already discovered. The fact that weapons could not have been found was not important. The presence of evidences indicated that the U.S.A. had already taken a necessary step regarding its future security. The president Bush was sure enough that they had done a great job.

America has enemies who don’t betray a secret and are merciless. So the nation must use everything and obey to government’s rules, in order to follow and undo their activities. Bush said in a speech in the Brady Briefing Room:

In Iraq, America and our coalition enforce the clearly stated demands of the world -- that a violent regime prove its own disarmament. In the aftermath of September the 11th, 2001, I will not take risks with the lives and security of the American people by assuming the goodwill of dictators³¹⁷.

As a consequence, the world had taken one more step to get more independent.

3-1-3 Terrorism: The New Face of Menace

³¹⁵ George W. Bush, “President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat” Cincinnati, October 7, 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html> (5 December 2003)

³¹⁶ George, W. Bush, “Remarks on Middle East, Iraq at Cabinet Meeting,” Washington, D.c., June 9, 2003, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/08/20020826.html> (5 December 2003)

³¹⁷ President Bush Announces Formation of Independent Commission, February 6, 2004, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/02/20040206-3.html>

Iraq is one of the seven countries that have been designated by the Secretary of State as state sponsors of international terrorism. UNSCR 687 prohibits Saddam Hussein from committing or supporting terrorism, or allowing terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq, but Saddam continued to violate these UNSCR provisions. Taking up a case to accuse Iraq, the Bush administration said: Saddam has connections with international terrorists and is a follower of them. Iraq shelters terrorist groups including the Mujahedin-e-Khalq Organization (MKO), which has used terrorist violence against Iran and in the 1970s was responsible for killing several U.S. military personnel and U.S. civilians³¹⁸. There were some connections between the attackers of September 11 and Iraq Government. For example, Atta, he was “leading hijacker of the first jet airliner to WTC, apparently, the lead conspirator in the attacks of September 11, met with a senior Iraqi intelligence. And also anthrax used against Media in Florida “in the letter sent to Senator Tom Daschle’s officer come from same place where Atta visit³¹⁹.” And Americans also beleived that destruction of the regime in Iraq would be a part of the desruction of al Qaeda. US administration regarded the weapons of Iraq as a potential target of market for al Qaeda to use. Johndroe supported this idea and stated: “We are concerned because of al Qaeda's interest in obtaining and using weapons of mass destruction³²⁰”. Iraq was a heaven for al Qeada as to include chemical weapons, especially in the free zone in Nothern Iraq.

³¹⁸ op. cit. „Saddam Hussein's Support for International Terrorism.”

³¹⁹ GARY SCHMITT, Why Iraq, Gary Schmitt, Weekly Standard. October 19, 2001.
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqmiddleeast2001.htm>

³²⁰ Barton Gellman , U.S. Suspects Al Qaeda Got Nerve Agent From Iraqis. Washington Post. Thursday, December 12, 2002; Page A01,

On the other hand, it was not only America who was anxious about terrorism in Iraq. Egypt was one of these countries that tried to solve this problem. The fear of some Egypt diplomats which is about Saddam's government is that:

Saddam wants countries like Jordan and Egypt and Saudi Arabia to know that if they support the United States, they're going to have to deal with a new terrorism problem.. And the threat is not just going to be against the United States but the overall stability of other nations in the Arab world³²¹..

America wanted to protect its friends and have power thanks to being democratic in the region. So "the single most important strategic criteria for military action against Iraq is whether or not such a course will aid or hinder U.S. efforts to prevent terrorist attacks."³²² Bush stated that Iraq war formed a morale front to struggle terrorism: According to Bush, Iraq was a symbol of showing power to struggle terrorism. Showing power was a part of the war. In other words, "terrorist attacks are not caused by the use of strength. They are invited by the perception of weakness."³²³.

Rice says "if we speak obviously, Saddam Hussein's regime was a risk for the security of US and the world, so there is a war in Iraq. This was a regime that pursued, had used and possessed weapons of mass destruction; had links to terror"³²⁴.. A writer of New York Times Thomas Friedman expressed very well that Iraq's side in the war was the real reason for war:

³²¹ Rajiv Chandrasekaran, "Iraq Threatens to Widen Conflict If U.S. Attacks," *Washington Post*, 11 September 2002

³²² James E. Doyle, "Attacking Iraq Could Increase Terror Against America," *Carnegie Endowment*, 30 September 2002, <http://www.ProliferationNews.org> (1 September 2003)

³²³ Nicholas Lemann, "Real Reasons", *The New Yorker*, 2003-09-22, http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/?030922ta_talk_lemann

³²⁴ op. cit. , Condoleezza, "Transforming the Middle East"

The "real reason" for this war, which was never stated, was that after 9/11 America needed to hit someone in the Arab-Muslim world. Afghanistan wasn't enough because a terrorism bubble had built up over there — a bubble that posed a real threat to the open societies of the West and needed to be punctured. This wasn't a situation that can be accepted for America which is the free world's father and guide. "And Friedman goes on to say"; the only way to puncture that bubble was for American soldiers, men and women, to go into the heart of the Arab-Muslim world, house to house, and make clear that we are ready to kill, and to die, to prevent our open society from being undermined by this terrorism bubble³²⁵.

One of the main reasons of dealing with Iraq is that Saddam was still standing after the terrorism activities and that was a mode for other powers. According to a political explanation: "This terrorism bubble has come to threaten open societies and all they value. So, they going to use Iraq — because they can — to demonstrate to you that we'll come right into the heart of your world to burst this bubble³²⁶." Purpose of war is the "pressure³²⁷."

The connection of Saddam regime with terrorism didn't finish at that point. He helped the other countries develop terrorism such as the case between Israil and Palestine. The ideology which Saddam's rules also included was commitment to the liberation of Palestine. It deemed the Arab-Israeli conflict a question of to be or not to be³²⁸. According to US foreign affairs, the bombers who kill themselves for their goals take the all payment which includes different quantity for death, sore, defect. That is the prize of them given by Saddam:

³²⁵ Thomas I. Friedman, "Because We Could", *New York Times*, June 4, 2004,

³²⁶ Ibid.

³²⁷ Tom Donnelly, War on Terrorism, Project Memorandum, November 5, 2001.
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/war-110501.htm>

³²⁸ Kaplan, Kristol, op. cit . , p. 22

Mahmoud Besharat, a representative on the West Bank who is handing out to families the money from Saddam, said, You would have to ask President Saddam why he is being so generous. But he is a revolutionary and he wants this distinguished struggle, the intifada, to continue³²⁹.

According to Bush government, Iraq war was very important not only to struggle terrorism but also to daunt the supporter or partner of terrorism. But there was a different side of Iraq war that Bush government doesn't want to tell; Israil was a device to supply the security in order to make sure the flow of oil at the term of cold war Iraq's responsibility was same with Israil in new millenium. Iraq was chosen for that duty because there were lots of agents that made the situation easy. Lastly, while it was an aggressive country in the region, it was the representative of free world in the region. Germany has changed after the World War II, similar to this Iraq has also changed. America could dominate the Middle East by the military which it would put into Iraq. Transformation of the Middle East through Iraq into the progressive Arab State was to "create a new modernity in the Muslim world"³³⁰. But it seems impossible for Saudi Arabia.

³²⁹ op. cit., Saddam Hussein's Support for International Terrorism

³³⁰ Gary Schmitt, McCain on Iraq, Project Memorandum, November 5, 2003
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraq-20031105.htm>

CONCLUSION

This work has consequently managed to give reasons for the fact that the American foreign policy has been focused on the Middle East following September the 11. The work is based on the argument that there are several reasons – and maybe a dozen of reasons – for the American intervention in the Middle East. The historical qualities of the Middle East, September 11 and related ‘unbelievable’ incidents, but especially, the fact of new group (members of PNAC/ neo-conservatists) proving their points right that have kept claiming since 1990, and being influential on the new government, the possibility of new groups formed by the international system being controlled by the anti-democratic terrorists, illegal groups have left the U.S.A. with no chance but launching attacks on the region. The new understanding in the U.S foreign policy decision making, following September 11 under heavy influence of neo-conservatists was aimed to stop the Saddam regime and its effects on the regime. Because, it was (is) necessary for America’s global leadership, and its role as the guarantor of the current great-power peace, relies upon the safety of the American homeland; the preservation of a favorable balance of power in the Middle East and surrounding energy producing region, and the general stability of the international system of nation-states relative to terrorists, organized crime, and other non-state actors.

The intervention in the region has been based on the line of argument that America could as well stop a movement from existing that would cause the American leadership for the region not to produce results in the future, by trying to establish a kind of democratic government. The Middle East has had the potential of making the American leadership bad in several ways, especially using the historical records. The fact that radical groups had already started to make bad use of cultural

differences, political and social deterioration caused America to launch attacks on the region only to have a failure in the 1990s. The failure of the U.S.A. gave encouragement to the countries similar to Iraq. Using the Israel – Palestine conflict to his advantage had strengthened the success of Saddam, and also it has had negative effects on the public opinion. The U.S.A had always been concentrated on the way to solve the problem in the region by means of the public opinion up to September 11.

September 11 caused the U.S.A. to take a different approach to the region. The U.S.A started to hold that if it went to war with Iraq and solve the Israel – Palestine conflict, the Middle East would probably get organized. This project would work to the advantage of the U.S.A. in the long run. In this way, America would be able to stop another source of power in the region existing, so that no country would be able to claim to make the region better. The implementation of a new source of power based on anti-democratic theories in the region could possibly lead to great dangers to America. That is, by and large. what American ideals about the region are like?

Consequently, events in the region could as well say that the process of democratising the region would need to be accompanied by security. The process of democratising the region by means of security would definitely stop an anti-American movement existing. The lack of a democratic vision not based on security means to the U.S.A. a complex problem to deal with, because it was ideologically loaded. If the region were left by itself to get democratised, it would probably take a very long period of time. During the process by which information and communication spread quickly, differences are more likely to turn into a conflict. A factor of that kind would not naturally be for the good of the U.S.A. when the existence of some other sources of power is considered to be a fact. Today, this is thought to be the basis for American preventive intervention in the Middle East so that it could be democratised. According to current administration, especially for the

some staff emerged from PNAC, American strategy for the coming decades should seek to consolidate the great victories won in the 20th century – which have made Germany and Japan into stable democracies, for example – maintain stability in the Middle East, while setting the conditions for 21st-century successes. This fact has already been explained by many neo-conservatives in several ways.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amnesty International Annual Report 2000: Iraq
<http://www.web.amnesty.org/web/ar2000web.nsf/countries/24fe8ccc9d037845802568f200552932?OpenDocument> (20 May 2004)

Aras, Bülent (2004), *Küresel Dönüşüm. Radikal Yaklaşımlar*, İstanbul: Q-Matris

Aras, Bülent (2004), *Ortadoğu ve Türkiye*. İstanbul: Q-Matris

Aras, Bülent (2004), "Terror, The International System and Turkey" *Insight Turkey*, Vol: 6, No: 1, pp. 129–135

Arı, Tayyar (2004), *Irak, İran ve ABD. Önleyici Savaş: Petrol ve Hegomanya*, İstanbul: Alfa

Asmus, Ronald "Let's Get Serious About Democracy in the Greater Middle East:" (11 May 2004), See: http://www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/showArticle3.cfm?article_id=9149&topicID=56

Assesses the Economic and Social Damage Caused by the Current Conflict" World Bank Releases Report on Palestinian Economic Crisis. 5 March 2003. See: <http://usinfo.state.gov/regional/nea/summit/text2003/0305econ.htm>. (3 April 2004)

Bahgat, Gewdat, (1997), "Basra Körfezi ve İsrail: Geçmişe ve Geleceğe Bakış", *Avrasya Dosyası*, Vol: 9, No: 4: 255-250

Balcı, Ali(2004), *Filistin Savaş ve Barış Arasında, Dünya Çatışma Bölgeleri*, Ankara: Nobel

Baradei, Mohamed, (2002: October 21), "Inspections Are the Key," *Washington Post*,

Barton Gellman , U.S. Suspects Al Qaeda Got Nerve Agent From Iraqis, *Washington Post*, Thursday, December 12, 2002; Page A01, May 5, 2004)

Barry, Tom, "Bush Administration is Not Isolationist", *Common Dreams* (2001) See: <http://www.commondreams.org/views01/0720-05.htm>, (10 May.2003)

Benjamin, Daniel, (2002: October 31), "In the Fog of War, A Greater Threat," *Washington Post*,

Berridge, R., *International Politics: State Conflict since 1945*. New York.

"Bin Laden Interview With "May Peter Bergen and Peter Annett, CNN.
(1997)

Bishari, Marwan(2003). *Filistin/ İsrail: Barış veya Irkçılık*. İstanbul: Kitap
Yayınevi

Boot, Max, (2004), "The Bush Doctrine Lives", *The Weekly Standard*,
(02/16/), Vol: 009

Brutens, Karen (2000), "In pursuit of Pax Americana", *Russian Social
Science Review*, vol. 41, no.3: 35-48

Bush Calls for Nuclear Cuts(2001), Missile Defense Development,
Dispatches High Level Delegation to Consult with Allies
See:<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/arms/stories/01050177.htm> (13 September
2003)

Bush ,George W (2002)., Remarks, "President's Remarks at the United
Nations General Assembly" New York, See:.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html> (14 May 2004)

Bush ,George W (2002)'Remarks by the President at the Exercise of the
United States Military Academy, West Point, New York', See:www.whitehouse.gov
(16 September 2003)

Bush ,George W(1999)., "A Period of Consequences", The Citadel,
See:http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/program/news99/92399_defense.htm (17
September 2003)

Bush ,George W. "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American
People,1 Washington, D.C (2001),See:
www.whitehouse.gov/news/realase/2001/09/20010920-8.htm. (10 September 2003)

Bush ,George W.(2003), "Speech on Progress in Operation Iraqi Freedom,
See:www.whitehouse.gov/news/release/2003/04/200304166-9html (10 may 2003)

Bush ,George W.(2002), "President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat" Cincinnati,
See:<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html> (5
December 2003)

Bush ,George W.(2003) Endowment for Democracy United States Chamber
of Commerce Washington, D.C.
See:<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/11/20031106-2.html> (11
January 2004)

Bush, George, W. (2003), "Remarks on Middle East, Iraq at Cabinet
Meeting," Washington,D.c.

See:<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/08/20020826.html> (5 December 2003)

Butler, Richard (2000), *Saddam Defiant*, London: Weindenfeld & Nicholson

Byman, Daniel (1999), "Proceed with Caution: U.S. Support for the Iraqi Opposition" *The Washington Quarterly*, (summer): 18-29

Byman, Daniel (2000), "After the storm: U.S Policy toward Iraq since 1991". *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol: No.4: 493-516

Caesar, Judith, "Rumblings under the Throne: Saudi Arabian Politics", *the Nation* 251:21, 762,

Carlton ,Ritz(2002), "Remarks by the Vice President to the Council on Foreign Relations" Washington, DC, See: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/vicepresident/newsspeeches/speeches/vp20020215.html> (14December 2003)

Chandrasekaren, Rajiv (2002: September 11), "Iraq Threatens to Widen Conflict If U.S. Attacks," *Washington Post*

Cheney, Dick (2004)," The Greater Middle East — The Bush Administration's Perspective", *The Globalist*, See:<http://www.theglobalist.com/DBweb/StoryId.aspx?StoryId=3754> (11 June 2004)

Cheney, Dick (2002), "Vice President Speaks at VFW 103rd National Convention" See:<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/08/20020826.html> (12 April 2004)

Cheney, Dick (2003), NBC's Meet the Press, Washington, D.C. See:<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/cheneymeetthepress.htm> (12 January 2004)

Chomsky, Noam (2003) , *Amerikan Müdahaleliği*, Tran, Taylan Doğan- Barış Zeren, İstanbul :Aram

Chomsky, Noam(2001), *Kuşatma Altında Irak*, İstanbul: Everest Yayınları,

Cilluffo, Frank J., "Cyber Attack: the National protection Plan and its Privacy Implication", *Center for Strategic & International studies*. 1 February 2001. p. .3

Cleveland, William L(1994), *Modern Middle East* . Boulder: West view Pres

Cohen, 11Richard (2002: September 24), "Hitler and Bad History," *Washington Post*

Combs, Cindy C., *Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2003)

Cordersman, Anthony, "If We Fight Iraq: Iraq and Weapons of Mass Destruction", *CSISS*, 2002

Cordesman, Anthony and Burke, Arleigh (2001), *Stability and Instability in the Middle East*, Center for Strategic and International Studies
See: http://www.csis.org/burke/mees/stab_instab_meonly.pdf

Cordesman, Anthony and Burke, Arleigh. (2004), "The Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East" *Center for Strategic and International Studies* See: http://www.csis.org/burke/mb/me_wmd_mideast.pdf (25 March 2004)

Cordesman, Anthony and Bruke, Arleigh. "Weapon of Mass Destructions In the Middle East," *CISS*

Çarkoğlu, Ali, Mine Eder Kemal Kirişçi (1998), *Türkiye ve Orta Doğu'da Bölgesel İşbirliği*, İstanbul: TESEV

Çaşın, Mesut (1997), "Körfez Savaşı'nın Stratejik Sonuçları". *Avrasya Dosyası*, (Summer), Vol. 1, no. 2: ,225-251

Daalder, Ivo & Lindsay, James (2003), *America Unbound*. Washington: Brookings Institution press

Dan McKivergan, Lieberman's Speech on the War on Iraq, September 13, 2002, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraq-091302.htm> (May 1, 2004)

Dark, K.R. and Hariss, A. L. (1996), *the New World and the New World Order*. New York: Martin's Press

DarK, K.R.(1996), and Harris ,A. L., *The New World and the New World Order*. New York: Martin's Press

Davis ,Uri "Palestine Refugees at the Crossroad of 1996 Permanent Status Negotiations", <http://www.shaml.org/publications/monos/mono1-2.htm> (17 April 2004)

Davutoğlu, Ahmet(2002), *Stratejik derinlik*, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları

Deng ,Yong, (2000) "Is There a US Global Strategy?" Prepared for the Conference, "The Global Role of PRC Hotel Edgewater, Seattle, Washington, USA See: <http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/papers/deng00.pdf> (10 May 2004)

Department of State Human Rights Reports for Iraq" (2001). See: <http://www.humanrights-usa.net/reports/iraq.html> (10 January 2004)

Department of State Human Rights Reports for Iraq, Released by the U.S. Department of State (2001) See:<http://www.humanrights-usa.net/reports/iraq.html> (10 February2004)

Dodge, Toby (2003), "US Intervention and Possible Iraqi Futures". *Survival Quarterly*, Vol: 45, No: 3: 46-54

Doyle ,James E.(2002), "Attacking Iraq Could Increase Terror Against America," Carnegie Endowment. See: <http://www.ProliferationNews.org> (1 September 2003)

Dunn, David H., "Myth motivation and 'Misuderestimations' The Bush Administration and Iraq" *International Affair* 9/ 2 2003, p.280 (279-297)

Efrati ,Caroline, Factors of Growth in the Palestinian Economy", Recivied in University WebsiteFactors of Growth in the Palestinian Economy, <http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/maxpages/faculty/gmbonham/2000-Fall-IR-Projects/Website-Group/ICN/Copy%20of%20ICNweb/efrati2.htm>

Efrati, Caroline(2000) Factors of growth in the Palestinian economy See:<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/maxpages/faculty/gmbonham/2000-Fall-IR-Projects/Website-Group/ICN/Copy%20of%20ICNweb/efrati2.htm> (3 September 2003)

Emerson, Steven (2000),"International Terrorism and Immigration Policy". United States House of Representatives Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims See:<http://www.house.gov/judiciary/emer0125.htm> (8 March 2004)

Eyal Zisser, "Hezbollah: New Course or Continued Warfare". MERIA Vol: 4, No: 3: 15-(2000)

Friedman, Thomas (2004: June 4) "Because We Could", *New York Times*

Fromkin, David (1975), "The strategy of Terror". *Foreign Affairs*, 53. (2, july), pp. 19-25

"Full text of Middle East 'Road Map'" (2003) See:<http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/0508/p25s01-wome.html> (11 April 2004)

Garnham, David (1995), and Tessler Mark. *Democracy, war, peace in the Middle East*, Indiana: University Press

Gary Day (2001) , *Class*, London: Routledge

Gary Schmitt and Tom Donnelly, A War with a purpose, Weekly Standard, September 17, 2001 http://www.newamericancentury.org/Schmitt_Donnelly-091701.pdf (May 3, 2004)

Gary Schmitt, McCain on Iraq, Project Memorandum, November 5, 2003
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraq-20.031.105.htm> (May 5, 2004)

Gary Schmitt, Why Iraq, Gary Schmitt, Weekly Standard, October 19, 2001,
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqmideast2001.htm> (May 3, 2004)

Gary Schmitt, State of Terror, Weekly Standard, November 20, 2000
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/Schmitt-112000.pdf> (May 3, 2004)

Gause, F.Gregory (2001), "Getting It Backward on Iraq", *Foreign Affairs*,
(May/ June): 41-56

Gideon Rose, "The Rollback Fantasy", From *Foreign Affairs*,
January/February 1999, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19990101faessay950/daniel-byman-kenneth-pollack-gideon-rose/the-rollback-fantasy.html> (May 3, 2004)

Goldenberg, Suzanne and Borger, Julian in Washington, "How Cheney's
Revelation Led towards the Point of no Return," *The Guardian*, Friday January 17,
2003,

Gordon, Philip (2003), "Bush's Middle East Vision." *Survival* 45 (spring):
155-165.

"Graduation Exercise," (1992, March 8), *New York Times*

Gurulé, Jimmy (2003) "The Global Effort to Stop Terrorist Financing." *U.S.
Foreign Policy Agenda*, Vo: 8, No: 1, (August): 15-25

Hacker, Frederick J.(1976) ,*Crusader, Criminals, Crazyies: Terror and
Terrorism in Our Time* , New York: Norton

Halliday, Fred (1991), "The Gulf War and its Aftermath. First Reflections",
International Affairs, 67, No. 2:217-235

Halliday, Fred (2002), *Two Hours that shook the world*. London: Saqi Books
Held, David & McGrew, Anthony (2002), *Globalization/Anti-Globalization*,
Cambridge: Polity

Helms, Christine Moss (1994), *Iraq*, Washington: Brooking Institution

Herring ,Eric (1999), "Betwen iraq and Hard Place: A critique of the British
Government's Narrative on UN Economic Sanction." See:
www.cam.ac.uk/societies/casi/conf99/doc/herring.html (14 March 2004)

Herrmann, Richard (1991). "The Middle East and New World Order,"
International Security, Vol. 16, no. 2: 46-55

Hirsh, Michael (2002), "Bush and the World", *From Foreign Affairs*, (September/October): 10-25

Hirst Paul (2001), *War and Power in the 21st Century*, Oxford: Polity

Hoffman, Stanley (1990), "A New World and its Troubles". *Foreign Affairs*, Vol: No: 69, no. 4, 1: 120-121

Holmes, Kim (2003), "American Internationalism", *U.S. Foreign Policy agenda*, (August):1-16

Hoskins, Halford L. (1967). *changing of the Guard in the Middle East*, Current History, (February): p.60-74

Hudson, Michael C. (1998), *Middle East Dilemma*, London: Tauris Publisher

Inat, Kemal(2004), *Dünya Çatışma Bölgeleri*, Ankara: Nobel

Iraq Report on Human Rights Practices for 1997 ", The Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, January 30,1998, U.S. Department of State, See:<http://www.kdp.pp.se/hrri.html> (27 March 2004)

"Iraq After Saddam, the quagmire of political reconstruction', *ISSS*, Comment, vol: 8, no:4, May,2002

IRNA, 1708 GTM, 26 Ocak 1999

Isherwood, Michael (2002), "U.S. Strategic Options for Iraq: Easier Said than Done", *the Washington Quarterly*, (spring): 135-151

"Islam Divided ", (1990: September 22), *The economist*,

Ismail, Tareq Y. and Ismael, Jacqueline S., *the Gulf War and the New World Order*, (Gainesville: University Press of America. 1994) p., 56

Jervis, Robert (2003), "Understanding the Bush Doctrine", *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol: 118, No: 3,: 365-379

Jervis, Robert (2003), "Understanding the Bush Doctrine", *Political Science Quartly*, Vol: 118, No: 3 (Fall): 356-370

Jhon, Henry (1988), *Temple 1784-1865*, Lordra: Parlesmon

Jhonsons Chalmers (2004) *The Sorrow of Empire*. New York: Metropolitan

Judt ,Tony, 'The Way We Live Now', (The New York Review of Books, March 27, 2003), p. .5

Kagan, Robert and Kristol, William (2000). *Present Dangers*. California, Encounter Books,

Kaplan, Lawrence F., William Kristol (2003). *the WAR on Iraq*, California: Encounter Books,

Karaman, Lütfullah (1991), *Filistin Sorunu*. İstanbul: İz yayıncılık

Katzman, Kenneth (2002) "Terrorism: Near Eastern Groups and State Sponsors", CRS, Code RL31119, See:<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL31119.pdf>, (10 March 2004)

Kaysen, Carl and Miller, Steven and Malin. Martin and Nordhaus, William and Steinbruner, John, "War with Iraq", *American Academy of Arts and Sciences*. ISBN#: 0-87724-036-1, 2002

Keridis, Dimitris(2004) "Europe and Israel: what went wrong?". *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol: 2, No: 4 (Vinter) pp. ,135-145

Khalilzad, Aalmay, (1998) "Source of Conflict in the Near Middle East, Source of Conflict in the 21st Century", RAND

Kissinger, Henry (2001), *Amerikanın Dış Politikaya İhtiyacı Varmı?* tran. Tayfun Nevadan, Ankara: Metu Pres

Koç Bahadır (2002), "İyi Kötü ve Çirkin: Amerika'nın Orta Doğu Politikaları", *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol: 2, No: 21:5–22

Kristol, William (2004), "About Those Iraqi Weapons". *the Weekly Standart*, 05/31/ Vol: 9, pp., 20-25

Kristol William. , Kagan Robert. , (1999) 'George bush, A Distinctly American Internationalism' *The Weekly Standart*. 7 (29 November): 1-13

Lemann, Nicholas(2003), *Real Reasons*, *The New Yorker*. See:http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/?030922ta_talk_lemann

"Letter to Bush", (2001) See: <http://www.newamericancentury.org/Bushletter.htm> (12 December 2003)

"Letter to Ginrich ve Lott on Iraq", (1997)See: <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm> (10 December 2003)

"Letter to President Clinton on Iraq", (1997) See: <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm> (9 December 2003)

Lindley-French, Julian, "U.S. The New Leviathan?" *Institute for Security Studies Newsletter*, No. 3-4, September 2002.

Mandela, Nelson (1995), *Our Global neighbourhood*. New York: Oxford University Press

Mann, Michael (1988), *the autonomous power of the State*. Oxford: Blackwell

Marc Gerecht, Liberate Iraq, *Weekly Standard*, May 14, 2001, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraq-20.010.514.htm> (May 2, 2004)

Mark ,Clyde R., " Israeli-United States Relations" *Congressional Research Service ~ The Library of Congress, Congressional*, 14, 2003., Summary

Mark, Clyde R., *Congressional Research Service ~ the Library of Congress, Congressional*, Israeli-United States Relations, April 13. 2003. Summery.

Mark Lagon, Project Memorandum, Iraq, January 7, 1999, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqjan0799.htm> (May 1, 2004)

McCulloch ,Lesley(2002), No political will to solve the problems in Aceh, See: <http://www.asiaobserver.com/Indonesia-story1.htm> (21 October 2003)

Mi'Ari, Mahmoud, "Attitudes of Palestine's toward Normalization with Israel", *journal of Peace Research*, Vol.36, No. 3(May, 1999), 339-348. p 341

Migdalovitz, Carol, "The Middle East Peace Talks", CRS, Order Code IB91137, p., 1

Murat Yılmaz (2004), "Filistin'de İnsan hakları İhlalleri ve Duvar Gerçeği", *Kudüs*, No: 4, PP. , 86-92

Murphy ,Sean D., "Terrorist Attacks on World Trade Center and Pentagon", *The American journal of International Law*, Vol. 96, No. 1(Jan.,2002),237-255. p. ,293

Negri, Antonio(2000), *Empire*, Cambridge: Harvard

Neustadt,Richard (1990)*Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents*, New York: The Free Press

Nye Joseph (1997), *Understanding the International Conflict*, New York: Longman

Organski F (1958),*World Politics*, New York. Enconter Books

Özdağ, Ümit, Terrorism (2001), "Küresel Güvenlik ve Türkiye", *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol: 2, No:19, pp. , 5-14

Özel ,Soli (2003) , “Democracy and Middle Eas”. TEMPO.
see:http://www.tempodergisi.com.tr/toplum_politika/00774/ (1 May 2004)

Paul, T.V. (1994), *Asymmetric conflict: War Initiation by Weaker Powers*
Cambridge: University Press

Peres ,Shimon. “Talking About Middle East”. 2 February 2004, Sheraton
Hotel, Ankara, Quoted in, Mustafa Kibaroglu (2003). “Ortadoğu ve Kitle İmha
Silahlar” *Avrasya Dosyası*, Vol: 9, No: 4, (Winter): 107-126

Peretz, Don (1988), *the Middle East Today*, New York: Pragger

Peretz Don (1998) “Intifadeh: The Palestine Uprising”.*Foreign Affairs*. Vol
:66, No: 5 (Summer)pp. 964-981

Perl, Raphael F., “Updated September 12, 2001. Terrorism, the Future, and
U.S. Foreign Policy”, CRS Order Code , IB95112, Issue Brief for Congress

Peter Raman (1993), *Contemporary Literary Theory*, Kentucky: UPK

Peterson, Scott (2002), “Iraq Prepares for Urban Warfare,” *Christian Science
Monitor*, (4 October):5-11

Polak, Kenneth (2002), “Next Stop Baghdad?” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol: 8, no: 2,
pp. ,79-89

Powell Colin (1993), “U:S Force: Challenges Aheads” , *Foreign Affairs*. Vol.
71, No:, 5 (Winter)pp., 31-46

Powell, Colin (2003), “American Internationalism: U.S. Foreign Policy Agen
da” *Electronic journal of the U.S. Department of State*, Vol: 8, No: 1, (August)

President Discusses Growing Danger posed by Saddam Hussein's
Regime,(2002)
See:<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020914.html> (2 April
2004)

President’s Words,”Free People Will Keep the Peace of the World.” *New
York Times*, 27 February 2003

“Project for the New American Century”. (2000) Rebuilding America's
Defences See: www.newamericancentury.org.pl.) (21 February 2003)

Purcell ,Kaufman (2003). “U.S. Foreign Policy since September 11th and its
Impact on Latin America” , PENT, 6 de September de 2002 See:
<http://www.farn.org.ar/informacion/ci/novedades0306.html> (24 December,)

“Rebuilding American Defence” (2000).
see:<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf> (1 December 2003)

Releases the First Arab Human Development Report, UNDP See:
<http://www.undp.org/rbas/ahdr/ahdr1/presskit1/EnglishPressKit.pdf> (12 June 2003)

Remnik ,David, (2002: September 23) “Us and Them,” New Yorker,
<http://www.newyorker.com> (11 April 2004)

“Responsibility for the Terrorist Atrocities in the United States UK Press Release” (2001) See: [http:// www.number-10.gov.uk/news.asp?Newsid=2686](http://www.number-10.gov.uk/news.asp?Newsid=2686) (11 Mart 2004)

Rhodes, Edward (2003), “The Imperial Logic of Bush's Liberal Agenda”, *Survival*, 45: 131-154

Rice, Condoleezza, (2003: August 7) “Transforming the Middle east.” *Washington Post*

Rice, Condoleezza , (2000) ,“Promoting the National Interest” , *Foreign Affairs*, (January/February): 41–49 See Also: www.foreignpolicy2000.org

Robert Kagan and William Kristol, A Green Light for Israel, *Weekly Standard*, August 27, 2001, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/middleeast-20.010.827.htm> (May 2, 2004)

Roberts, Jhone (1995), “Visions and Mirages: The Middle East in a New Era”, New York: Mainstream

Rubin ,Barry, U.S. Policy in the Intifadah Era. MERIA. Internet Edition,
<http://meria.idc.ac.il/us-policy/data1988.html>

Ruspini, Paolo (1997), “Iraq and the strategy of Dual containment”. *Defence Analysis*, Vol. 15, No. 1, p., 87-95

Russet, Bruss, *Controlling the Sword: The Democratic Governance of National Security*, (Cambridge, Harvard University, 1990.)p. ,68

“Saddam Huseyin: Crimes and human rights abuses, a report on human costof Saddam’s polices,” Foreign policy affice& coomenwealth office, http://www.csst-queca.com/pdf/Saddam_Human_rights.pdf, (11 December 2003)

Saddam Hussein's Defiance of United Nations Resolutions, (2001)
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect2.html> (10 2003 December)

Saddam Hussein's Development of Weapons of Mass Destruction,
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect3.html>

Saddam Hussein's Development of Weapons of Mass Destruction.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect3.html> (16 April 2003)

"Saddam Hussein's Repression of the Iraqi People".
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect4.html> (16 February 2004)

"Saddam Hussein's Repression of the Iraqi People".
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/decade/sect4.html> (11 December 2003)

Safty, Adel (2003). *Democracy and Government*. Istanbul: BUP

Said, Edward (1985), *Filistin Sorunu*, trans. Alev Alatlı. Istanbul: Pınar Publishing

Scarborough, Rowan. (2002: September 18) "War in Iraq Seen as Quick Win," *Washington Times*.

Schenker, David (2003), *Dancing with Saddam*, New York: Lexington Books

Schiff, Maurice, "Trade Policy and Labor Services: Final Status Options for the West Bank and Gaza" The World Bank Report, February 2004, See Also:
<ftp://repec.iza.org/RePEc/Discussionpaper/dp1029.pdf> (10 April 2004)

Schmidt, Brian (1998). *The Political Discourse of Anarchy*, Albany: State University of New York Press

Scholsstein, Steven, *the End of American Century*, (Chicago: Congdon&Weed, Inc, 1989,) p., 462

Scholsstein, Steven (1989), *The End of American Century*. Chicago: Congdon & Weed

Schwartz, Stephen (2001), "The Ladenese Epistle". The Weekly Standard, See:
<http://www.weeklystandard.com/content/public/articles/000/000/000/396jlqyy.asp> (2 May 2004)

Scrine, Robert H (1990), "Beyond the Cold War: Emerging International Relations in the 1990s", *International Affairs*, no. 2: 13-28

Simon Steve, Benjamin Daniel (2000), "America and the New Terrorism", *Survival*, Vol. 42, No. 1, (spring): 60-66

Smucker, Philip. "As U.S. Talks Up Iraq Threat. Gulf States Stifle a Yawn." *Christian Science Monitor*, 20 September 2002.

Southern Iraq Human Rights Abuses and Views on Justice, Reconstruction and Government, Physicians for Human Rights(2003):See:
<http://www.phrusa.org/research/iraq/docs/iraqsurvey.pdf> (1 May 2004)

Speech by Iraqi President Ahmad Hassan Al-Bark on the Anniversary of the July 17, 1968 Revolution. Baghdad, July, 1975. . Journal of Palestine Studies, Falestine Studies, Vol. 5, No. 1/2 Autumn, 1975-Winter 1976, 255-300

“Statement on the Defense of Taiwan”, (1997) See:
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm> (10 December 2003)

“Statement of Principle”, (1997)
See:<http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm> (15 December 2003)

“Statement of purpose”, (1997)
See:<http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm> (9 December 2003)

Steinberg Gerald M (1998) “Israel and the United States: Can the Special Relationship Survive the New Strategic Environment”, MERIA Vol: 2, No: 4: 42–58

Storey, David (2000: February 3). “Boarder Russian Oil Tanker in Gulf is Detained”, *REUTERS*
Şen, Alper, (2002), 11 Eylül Sonrasında Mısır ve Orta Doğu Radikal İslam Hareketi”, *Stratejik Analiz*, No: 21:63-73

Telhami ,Shibley(2004),*The Stakes: America in the Middle East*, Cambridge:Westview Press

Tenet, George, (2004) “Worldwide Threat- Converging Denger in a Post 9/11 world”, Senate Office Building, Washington D.c. Time: 9:37 a.m. Tuesday, March , See
Also:http://www.ceip.org/files/projects/npp/pdf/Testimony/tenet_3_04_04.pdf (5 April 2004)

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. 2002, Washington, D.C, September 2002.www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.Pdf (1 October 2003)

'The President's State of the Union Address', 29 January 2002. See Also:
www.whitehouse.gov

The United Nations the European Year Book vol:10, 1991, p. ,9

Thomas, Evan (2002: September 16) “Rumsfeld's War” *Nnewsweek*

Tom Donnelly, War on Terrorism, Project Memorandum, November 5, 2001.
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/war-110501.htm> (May 3, 2004)

Tripp, Charles (2000). *a History of Iraq*. Cambridge: University Press

Tunç ,Hakan(2004). *Amerikanın Irak Savaşı*. İstabil: Harmoni Publishing.

Turhan, M İbrahim(2003), *Filistin Çıkmazdan Çözümüne*, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları

Viotti Paul, Kaplan Mark. (1987). *International relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism*, New York: McMillan Publishing

U.S. Launches Initiative to Promote Democracy in Mideast.
<http://www.islamonline.net/English/News/2002-12/12/article16.shtml>. (10 May 2004)

Wallace, Michael (1982), "Armaments and Escalation: Two Competing Hypotheses", *International Studies Quarterly*, 26. (March): 37-56

White House, National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (Washington, DC: December 2002)

Wight, Martin (1992), *International Theory: The Three Traditions*. New York: Holmes and Meier

William Kristol and Robert Kagan, The Gathering Storm, Weekly Standard, October 19, 2001, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/Editorial-102901.pdf> (May 3, 2004)

William Kristol and Robert Kagan, The UN Trap, Weekly Standard, November 8, 2002, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraq-110802.pdf> (May 4, 2004)

William Kristol, Bush vs. Powell, Washington Post, September 25, 2001
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/bushpowell-092501.htm> (May 4, 2004)

William Kristol, Weekly Standard, The Axis of Appeasement, August 16, 2002, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraq-081602.pdf> (May 4, 2004)

Willox ,Philip C(2001).. "Report on Israeli Settlement", Middle East Peace. Vo: 11 No: 7 See:<http://www.fmep.org> (11 May 2004)

Wolfowitz ,Paul(2003) "Interview with Sam Tanenhaus of Vanity Fair"
<http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2003/tr20030509-depsecdef0223.html> (11 April 2004)

Wright, Robin. (1998). "America's Iraq policy: How did It Come to This". *The Washington Quarterly*, (Summer): 58-69

Wurmser, David. (2001), "The Saudi Connection." *Weekly Standard*. Vol: 007, Issue 07. See: <http://www.weeklystandard.com/content/public/articles/000/000/000/393rwyib.asp?pg=1> (4 April 2004)

Yakan, Muhammed (1997), "From War to Peace: Obstacles. Prospects. Implementation of the Middle East Peace Process." *Israel Affair* 3. (Spring/Summer) 145-153

Young, Karen, 2003: April 16) "Chirac Moves To Repair United States Ties." *Washington Post*,

Zunes, Stephen (2001), "Foreign Policy by Catharsis: the Failure of U.S Policy toward Iraq", *Arab Studies Quarterly*, vol: 23, No: 4: 71-83