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Early Western and Middle Eastern Relations

* According to Stoessinger and his source, Bernard Lewis:

There were tension since the inception of the Ottoman Empire:
* 18th Century Revolutions of Western Europe
* English Industrial Revolution
  * Scientific inventions were regarded as "destabilizing"
* French Revolution of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity"
  * Clashed with Ottoman’s rigid class system
* American principle of Secularism
  * Ottoman Empire strongly believed that the Mosque and State were joined under Muhammad
* Western concept: "Emancipation of Women"
  * Women were never regarded as equals
John Stoessinger:

- “When the Ottoman Turks discovered that they had been left behind, they blamed the Western countries for their decline. It was a classic example of projecting their own failure onto someone else; after all they had walled themselves in. The Ottoman Empire had become the “sick man of Europe” by choice, not by conquest.” (p. 325)
Early Western and Middle Eastern Relations

Contrary to Stoessinger, according to the US scholar, James Gelvin:

the Ottoman Empire was quite open to modernization and introduction of modern technologies. However, the Western powers, France and Britain, afraid that the Ottoman Empire’s power might increase, did not want to share their newest technology with the Ottomans. If they would sell some technology to Istanbul, that would have been outdated. Only Germany, the French and British rival, was interested to help the Ottoman Empire get industrialized and even attempted to help the Ottomans build the railroad from Berlin to Basra. However, the British were firmly against the idea, afraid that the railroad could provide for Germany a quick access to the Iraqi and Persian oil fields. Thus, Istanbul had to wait until 1940 to get connected to Baghdad by railroad and until 1964 to get connected to Basra.

The Ottoman Sultan Abdülmecid I already in 1839 started serious reforms of the society with his “Noble Edict of the Rose Chamber” in which he promised reforms such as the abolition of tax farming, reform of conscription, and greater equality of religion. The goal of the decree was to help modernize the empire militarily and socially so that it could compete with the Great Powers of Europe. It also was hoped the reforms would win over the disaffected parts of the empire, especially in the Ottoman controlled parts of Europe, which were largely Christian.
Post World War II Relations

* The United States becomes outside power in the Middle East
  * Developed 3 main concerns:
    * Persian Gulf Oil
    * The new nation of Israel
    * Containment of the Soviet Union
  * Concerns difficult to manage due to:
    * Rise of Arab Nationalism
      * Made United States uncomfortable
      * Perceived as an alliance with communism
    * Two major Arab-Israeli Wars
      * United States failed to form close relationships with Arab nations beyond Saudi Arabia; only Iran and Israel
      * Policy Dilemma: how to reconcile American support for Israel and establish good relations with Arab World?
  * Arab oil embargo of 1973
    * Arabs believed the United States backed Israel and imposed embargo
    * Arab Nations cut off oil shipment to the United States
“By the End of the 1970’s, there was not much good will toward the United States in the Arab world. America was seen as being on the side of the forces of the status quo, the forces of conservatism, the forces opposing Arab unity and opposing the kinds of social change, social reform and even social revolution that many Arabs felt was necessary”

- Zachary Lockman; PhD Professor of Middle Eastern History at New York University
1979 Iran’s Islamic Revolution and Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan

- A watershed for the United States and Middle East
- Foreshadowed a rise in Islamic Radicalism under Khomeini
- Radicalism becomes center of American concern

Escalation of Violence and Tension:

- Soviet Invasion in Afghanistan
  - United States organized an Anti-Soviet Guerrilla War
  - Consequence: Afghani War Veteran Osama Bin Laden would later turn against the United States

- Iran-Iraq War of 1980-1988
  - The United States viewed Iran as the enemy
  - Consequence: Regan Administration looked kindly onto Saddam Hussein; viewed as strategic ally and supplied weaponry stockpiles

- Iraqi Invasion of Kuwait of 1990
  - United States led coalition ousted Iraqi forces from Kuwait
  - Consequence: Iraq is established as a deadly enemy to the United States
“The Regan administration and eventually its special envoy Donald Rumsfeld came to look kindly onto Saddam Hussein […] America saw Iraq as a strategic ally and we were prepared to turn our heads while Saddam Hussein was doing some of his worst atrocities. In 1983, at the time when the first use of chemical weapons were being used against the Kurds, we just looked the other way …”

- William Quandt; American Scholar, Author and Professor
Early Residual Effects

* Terrorism against the United States erupted in murderous determination
  * 1993: First bombing of the World Trade Center in New York; the work members of Al-Qaeda
  * 1996: The Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia housed United States Air Force personnel; the work of Hezbollah, an Islamic Militant group
  * 1998: United States Embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania linked to Osama Bin Laden and members of the Egyptian Islamic Jihad

* Islamic Radicalism became an official enemy of the United States
  * Initially In the form of Osama Bin Laden and his network Al-Qaeda
  * Eventually terrorist network extended throughout every Islamic nation from Morocco to Indonesia
The Early 2000’s

* The new century continued to have escalated tensions:
  * The failure of the Middle East Peace Process in 2000
  * The outbreak of warfare between Palestine and Israel
  * The September 11th attacks in 2001
  * The United States war in Afghanistan in 2001
  * The United States invasion of Iraq in 2003

* The “Axis of Evil” Speech by George W. Bush 2002:
  * Beginning establishment of “preemptive action”
  * Declared Iraq, Iran and North Korea as the world’s most dangerous regimes
  * Countries would not be permitted to develop nuclear, chemical or biological weapons
Implications of “Axis of Evil” Speech

* Triggered an immediate response:
  * 2002: Saddam Hussein announced increase in amount offered to families of martyred suicide bombers; $10,000-25,000
  * Iran sent large shipments of weaponry and arms to Palestine “in attempt to raise ferocity of Israeli-Palestinian conflict” or “to support the Palestinian national liberation movement” (depending on perspective)
  * Kim Jong Il condemned speech as a declaration of war by the United States and threatened to withdraw from NPT

* The Bush Administration’s reaction:
  * Continued to pursue War in Iraq
    * “The only path to safety, is the path to action” (Bush 2002)
  * Entered into negotiations with North Korea
    * “the country was building a growing nuclear arsenal” (Stoessinger 331)
“The policies that the United States has pursued in the Middle East, have, over time, undermined more moderate political ideologies and have built sympathy for more radical ones; now you are seeing Islam turn away from the earthly flags of democracy [...] this is the consequence of a series of American mistakes and determine American intervention as a failed policy”

- David Lesch PhD Professor at Trinity University
The consequence of a series of American mistakes? Pt. 1

Application of the Munich Analogy:

The wrongful appeasement of an aggressor will only encourage hostile actions.

During Iran-Iraq War of 1980-1988:

The United States favored Iraq; declared Iran the enemy.

Action: Turned their heads to Saddam Hussein’s atrocities and crimes; appeased his appetite for aggression.

Result: Saddam Hussein and Iraq became deadly enemies of the United States in the Kuwait War of 1990 and thereafter.

After the “Axis of Evil” Speech in 2002:

The Bush Administration initially declared that North Korea may not produce nuclear weapons.

Action: King Jong Il perceived this as a threat of war; United States then decides to negotiate with North Korea.

Result: North Korea retracts from NPT and remains unstable threat to the International System.
The consequence of a series of American mistakes? Pt. 2

* Application of the Bureaucratic Inertia Model:
  * The tendency for bureaucratic organizations to perpetuate existing procedures regardless of whether they are now counterproductive
  * Counterterrorism as an American Foreign Policy applies to Bureaucratic ritualism
    * Irreconcilable American policy goals dating back 60 years:
      * Establishing American hegemony in International System
      * Practicing American intervention in the Middle East
    * Actions taken for short term gain resulting in long term trouble for the Middle East and the United States
      * Initiating military action in Afghanistan and Iraq
      * Negotiations with radical authoritarian regimes like North Korea further dissipate Middle Eastern relations as tensions grow between the Middle East and the United States
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The Invasion and Occupation of Iraq

Patrick Gallagher
The Invasion

- President Bush sets unrealistic expectations for Saddam
  - Demands disarmament
  - Demands regime change

- Bush begins invasion with “coalition of the willing” in order to liberate Iraq
  - “Shock and Awe” airstrikes against Iraqi Army
  - Large scale invasion from the South aimed towards Baghdad
    - Reminiscent of the liberation of Europe in WWII
Post-Invasion Iraq and the US Occupation

“It became clear very quickly in post-Saddam Iraq that the Americans had prepared very well for waging war, but hardly at all for waging peace”- Stoessinger

• Saddam’s tyranny is replaced by a power vacuum
  – Chaos in the streets: looting and mobs produce more civilian casualties than the invasion itself

• Guerilla resistance forms
  – Saddam loyalists form insurgencies against the US occupation forces
    • Disbanded Iraqi Army soldiers make up a large portion due to losing their pay and animosity towards US forces
  – Al-Qaeda begins to establish itself in Iraq under Jordanian Jihadist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi
Struggle for Power in Occupied Iraq

- Shi’ite majority that was oppressed under Saddam, begins to seize power
  - Mistrusted the US due to US encouragement for them to rebel in First Gulf War, followed by US abandonment leaving them back in the hands of the tyrannical Saddam

- Sunni population (20%) boycotts the elections, resulting in a disproportionate amount of power being held by the Shi’ite majority, little Sunni input on the new constitution

- Sunni vs. Shi’ite sectarian violence occurs, with a Bosnia style civil war seeming likely
  - Zarqawi and his supporters attack Shia holy sites, causing Shi’ites to reciprocate and attack Sunni sites
  - New government, headed by the Shi’ite Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki, established as a Shi’ite regime rather than a unified Iraqi nation.
Individual Level of Analysis: Saddam Hussein

- Narcissistic Personality
  - Lavish palaces, statues, etc.
- Had an ideal of a united Arab nation, ruled by himself
- Valued personal survival above the success of his regime
- “This was no martyr who worshipped death. This was a man who worshipped life—his own.” Stoessinger, pg.346
Containment vs. Preemption

• Saddam always chose survival
  – Likely destroyed any WMDs present in his country prior to the US invasion
  – Stole $1 Billion from Iraqi Central Bank and went into hiding during the invasion
  – Surrendered from a hole in the ground outside one of his palaces on 13 December, 2003

• Libya was contained, why not Iraq?
  – Qaddafi surrenders his nuclear arsenal in December, 2003
• Bush Administration links Libya’s surrender of their nuclear arsenal to the invasion of Iraq
  – Qaddafi began to abandon the state sponsored terrorism he initially utilized in favor of negotiations with the West prior to the war in Iraq
  • In 1999, relinquished terrorists that bombed Pan Am Flight 103 in 1988
  – Libya gave in to negotiations through political pressure, rather than through military force

If Qaddafi, who showed direct aggressive action towards the United States, gave in to containment, it is likely that the survival-minded Saddam would have as well.

“Preemptive war is a “quick fix” that provides the illusion of an easy victory. Containment demands patience and fortitude, and yet more patience. But, it does not demand a ‘rendezvous with death’ for young men and women on some distant battlefield.” –Stoessinger, pg.349
THEORIES OF WAR
APPLIED TO THE IRAQ WAR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Causal/explanatory focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realism</strong></td>
<td>Unipolarity, maintain hegemony and avoid post-9/11 decline by demonstrating U.S. willingness to use force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid nuclear proliferation, eliminate Iraqi WMD threat against the U.S. and its allies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain regional military bases, pressure Syria and Iran, assist Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secure U.S. oil supplies, reduce energy vulnerabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.N. inspections are unreliable, sanctions policy causes resentment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberalism</strong></td>
<td>Democracies’ fear that dictatorships will attack them first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security derives from spreading democracy and human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elite interests</strong></td>
<td>War for partisan political gain: Divert public from failure to prevent 9/11 or capture al-Qaeda leaders, and from past ties to Saddam Hussein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vested interests (e.g. energy corporations), war profiteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interests of the defense bureaucracy and intelligence agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideological</strong></td>
<td>Neoconservative belief in efficacy of unilateral force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influences</td>
<td>Orientalist beliefs about Middle Eastern peoples, and evangelical Christian beliefs concerning Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vengeful U.S. nationalism after 9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality</strong></td>
<td>Bush’s need to surpass father, family vendetta against Saddam Hussein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and social</td>
<td>Attractions of applying the “Munich analogy” to Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychology</td>
<td>Cognitive inability to adapt to a non-state adversary and reflexive resort to Cold war strategies and weaponry, ignorance of the Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Societal need for enemies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIVIDUAL LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

Stoessinger on Bush

George W. Bush’s road from Afghanistan to Iraq was paved by gradual steps toward the crusading end of the personality spectrum: First, his evangelical conversion predisposed him toward a Manichean, good-versus-evil worldview; second, the influence of neo-conservative intellectuals reinforced that worldview; third, Bin Laden’s slipping from his grasp frustrated him; and last, Saddam Hussein’s attempt to assassinate his father triggered a personal grudge. All of these factors culminated in a fixation on Saddam, until Bush was convinced his tyrannical and dangerous presence had to be removed, peacefully if possible but by force of arms if necessary. (402)
INDIVIDUAL LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

George Bush Personality

- Malignant Narcissist
  - Interaction with others to fulfill own interests
    - Obsession with pinning 9/11 on Iraq
    - Destruction of others validity and political careers (I.E. Colin Powell) as means to justify his desires

Manichean
- Good vs. Evil
- Knowledge and enlightenment

Crusader
- Move from pragmatist
  - Rejection of diplomacy in favor or military action
  - Axis of evil speech
  - Identifiable enemy which is morally reprehensible

Saddam Hussein Personality

- “Highest priority was to survive as a ruler” (331)

“Malignant Narcissist”
1. Pathological narcissism
   - Grandiose, overconfidence, self absorption

2. Antisocial
   - Motivated by power
   - Not concerned with diplomacy
   - Exploit beliefs of others against them in Hussein’s case

3. Paranoid Outlook
   - Siege mentality
   - Project hostilities

4. Unconstrained Aggression
   - Ruthless
   - Skilled at hiding this

“Top aides afraid to tell Hussein that his WMD existed strictly on paper”

“See weapons of mass destruction!”
NEO CONSERVATISM IN THE BUSH SENSE

- Nationalistic Pride
  - Painting the war as good vs. evil
  - Allies vs. Axis of Evil
- Idealism World Affairs
  - The US can intervene and save the day
  - Democracy can win
- Preservation American primacy
  - Save hegemony
  - Hard Power Tactics
    - Military
- Moral Responsibility
  - Spread democracy

- Unilateral tendencies
- American hubris
  - Failure to understanding implications of unilateral action
- Suspicious international institutions
  - Rejection UN
    - Stifles state sovereignty

Created an echo box of sorts where individuals would affirm their own beliefs with others who held similar worldviews. Allowing them to avoid cognitive dissonance and streamlining the process for a preemptive war.
Further the stress associated with producing policy in the post September 11th landscape ultimately served to make “war-hawks” such as Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Cheney, Perle, Feith and President Bush to hide and alter information in an attempt to sway the sentiment of skeptics such as; Powell, Tenet and Armitrage who were more passive about regime change in Iraq (Badie)

Stoessinger
-Influence of neoconservative scholars reinforced Bush’s good vs.. Evil worldview

“The Iraq War will always be linked with the term ‘neoconservative,’” George Packer wrote in his book on the war, and he is probably right. The conventional wisdom today, likely to be the approved version in the history books, is that a small group of neoconservatives seized the occasion of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, to steer the nation into a war that would never have been fought had not this group of ideologues managed somehow to gain control of national policy.”
EXPECTED UTILITY

• **GW Bush**
  • US superior military might
    • Evidence of first Persian Gulf War
    • Capture Baghdad easily
    • Sphere of influence in Middle East
      • Protect Israel
      • Control oil
      • Spread democracy

• **Elite Interest**
  • Tax breaks for campaign contributions
    • “Bush tax cuts”
  • In return large military contracts to private military companies
    • Halliburton, Lockheed Martin
MISPERCEPTIONS

• GHW Bush understood the problems inherent with occupying Iraq
• GW Bush believed the war would be relatively easy and painless
• Failure to recognize actions by Hussein that signaled diplomacy
• Each leader signaling strength

"Trying to eliminate Saddam ... would have incurred incalculable human and political costs. Apprehending him was probably impossible ... We would have been forced to occupy Baghdad and, in effect, rule Iraq ... there was no viable 'exit strategy' we could see, violating another of our principles. Furthermore, we had been self-consciously trying to set a pattern for handling aggression in the post-Cold War world. Going in and occupying Iraq, thus unilaterally exceeding the United Nations' mandate, would have destroyed the precedent of international response to aggression that we hoped to establish. Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land."
EXPECTED UTILITY/GAME THEORY

- United States attacks Saddam, therefore Iraq loses its chemical and biological weapons and never gets nukes, therefore Iraq is no longer a problem.

  Or

United States doesn't attack Saddam, therefore Saddam uses chemical and biological weapons and, once he has them, nukes, therefore many people, including perhaps many in the United States, die.

- United States attacks Saddam, therefore Saddam doesn't hit back with chemical and biological weapons because he doesn't have them, therefore Iraq is no longer a problem.

  Or

United States doesn't attack Saddam, therefore Saddam doesn't hit back with chemical and biological weapons because he doesn't have them, therefore Iraq is no longer a problem.

- United States attacks Saddam, therefore Iraq hits back with chemical and biological weapons.

  Or

United States doesn't attack Saddam, therefore Saddam doesn't attack the United States with chemical and biological weapons, in part because he doesn't want to admit he has them.

"If the US and Iraq were caught up in self-delusions, biased decision-making, and failures to update prior beliefs, then their actions are inconsistent with the assumption that actors will seek out and make use of all available information. This [is a] crucial shortcoming in bargaining theory…(Casey)

As previously mentioned with each leader signaling a position of power, as well as information asymmetries between the two which existed partially because of their narcissist personalities it was hard to make rational decisions.

In essence game theory and expected utility are somewhat applicable but individual contexts are more important specifically in regards to this war.
BPM

- Pursing self interest
  - Bush vendetta vs. Hussein
  - Failure to capture Bin Laden
    - Hussein next best way to capture public sentiment
  - Desire to win reelection
  - Neocons regime change
  - State department use military which we spend so much on
- Drawing it out to a logical conclusion.
- No one trying to make state better

- War hawks vs. war-weariness
- Imminence of attack, cherry-picking of evidence as Stoessinger asserts made an invasion a natural political buildup and process.
- GW Bush
  - Ask for unilateral de-escalation to take heat off of United States increased military spending
- Cheney ties to Halliburton
  - Military industrial complex
  - War profiteering
- Pluralism was not allowed to function
- Liberals focused on the chances that different regimes would attack one another
- Conservatives and neoconservatives focused on maintaining hegemon
Bureaucracy in Action: Military Influence

- US military spending in real dollars
- Evidence of military industrial complex
- Buildup post 2000
  - Self fulfilling prophecy
- US ask for unilateral de-escalation while they increase spending

Bureaucratic incentives for war may also stem from the preference of military leaders for offensive strategies over defensive ones, and from the rigidity of military planning. During the long lead-up to the Iraq war, and the months-long positioning of U.S. troops in the region, it is possible that “war plans and the process of war planning became policy by their own momentum” (Woodward, 2004, 3, 10-11). (Lieberfield)
MARXIAN AND HOBSONIAN

- War Profiteering
  - Energy Companies
  - Armament Suppliers
  - Oil Companies

- Halliburton
  - Oil Services
  - Cheney leave as CEO to be VP. Main project to develop New National Energy Policy
    - LOGCAP
    - $30 million+ retirement package

- KBR
  Halliburton subsidiary in 2001 wins contract to supply logistics and services.

http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=12476
CONCLUSION

A combination of individual factors and groupthink allowed bureaucratic actors and informal elites the opportunity to engineer and alter perceptions of the Iraqi regime. From this understanding war became an inevitably thusly legitimizing the Bush preemptive war.
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