Providing a Framework to Understanding Why the US Invaded Iraq in 2003

Wendy S. Davis

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Political Science

Timothy W. Luke, Chair
Georgeta Pourchot, Co-Chair
Scott G. Nelson

April 27, 2007
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Iraq, 9/11, Bush, Cheney, PNAC, Saddam Hussein, Oil

Providing a Framework to Understanding Why the US Invaded Iraq in 2003

Wendy S. Davis

(ABSTRACT)

Cloaked in the ambition of the "war on terror" and buoyed by the unwavering post-9/11 support, the United States engaged in a bombing campaign in Iraq followed by an invasion in March 2003. In preparation for the 2003 invasion, the United States built a complicated case for war based on several problematic bodies of evidence and then presented this evidence to the American people and the international community; this disputed evidence was collected to justify the invasion of Iraq. The tenets of the case for war included: the connection of Saddam Hussein to the events of 9/11, the threat of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and the unknown motives and future actions of an evil dictator. The United States is now over five years into the war, and the overarching sentiment among the American people is that the war in Iraq was based on faulty information and that "evidence" used to justify the war was either mostly unfounded or even fabricated.

Given this problematic evidence to support the official justifications for war, the research question is "Why did the United States still invade Iraq in March 2003?" Clearly, there is not a definitive answer to the research question. The variables for engaging in war are very complex. Often times the benefit of time passage will allow scholars to obtain a more focused understanding of "why" a sovereign power engaged in a particular war. We are not yet at a point where we can write definitively about "why" the US invaded Iraq in 2003. However, it is possible to present an analytical case regarding the reasons used in the time leading up to the US invasion of Iraq. In this thesis, the evidence has been explored, and the result is a presentation, an assessment of the evidence to make a case for why the US invaded Iraq.

Many different political opinions and theories have been advanced to explain why the United States entered this war. Several credible scholars and journalists have made meaningful contributions to the study of this war and the justifications used by the White House for it. It is possible to provide a preliminary framework for understanding why the United States invaded Iraq by using current events literature, official documents and other available sources to document the war in the absence of the official, classified documents. Based on an assessment of available evidence, this thesis proposes that one of the primary reasons for the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 centers on oil; the US was interested in protecting its oil interests and what the White House saw as US geo-strategic position in the Middle East.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Providing a Framework to Understanding Why the US Invaded Iraq in 2003

Cloaked in the ambition of the "war on terror" and buoyed by the unwavering post-9/11 support, the United States engaged in a bombing campaign in Iraq followed by an invasion in March 2003.   In preparation for the 2003 invasion, the United States built a complicated case for war based on several problematic bodies of evidence and presented this evidence to the American people and the international community; this disputed evidence was collected to justify the invasion of Iraq. The tenets of the case for war included: the connection of Saddam Hussein to the events of 9/11, the threat of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and the unknown motives and future actions of an evil dictator. The United States is now over five years into the campaign, and the overarching sentiment among the American people is that the war in Iraq was based on faulty information and that "evidence" used to justify the war was either mostly unfounded or even fabricated.

Given this problematic evidence to support the official justifications for war, the research question is "Why did the United States still invade Iraq in March 2003?" Clearly, there cannot be a definitive answer to the research question. The variables for engaging in war are very complex. Often times the benefit of time will allow scholars to obtain a more focused understanding of "why" this sovereign power engaged in a particular war. We are not yet at a point where we can write definitively about "why" the US invaded Iraq in 2003. However, it is possible to present an analytical case regarding the reasons used in the time leading up to the US invasion of Iraq. In this thesis, the research question was approached by exploring the available evidence, and this thesis is an assessment of the evidence to make a case for why the US invaded Iraq.   This framework consists of three major components.

The first contention is that key officials in the United States government planned and politicked since the 1991 Gulf War to remove Saddam Hussein from power. This plan was conceived by leaders of the Gulf War, and indeed, there is an important historical and political connection linking the Gulf War to the US invasion of Iraq in 2003. This plan, conceived by conservative leaders, was postponed for eight years during the Clinton Administration because of partisan

1

differences in how the US should conduct itself on the world stage. Shortly after the election of George W. Bush, the plan was revitalized gradually and actions were being taken to implement the plan to remove Saddam Hussein from power during the early months of the Bush (43) administration.

The second contention is that an unexpected catalyst occurred when terrorists attacked America on September 11, 2001. The United States retaliated for the 9/11 attacks with a bombing campaign in Afghanistan to impair the Taliban rule over that country and track down Osama Bin Laden and Al Qaeda to destroy them and their Afghan bases of operation. In the hours following 9/11, key government officials tried to link 9/11 to Saddam Hussein. The US decided to use military power against Afghanistan and delay any attack against Iraq. While the US was never able to prove a definitive connection between Saddam Hussein, terrorism and 9/11, the Bush administration leveraged the terrorist attacks to redefine standards of analysis, proof and justification for foreign policy decisions and to advance an aggressive agenda against Iraq. The American desire for revenge and the residual emotion of 9/11 provided a perfect window of opportunity for the Bush Administration to advance its military and political agenda for Iraq. Indeed, in the early days of the 2003 campaign, many Americans made a distinct connection between Iraq and the US declared "war on terror." Much of this connection, however, seems to be an artifact of the administration's public relations campaign against Baghdad.

Hence, the US government worked to build a case for war incriminating Iraq as a threat to the United States. Key officials in the United States government advised the President against an Iraqi invasion; however, the Bush Administration continued to prepare for war. The evidence suggests the United States government knew that the information used to build the case for war was faulty. In the absence of credible reasons to wage war, it is evident that there are other reasons that key officials in the United States government desired a war in Iraq. There are not definitive answers to the research question, but there are several theories which have merit, and this research begins to explore them.

Third, if we accept that the war began under faulty pretenses and that the war in Iraq has a questionable foundation, it is important to consider *why* the US chose to engage in this war at

this particular time in history. The central purpose of this thesis is to explore alternative reasons for the US engagement in Iraq during 2003. In short, this thesis proposes that the US was interested in protecting its oil interests and what the White House saw as US geo-strategic position in the Middle East. Additionally, there are other extraneous reasons for invading Iraq ranging from personal agendas to personal profit that can only be explored briefly here.

Many different political opinions and theories have been advanced to explain why the United States entered this war, and several credible scholars and journalists have made meaningful contributions to the study of this war and the justifications used by the White House for it. It is possible to provide a preliminary framework for understanding why the United States invaded Iraq by using current events literature, official reports and other available sources to document the war in the absence of the official, classified documents.

In January 2007, the former Saudi Arabian Ambassador to the United States, Prince Turki Al-Faisal al Saud said the following: "I think the time to incriminate about why the United States invaded Iraq is way past beyond us. Whatever mistakes or mistaken assumptions or mistaken reasoning took place we should look to the future and hopefully move forward to allowing the Iraqi people to achieve the kind of peace and security that they deserve" (Al-Faisal, 2007). Several distinguished and respected researchers and policy makers disagree with His Royal Highness. This thesis argues that now is the correct time to evaluate why the US engaged in Iraq and that there is value in asking "why" and exploring possible answers. This war can serve as an important case study in US decision making. It is imperative that we explore "why" in order that we might make better informed judgments for the short term tenure of the war and more informed long term foreign policy decisions.

Structure of Thesis:

Chapter One

Chapter One begins with a discussion of history. In large part, the war efforts were directed toward one man: Saddam Hussein. It is important to understand the history of Saddam Hussein, his political history in Iraq and his relationship with the United States. Of particular interest is

3

the time period of the Gulf War (1990-91). There were many "loose ends" from the Gulf War that created an unstable political relationship between the US and Saddam Hussein. For the decade following the Gulf War, Saddam played a version of a "shell game" with the United States by refusing to cooperate with UN weapons inspectors, intentionally violating imposed no-fly zones, and continuing as a merciless dictator perpetrating atrocities against his own citizenry. This dynamic is a contributing factor for some of the "official" and "unofficial" reasons for invading Iraq in 2003. The historical analysis is only the preface to understanding why the United States entered into a war in Iraq in 2003.

Chapter Two

Chapter Two consists of three main points. First it is important to introduce the ideas of The Project for the New American Century (PNAC) and focus specifically on the PNAC vision for a new US foreign policy strategy in Iraq. For nearly three years, PNAC worked to influence President Clinton, members of Congress and the media with their ideas. When George W. Bush became the 43rd President of the United States in 2000, he selected many PNAC members to lead the nation. This fact appears to be a significant variable in the 2003 Iraq War.

Second, the vision for Iraq created by PNAC translated into foreign policy strategy under the new Bush Administration. The rhetoric (by way of public interviews and official statements and publications) indicates that the Bush Administration was pro-actively planning "action" in Iraq. There is evidence that suggests a war plan for Iraq was in place long before 9/11, and this chapter seeks to expose that evidence.

This chapter concludes with a discussion of 9/11 as a watershed event; it is important to highlight the significance of 9/11 because often times the war in Iraq is presented as an extension of the war on terror. The terrorist attacks and the subsequent declaration of war against "the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them" provided an opportunity to expedite the Bush Administration's agenda in Iraq. 9/11 enabled the United States to create a case for war in Iraq and present that case to the American public in such a way that there was widespread support for the initial invasion of Iraq.

Chapter Three

Chapter Three is dedicated to defining the "official" justifications for war and deconstructing the justifications by examining the evidence. Today we have the benefit of time passage to realize that many of the justifications for war with Iraq were based on faulty information and assumptions. Once it has been established that the official justifications were problematic, an alternate explanation can be explored.

While there are many theories that advance alternate explanations for the US invasion of Iraq, two themes consistently recur in the literature: US oil interests and US global position. The two theories are not independent of each other, but indeed, they are interrelated. There is a strong connection between the US global position and the ability of the US to control and manage oil interests abroad. Because these two topics consistently recur in the literature and because these two theories are closely interrelated, both will be explored in this thesis.

Chapter Four

Chapter Four is the first of two chapters that explore alternate theories to explain why the United States invaded Iraq in 2003. Chapter Four focuses on the work of author Michael Klare. In his book Blood and Oil, Klare chronicles the US dependency on oil as a driver for major political, economic and military decisions of the past century. Klare writes that oil is "the" reason for war in Iraq. Klare treats oil as a commodity, a scarce natural resource that is necessary to sustain the American quality of life to which we are accustomed. While he does not specifically mention Iraq, Klare proposes three primary reasons that oil will be "the factor" in future global crises. To support his claim, Klare outlines the results of "an intensive study of oil, geopolitics and American foreign policy." First, there are historical evidences that validate the importance of oil as a foreign policy issue. Second, the attributes of oil and its importance to the American economy make it a vital resource worth protecting. Finally, the United States has shown little desire to lessen our oil dependency thereby perpetuating the need to protect oil interests. Each of these claims will be summarized, and supplemental evidence will be introduced to support Klare's assessment of oil and how oil played a role in the US decision to invade Iraq in 2003.

Chapter Five

If asked, "Why did the United States invade Iraq in 2003?" Neil Smith would respond that it was oil; however, he comes to his conclusion for a very different reason than Klare. In his book The Endgame of Globalization, Neil Smith suggests that the war in Iraq is part of a century-long pattern of the United States' efforts to shape the world in the image of US liberalism. Smith suggests that the neocon movement is not revolutionary but that the principles embraced by the Bush Administration have been fundamental throughout America's history. The personalities and leadership styles of individual presidents make it appear that there have been different globalization strategies throughout the centuries, but in reality, America has always had globalization as a goal. Smith states, "Oil is clearly a central calculation in the decision to invade Iraq and topple the Saddam Hussein regime, but as many have remarked, its relevance goes well beyond Iraq or simply the control of supplies of the US market." Smith makes a case that Iraq is strategically important to the US goal of globalization, and therefore, the US focused attention on controlling the country in order to control the oil. This chapter reviews Smith's work and explores evidence that support Smith's claim.

Conclusions

This thesis will conclude with a summary of findings, limitations with the research and recommendations for expansion of this topic for future research projects.

Chapter 1

The Gulf War: A Preface to the war in Iraq

Saddam Hussein is the most methodical Arab leader of the 20th century. He's organized. He's a daydreamer. And also, he had the following. He was popular. But Saddam Hussein is a planner. And he has affected the Middle East so considerably that we need to understand him (Aburish, 2000).

The intent of this chapter is to provide historical background and analysis of the Gulf War in order to support the contention that the events surrounding to the Gulf War in 1991 and the continuum of events from 1991-2003 were related to the US decision to invade Iraq in 2003. This chapter addresses the following topics: Saddam Hussein and his rise to power, the importance of the Iran-Iraq War, the Gulf War between Iraq and the United States in 1991, and political "loose ends" from the Gulf War. An examination of the history of Saddam, Iraq and the Gulf War is not simply an exercise in fact finding. Hussein's youth, young adulthood, introduction to the Ba'ath Party and rapid rise to power in Iraq are all important to understanding Saddam Hussein. The history allows us to make important connections about events that began with the Gulf War, continued through the 1990s and led to the US invasion of Iraq in 2003.

Hussein's Rise to Power in Iraq

Saddam Hussein was born into a peasant family on April 23, 1937 near Tikrit, Iraq and was left fatherless at a young age to be raised by his mother (Deans, 2006). After nearly a decade of such living, Saddam was passed on to Kharaillah Tufah, his maternal uncle, and under tutelage of his militant Iraqi Nationalist uncle, he learned to keep his family and friends close and seek revenge for betrayal of that loyalty. At the age of 20, Saddam joined the Ba'ath party: a party that reflected the tribal loyalties of Saddam's youth (Besheer, 2006). A year after joining, the Ba'ath party came into power under General Abdul-Karim Qasim's leadership in overthrowing the Monarch of Faisal II (Mallery, 2003). Although not directly involved in this overthrow, Saddam's association with the Ba'athists and their dominance in Iraq paved the way for his eventual reign of power.

As a young Ba'athist, Saddam participated in a failed "assassination attempt against Iraqi Prime Minister Abdul Karim Qasim. Hussein was wounded in the leg during the attempt and fled the

country" (Garamone, 2003). The Egyptian government harbored Saddam Hussein in Cairo after the assassination attempt, and Hussein remained there until the Ba'ath Party assassinated the Prime Minister in a 1963 (Moubayed, 2007). Abdul Rahman Arif would claim the leadership position in Iraq following the coup and assassination of Qasim ("Background Note: Iraq," 2006).

After the assassination of Qasim, Saddam Hussein returned to Iraq where he was imprisoned from 1964-1966 for his previous involvement with the Qasim assassination attempt (Garamone, 2003). In 1968, Saddam participated in a successful coup to overthrow Iraqi President Arif (Garamone, 2003). General Ahmed Hassan al-Bakr succeeded Arif as the President of Iraq, and al-Bakr appointed his cousin, Saddam Hussein, as his Vice President (Garamone, 2003). As Vice President of Iraq, Hussein began a quick ascent to power by taking control over key domestic and international government activities. In 1979, Hussein persuaded his 65 year old cousin to step down from the Presidency and relinquish power to him ("Background Note: Iraq," 2006). Saddam Hussein remained President of Iraq from 1979 until 2003 when his government was overthrown after US troops invaded Iraq and moved into Baghdad.

Importance of the Iran-Iraq War 1980-1988

In a chronology of Saddam and Iraq, it is important to include the eight-year Iran-Iraq War. This war is important for two reasons. First, it provides further insight into US interests and involvement in the Middle East. Second, Saddam believed that this war was fought by Iraq on behalf of all Arab nations. As a result, Saddam felt the $40 billion war loans issued to Iraq by Saudi Arabia and Kuwait should be forgiven as acknowledgement for the protection of the Arab world and in appreciation for the protection (Alfonsi, 2006, p. 44). Saddam's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 was directly related to the eight year war with Iran and the desperate financial condition of Iraq after the war.

Iraq invaded Iran on September 22, 1980, in part, over the disputed Shatt Al-'Arab waterway (Davidson, 1980). At the onset of the war, the official US position was one of neutrality (Galbraith, 2006, p. 17). The US re-established relations with Iraq in 1984 and "restored full diplomatic relations" (Galbraith, 2006, p. 22). While it appeared that the United States was supporting Iraq over Iran in this conflict, Americans discovered near the end of the Reagan

Presidency that the US had authorized a covert operation to sell arms to the Iranians. The arms were to be received in exchange for US hostages held in Lebanon by pro-Iranian groups. The proceeds of the arms sales financed the anti-Communist Contra efforts against the Sandinista government in Nicaragua (Galbraith, 2006, p. 23). The US had formed alliances of convenience with **both** Iraq and Iran. Saddam spoke of this betrayal as he addressed Ambassador April Glaspie on the eve of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990. Saddam mentioned "Irangate" as a "blow" to the relationship between Iraq and the United States (Alfonsi, 2006, p. 33). The war between Iraq and Iran ensued for nearly eight years with campaigns on the air, land and sea. Neither side could declare victory in a war that cost both sides so many resources.

Turning Point in US-Iraq Relations: Saddam Invades Kuwait in 1990

Every war must be placed in its historical context. In the early 1960s, the southern Iraqi province of Basara declared independence from Iraq, and the nation of Kuwait was formed. The British sphere of influence in the Middle East had weakened, and in order to maintain influence in the region, the British government supported Kuwaiti independence (Alfonsi, 2006, p. 39). The newly created nation of Kuwait provided plentiful oil reserves that would be protected by the British, and in turn, British protection ensured that Kuwait would sell petroleum resources to that country (Alfonsi, 2006, p. 39).

In 1988, after the Iraq-Iran war ceasefire agreement, Iraq was in dire financial straights. War debt compounded the problems of the financially devastated Iraq and put Saddam in a desperate position; he and his country were in needed of cash. He expected Kuwait to forgive Iraq's war debt to help alleviate the financial crisis in Iraq. Saddam's contention was that Iraq had defended all Arab nations in the war against Iran, and the "Gulf states ought not to dun Iraq for expenses incurred on their behalf" (Conduct of the Persian Gulf War, p. 45). According to an official report to Congress, "by mid 1990, Iraq had only enough cash reserves for three months of imports and an inflation rate of 40 percent" (Conduct of the Persian Gulf War, p. 44). Saddam was aggravated by Iraq's financial condition and saw an opportunity to intimidate his "rich, but weak neighbor, Kuwait" (Conduct of the Persian Gulf War, p. 45). When Saddam

demanded money from Kuwait, the Kuwaiti Amir countered with a small, long-term loan to Iraq (Conduct of the Persian Gulf War, p. 45).

Not satisfied with this option, Saddam took another approach in an effort to influence Kuwait; he recycled an old argument about land rights on the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border. According to the 1992 official report to Congress, "Iraq again raised the long-standing question of ownership of the islands of Warbah and Bubiyan, which it claimed are important for secure access to its ports on the Khawr 'Abd Allah --the waterway leading to the Persian Gulf that is the only alternative to the closed Shatt Al-'Arab, cluttered with debris from the Iran-Iraq war" (Conduct of the Persian Gulf War, p. 45). When Kuwait declared independence from Iraq in 1961, Iraq never "agreed formally to accept the existing boundary between the two countries" (Conduct of the Persian Gulf War, p. 46).

Furthermore, OPEC had agreed on oil production limits in order to control the per-barrel price of oil. Iraq claimed that Kuwait violated the agreement by producing extra barrels of oil. This added more product to the market, lessening demand and lowering the per-barrel price of oil. Saddam claimed that every one dollar drop in per-barrel oil prices cost Iraq $14 billion a year in revenue (Hussein, 1990). Saddam claimed Kuwait's manipulation of oil prices was a criminal act. He sent a letter to the Arab League declaring that Kuwait's 'theft' of oil revenue was an act of 'military aggression' against Iraq (Aziz, 1990).

This claim by Saddam definitely caught the attention of the United States government. In response to Saddam's claims, the US stance was one of "commitment to the individual and collective self-defense of our friends in the Gulf" ("National Security Directive 45," 1990). The US made calls to key allies in the Middle East: Egypt, Jordan and Kuwait. All agreed that the problem needed to be handled by the Arab nations, and they had a plan to manage the conflict in short order.

Saddam Hussein had promised Egypt and Jordan that no action would be taken against Kuwait until talks had transpired. In violation of his word, Saddam sent 100,000 troops to the Kuwait border, led by his elite Republican Guard. The United States was aware of the troop build up,

but the US was assured by Egypt and Jordan that Saddam would not invade. Much to the dismay of the United States and most of the free world, Saddam did invade Kuwait on August 1, 1990.

The leaders of Egypt and Jordan, while sympathetic to Saddam's cause, were frustrated that he lied to them. In a December 29, 2006 article in the Chicago Tribune, Aamer Madhani chronicled the highlights of Saddam's rule. One of Saddam's political strategies was to "stay ahead of his opponents by remaining feared and unpredictable" (Madhani, 2006). "What is politics?" Hussein asked rhetorically. "Politics is when you say you are going to do one thing while intending to do another. Then you do neither what you said nor what you intended" (Madhani, 2006). In the case of Kuwait, Saddam definitely said one thing while he intended (and did) another.

When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990, it created international pandemonium. The United States was concerned that Saddam might advance troops into Saudi Arabia, and if that happened, there was a real threat to that country's sovereignty and stability in the region. The United States was also deeply concerned about the Iraqi domination of the world oil market. When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, Saudi Arabia was the world's largest producer of oil with Iraq and Kuwait second and third, respectively. The crisis in Kuwait ultimately forced the US to make political decisions and take military actions.

The United States Responds to Iraqi Occupation of Kuwait in 1990-1991

The US reaction to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the subsequent military action by the US in 1991 is crucial to understanding the US invasion of Iraq in 2003. The United States was surprised that the Iraq actually invaded Kuwait. President George H.W. Bush had been in close contact with key allies in the Middle East, and he was confident that this crisis could be averted diplomatically by the Arab nations. Saddam had promised that he would not advance the situation in Kuwait until after the peace talks. The situation changed dramatically when Saddam forged ahead with an invasion in August 1990. When Saddam broke his personal promises to the Arab nations, his credibility suffered among those nations, the United States and sovereigns

around the world. A level of trust was breeched, and this would impact how the United States would manage relations with Saddam in the future.

The United Nations reacted swiftly and imposed international sanctions on August 6, 1990 ("Resolution 661," 1990). The United States worked quickly to build an international coalition of nations to construct a plan on how to manage the situation. It was not difficult to obtain support for this effort; there was global outrage over the invasion even among the Arab world.

The scope of Saddam's invasion was alarming. Over 100,000 Iraqi troops had been assembled and took part in the middle-of-the night invasion (Johns, 2006). The ground troops were supported by a significant air campaign as they advanced on Kuwait City. "Despite months of threatening rhetoric [from Iraq] directed against Kuwait," by most accounts, the Kuwaiti military and the Kuwaiti citizenry were stunned by the invasion (Alfonsi, 2006, p. 60). Amidst pressure from the international community, Saddam Hussein remained unfeigned and declared Kuwait as an annexation territory of Iraq.

On August 7, 1990, President Bush ordered US troops and warplanes to Saudi Arabia; the action was called Operation Desert Shield, and the objective was to protect Saudi borders from a possible invasion from Saddam Hussein. On August 8, 1990, President George H.W. Bush spoke to the nation in a television address where he outlined "four simple principles that he said would define his approach to the Gulf Crisis" (Bush, George H.W., 1990a). During his speech, President Bush formalized the US position on the crisis.

- First, we will seek the immediate, unconditional, and complete withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait.
- Second, Kuwait's legitimate government must be restored to replace the puppet regime.
- Third, my administration, as has been the case with every president from President Roosevelt to President Reagan, is committed to the security and stability of the Persian Gulf.
- And fourth, I am determined to protect the lives of American citizens abroad. (Bush, George H.W., 1990a)

It was well known that the United States was deeply concerned that Saddam Hussein would advance beyond Kuwaiti borders into Saudi Arabia. President Bush stated this in response to a reporter question. "The Iraqis moving down to the Kuwait-Saudi border when, indeed, they had

given their word that they were withdrawing. That heightened our concern" (Bush, George H.W, 1990b).

The United States was concerned about the sovereignty and security of Saudi Arabia, but the US was also deeply concerned about the oil in the Middle East. When Saddam advanced on and occupied Kuwait, a significant amount of oil reserves were in his control. An advance on and occupation of Saudi Arabia would greatly impact the control of global resources and place a majority of the Middle East oil reserves in Saddam's hands. There is not conclusive evidence to prove that this was ever the intent of Saddam Hussein, but the fact that he did not retreat from Kuwait created a significant risk and required action.

From August 1990 to January 1991, the United States mobilized almost half a million US troops to the Gulf Region in preparation to drive Iraq from Kuwait. With permission from Congress, President Bush authorized the US air campaign against Iraq on January 16, 1991. About a month later, the ground war began. The war is sometimes called at the "100 Hour War" because that is the approximate duration of the ground war against the Iraqi military. The official cease fire was on February 27, 1991.

Political Loose Ends?

One of the greatest criticisms of the Gulf War is that the United States did not go all the way to Baghdad and remove Saddam Hussein from power. In his book, Circle in the Sand, Christian Alfonsi writes that President Bush had personal distain for Saddam Hussein. In fact, behind closed doors with advisers, President Bush was emphatically emotional about his desire to go all the way to Baghdad and "get" Saddam. However, the tempered position of the administration and the official message was that the US would adhere to the objectives of the stated mission which did not include "going all the way to Baghdad."

President Bush wanted to keep focus on the issue that pulled the allies together. The primary issue was protection of Saudi Arabia against an advance by Saddam Hussein and the immediate, unconditional and complete withdrawal from Kuwait. President Bush did not wish to enlarge the scope of the mission to include a regime change in Iraq because he did not wish to lose

credibility among the allies. Bush also met opposition for the war from a Democratic-led Congress. Some of Bush's own advisors were in favor of sanctions over military intervention. President Bush decided to control the scope of the Iraq mission and chose to refrain from "going after Saddam."

Additionally, it was widely predicted that Saddam would be overthrown by his own people. Historically, Iraqi leaders have been frequently overthrown by political uprisings. Saddam himself was involved in an assassination attempt at a young age. The economic condition of the country coupled with a failed war in Iran and a failed attempt in Kuwait left the dictator vulnerable to a revolt and takeover by his own people. The US and other world powers counted on that as a probability. Leaving this task to the Iraqis was a miscalculation that would haunt President Bush through his Presidency and beyond.

General Norman Schwartzkopf was interviewed by reporter David Frost in March 1991. One of his comments caused the Bush Administration great consternation. When asked if the US military had destroyed Saddam's Republican Guard, Schwartzkopf said:

> Well, yeah. I mean it is a question of how do you define the word destroy. ... You know we didn't destroy them to the very last tank. And again, this is a point that I think may be lost on a lot of people. That was a very courageous decision on the part of the president to also stop the offensive. ... Frankly, my recommendation had been continue the march ... and make it a battle of annihilation. And the president made the decision that we should stop at a given time, at a given place that did leave some escape routes open for them to get back out, and I think it was a very humane decision (Schwartzkopf, 1991).

This comment by the general may have seemed benign, but the comment was not well received by the Bush Administration. The media focused on the possibility that the United States had missed an opportunity in Iraq. President Bush had a short-lived "victory" period after the Gulf War.

According to the history of George H.W. Bush as posted on the official White House Website, "despite unprecedented popularity from this military and diplomatic triumph, Bush was unable to withstand discontent at home from a faltering economy, rising violence in inner cities, and continued high deficit spending" (Bush, George H.W., n.d.). President Bush lost his re-election bid in 1992 largely over domestic issues.

14

US-Iraq Relations from 1991-2001

After President Bush "won the war but lost the election," the stewardship for Iraq fell to the Clinton Administration. The Clinton policy for Iraq was one of containment through the maintenance of sanctions and response to sporadic no-fly zone violations. One Iraqi expert suggests that "the peace and prosperity America enjoyed during the 1990's dulled popular sensibilities about the existence of danger from Iraq" (Mylorie, 2001a).

In 1995, the United Nations implemented an oil-for-food program aimed at assisting Iraqi rebuilding efforts and the global humanitarian effort. Under this program, Iraq sold approximately $65 billion worth of oil. Seventy-five percent of the proceeds were used to fund global humanitarian efforts and the remaining proceeds were allocated to Iraq for "war reparations" ("Oil for Food," 2003). "About $31 billion worth of humanitarian supplies and equipment were delivered to Iraq under the Oil-for-Food Programme between 20 March 1997 and 21 November 2003, including $1.6 billion worth of oil industry spare parts and equipment" ("Oil for Food," 2003). A major criticism of the program was that Saddam and his associates personally benefited from the UN program and that the Iraqi citizenry suffered further oppression as Saddam rebuilt his wealth ("Oil for Food," 2003).

In 1993, the Kuwaitis thwarted an assassination plot against former President Bush. Clinton retaliated by firing upon Baghdad intelligence headquarters in the middle of the night (Von Drehle, Smith, 1993). Critics said that this symbolic retaliation was an ineffective measure; it didn't punish Saddam and gave the perception that the US was weak on a definitive stance in Iraq.

"From 1991 until now, we are in war"
While the some criticized the United States for being weak in Iraq, the Iraqi Ambassador to the United Nations had a different opinion. In an October 2001 interview, Mohammed Aldouri, Iraqi Ambassador to the UN, asserted that the United States has remained "at war" with Saddam

and Iraq since the end to the Gulf War in 1991. The Ambassador cited sanctions and military acts against Iraq as evidence of perpetual war.

> Look, we consider ourselves from 1991 until now, we are in war, unfortunately, with the United States and with Britain because we have, on a daily basis, a strike against Iraq by warrior planes. So on a daily basis, so there are always attacks here and there, in the south, in the north, in Baghdad (Aldouri, 2001).

Even though the United Nations offered Iraq an "oil-for-food" program, Iraq still remained under hefty UN sanctions. These types of sanctions deeply impacted the lives of the Iraqi citizens. "From 1991 to the end of Hussein's regime in April 2003, Iraq lived under paralyzing United Nations sanctions that turned the oil-rich country into a Middle East backwater" (Madhani, 2006). While sanctions are a non-military solution to a situation, some argue that sanctions impose hardships "affecting ordinary people far more than leaders" (Madhani, 2006). One goal of sanctions is to pressure the sanctioned government to comply with an international directive from the United Nations. Sanctions in the case of Iraq were ineffective in eliciting change in Saddam's regime; instead, the Iraqi people suffered. It is important to remember the Iraqi people are non-willing participants in this decade's long conflict between Saddam Hussein, the United States and others in the global community.

Weapons of Mass Destruction

The United Nations imposed sanctions, and the United States enforced the no-fly zone, but Iraq would have been able to negotiate an end to sanctions had Saddam complied with UN weapons inspectors who were attempting to monitor his WMD programs and ensure the disarmament of Saddam's government. Saddam Hussein's son-in-law, Hussein Kamil, defected from Iraq in 1995 and shortly thereafter revealed that Saddam's weapons of mass destruction had survived the Gulf War (Mylorie, 2001a). This information received some attention from President Clinton. Before this time, Saddam was not perceived as a viable threat to the region or to the United States. The possibility that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction required the Clinton Administration and the global community to react and respond. United Nations acted with renewed interest in an attempt to monitor Saddam's weapons program. For the most part, Saddam was uncooperative. Saddam was particularly uncooperative in 1997 and 1998. Out of diplomatic options, the United States in alliance with Great Britain threatened military air strikes

as penalty for non-compliance with violations of the 1991 post-Gulf War agreements and non-compliance with UN weapons inspectors.

In November 1998, about 20 minutes before the United States was set to strike, Saddam agreed to allow UN inspectors back into Iraq. Saddam's passive-aggressive behavior was not tolerated by the United States or the international community. When he continued to resist inspections, the United States began a "massive air campaign against key military targets in Iraq" in November 1998 (McIntyre, 1998).

For an entire decade, Iraq played a version of a "shell game" with UN weapons inspectors (Broad, Miller, 1998). In shell game is a game, a pea is placed under one of three walnut shells then a skilled con artist uses slight of hand to trick a player into following the pea. The con is typically so skilled that even the most attentive player has difficulty locating the pea. Many times when a player does guess the correct shell, the con is able to conceal the object so that the con is always in control of the game. Many criticized the Clinton Administration for "playing along" in Saddam's game instead of refusing to play. One critic wrote the following:

> The new Bush administration will inherit not so much a policy on Iraq, as eight years of neglect. If the new administration continues on the path Clinton has laid, it will find that the threat posed by Saddam will increase significantly during its term in office.
>
> The alternative is to resolve, at the outset, on adopting a vigorous policy toward Iraq. That would entail reestablishing the goal of the administration that fought the Gulf War: ousting Saddam. If the new administration were to make a serious and credible commitment to that goal, it would have support from a significant number of states in the region, including Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Turkey, Jordan, and Egypt (Mylorie, 2001a).

A "vigorous policy toward Iraq" is exactly what the George W. Bush Administration had in mind when the President and his advisers took office in January 2001.

In summary, the focus of this chapter is the history of Saddam, the Gulf War and the time period from 1990-2003. The brief history is presented as an important foundation to the case for why the US decided to invade Iraq in 2003. In this history we see the rise of a dictator: Saddam Hussein. The Iran-Iraq war is introduced as a precursor to the Gulf War; at issue is the war debt incurred by Iraq as a result of the Iran-Iraq War and the fact as Saddam Hussein tried to bolster

his failing post-war economy by annexing oil-rich Kuwait back into Iraqi borders. The United States, fearful of a possible advance on Saudi Arabia and worried over Iraq's control of oil resources, planned and executed an invasion of Kuwait to force Iraq into retreat.

The United States had established diplomatic relations with Iraq in 1984, and when Saddam Hussein advanced on Kuwait in 1990 and broke promises to the Arab League and the United States, it dramatically affected his credibility in the global community. Since the end of the Gulf War, Iraq and the United States have been in constant conflict; Saddam continued to violate UN Resolutions and the no-fly zone restrictions. As a result, Hussein's credibility with the United States continued to deteriorate. The remaining chapters in this work focus on how the United States built a case for war in Iraq, but it is important to consider these foundational events.

Chapter 2
The Creation of a War Plan for Iraq

I wouldn't ease the sanctions, and I wouldn't try to negotiate with him. I'd make darn sure that he lived up to the agreements that he signed back in the early '90s. I'd be helping the opposition groups. And if I found in any way, shape or form that he was developing weapons of mass destruction, I'd take 'em out. I'm surprised he's still there (Berke, 1999). –Presidential Candidate George W. Bush

In November 1992, William Jefferson Clinton was elected as the 42nd President of the United States of America. As George H.W. Bush left the White House in 1993, Clinton inherited the situation in Iraq. During Clinton's tenure as President, he supported sanctions against Iraq, provided US military support to police the no-fly zone, and authorized military force against Iraq when necessary. Military actions included a retaliatory act for an assassination attempt against former-President Bush and non-compliance (and outright obstruction) with UN weapons inspection efforts. Clinton's policy toward Iraq can be categorized as containment (Kurtz, 2002). Not all agreed with the Clinton Administration's policy toward Iraq.

During the 1990s, a group of high profile Republicans formed a think tank group called Project for the New American Century (PNAC). This group of individuals wrote in their "Statement of Principles" that "American foreign and defense policy is adrift" ("Statement of Principles," 1997). PNAC began a campaign of rhetoric to promote their ideas, and their campaign included an open letter to President Clinton suggesting very specific changes that needed to be made to foreign policy.

This chapter has three main points. First it is important to introduce the ideas embraced by the members of the Project for the New American Century. For nearly three years, PNAC worked to influence the President Clinton, members of Congress and the media with their ideas. When George W. Bush became the 43rd President of the United States in 2000, he selected many PNAC members to lead the nation. This fact is significant to the research question of this thesis.

Second, the vision for Iraq created by PNAC translated into foreign policy strategy under the new Bush Administration. The rhetoric which was penned by the PNAC and adopted as the US foreign policy direction indicates that the Bush Administration was pro-actively planning

"action" in Iraq. There is evidence that suggests a war plan for Iraq was in place long before 9/11, and this chapter seeks to expose that evidence.

This chapter concludes with a discussion of 9/11 as a watershed event. It is important to highlight the significance of 9/11 as a watershed event because often times the war in Iraq is presented as an extension of the war on terror. The terrorist attacks and the subsequent declaration of war against "the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them" provided an opportunity to expedite the Bush Administration's agenda in Iraq (Bush, G. W., 2001b). 9/11 enabled the United States to create a case for war in Iraq and present that case to the American public in such a way that there was widespread support for the initial invasion of Iraq.

Project for the New American Century: A Neo-conservative Agenda

The Project for the New American Century was established in 1997 and is a "non-profit, educational organization whose goal is to promote American global leadership" (About PNAC, n.d.) Many of the members of the PNAC served in the Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations. These former leaders and influential Republicans had been participants in shaping and implementing foreign policy. This group of Republicans has also been called "Neoconservatives" or "Neo-cons." While there is much rhetoric surrounding the goals and objectives of the Neo-cons, it is generally accepted that, "Neoconservatives believe in using American might to promote American ideals abroad" (Boot, 2002).[1]

The "neo-con movement" is an effort to return to foreign policy ideals that have roots in the Reagan and Bush Administrations. One author described foreign policy under Reagan and Bush

---

[1] In an alternate view of neo-conservatism: "The most prominent champions of this view inside the administration are Vice President Dick Cheney and Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz. Their agenda is known as "neo-conservatism," though a more accurate term might be "hard Wilsonianism." Advocates of this view embrace Woodrow Wilson's championing of American ideals but reject his reliance on international organizations and treaties to accomplish our objectives. ("Soft Wilsonians," a k a liberals, place their reliance, in Charles Krauthammer's trenchant phrase, on paper, not power.) Like Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan, "hard Wilsonians" want to use American might to promote American ideals" (Boot, 2002).

as being "aggressive" categorized by "unprecedented military build up." During the Reagan and Bush (41) years, we led "invasions of Panama and Grenada, counter-insurgency wars in Central America, the Cold War showdown with the Soviet Union, and the arming of Iraq as a counter to radical Islamists in Iran" (Shank, 2003).

The members of the PNAC were eager to continue promoting the US global position of dominance in a post Cold War world. For eight years the neo-cons waited for Clinton to vacate the White House so that they could implement ideas that had been in the planning stages since the early 1990s.

> After the first Gulf war, Paul Wolfowitz, then undersecretary of defense for policy, drafted a defense planning document that laid out the core ideas of what was to become the Project for the New American Century's vision. It was a strategy of maintaining and strengthening unchallenged U.S. military superiority against a potential future superpower rival and against unrest around the world, through pre-emption rather than containment and unilateral military action rather than multilateral internationalism. Bush Sr. administration officials rejected it as too radical (Shank, 2003).

On March 11, 1992, the <u>Washington Post</u> ran an article that outlined the "nation's direction for the next century" (Gellman, 1992). An internal Department of Defense memorandum penned by Paul Wolfowitz (and never intended for public release) was leaked to the <u>New York Times</u>, and the American public and international community reacted. Within a month of the <u>Post</u> and <u>Times</u> articles, the Department of Defense had written a revised memorandum. A comparison of the initial and revised DOD memoranda contents can be found in Appendix A.

For almost five years, the foreign policy vision endorsed by Dick Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz (and others) was not addressed again publicly. Then in 1997, the PNAC was created, and the neo-conservatives used their collective signatory power and endorsement to promote foreign policy initiatives. They began their campaign with a "Statement of Principles;" the document outlined specific suggestions for re-directing US foreign policy initiatives.

Regarding the PNAC "Statement of Principles" document, reporter Duane Shank wrote:

> After criticizing the Clinton administration for "incoherent policies," "squandering the opportunity," and "inconstant leadership," they presented their alternative.

"American foreign and defense policy is adrift," the statement said. "...As the 20th century draws to a close, the United States stands as the world's preeminent power…. Does the United States have the resolve to shape a new century favorable to American principles and interests?" The statement ended by calling for "a Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity" (Shank, 2003).

The next statement issued by the PNAC was an open letter to President Clinton. The letter was released on January 26, 1998 (the day before the State of the Union Address). The following is the complete first paragraph in the letter to President Clinton.

> We are writing you because we are convinced that current American policy toward Iraq is not succeeding, and that we may soon face a threat in the Middle East more serious than any we have known since the end of the Cold War. In your upcoming State of the Union Address, you have an opportunity to chart a clear and determined course for meeting this threat. We urge you to seize that opportunity, and to enunciate a new strategy that would secure the interests of the U.S. and our friends and allies around the world. That strategy should aim, above all, at the removal of Saddam Hussein's regime from power. We stand ready to offer our full support in this difficult but necessary endeavor (Project for the New American Century, 1998a).

Without hesitation, the PNAC stated their desire to remove Saddam Hussein from power. It is important to pause for a moment to reflect upon the importance of this paragraph. First, it was written in 1998, three years before George W. Bush was elected and the Republicans took control of the White House. One could easily contend that this was the first published statement endorsing a case for war against Saddam Hussein (and Iraq). Second, it is somewhat brazen for former high ranking government officials to use a non-profit "educational organization" as a platform for advancing foreign policy initiatives contradictory to the containment policy of a sitting US President. The rest of the letter continues on with bold and succinct suggestions for ousting Saddam Hussein from power.

The following are experts from the PNAC letter to President Clinton (Project for the New American Century, 1998a).

- The policy of "containment" of Saddam Hussein has been steadily eroding over the past several months.
- The only acceptable strategy is one that eliminates the possibility that Iraq will be able to use or threaten to use weapons of mass destruction. In the near term, this means a willingness to undertake military action as diplomacy is clearly failing. **In the long term, it means removing Saddam Hussein and his regime from power. That now needs to become the aim of American foreign policy.**

- We urge you to articulate this aim, and to turn your Administration's attention to **implementing a strategy for removing Saddam's regime from power.** This will require a full complement of diplomatic, political and military efforts. Although we are fully aware of the dangers and difficulties in implementing this policy, we believe the dangers of failing to do so are far greater. **We believe the U.S. has the authority** under existing UN resolutions to take the necessary steps, including military steps, to protect our vital interests in the Gulf. In any case, American policy cannot continue to be crippled by a misguided insistence on unanimity in the UN Security Council.
- We urge you to act decisively. If you act now to end the threat of weapons of mass destruction against the U.S. or its allies, you will be acting in the most fundamental national security interests of the country. **If we accept a course of weakness and drift, we put our interests and our future at risk.**

(Emphasis Added)

The contents of the letter leave little room for debate; it is very clear that this group of individuals wanted Saddam Hussein removed from power. They wrote that the US had the authority to perform this action, that we didn't need consensus from the United Nations and that failure to do so was putting our nation at risk. These same comments could have been written in any American newspaper from September 11, 2001 to March 19, 2003 (the time period from 9/11 to the invasion of Iraq).

Interestingly, Clinton does reference Iraq in his State of the Union Address January 27, 1998. It was not the hard stance that the PNAC desired, but there was acknowledgement of Saddam Hussein and his WMD program. The following is an excerpt from the State of the Union Address.

> Saddam Hussein has spent the better part of this decade, and much of his nation's wealth, not on providing for the Iraqi people, but on developing nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them.
>
> The United Nations weapons inspectors have done a truly remarkable job, finding and destroying more of Iraq's arsenal than was destroyed during the entire gulf war. Now, Saddam Hussein wants to stop them from completing their mission.
>
> I know I speak for everyone in this chamber, Republicans and Democrats, when I say to Saddam Hussein, "You cannot defy the will of the world," and when I say to him, "You have used weapons of mass destruction before; we are determined to deny you the capacity to use them again" (Clinton, W.J., 1998).

This statement was not the declaration that the NPAC was seeking. In fact, this mention of Iraq in the State of the Union Address probably underscored the NPAC position that Clinton was

weak on foreign policy, not willing to take definitive action. In a continued effort at influence, the PNAC wrote one final letter during the Clinton Administration. This letter was directed to Newt Gingrich (then Speaker of the House) and Trent Lott (then Senate Majority Leader). In the letter, the PNAC reiterates much of the language used in the Clinton letter, but this time the appeal is to the Congressional leaders to act in the absence of action from President Clinton.

The following are key excerpts from the PNAC letter to Gingrich and Lott (Project for the New American Century, 1998b).

> Now that **the administration has failed to provide sound leadership**, we believe it is imperative that Congress take what steps it can to correct U.S. policy toward Iraq. That responsibility is especially pressing when **presidential leadership is lacking or when the administration is pursuing a policy fundamentally at odds with vital American security interests.** This is now the case. To Congress's credit, it has passed legislation providing money to help Iraq's democratic opposition and to establish a "Radio Free Iraq." But more needs to be done, and Congress should do whatever is constitutionally appropriate to establish a sound policy toward Iraq.
>
> **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.** We recognize that 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 region. Only the U.S. can lead the way in demonstrating that his rule is not legitimate and that time is not on the side of his regime. To accomplish Saddam's removal, the following political and military measures should be undertaken:
>
> -- **We should take whatever steps are necessary to challenge Saddam Hussein's claim to be Iraq's legitimate ruler, including indicting him as a war criminal**;
>
> -- We should help establish and support (with economic, political, and military means) a provisional, representative, and free government of Iraq in areas of Iraq not under Saddam's control;
>
> -- We should use U.S. and allied military power to provide protection for liberated areas in northern and southern Iraq; and -- We should establish and maintain a strong U.S. military presence in the region, **and be prepared to use that force to protect our vital interests in the Gulf - and, if necessary, to help remove Saddam from power**
>
> **Although the Clinton Administration's handling of the crisis with Iraq has left Saddam Hussein in a stronger position that when the crisis began, the reality is that his regime remains vulnerable to the exercise of American political and military power. There is reason to believe, moreover, that the citizens of Iraq are eager for an alternative to Saddam**, and that his grip on power is not firm.

(Emphasis Added)

This statement by the PNAC extends beyond the message and scope of the first letter sent to President Clinton. The letter to Clinton had no real impact in that it was not effective in influencing foreign policy. Finding no ally in Clinton, the PNAC discredits him as a poor leader who is not acting in the interests of American security.

The war plan for Iraq is further defined by suggesting that Saddam be removed and that a "peaceful and democratic Iraq" should replace the regime currently in place. The PNAC also suggests that we might usurp the power of Saddam by declaring him a war criminal and using the legal system to convict him of crimes against humanity. Finally, the PNAC suggests that we have interests to protect in the Gulf, and for that reason, we need to remove Saddam because he is at worst an impediment and at least a nuisance. It is never explicitly expressed, but part of our interest in the Gulf is oil. With Saddam in power, the US would be required negotiate with him or at least establish functional diplomatic relations in order to have access to Iraqi oil. Because of his previous actions in Kuwait and subsequent disregard for UN Resolutions, Saddam had little credibility with the United States. Partnering with him for access to economic resources was not a viable option. The remaining option was to remove him from power, and this is exactly what the PNAC recommended.

The importance of the PNAC and its members cannot be underestimated. It is not uncommon that those running for president publish books, articles and public statements on their domestic and foreign policy agendas. What is unique about this particular scenario is that foreign policy ideas were not conceived by Bush; they were constructed by PNAC. The ideas were embraced by Bush, but he was not the master-mind of the ideas. The neoconservatives are influential advisors to George W. Bush, and they were the architects of today's foreign policy. The strong position of the PNAC shifted from an Iraq-centric focus near the end of 2000 during the presidential campaign to a more global focus. PNAC released a document in September 2000 that outlined the future of American foreign policy. The document is titled "Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century" (Donnelley, 2000). PNAC Chairman, William Kristol, purports that the strategy is a "comprehensive one" outlining the future direction that the United States should embrace as defense strategy (Kristol, 2001).

The Republicans waited for George W. Bush to be elected President of the United States. Soon after the installation of the new President, the pre-conceived plan for Iraq was discussed as a top issue in the newly formed Bush Administration. On March 21, 2001 this PNAC document was presented to the House Armed Services Committed by PNAC Chairman William Kristol. The document created by a non-profit think-tank was presented as part of the Congressional record in its entirety.

It is worth underscoring the importance of the PNAC. This is not a secret organization; this is a registered 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. They have a public website and were very aggressive about promoting their ideas. It is with eerie precision that a non-profit group promoted ideals, schooled a Presidential candidate, and within weeks after the installation of a new administration, was standing before members of Congress quoting ideas that had been five years in the making. What is even more interesting is that these ideals were the foundation of the present day war in Iraq. A lingering question persists. "How did we miss this?" Some have labeled the PNAC papers and statements as a "Blueprint for War" in Iraq (Koppel, 2003). Dr. Bernard Weiner, co-editor of the online site The Crisis Papers, suggests "nobody took such extreme talk seriously" (Weiner, 2004).

George W. Bush Elected: Preparations Begin to Implement the Plan for Iraq

> **'We really need to get the president-elect briefed up on some things,' Cheney said, adding that he wanted a serious discussion about Iraq and different options.' The president-elect should not be given the routine, canned round-the-world tour normally given incoming presidents. Topic A should be Iraq. (Woodward, 2004, p. 1)**

With George W. Bush in office, the new administration began working on a plan for Iraq. In speeches and interviews Bush officials openly spoke of the Iraqi threat and the desire to remove Saddam Hussein. Behind closed doors, there was a detailed political and military strategy devised that constituted a war plan for Iraq. Both the public and classified components of the war plan will be discussed in this section.

A Media Campaign: Advancing Rhetoric Regarding Iraq

Shortly after the issues surrounding the 2000 election were finalized, officials in the George W. Bush Administration began a campaign of rhetoric regarding Iraq. These public statements were a prelude to the presentation of an official war plan. Early in his administration, Bush "called Saddam a threat" (Mylroie, 2001). There are numerous cases of officials giving interviews in which the topics of Iraq and Saddam were addressed. The message was clear; the Bush Administration was closely monitoring Iraq. The following comments by Condoleezza Rice (then National Security Adviser) encapsulate the messaging that the Bush Administration desired to convey.

> Well, the president has made very clear that he considers Saddam Hussein to be a threat to his neighbors, a threat to security in the region, in fact a threat to international security more broadly. And he has reserved the right to respond when that threat becomes one that he wishes no longer to tolerate. I think it's always best not to speculate about the grounds or the circumstances under which one would do that.
>
> But I can be certain of this, and the world can be certain of this: Saddam Hussein is on the radar screen for the administration. The administration is working hard with a number of our friends and allies to have a policy that is broad; that does look at the sanctions as something that should be restructured so that we have smart sanctions that go after the regime, not after the Iraqi people; that does look at the role of opposition in creating an environment and a regime in Baghdad that the people of Iraq deserve, rather than the one that they have; and one that looks at use of military force in a more resolute manner, and not just a manner of tit-for-tat with him every day (Rice, 2001).

The message was clear: "Saddam Hussein was on the radar screen for the administration." The implication was that the administration was prepared to deal with Saddam. What had not yet been made public was how the administration intended to deal with Saddam and Iraq.

A Different Voice: Colin Powell

It is worth noting that one official consistently had a differing opinion from others in the Bush Administration regarding the prospect of war in Iraq. Colin Powell, Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the Gulf War, frequently took a diplomatic approach to any US plan in Iraq. Powell was not a member of the NPAC and typically is not regarded as a neo-con. Powell discussed the threat of WMD as a threat to the people and children of Iraq; this was in direct contrast to other Bush administration officials who advanced the idea that WMD were a direct threat to the United States (Powell, 2001a).

In an interview with Sam Donaldson on the Sunday morning news show, "This Week", the following was said:

> MR. DONALDSON: What you seem to be suggesting to me that, at the moment, you don't have enough evidence to believe that you should follow through on President Bush's words to take out those weapons.

> SECRETARY POWELL: We reserve the right to use whatever means may be necessary if we had a specific set of targets, or something occurred to us, or we found something that we think would be appropriate to go after (Powell, 2001b).

On the CBS television program, "Face the Nation", the following was said:

> MS. BORGER: This is, as you know, the tenth anniversary of the Gulf War. Do you believe Saddam Hussein is stronger or weaker than he was?

> SECRETARY POWELL: He's weaker, he's much weaker. That million-man army of ten years ago is gone. He is sitting on a very much smaller army of perhaps 350,000 that does not have the capacity to invade its neighbors any longer. He is living in three concentric rings of jails that he has created for himself in order to protect himself behind a security cordon. He has a great deal of money available to him through our Oil-for-Food Program, which he refuses to use entirely for the benefit of his people and for his children. Instead, he continues to pursue weapons of mass destruction to threaten the people and children of the region (Powell, 2001c).

Powell also testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee that containment and the use of sanctions has been reasonably successful (Cirincione, Orton, 2004). The tenor of Powell's comments is markedly different than others in the Bush Administration. In the days after 9/11, Powell was not in favor of attacking Iraq; he saw no connection between the two and thought that diplomatic options were a better approach to military ones. In the days following 9/11, Powell's role and influence in the Bush Administration would be marginalized. He would remain on as Secretary of State through Bush's first term, but he was not retained for a second term appointment.

The White House Plans for War in Iraq

In an interview with "60 Minutes," Former Bush Treasury Secretary, Paul O'Neill gave an interview where he revealed that the President took office in January 2001 fully intending to invade Iraq (Stahl, 2004). It is O'Neill's opinion that Bush was desperate to find an excuse for pre-emptive war against Saddam Hussein. Similar statements by O'Neill were made to author

Ron Suskind. O'Neill told Suskind that the first National Security Council meeting conducted by Bush focused on Iraq.

> The hour almost up, Bush had assignments for everyone. Powell and his team would look to draw up a new sanctions regime. Rumsfeld and Shelton, he said, "should examine our military options." That included rebuilding the military coalition from the 1991 Gulf War, examining "how it might look" to use U.S. ground forces in the north and south of Iraq and how the armed forces could support groups inside the country who could help challenge Saddam Hussein. Tenet would report on improving our current intelligence. O'Neill would investigate how to financially squeeze the regime.
>
> Meeting adjourned. Ten days in, and it was about Iraq (Suskind, 2004b, p. 74).

In the wake of 9/11 an important series of events has been broadly overlooked. In August 2001, the US and Iraq were actively engaged in a military conflict that consisted of the US bringing in ships to the region, an increase in US surveillance, and intermittent bombing of targets in Iraq. These events are well documented, and they provide evidence that the United States may have already begun to implement part of the military strategy against Iraq. The following is a brief timeline of articles highlighting military encounters between the two countries.

August 1   Pentagon sources confirmed Wednesday that a **second U.S. aircraft carrier has arrived in the Persian Gulf** in what Navy officials describe as a routine rotation. Sources told CNN the USS Enterprise arrived in the southern Gulf on Wednesday and will soon join the USS Constellation, which is about to end its scheduled tour of duty.

  Iraq appears to be bracing for an attack. Over the past week it dispersed some missiles, radars and aircraft into a more defensive posture, according to Pentagon sources. That includes moving some radar near Baghdad above the 33rd parallel, outside the southern no-fly zone where the U.S. bombs with some frequency.

  Pentagon officials would not confirm details of the planning, including the scale or timing of an attack. "We reserve the right to strike targets at a time and a place in a manner of our choosing," Pentagon spokesman Rear Adm. Craig Quigley said Tuesday" (McIntyre, 2001a).

August 7   **The United States on Tuesday bombed an Iraqi multiple rocket launcher** in northern Iraq in what Pentagon officials said was an immediate response to a provocation.

  Sources said on Saturday that an Iraqi MiG-23 flew some 60 miles into the southern no-fly zone, near where a U.S. predator unmanned aerial vehicle was conducting surveillance" (McIntyre, 2001b).

August 15   **US planes bombed a site in southern Iraq on Tuesday to knock out radar that helps Baghdad track and target Western aircraft**, in the latest of a string of hits on Iraqi military targets, the Pentagon said."

US Central Command said **Tuesday's strike was conducted "in response to recent Iraqi hostile threats against coalition aircraft monitoring the southern no-fly zone.**

Since the 1991 Gulf War, US and British planes have regularly patrolled "no-fly" zones in southern and northern Iraq, which are not recognized by Baghdad.

Iraq was banned from using all aircraft in the zones set up by Western powers to protect minority Kurds and Shi'ites ("US Warplanes Strike Radar Site in Southern Iraq," 2001).

August 27   "**Iraq says it shot down a US reconnaissance aircraft flying over the south of the country on Monday**, while the Pentagon admits that one of its unmanned Predator planes is missing.

Iraqi State television broadcast pictures of what it said was the mangled wreckage of the plane with American markings" ("Iraq Celebrates 'Downing' US Plane," 2001).

August 29   **[Iraq National Congress] starts beaming satellite television propaganda programs into Iraq using funds provided by the U.S. Congress**. The station is headquartered in Washington DC, with a "large production bureau" in London. The INC produces these programs with the help of a contract from Lockheed Martin Corp (Goodenough, 2001).

September 11 A second unmanned US spy plane has been downed by Iraq in less than a month, Baghdad said yesterday, following American reports that Iraq was beefing up its ability to strike US and British aircraft patrolling no-fly zones over Iraq's north and south.

A US military spokesman said a plane was missing and its loss was being investigated (Yacoub, 2001).

Emphasis has been added to aid the reader and underscore particular points of interest. The last quoted event in this timeline is September 11, 2001. That day changed many things, and it definitely impacted how the United States would manage the objectives in Iraq. The next section will highlight how 9/11 impacted the Bush strategy for Iraq.

9/11: A Watershed Event

> **The attack took place on American soil, but it was an attack on the heart and soul of the civilized world. And the world has come together to fight a new and different war, the first, and we hope the only one, of the 21st century. A war against all those who seek to export terror and a war against those governments that support or shelter them (Bush, G. W., 2001d).**

One day after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt addressed the United States Congress. In that speech he said, "Yesterday, Dec. 7, 1941 - a date which will live in infamy - the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan" (Roosevelt, 1941). On September 11, 2001, President George W. Bush addressed the nation from the Oval Office with words of a similar tenor. "Today, our fellow citizens, our way of life, our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts" (Bush, G.W., 2001b). While President Bush did not declare that September 11th was a day that would live in infamy, it undoubtedly will be.

It is impossible to chronicle the events of 9/11 without acknowledging the emotional impact to the US citizenry. Without question, 9/11 was the worst terrorist attack to ever occur on US soil. The emotional reaction was important. The attacks seemed to foster feelings of US patriotism. In his book, The Endgame of Globalization, Neil Smith captures the immediate post-9/11 sentiment.

> The powering of commercial planes into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in 2001 were highly local events yet at the same time utterly global. They certainly elicited a global response. Sympathy for the immediate victims—more than 2,700 New Yorkers hailing from some 90 countries, 180 military personnel and employees in Washington, DC and 30 people on a downed plane in Pennsylvania—came from everywhere as the gruesome results of the attacks played out in real time on television and computer screens around the world. From Seoul to Cairo, Moscow to Santiago, and throughout the Middle East, there were candlelight vigils and other sympathetic demonstrations deploring the attacks on New York and Washington. Horror mixed with widespread apprehension over the embarrassing ease of the attacks. That they seemed to come from nowhere raised the specter of sudden escalation of terrorists threats from which no one was safe. Especially for those who traveled to New York—less so the antiseptic space around the Pentagon— the depth of global empathy with the Untied States was extraordinary.   German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, reciprocating the cross-border Cold War comradery of John F. Kennedy four decades earlier ("Ich bin ein Berliner"), expressed the new sense of global vulnerability and affinity in the same terms; "we are all Americans now." "We are all Americans," insisted the September 12, 2001 banner headline in the French newspaper, Le Monde (Smith, 2005, p. 8).

The immediate reaction to the attacks and the lingering effects of the attacks on the American people was very important. If the Bush Administration could connect Saddam Hussein to 9/11, the persisting emotion of 9/11 and the American desire for revenge would most likely yield unwavering support for the invasion of Iraq. It is possible that the administration's plan for Iraq was already in motion on September 11, 2001, but if the terrorist attacks could be leveraged to build a case against Saddam Hussein, it would aid the campaign in Iraq.

Cheney Doctrine

Rarely has there been a Vice President as influential as Dick Cheney. As former Secretary of Defense, Cheney was in office during the "end" of the Cold War and the Kuwaiti crisis that yielded an American military response in the Middle East. As the Vice President under George W. Bush, Cheney's influence on foreign policy is dominating.

After September 11th, Cheney advanced rhetoric that has become known as the "One Percent Doctrine," chronicled in a book with the same title. In the midst of managing the aftermath of 9/11 and planning a response, Cheney said the following:

> If there's a one percent chance that Pakistani scientists are helping al Qaeda build or develop a nuclear weapon, we have to treat it as certainty in terms of our response. It's not about our analysis, or finding a preponderance of evidence. It's about our response. (Suskind, 2006a, p. 62).

This approach to foreign policy is a great deviation from the previous philosophy which was "analysis and action" (Suskind, 2006a, p. 62). In a few sentences, Cheney altered the foreign policy decision making process by demoting the foundation of analysis supported by evidence to a standard of one percent chance truth coupled with a response. Suskind wrote:

> …actual evidence became increasingly scarce. A key feature of the Cheney Doctrine was to quietly liberate action from such accepted standards of proof, and it was effective. Suspicion, both inside America and abroad, became the threshold for action" (Suskind, 2006a, p. 163).

This new standard gave way for a liberal interpretation of "proof," "evidence," and "justification," and focused on an action base-response based on suspicions. In Chapter Three, the US government's "case for war" is outlined in detail. Understanding the Cheney Doctrine is

vitally important to understanding the official "case" for war and the ease by which that case can be deconstructed by evidence.

The Bush Doctrine

Bush deviated from Clinton's foreign policy position of containment and deterrence. During his speech to West Point graduates in 2002, President Bush said the following:

> For much of the last century, America's defense relied on the Cold War doctrines of deterrence and containment. In some cases, those strategies still apply. But new threats also require new thinking. Deterrence -- the promise of massive retaliation against nations -- means nothing against shadowy terrorist networks with no nation or citizens to defend. Containment is not possible when unbalanced dictators with weapons of mass destruction can deliver those weapons on missiles or secretly provide them to terrorist allies (Bush, G.W., 2002b).

In his television address to the nation on the night of September 11th, President Bush said, "We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them" (Bush, G.W., 2001b). Those carefully crafted words are the foundation the "Bush Doctrine." On September 20, 2001 President Bush further clarified his policy when he said, "Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists" (Bush, G. W., 2001b).

Bush Doctrine embraces the following precepts:

Preemption

- "We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best. We cannot put our faith in the word of tyrants, who solemnly sign non-proliferation treaties, and then systemically break them. If we wait for threats to fully materialize, we will have waited too long" (Bush, G.W., 2002b).

Strength Beyond Challenge
- "America has, and intends to keep, military strengths beyond challenge thereby, making the destabilizing arms races of other eras pointless, and limiting rivalries to trade and other pursuits of peace" (Bush, G.W., 2002b).

Extending Democracy, Liberty and Security to All Regions
- "America has no empire to extend or utopia to establish. We wish for others only what we wish for ourselves—safety from violence, the rewards of liberty, and the hope for a better life" (Bush, 2002b).

The Bush Doctrine had its roots in the PNAC writings, but Bush articulated his version US foreign policy in the State of the Union Address in 2002; President Bush made clear that our quest to fight global terrorism would extend beyond al-Qaeda and random terrorists cells. US detected an "axis of evil" and declared North Korea, Iraq and Iran as members of the axis. This expanded definition of terrorism allowed the US to label Saddam an enemy of the state and a threat to US safety in the war on terror. Additional tenets of the Bush Doctrine were articulated as part of a commencement address that the President gave at West Point in the spring of 2002.

In the spring of 2002, the United States was actively engaged in preparations for war in Iraq. The next step would be to build a case for the American people to justify an invasion of Iraq. Chapter Three details the case that the United States government built to justify the war in Iraq, and in part, Saddam was used as justification for war.

Summary

The evidence presented in this chapter indicates that a plan for Iraq was conceived pre-George W. Bush. This plan was presented to key officials in the Clinton Administration. When Bush declared candidacy for the Presidential race, PNAC members were key in the education of George W. Bush on foreign policy issues. The vision of the PNAC was implemented when Bush selected many PNAC influencers as key advisers in his administration.

Soon after the Bush Administration was in place, Iraq became a key focus among those involved with national security issues. By some accounts, it was "the" primary topic of the first National Security Council meeting only 10 days into the Bush Presidency. It appeared that the initiatives outlined by the PNAC were now embraced by an administration who intended to act upon many of the foreign policy recommendations set forth by that group. In August and September of 2001, the United States, Great Britain and Iraq all engaged in military encounters that extended beyond the typical military actions taken for no-fly zone violations.

Then on September 11, 2001, the world changed. The events of 9/11 were unlike any that America had ever experienced, and doubt, fear and uncertainty was a new part of American culture. Key officials in the Bush Administration (including the President himself) set new thresholds for how the country would deal with those in opposition to the United States. Vice President Cheney said that if there were a 1% chance of a threat being true (like a threat of WMD) then we would need to respond as if it were true. President Bush took a stance of "you're either with us or against us" thereby declaring that the United States was prepared to act with or without our allies. It was unique time in US history. In the early days following 9/11, Americans were tolerant of many things if it would mean that terrorist attacks on the homeland could be prevented.

The next chapter is dedicated to how the United States government built a case for war in Iraq with the new standards of analysis, evidence and justifications.

Chapter 3
The US Government Builds a Case for War

With Afghanistan, Bush had international support to go to war, but many in the international community found Bush's case for invading Iraq to be 'flimsy' (Madhani, 2006).

Richard Clarke served as a National Security Council (NSC) adviser to two US Presidents: Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. During his tenure with the Clinton Administration, Clarke became the lead expert on counter-terrorism at the NSC. In his book, <u>Against All Enemies</u>, Richard Clarke chronicled an event that occurred on September 12, 2001. Clarke recounts that late in the evening of September 12, the President called Clarke and a few other NCS staff members into the Situation Room and closed the door. President Bush reportedly said, "Look, I know you have a lot to do and all…but I want you, as soon as you can, to go back over everything. See if Saddam did this. See if he's linked in any way" (Clarke, 2004, p. 32). Clarke reports that he assured the President that the terrorist attacks were committed by al Qaeda, but he promised to "look again."

This chapter focuses on how the Bush Administration built a case against Saddam Hussein founded on questionable "evidence" then presented this "evidence" to the American people and the United Nations as justification for war in Iraq. One tenet of the case for war was that there was a connection between 9/11 and Iraq. Next, there was a case made that Saddam had Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and would use them. Finally, the United States government vilified Saddam Hussein and highlighted aspects of his reign that were the most egregious and threatening. Each of the three main tenets of the case will be explored and evidence will be presented to show weaknesses in the government's case. It is important to deconstruct the official justifications for war in this chapter in order to advance alternative reasons for the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 in following chapters.

Case for War: 9/11 and Iraq are Related

> **…if we turn on Iraq now, it will look like we're just using September 11 as an excuse to go after our favorite enemy (Scowcroft, 2001).**

One day after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, Secretary of State Donald Rumsfeld "raised with his staff the possibility of going after Iraq as a response to the terrorist attacks" (Woodward, 2004, p. 24). On the day of the attacks, it was impossible to know who was responsible. Osama bin Laden, while accused, did not claim responsibility for several months (Bamber, 2001).

Four days after the terrorist attacks, Bush convened a meeting of key officials at Camp David to discuss the situation and plan for US action. It was agreed that Afghanistan should be a military target of retaliation for the terrorist attacks on US soil, but closely coupled with a discussion of Afghanistan was a second target: Iraq. "White House Chief of Staff Andrew H. Card said Iraq should not be a principal, initial target. Tenet also recommended that the initial military target should be Afghanistan, not Iraq" (Woodward, 2004, p. 25). Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary of Defense, Paul Wolfowitz were not convinced on the decision to leave Iraq out of the first round military efforts. When asked for a straw poll count on those in favor of military action in Afghanistan, Rumsfeld oddly abstained from voting. Wolfowitz contended that there was a 10-50% chance that "Saddam was involved in the 9/11 attacks—an odd conclusion that reflected deep suspicion but no real evidence" (Woodward, 2004, p. 26).

The Evidence: A Well-Crafted Conspiracy Theory

In the literature connecting Saddam and 9/11, the work of one woman continually recurs; her name is Laurie Mylroie. In 1995, Mylroie wrote an article for The National Interest titled, "The World Trade Center Bomb: Who is Ramzi Yousef? And Why it Matters" (Mylroie, 1995). In this article, she constructs an argument that an Iraqi intelligence agent was responsible for the WTC bombing in 1993 and "that his bombing conspiracies were meant as Saddam Hussein's revenge for the Gulf War."

Mylroie wrote:

> Most members of the U.S. national security bureaucracies think that Saddam Hussein has largely lain low since the Gulf War, constrained by economic sanctions and swift American reactions to his occasional feints to the south. But if in February 1993, Saddam ordered his agents to try to topple New York's tallest tower onto its twin, and if, in January 1995, Iraq sponsored an effort to destroy eleven U.S. airplanes in the Far East, then Saddam has not been quiescent.
>
> This, simply put, is why it is important to find out who Ramzi Yousef is and who may have put him up to his murderous work. Maybe Iraq had nothing to do with him, despite all the circumstantial evidence suggesting otherwise. But if it did, then the otherwise peculiar, bombastic, and extremely violent statements emanating from Baghdad might make more sense than they at first seem to (Mylroie, 1995).

She researched original source documents from the 1993 WTC bombing trials to build her case. Her primary focus is the identity of terrorists. She believes that historically the US has concluded that terrorist acts are propagated by individuals or groups with no particular ties to a sovereign. Her evidence seeks to prove that the identities of the terrorists are vitally important because it links them directly back to a sovereign, therefore re-inventing the idea of state-sponsored terrorism. In the case of the 1993 WTC bombings, she links Iraq directly to the bombings via the identity of one of the terrorists. In the absence of verifiable evidence, she constructs an "if then" scenario to fill in the blanks.

Key officials in the Bush Administration quoted Mylroie's research as supportive evidence to link Saddam to 9/11. As part of the PBS Frontline investigation, Gunning for Saddam, R. James Woolsey, former CIA Director was interviewed. He was asked the question: "When did you become aware, or when did you think that possibly Iraq was involved in some way in the World Trade Center bombing, or in terrorism against the United States?" (Woolsey, 2001).

> His response: Well, I left the agency in January of 1995, shortly before Ramzi Yousef was apprehended. It really wasn't until I saw Laurie Mylroie's article in National Interest that my interest was piqued. And then a few years later, when she sent me the manuscript to see if I would do an advertising blurb for her book, I went into it in great detail (Woolsey, 2001).

This response is alarming. The fact that Woolsey was the CIA Director and he made the connection between Hussein and the 1993 WTC bombings only **after** he read an article in The National Interest is disconcerting.[2]

On August 31, 2005, an articled titled, "A female conspiracy theorist took America to War" appeared on Aljazeera.com. The article states, "Laurie Mylroie is a conspiracy theorist whose political views have consistently been proved wrong. However, Bush and his aides decided to swallow her theories on Saddam's alleged weapons of mass destruction and launch [the] Iraq war" ("A Female Conspiracy Theorist Took America to War," 2005). It is highly improbable that Bush relied on Mylroie as a source of truth in connecting 9/11 to Saddam Hussein. However, in an effort to find a justification for war, it could very well be that Mylroie was actually a willing or unwilling participant in the Administration's quest to find a link between Saddam and 9/11.

CNN reporter, Peter Bergen wrote a detailed and insightful article in the December 2003 edition of the Washington Monthly that sheds a bright light on the Bush Administration's attempt to find evidence that would connect Saddam to 9/11. Bergen's article is titled, "Armchair Provocateur, Laurie Mylroie: The Neocons' favorite conspiracy theorist." Bergen suggests, "It is possible, of course, that the neocons did not find Mylroie's research to be genuinely persuasive, but rather that her findings simply fit conveniently into their own desire to overthrow Saddam" (Bergen, 2003).

Bergen goes on to suggest that key officials in the Bush Administration actually helped Mylroie with her book Study of Revenge: Saddam Hussein's Unfinished War against America published in 2000. Bergen sites Mylroie's acknowledgements in her book as evidence of an influence from the Bush Administration. He further sites endorsements from Richard Perle, Scooter Libby and Paul Wolfowitz as evidence of cooperation between the author and the White House.

Bergen does not believe there is any connection between Saddam and 9/11. Further, he finds Mylroie's research and publications to be unfounded.

> …The most comprehensive criminal investigation in history--involving chasing down 500,000 leads and interviewing 175,000 people--has turned up no evidence of Iraq's

---

[2] For more information see www.lauriemylroie.com

involvement, while the occupation of Iraq by a substantial American army has also uncovered no such link. Moreover, the U.S. State Department's counterterrorism office, which every year releases an authoritative survey of global terrorism, stated in its 2000 report: "[Iraq] has not attempted an anti-western attack since its failed attempt to assassinate former President Bush in 1993 in Kuwait." In other words, by 9/11, Saddam's regime had not engaged in anti-American terrorism for almost a decade (Bergen, 2003).

Bergen may or may not be entirely accurate in his personal assessment of the situation. However, in the absence of strong evidence connecting Saddam to 9/11, many Americans would agree with Bergen over Mylroie.

The Bush Administration never refuted Mylroie's claims. In fact, she has become an unwavering voice for the US invasion of Iraq standing behind her conclusions. In May 2004, she authored an articled titled, "The Saddam-9/11 Link Confirmed" where she wrote:

> Never before in this country's history has a president ordered American soldiers into battle, without fully explaining why they are asked to risk life and limb. One would never know from the administration's public stance that senior officials, including the President, believe that Iraq was involved in the 9/11 attacks.
>
> Iraq was indeed involved in those assaults. There is considerable information to that effect, described in this piece and elsewhere. They include Iraqi documents discovered by U.S. forces in Baghdad that U.S. officials have not made public (Mylroie, 2004).

Dick Cheney also pushed to find evidence linking Saddam Hussein to al Qaeda (Suskind, 2006, p.190-91). Cheney insisted that Mohammed Atta, well-known 9/11 terrorist, had met with Iraqi officials in Prague. The presumption was that Atta was collaborating with Iraq in some way. This has been researched by the CIA and the 9/11 Commission, and there has never been any credible evidence to prove that a meeting occurred (McCarthy, 2004).

Use of Rhetoric to "Create" a Case Against Saddam

> **Well, to me right now, Saddam is a problem, but he is a separate problem ... It is not at all clear that he is a part of a global terrorist network, which is what we're focusing on. --Brent Scowcroft, former National Security Adviser (Scowcroft, 2001)**

The demeanor of some key officials and their overwhelming desire to invade Iraq is a very interesting study. One can draw one of several possible conclusions. First, they really believed that there was a connection between Saddam Hussein and 9/11. Second, they really hoped there

was a connection between Saddam and 9/11 because that would create justification for an invasion of Iraq. Perhaps there is a third idea; knowing that there was a little or no connection between Saddam and 9/11, it would be easy to use the that event to advance the US fight against global terrorism and declare Saddam an enemy of the state and therefore still justify an invasion of Iraq.

The United States government tried valiantly to justify the war in Iraq with evidence, and the first attempt at a case was linking Saddam to 9/11. In an interview for PBS Frontline, New York Times reporter, Elaine Sciolino said this about former CIA Director James Woolsey:

> Jim Woolsey, the former director of Central Intelligence, has taken an extremely active role in the anti-Saddam strategy. He was one of the signatories of the letter from the late 1990s that promoted a much more vigorous campaign against Saddam Hussein. And he's also a brilliant lawyer. And he sort of has put together a case against Saddam Hussein, regardless of September 11.
>
> Saddam Hussein probably tried to assassinate former President George Bush. Saddam Hussein does have weapons of mass destruction. One doesn't even have to make a legal argument about why he might be overthrown (Sciolino, 2001).

Sciolino's comments are telling. She suggests that Woolsey spearheaded the "case" building effort in the "anti-Saddam strategy." Interestingly, Woolsey also provided an interview for the same PBS Frontline investigation, and he also references the use of evidence in the case against Saddam. Woolsey said:

> Conclusive evidence is a phrase that most people think of in a law enforcement context, beyond a reasonable doubt. That's not the kind of evidence that you get in intelligence. You get indications. I think that if one sets the standard at conclusive evidence, one will always be disappointed in virtually any intelligence assessment.
>
> What you get is material that enables you to make a judgment. Most of this is about judgments, and it's not the kind of evidence that will convict people in a court of law of a crime. It's a different thing altogether. And so whenever I hear a phrase like "no conclusive evidence," I immediately say, "If you're talking about intelligence, you're using the wrong standard."
>
> I don't know how many pieces of evidence one needs in the case of someone like Saddam Hussein. We are not, after all, trying to convict him in a court of law beyond a reasonable doubt. We're trying to make a judgment about American foreign policy and national security policy and whether that set of circumstances creates enough material for us to make a judgment that he has been actively involved in terrorist incidents against the United States (Woolsey, 2001).

At the end of the PBS Frontline interview, Woolsey was asked, "Are we going to learn more things that might tie Saddam and Iraq to this?" Woolsey's reply was, "It may be a function of whether we get more volunteers coming forward with information. It's also a function of whether the CIA and allied intelligence services are now out there looking hard for such ties. I don't think they were for some time; I hope they are now" (Woolsey, 2001).

No "volunteers" came forth with information solidifying a connection between Saddam Hussein and 9/11. A solid connection between 9/11 and Saddam Hussein would have made the invasion of Iraq justifiable. The Bush administration would continue to pursue "Saddam connection" even though there was no credible evidence that the CIA could find linking the Iraqi leader to 9/11 (Suskind, 2006a, p. 190). Perhaps the Administration was seeking so diligently for a connection because a war had already been in the planning stages for months (Stahl, 2004). Well crafted rhetoric created a link between Saddam and terrorism in a way that the evidence never could. After finding no demonstrable connection between Saddam and 9/11, the US strategy shifted from the 9/11 connection to building a case for WMD.

Case for War: Saddam Hussein has WMD (and Might Use Them)

> **It is sort of fascinating that you can have 100 percent certainty about weapons of mass destruction and zero certainty of about where they are. --Hans Blix, Head of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission January 2000-June 2003 (McCool, 2003)**

After Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the United States in cooperation with a coalition of nations intervened and drove Iraq out of Kuwait. The primary and stated US objectives in 1991 included protecting the sovereignty of Kuwait, protecting our allies from an Iraqi advance in the region and protecting oil interests in the Middle East. US officials were also concerned that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction.

It is commonly accepted that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction before the Gulf War in 1991. David Kay, former UN weapons inspector said, "No one doubts that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction pre-1991" (Kay, 2003). Weapons of mass destruction (WMD)

include three primary categories of weapons: nuclear, chemical and biological. In 1990-91 the primary concern was that Iraq was on the verge of acquiring the technology needed to build a nuclear weapon. While visiting US troops in the Gulf on Thanksgiving Day 1990, President George H.W. Bush said that he was concerned that the Iraqi's nuclear program was "more advanced than previously thought" (Milhollin, 1990).

> President Bush and CIA Director William Webster have made clear that Iraq's weapons program is at the forefront of their thinking about regional security in the Persian Gulf Bush has said that even if Iraq withdrew from Kuwait tomorrow, Iraq's chemical and other weapon potential "would be a problem [that] . . . would have to be resolved." Webster has been even blunter. He said the Gulf "will never be secure again" until Saddam "has been disassociated with his instruments of mass destruction in one form or another" (Milhollin, 1990).

At the end of the Gulf War, the United Nations passed Resolution 687. Among the tenets of the resolution were the conditions that Saddam Hussein would remain in power as the leader of Iraq, but he was required to destroy his weapons of mass destruction and allow UN Weapons inspectors access to weapons facilities ("Resolution 687," 1991).

In the early 1990s, the UN Special Commission (UNSCOM) was aggressive in their efforts to pursue inspections ("Saddam Hussein's Deception and Defiance," 2002). These efforts were met with much resistance from Iraqi officials, and at times the weapons inspectors were physically blocked from locations. When UNSCOM met Iraqi resistance, the UN was not responsive to the problem; the Council did not seem to have a plan for Iraqi non-compliance. UNSCOM took a new approach to hunting down Iraqi weapons. Acting like an intelligence agency, one of its most important tools became U-2 planes, which are used to collect surveillance photos over Iraq (Nelan, 1999). For a decade the United Nations attempted to monitor Saddam's weapons program. A brief timeline of UN attempts to monitor Iraq's weapons program can be found in Appendix B.

For an entire decade, Iraq played a version of a "shell game" with UN weapons inspectors (Broad, Miller, 1998). The results of the UNSCOM weapons inspections were not definitive. It is commonly accepted that some of the Iraqi weapons were destroyed. When Charles Duelfer of the Iraq Survey Group testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, he said that

research proved that "Iraq's WMD program was essentially destroyed in 1991 and Saddam ended Iraq's nuclear program after the 1991 Gulf War" (Drash, 2004).

Khidhir Hamza was a nuclear physicist who once headed the Iraqi nuclear weapons program before he defected in 1994. Hamza has some unique insight into the weapons inspections. A PBS Frontline reporter asked Hamza: "How successful or unsuccessful was the United Nations in eradicating the nuclear and the biological threat that Iraq presents here?" (Hamza, 2001).

Hamza's response:

> The United Nations inspectors had a very misguided opinion about what is disarmament. They thought if you have something, I take it away from you, and you are disarmed. Despite the knowledge you have, the expertise you gained through the years, your contacts that could repurchase parts for you and put the thing back together. They discounted all this. If you have a piece of equipment, they take it away, and you are disarmed.
>
> This is simplistic. They are not naïve; I talked to them. I talked to many of the inspectors. We had some kind of give and take in this. But they were restricted.
>
> For example, on the nuclear ... the critical parts, that Iraq could not replace easily, we did not tell about -- for example, the molds that you make explosives with, the machines that you make explosives with. Nobody is going to sell you these anymore. Very difficult. So Iraq did not give these up. Not a single explosive was given to the inspectors for the nuclear weapon program. Not a single mold, not a single machine (Hamza, 2001).

Because the weapons inspections were not conclusive, it was possible that WMD still existed. The possibility that Saddam Hussein still had WMD became a primary reason for the United States to invade Iraq. To emphasize the threat of WMD, the United States presented evidence that intended to prove the existence of WMD.

The Evidence: The National Intelligence Estimate

> **…if we were to proceed against Saddam, we have to have very specific, publicly presentable evidence for doing so that he was in some way connected with the anthrax horrors or with Sept. 11, or some other claim, rather than simply that we're being vengeful for what's happened in the past…. --Richard Butler, former chairman of UNSCOM (Butler, 2001)**

In 2002, the Bush Administration was working to build a case for war in Iraq. Key officials in the administration continued a campaign of rhetoric giving speeches and interviews about links between Saddam and al Qaeda (Judis, Ackerman, 2003). The Bush campaign for war was aimed

at the US citizenry, but it was also aimed at the US Congress. Bob Graham, a Florida Democratic Senator and Chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee asked for a National Intelligence Estimate[3] to verify the claims that the President and his staff were making about the Iraqi threat. Senator Graham and the other committee members "received a 25-page classified response reflecting the balanced view that had prevailed earlier among the intelligence agencies-- noting, for example, that evidence of an Iraqi nuclear program or a link to Al Qaeda was inconclusive" (Judis, Ackerman, 2003).[4]

Reportedly, Senate Intelligence Committee members Graham and Dick Durbin advocated for a declassified version of the NIE that could be shared with the public. Their intent was to leverage CIA intelligence to refute the rhetoric put forth by the Bush Administration. When the declassified NIE was released in October 2002, there were six key findings ("Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs," October 2002).

1. Baghdad hides large portions of Iraq's WMD efforts.
2. Since inspections ended in 1998, Iraq has maintained its chemical weapons effort, energized its missile program, and invested more heavily in biological weapons; most analysts assess Iraq is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program.
3. How quickly Iraq will obtain its first nuclear weapon depends on when it acquires sufficient weapons -grade fissile material.
4. Baghdad has begun renewed production of chemical warfare agents, probably including mustard, sarin, cyclosarin, and VX.
5. All key aspects—R&D, production, and weaponization—of Iraq's offensive BW program are active and most elements are larger and more advanced than they were before the Gulf war.
6. Iraq maintains a small missile force and several development programs, including for a UAV that most analysts believe probably is intended to deliver biological warfare agents.

"Graham and Durbin were outraged to find that it omitted the qualifications and countervailing evidence that had characterized the classified version and played up the claims that strengthened the administration's case for war" (Judis, Ackerman, 2003). Senator Graham asked for more of

---

[3] An NIE is the collective judgment of the analytic branches of all the 16 agencies of the national intelligence community as to what constitutes reality with regard to a particular subject at a particular time. It is written by a body called the National Intelligence Council (NIC) under the control of the Director of the CIA.

[4] "According to one congressional staffer who read the document, it highlighted "extensive Iraqi chem-bio programs and nuclear programs and links to terrorism" but then included a footnote that read, "This information comes from a source known to fabricate in the past." The staffer concluded that "they didn't do analysis. What they did was they just amassed everything they could that said anything bad about Iraq and put it into a document" (Judis, Ackerman, 2003).

the classified NIE to be released to present a document more in harmony with the classified version. In response to the committee request, one section of dialogue from a closed hearing was declassified. In that dialogue, Senator Levin asked if Saddam would advance an unprovoked attack against the United States using WMD. The expert indicated that the probability of an unprovoked attacking involving WMD was "low" but that if Saddam was attacked, he might use WMD as a method of retaliation.

The response to the Senate Intelligence Committee was authored by CIA Director, George Tenet. The Director provides the following thoughts on newly declassified information:[5]

> "In the above dialogue, the witness's qualifications--"in the foreseeable future, given the conditions we understand now"--were intended to underscore that the likelihood of Saddam using WMD for blackmail, deterrence, or otherwise grows as his arsenal builds. Moreover, if Saddam used WMD, it would disprove his repeated denials that he has such weapons" (Tenet, 2002).

The White House blocked the CIA from declassifying any further information in the classified version of the NIE.

Within two weeks of the NIE, the US Congress passes House Joint Resolution 114 "Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002." Senators Graham and Durbin voted against the resolution. President Bush signed the resolution into law on October 16, 2002. On March 20, 2003 the United States began the invasion of Iraq (Bush, 2003b).

---

[5] From the text of the Tenet Letter to the Senate Intelligence Committee dated October 7, 2002. Regarding the 2 October closed hearing, we can declassify the following dialogue:
Senator Levin: . . . If (Saddam) didn't feel threatened, did not feel threatened, is it likely that he would initiate an attack using a weapon of mass destruction?
Senior Intelligence Witness: . . . My judgment would be that the probability of him initiating an attack--let me put a time frame on it--in the foreseeable future, given the conditions we understand now, the likelihood I think would be low.
Senator Levin: Now if he did initiate an attack you've . . . indicated he would probably attempt clandestine attacks against us . . . But what about his use of weapons of mass destruction? If we initiate an attack and he thought he was in extremis or otherwise, what's the likelihood in response to our attack that he would use chemical or biological weapons?
Senior Intelligence Witness: Pretty high, in my view.
In the above dialogue, the witness's qualifications--"in the foreseeable future, given the conditions we understand now"--were intended to underscore that the likelihood of Saddam using WMD for blackmail, deterrence, or otherwise grows as his arsenal builds. Moreover, if Saddam used WMD, it would disprove his repeated denials that he has such weapons (McLaughlin 2002).

Deconstructing the Evidence

> **I think it was…probably the worst of the modern NIE's, partly explained by the pressure, but more importantly explained by the lack of information they had. And it was trying to drive towards a policy conclusion where the information just simply didn't support it. --David Kay, former Iraq Weapons Inspector, member of Iraq Study Group (Kay, 2006)**

"In June 2003, the US Senate Select Committee on Intelligence began a formal review of U.S. intelligence into the existence of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs…as part of the Committee's continuing oversight of the intelligence activities of the United States" ("Report on the US Intelligence Community's Prewar Intelligence Assessments on Iraq," 2004). A detailed analysis from the Committee yielded three key conclusions. First, the Committee concluded that the unclassified NIE differed from the classified version in a way that misrepresented the detailed NIE ("Report on the US Intelligence Community's Prewar Intelligence Assessments on Iraq," 2004). Second, the Committee concluded that the declassified (public) version of the NIE did not include any dissenting opinions. The Committee further contends that there were dissenting opinions in the classified version of the NIE and that removing these opinions gave the reader "an incomplete picture of the nature and extent of the debate." Finally, the Committee concluded that the threat of biological weapons stated in the unclassified document "conveyed a level of threat to the United States homeland inconsistent with the classified National Intelligence Estimate" ("Report on the US Intelligence Community's Prewar Intelligence Assessments on Iraq," 2004).

CIA analyst Paul Pillar was responsible for coordinating the inter-agency effort in compiling data and writing the infamous 2002 NIE. Pillar's insight is telling. He confirms that no one in the Bush Administration (specifically not the President, the Vice President or the National Security Advisor) ever requested information from the CIA regarding Iraq (Pillar, 2006). Pillar suggests that a policy decision to invade Iraq had already been made and that the CIA was used to "provide intelligence [which] was being looked to support that decision rather to inform decisions yet to be made" (Pillar, 2006). Deputy Executive Director of the CIA, William Brennan endorses Pillar's comments. In commenting on the creation of the October 2002 NIE, Brennan said, "At the time there were a lot of concerns that it was being politicized by certain individuals within the administration that wanted to get that intelligence base that would justify

going forward with the war" (Kay, 2006). There are many sources within the intelligence community who concur with both Pillar and Brennan's view of the NIE (Kay, 2006).

Leveraging the Evidence: Perpetuating the Rhetoric

Rhetoric is the art of persuasion. As with the "case" linking Saddam Hussein to 9/11, in the absence of evidence, the Bush Administration continued to speak as if there was a threat. It reminds one of the saying, "If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it."

The evidence presented by the NIE whitepaper was the source for much of the rhetoric that the administration advanced from October 2002 through the invasion in March 2003. President Bush used data collected for the NIE in his 2003 State of the Union Address when he said.

> The International Atomic Energy Agency confirmed in the 1990s that Saddam Hussein had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, had a design for a nuclear weapon and was working on five different methods of enriching uranium for a bomb. **The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.** Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production. Saddam Hussein has not credibly explained these activities. He clearly has much to hide (Bush, G.W., 2003a).

The highlighted portion of this quotation is known as the "16 Words" in the State of the Union Address in 2003. This statement was not cleared by the CIA for inclusion in the address, and the delivery of that statement caused much controversy that has continued for years after it was spoken. Perhaps the 16 words were included for added "shock value" to underscore the urgency of the need for war. Perhaps the 16 words were simply a hyperbole of the facts. Whatever the intent of the message, this part of the State of the Union address underscores the importance of rhetoric advanced by the Bush Administration to make a case for war.

Case for War: Saddam is a Dictator Who Needs to Be Removed from Power

> **While he hadn't left as long a trail of dead as Adolph Hitler or Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, Hussein and his cohorts represented one of the most diabolical regimes in modern history (Madhani, 2006).**

The third tenet in the case for war was a simple one; Saddam is an evil dictator, and we all will be better off with him removed from power. There is evidence to validate that Saddam was a dictator and that he was "evil" (as judged by various atrocities committed against Iraqi citizens). While he may be an evil dictator, it is difficult to prove that we would all be better off with him removed from power. Again, rhetoric plays an important role in this particular argument for war against Iraq.

The Evidence: Saddam is an Evil Dictator

There are few who would argue with the contention that Saddam Hussein was ruthless dictator, and there is ample evidence to illustrate this fact. On the day of Saddam's execution, one reporter wrote, "Over his 24 years as president of Iraq, Saddam Hussein earned the moniker Butcher of Baghdad by ruling with brute force, torture and cunning" (Madhani, 2006). The same article highlights the fact that "Hussein's most horrific atrocities were the acts of brutality he meted out against fellow Iraqis" (Madhani, 2006).

When Saddam Hussein assumed the Iraqi presidency on 1979, he set a precedent for how he would manage his regime. Saddam's predecessor, Hafez al-Bakr, was engaged in a plan with Syria to unify the countries of Iraq and Syria. This unification plan would most likely weaken the position of Iraq as a sovereign, and the plan would marginalize Saddam's role as a leader. Saddam pressured the aging and ailing al-Bakr to resign, and this caused a great uproar within the Ba'ath Party.

Sensing disloyalty among party members between those who supported al-Bakr and those who supported him, Saddam convened a meeting of Ba'ath party leaders where he presented the names of 68 individuals who he accused of being spies and disloyal conspirators. The individuals were removed from the room one by one and taken into custody. Saddam asked for this event to be video taped, and the footage can be seen in various television specials

chronicling his life. The party members were literally sweating as they waited to hear if they had been marked as disloyal to the regime. After the names were read, Saddam calmly congratulated the members that remained.

> In a rising crescendo of desperation to prove their loyalty, the surviving Ba'athists shout "Long live the party! Long live the party! God save Saddam from conspirators!" Saddam, meanwhile, can be seen reaching for a tissue. The tears are contagious. Then, to guarantee the loyalty of his high command, Saddam goes to sit among them. He then invites them to form the firing squad to execute their former comrades. Saddam has neatly lured his colleagues into sharing guilt (Carter, 1991).

In 1982, Saddam was traveling in northern Iraq, and he stopped to make a public appearance at a small Shiite village. Upon departure from the area, Saddam's convoy was attacked, and Saddam believed this to be an assassination attempt. Like many of his public appearances, this one was video taped. With the same calmness exhibited when he called out 68 Ba'athist party members to potential execution, Saddam questioned villagers himself. The video concludes with Saddam speaking of two potential assassins, "Keep them separate and interrogate them" (Hilsum, 2005).

> The people of Dujail call the events of the following months and years 'al karitha' - the disaster. Arrests and killings began immediately, followed by bombardments from helicopter gunships. Soldiers cut down the date palms on which the people depended, and bulldozed their houses (Hilsum, 2005).

In the late 1980s, Saddam authorized a campaign against the Kurds in northern Iraq, and what ensued has been labeled by an international tribunal as "genocide" ("Killing of Iraq Kurds 'Genocide'," 2005). The Iraqi military campaign against the Kurds, known as al-Anfal, killed thousands of Kurds (Robertson, 2007). Estimates of those killed numbers between 50,000 and 100,000 ("Life Under Saddam Hussein," 2003).

In 1991, the Shiites in southern Iraq rose up against Saddam Hussein in an attempt to overthrow the government. Peter W. Galbraith, former Ambassador to Croatia and one time PNAC member, wrote the following about the 1991 uprising:

> On Feb. 15, 1991, President George H.W. Bush called on the Iraqi military and people to overthrow Saddam Hussein. On March 3, an Iraqi tank commander returning from Kuwait fired a shell through one of the portraits of Hussein in Basra's main square, igniting the southern uprising. A week later, Kurdish rebels ended Hussein's control over much of the north (Galbraith, 2003).

Galbraith notes that that the Shiites pleaded to him personally for US intervention to assist with the uprising. As documented in Chapter One of this work, the United States did not support the

Iraqi's in their attempt to overthrow the Hussein regime. Saddam would respond to the uprisings in the south by the Shiites and the north by the Kurds as he had with other disloyalties. "Some 100 Shiite clerics have been murdered, including four senior ayatollahs. Draining the marshes displaced 400,000 Marsh Arabs, destroying a culture that is one of the world's oldest, as well as causing immeasurable ecological damage" (Galbraith, 2003).

There are many stories detailing Saddam's dictatorial reign, and his disregard for human life. He was not hesitant to kill those close to him who were pursuing power positions. He also killed two of his sons-in-law who had fled Iraq and returned only under the promise that they would not be killed (Madhani, 2006). There is little question that Saddam was an evil dictator. The United States leveraged Saddam's atrocities against his own people as a justification for why the United States invaded Iraq in 2003.

"The Regime was Saddam—and Saddam is Different"

There are many dictators in the world, and there are many dictators who commit egregious acts against their own citizenry. What made Saddam Hussein a unique and special target of the United States? We gain some insights to the answer to this question from the Duelfer Report. In 2003, the Iraqi Study Group was formed to study the WMD issue (or lack thereof) in Iraq post-invasion. The report, penned by Charles Duelfer, found that there were no stockpiles of WMD in Iraq, and the report seeks to find how US intelligence assessments were misaligned with the facts.

One other important aspect of the Duelfer Report is a unique profile of Saddam Hussein. Members of the Iraqi Study Group were able to "debrief" or interview Saddam Hussein as part of their project. This was done while Saddam was in captivity awaiting trial for crimes committed in Dujail. In an effort to define and clarify his legacy, Saddam participated in the debriefings. The Duelfer Report states: "The former Regime was Saddam, and he was the one person who made important decisions. It was his assessment of the utility of various policy options that was determinant. It was Saddam's calculations of risk and timing that mattered" (Duelfer, 2004).

The report makes an important connection between Saddam Hussein and WMD.

> We have tried to sort through the data available and have tried to judge candid views from Saddam on WMD as well as his likely vision of the future of Iraq and the role of WMD. **What seems clear is that WMD was a tool of power or leverage that varied in its utility in advancing toward his goals for himself and Iraq** (Duelfer, 2004, p. 3). (Emphasis present in original document.)

This is an interesting observation by the Iraqi Study Group. There are detailed statements in the report that support this conclusion. The Study Group ascertains that Hussein's goals were first, survival and second, release from UN sanctions. The Study Group concludes that before the Gulf War, Iraq had WMD with an emphasis on nuclear technology but that after the Gulf War, Iraq probably did destroy most nuclear hardware in an effort to become unencumbered from UN sanctions (Duelfer, 2004, p. 10). The report also concludes that Saddam's primary goal was to keep the intelligence needed to produce WMD, not the supplies. Additionally, Saddam confessed to leveraging WMD as a deterrent to Iran.

The report states:

> Virtually no senior [weapon's inspector in] Iraq; believed that Saddam had forsaken WMD forever. Evidence suggests that, as resources became available and the constraints of sanctions decayed, there was a direct expansion of activity that would have the effect of supporting future WMD reconstitution (Duelfer, 2004, p. 10).

The US justified the invasion of Iraq in part because there was "evidence" to suggest that Hussein had WMD. The Bush Administration functioned under the "one percent doctrine" implying that if there is a one percent chance of it being true that we treat it as if it were true. With regard to the existence of WMD, it passed the one percent test. Ironically, Saddam himself is partially to blame for this assumption because he admittedly used WMD as "a tool of power or leverage" (Duelfer, 2004). By refusing to cooperate with UN weapons inspectors and simultaneously leveraging WMD as a tool of power, this created suspicion that WMD "probably did exist." In a post 9/11 climate and under the new rules of the one percent doctrine, that suspicion constituted justification.

The fact that Saddam and Iraq are inseparable also created a unique opportunity to formulate the justification for war. If Saddam is evil, we must oust him from power. In order to oust him from

power, we needed to invade Iraq. With a leader and his country inseparable, the rhetoric for war was focused on Saddam, not Iraq. The problem with this logic is that we invaded the nation of Iraq in our attempt to oust the dictator who ruled it.

The Rhetoric of War

> **The world would be better off without him [Saddam Hussein]. And so will the future (Bush, G.W., 2002a).**

If we accept the fact that Saddam and Iraq are inseparable, it becomes easier to advance rhetoric aimed at appealing to emotions. If we believe that Saddam is evil, and if we believe that it is the right thing to remove him from power because he is evil, then we must believe that in some manner if we invade Iraq, there will be benefits.

On November 30, 2005, the US government released a document titled "National Strategy for Victory in Iraq." The report states: "Helping the people of Iraq is the morally right thing to do -- America does not abandon its friends in the face of adversity" (Bush, G.W., 2005). This statement appeals to our morality of right and wrong and presumes that Saddam Hussein's regime is "wrong" and that a US invasion to change the regime would be "right." The report also states: "Helping the people of Iraq, however, is also in our own national interest" (Bush, G.W., 2005). From the section of the report titled "The Benefits of Victory in Iraq":

- If we and our Iraqi partners prevail in Iraq, we will have made America:
  - *Safer...*
    - by removing Saddam Hussein, a destabilizing force in a vital region, a **ruthless dictator** who had a history of pursuing and even using **weapons of mass destruction**, was a **state sponsor of terror**, had invaded his neighbors, and who was violently opposed to America;
    - by depriving terrorists of a safe haven from which they could plan and launch attacks against the United States and American interests;
    - by delivering a strategic setback to the terrorists and keeping them on the run;
    - by delivering a decisive blow to the ideology that fuels international terrorism, proving that the power of freedom is stronger than a perverse vision of violence, hatred, and oppression.
  - *Stronger...*
    - by demonstrating to our friends and enemies the reliability of U.S. power, the strength of our commitment to our friends, and the tenacity of our resolve against our enemies;

- **by securing a new friend and partner** in the fight against terrorism **in the heart of the Middle East**.
  - *More Certain of its Future ...*
    - politically, by bolstering democratic reformers -- **and the prospects for peaceful, democratic governments** -- in a region that for decades has been a source of instability and stagnation;
    - **economically, by facilitating progressive reform in the region** and depriving terrorists control **over a hub of the world's economy**.

(Emphasis added.)

Rhetoric can be very powerful, and the notion that we will be "safer, stronger, and more certain of our future" after an invasion of Iraq is appealing. This particular example of rhetoric is important because it encapsulates the three primary justifications that the United States used in building a case to invade Iraq: a connection to terrorism, WMD and the individual character of Saddam Hussein.

Summary

The "case" for war in Iraq was an effort to gain public approval. The case for war included three main tenets: 1) there was a link to Saddam and 9/11; 2) Saddam had WMD and would use them; and 3) Saddam himself was an evil dictator that needed to be removed from power. Of the justifications given, it is the last one which holds the most merit based on the evidence provided in this chapter. Saddam was an evil dictator. That said, the administration did not prioritize this particular rhetoric before the invasion. If it did, then it would have had to address an international legal question such as "Why was it the responsibility of the US to remove him from power?" Instead, the administration chose to prioritize security and safety, two topics of great emotional impact on the public in the aftermath of 9/11.

The government might have been better served to state that our primary goal was to oust Saddam Hussein from power and that, with or without evidence, Iraq and the world would be better off without him. Instead, the government sought to build a case comprised of questionable evidence. In reality, the war would proceed with our without public approval, but the administration attempted to supply evidence as a justification for the war.

If we accept that the war began under faulty pretenses and that despite the questionable foundation to the war that the US still continues engagement in Iraq, it is important to consider *why* the US chose to engage in this war at this particular time in history. The remainder of this work is dedicated to exploring alternate reasons for the US invasion of Iraq in 2003.

Chapter 4
The Economics of Oil

The only interest the United States has in the region is furthering the cause of peace and stability, not in [Iraq's] ability to generate oil," said Ari Fleischer, the White House spokesperson (Klare, 2004a, xvi).

While there are many theories that advance alternate explanations for the US invasion of Iraq, two themes consistently recur in the literature: US oil interests and US global position. The two theories are not independent of each other, but indeed, they are interrelated. There is a strong connection between the US global position and the ability of the US to control and manage oil interests abroad. Because these two topics consistently recur in the literature and because these two theories are closely related, both will be explored in this thesis. This chapter is dedicated to examining the possible reasons that oil was a factor in the US decision to invade Iraq in 2003.

In his book <u>Blood and Oil</u>, Michael Klare chronicles the US dependency on oil as a driver for major political, economic and military decisions of the past century. Klare writes that oil is "the" reason for war in Iraq. This chapter begins with a recapitulation of Klare's argument and focuses on evidences to support Klare's claim. In the second part of this chapter, evidence is presented that suggests that oil was foundational to why the US invaded Iraq in 2003.

<u>Oil: An Important Resource to the United States</u>

President Bush and his aides sternly dismissed suggestions that the war was all about oil. "Nonsense," Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld declared (Baker, 2006).

In his book <u>Blood and Oil</u>, Michael Klare provides the framework for understanding the importance of US oil as part of our culture, our economy and our foreign policy. His framework provides a solid foundation necessary for making a case that links oil to the decision to invade Iraq in 2003.

In the preface of <u>Blood and Oil</u>, Michael Klare makes the statement, "Resources, not differences in civilizations or identities, are the root of most contemporary conflict" (Klare, 2004a, p. xii).

In his 2001 work titled <u>Resource Wars: The New Landscape of Global Conflict</u>, Klare wrote of resources as a source of global conflict, and at that time, he concluded that all resources were essentially equal in their propensity to create international hostilities. However, in his work <u>Blood and Oil</u>, he refines his position and suggests "that petroleum is unique among the world's resources—that it has more potential than any of the others to provoke major crises and conflicts in the years ahead" (Klare, 2004a, p. xiii).

There are three primary reasons that Klare concludes that oil will be a factor in future crises; to support his claim, Klare outlines the results of "an intensive study of oil, geopolitics and American foreign policy" (Klare, 2004a, p. xiii). First, there are historical evidences that validate the importance of oil as a foreign policy issue. Second, the attributes of oil and its importance to the American economy make it a vital resource worth protecting. Finally, the United States has shown little desire to lessen our oil dependency thereby perpetuating the need to protect oil interests. Each of these claims will be summarized.

A Historical Precedent for Managing "Energy Security" Issues

Klare purports that World War II expended many of the US oil resources and that "by the end of World War II it was apparent that we would someday start to exhaust our reserves and would need large amounts of petroleum to supplement the declining domestic supplies" (Klare, 2004a, p. xiv). As the US government was required to pursue imported energy, the acquisition and protection of oil became a foreign policy issue (Klare, 2004a, p. xiv). Near the end of World War II and shortly before his death, President Franklin D. Roosevelt met with Saudi Arabia King Abdul Aziz ibn Saud on a US war vessel in the Red Sea in February 1945. Abdul Aziz was the first leader of "modern" Saudi Arabia, and most experts conclude that this international alliance was one of strategy. The meeting produced "the unprecedented oil-for-protection arrangement that has governed American ties with Saudi Arabia ever since" (Klare, 2004a, p. xii).

Roosevelt was not the only US president actively engaged in ensuring US access to petroleum resources. There are many other references in history which validate the importance of energy security in US foreign relations and foreign policy. While it is impossible to reference history in its entirety, a few historical occurrences deserve mention.

President Jimmy Carter managed many global crises during his tenure as President, and one of the major issues he monitored was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. This Cold War Era invasion was viewed as a hegemonic act by the Soviets and deemed a threat to the stability of the Middle East and a threat to US oil interests there. In his State of the Union Address in 1980, President Carter addresses this issue.[6]

President Carter clearly stated 1) The Middle East is important to the United States because of oil resources; 2) Strategic position (control) in the Middle East is important because it impacts the oil production and availability; and 3) The US will use military force to protect oil resources in the Middle East. This international crisis underscored how important oil is as a limited international commodity. It is so important, in fact, that the United States considered "an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America." The President further stated that this assault would be "be repelled by any means necessary, including military force" (Carter, 1980).

---

[6] From the President's State of the Union Address: The region which is now threatened by Soviet troops in Afghanistan is of great strategic importance: It contains more than two-thirds of the world's exportable oil. The Soviet effort to dominate Afghanistan has brought Soviet military forces to within 300 miles of the Indian Ocean and close to the Straits of Hormuz, a waterway through which most of the world's oil must flow. The Soviet Union is now attempting to consolidate a strategic position; therefore, that poses a grave threat to the free movement of Middle East oil.

This situation demands careful thought, steady nerves, and resolute action, not only for this year but for many years to come. It demands collective efforts to meet this new threat to security in the Persian Gulf and in Southwest Asia. It demands the participation of all those who rely on oil from the Middle East and who are concerned with global peace and stability. And it demands consultation and close cooperation with countries in the area which might be threatened.

Meeting this challenge will take national will, diplomatic and political wisdom, economic sacrifice, and, of course, military capability. We must call on the best that is in us to preserve the security of this crucial region.

Let our position be absolutely clear: An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.

During the past 3 years, you have joined with me to improve our own security and the prospects for peace, not only in the vital oil-producing area of the Persian Gulf region but around the world (Carter, 1980).

The second note-worthy historical reference is the US campaign against Iraq in 1991. This historic event was documented in-depth in Chapter One of this work. In 1991 the US applied principles outlined in the Carter Doctrine and used military force against Iraq in retaliation for a hegemonic invasion of Kuwait in 1990. The invasion ensured that the US oil interests in the Middle East were protected by securing the sovereignty of Kuwait and stopping further Iraqi advance into Saudi Arabia.

The three examples presented involving Presidents Roosevelt, Carter and George H.W. Bush provide evidence that the US has been actively engaged in US energy security issues since the 1940s. Energy security became a foreign policy and diplomacy issue near the end of WWII, and in the six decades since that time the energy security has remained an important component of US foreign policy.

A Resource Worth Protecting: Attributes of Oil and Importance to US Economy

> **America's vital interests in the Central Region are long-standing. With over 65 percent of the world's oil reserves located in the Gulf states of the region—from which the United States imports nearly 20 percent of it's needs; Western Europe, 43 percent; and Japan, 68 percent—the international community must have free and unfettered access to the region's resources. General J. H. Binford Peay II testimony before a House subcommittee in 1997 (Klare, 2004a, p. 4)**

Oil is important to the global economy, and therefore, oil is important to the United States. This section will outline some facts regarding oil. It is important to understand this evidence because it highlights how this natural resource is top among all world resources and why the United States views it as worth defending.

Michael Klare contends that "nearly every economic recession since WWII has come on the heels of global petroleum shortage and an accompanying surge in prices" (Klare, 2004a, p. 9). Indeed, oil is core to the American industrial economy and will likely remain the nation's principal source of energy for years to come (Klare, 2004a, p. 9). Oil is a limited natural resource and a majority of the world reserves are found in the Middle East. The top five oil reserves are found in the geographic borders of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait and Iran.

Country	Reserves at end of 2002	Actual Production in 2002	% of World Total Production
Saudi Arabia	261.8 billion barrels	8.68 million barrels/day	11.7
Iraq	112.5 billion barrels	2.03 million barrels/day	2.7
UAE	97.8 billion barrels	2.27 million barrels/day	3.1
Kuwait	96.5 billion barrels	1.87 million barrels/day	2.5
Iran	89.7 billion barrels	3.37 million barrels/day	4.6
			24.6

Source: ("BP Statistical Review of World Energy," 2005, p. 6)

In contrast, the numbers for the United States in 2002 were:

Country	Reserves at end of 2002	Actual Production in 2002	% of World Total Production
USA	30.4 billion barrels	7.70 million barrels/day	10.4

Source: ("BP Statistical Review of World Energy," 2005, p. 6)

An examination of the numbers reveals that the United States actually extracts a tremendous amount of oil each day; it is second in production only to Saudi Arabia. However, the numbers do not reveal all of the facts. Klare points out that "the United States—with something less than 5 percent of the world's total population—consumes about 25 percent of the world's total supply of oil" (Klare, 2004a, p. 11). Furthermore, in 1998 America passed an important threshold; in 1998, our import of foreign oil was 50% of our total consumption (Klare, 2004a, p. 11).

Currently, the United States is the only global superpower, but this dominant power position is weakened when the United States is dependent upon foreign oil. Michael Klare writes, "Oil makes this country strong; dependency makes us weak," and herein lies a serious dilemma for the United States. Dependence on foreign sovereigns for over 50% of our oil consumption makes the United States vulnerable in many ways. The US is subject to supply disruptions abroad and the implications of such disruptions on the US economy. Additionally, the United States may use economic resources to pay for foreign oil when those resources might have been allocated differently were there not such a dependence on foreign oil. The United States has granted in the past and might grant in the future political and economic favors to oil producing nations, and sometimes the political agenda of an oil producing ally might not be in alignment with US goals and objectives. Finally, the US might become entangled in conflicts abroad in order to protect US oil interests. We have seen this in the past with the Gulf War, and later in

this section, it will be argued that oil is one of the primary reasons that the US chose to invade Iraq in 2003.

US Dependency on Oil: No Sign of Decline

Many people associate oil with products related to transportation such as gasoline or other fuels. However, oil derivatives comprise many of our common household items such as carpets, fabrics and plastic products. While most politicians will acknowledge that the United States has a dependency on foreign oil, relatively little has been done to alter that dependency. Petroleum dependency was noted by President George W. Bush early in his presidential tenure. In May 2001, President Bush said, "If we fail to act, our country will become more reliant on foreign crude oil, putting our national energy security into the hands of foreign nations, some of whom do not share our interests" (Bush, G.W., 2001a).

Several years have passed since this comment was made by President Bush. The comment could be analyzed on different levels. First, President Bush could be suggesting a call to action to avoid an energy security crisis with foreign nations. This comment (when put into its proper context) was spoken as part of an introduction to the administration's official plan for energy. In his proposal, President Bush suggested drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to look for other sources of oil within the confines of US borders and within US control. He also proposed development of hybrid vehicles and hydrogen-powered vehicles to curb the American usage of oil. The same quotation by President Bush may also be seen as a foreshadowing of the administration's intent with regard to "nations who do not share our interests" who seek to make access to energy difficult for the United States.

Michael Klare points out that the President's energy strategy did little to neither "reverse that nation's growing reliance on imported oil nor did it eliminate America's dependence on the Persian Gulf" (Klare, 2004a, p.15). One writer summed up the US oil dependency issue with these words: "The Bush administration's energy policy is predicated on ever-growing consumption of oil, preferably cheap oil" (Renner, 2003).

Summary of Klare's Theory on Oil Dependency

Klare concludes: "Four key trends will dominate the future of American energy behavior: an increasing need for imported oil, a pronounced shift toward unstable and unfriendly suppliers in dangerous parts of the world; a greater risk of anti-American or civil violence, and rising competition for what will likely prove a diminishing supply pool" (Klare, 2004a, p. 23-24). Klare also writes that American leaders present rhetoric about decreased oil usage but do little to decrease our dependency. Klare believes that the United States will continue the historical trend of "relying on military means to ensure the uninterrupted flow of energy" (Klare, 2004a, p. 23-24).

Klare's work, Blood and Oil, is an interesting and "an intensive study of oil, geopolitics and American foreign policy" (Klare, 2004a, p. iii). His work provides perspective to the energy security issues that the US has managed for six decades. Klare also provides solid evidence that the United States is dependent on oil and that a majority of the world's oil is in the Middle East. However, Klare's ideas do not prove that there was a link between oil interests and the US invasion of Iraq in 2003. The next section of this chapter is dedicated to presenting evidence that indicates that oil is one of the reasons that the United States invaded Iraq in 2003.

Oil: A Reason for Invading Iraq in 2003

The official justifications for war were 1) Saddam Hussein had WMD and would use them; 2) Saddam Hussein had links to terrorists; 3) Saddam was a terrible dictator, and the world would be a better place without him in it. Unofficially, however, US oil interests played a major role in the United States decision to invade Iraq in 2003.

There is evidence to support his claim, and this evidence will be presented in this section. First, key leaders in the Bush Administration have personal and vested interests in the oil industry. Second, during the second week of the Bush Administration, the Cheney Energy Task Force was created to study and make recommendations for energy policy in the Bush Administration. There is evidence to suggest that the Energy Task Force consulted with industry experts and made preliminary plans to manage the Iraqi oil supply. Finally, evidence suggests that one of the first

tasks of the US military during the March 2003 invasion of Iraq was to secure the Iraqi oil fields thereby suggesting the importance of energy security and control of the Iraqi oil supply.

Oil has never been acknowledged by the Bush Administration as a reason for war, but it has been the topic of much public debate in America. In short, it may be years before we are ever able to validate or discredit oil as a reason for war. However, in an effort to find an answer to the question, "Why did the United Sates invade Iraq in 2003?" oil must be explored as a possible reason.

Key Officials in the Bush Administration are Personally Vested in the Oil Industry

One author wrote, "The Bush Administration's ties to the oil and gas industry are beyond extensive; they are pervasive" (Renner, 2003). Peter Eisner who is the director of a non-partisan watchdog group said this about the Bush link to oil: "You can't talk about the career of any George Bush -- father or son -- without talking about oil" (Cave, 2001). Eisner follows up with the comment, "There's no denying that this is an oil administration" (Cave, 2003).

Oil has long been an important part of the Bush Family. After George H.W. Bush graduated from Yale, he and his wife Barbara (parents to George W. Bush) began their early married life with a career in the oil industry in West Texas (Hatfield, 1997, p. 529). In the late 1970s, George W. Bush began his own oil and gas company named Arbusto Energy (Lardner, 1999, p. A1). Several of George H.W. Bush's friends and business contacts invested in the younger Bush's newly formed oil company. Through connections in the international oil industry, George W. Bush became connected with a variety of people including members of the notorious bin Laden family from Saudi Arabia.

By all accounts, Bush was never a very successful businessman in the oil industry. An oil-industry colleague of Bush said, "There's a lot of luck and a lot of science to oil drilling. Drilling is hit or miss. He didn't have the luck" (Lardner, 1999, p. A1). Arbusto Energy was bought and sold multiple times and in the process, experienced several name changes. In the late 1980s George W. Bush shifted his interests from oil to baseball when he became co-owner of the Texas Rangers baseball franchise.

Controversy surrounded Bush's exit from the oil industry. During the end of his tenure in the oil industry, Bush was invested in a company named Harken. In June 1990 Bush sold most of his shares in Harken, and "eight days after Bush's stock sale, Harken wound up its second quarter with operating losses from day-to-day activities of $6.7 million, almost three times the losses it reported for the second quarter of 1989" (Lardner, 1999, p. A1). In 1991 the Securities and Exchange Commission launched an investigation into the sale of the stock. Apparently Bush had neglected to "submit a notice of actual sale of the stock" (Lardner, 1999, p. A1).

Vice President Dick Cheney also has ties to the oil industry. He was the chief executive officer of Halliburton from 1995 to 2000 ("Cheney's Halliburton Ties," 2003). According to the Halliburton website, the company "adds value through the entire lifecycle of oil and gas reservoirs, starting with exploration and development, moving through production, operations, maintenance, conversion and refining, to infrastructure and abandonment" (About Halliburton, n.d.). When he agreed to run as George W. Bush's Vice Presidential Candidate, Cheney severed his financial ties with the Halliburton Corporation.

The fact that President Bush and Vice President Cheney have past involvement in the oil industry is not enough to make a conclusion that oil was a primary motive for the invasion of Iraq in 2003. However, perhaps more than any other set of executive officers in US history, business relationships and personal friendships forged in the oil industry directly impacted US Energy Strategy.

National Energy Policy: "The Cheney Report"

The National Energy Policy Development Group was a group, created by Executive Order on January 29, 2001. The group was chaired by Vice President Dick Cheney and is commonly known as the "Cheney Task Force." The group produced and presented an official "National Energy Policy" to the President of the United States in May 2001 ("National Energy Policy," 2001). The report is 170 pages in length, and near the end of the report, there is a summary of the recommendations made by the Task Force to the President with regard to formulating and implementing a National Energy Policy. Each chapter of the report is summarized with accompanying recommendations. When the President announced the NEP in May 2001 he said that it was the initiative of the United States to reduce energy "demand by promoting innovation

and technology to make us the world leader in efficiency and conservation" (Klare, 2004b). The report *does* emphasize reduction in energy dependence and security of energy resources. However, the detail of the report tells a different story than the rhetoric of its announcement.

One critic said that "the main thrust [of the report] was to call for a foreign and military policy in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East that would secure continued U.S. access to foreign energy sources" (Barry, 2006). The same author quoted Michael Klare's book Resource Wars. "Michael Klare reported: 'One-third of the recommendations in the report are for ways to obtain access to petroleum sources abroad'" (as cited in Barry, 2006). Indeed, there are more recommendations regarding energy security than any other topic broached by the report.

In May 2003, Michael Klare presented a paper at a conference in Paris, France detailing his assessment of the 2001 National Energy Policy report. Klare writes that the "NEP does *not* propose a reduction in America's overall consumption of oil. Instead, it proposes to slow the growth in U.S. dependence on imported petroleum by increasing production at home through the exploitation of untapped reserves in protected wilderness areas" (Klare, 2003). Klare goes on to write that the United States is committed to "removing obstacles – whether political, economic, legal, and logistical – to the increased procurement of foreign oil by the United States" (Klare, 2003).

In Blood and Oil, Klare makes the statement that the United States will need to rely "on military means to ensure the uninterrupted flow of energy" (Klare, 2004a, p. 23-24). In his 2003 conference paper, Klare writes:

> The Cheney energy plan will also have significant implications for U.S. security policy and for the actual deployment and utilization of American military forces. This is so because most of the countries that are expected to supply the United States with increased petroleum in the years ahead are driven by internal conflicts or harbor strong anti-American sentiments, or both. This means that American efforts to procure additional oil from foreign sources are almost certain to encounter violent disorder and resistance in many key producing areas. And while U.S. officials might prefer to avoid the use of force in such situations, they may conclude that the only way to ensure the continued flow of energy is to guard the oil fields and pipelines with American soldiers (Klare, 2003).

The National Energy Policy was not revolutionary in its contents. The document went largely unnoticed at the time it was published and adopted as the US energy policy directive, but it has been scrutinized in more detail years after its publishing.

The National Energy Policy is not unlike the documents penned by the Project for the New American Century (PNAC). The PNAC memos stated in very clear language that the United States needed to remove Saddam Hussein's regime from Iraq. The National Energy Policy clearly states that energy security, vis-à-vis the protection of foreign oil sources, is fundamentally important to the United States. If the PNAC documents were a call for war, the need to protect US energy interests (as outlined by the NEP) could be considered the justification for war.

It is interesting that the Energy Task Force was one of the first Presidential directives made at the onset of the Bush Presidency. Equally interesting is the fact that Vice President Cheney, not the US Energy Secretary, was placed as the chair of the group. These two facts allow one to draw the conclusion that 1) energy policy is important to the United States; and 2) the details of energy policy are so important to this administration that the project needed to be managed by the Vice President.

The Energy Task Force: A Strategic Planning Session for War in Iraq?
During the months that the Energy Task Force convened, President Cheney requested the collective knowledge of outside consultants to advise the Task Force. The input of industry experts can be invaluable to a task force with an aggressive timeline to create a federal energy policy. The criticism, however, is that Vice President Cheney refused to disclose the non-federal employees associated with consulting for the Energy Task Force.

In the spring of 2001, members of Congress began to question the details of the Energy Task Force and the resulting National Energy Policy. Henry Waxman (D), California and John Dingell (D), Michigan requested information regarding the proceedings of the Energy Task Force ("G.A.O. Suit Against Cheney's Energy Task Force Is Dismissed," 2002). It was the contention of the Congressmen that that the task force had privately consulted with major

campaign contributors to discuss energy policy. The Government Accounting Office sought to investigate, but the investigation was impeded by the Vice President. A lawsuit was filed to enable GAO access to information.

> The suit asked the court to require Cheney to reveal who attended the energy tax force meetings, with whom the task force met to develop its energy recommendations, how it determined whom to invite and how much it cost to develop the policy ("G.A.O. Suit Against Cheney's Energy Task Force Is Dismissed," 2002).

Congress was concerned that if campaign contributors were involved in advising on the United States National Energy Policy that it was probable that the contributors (energy companies) were going to benefit financially if the recommendations from the task force were implemented. The Congress focused on drilling rights in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and how this would benefit energy companies friendly with the Bush Administration.

Ultimately, the law suit was dismissed, and the GAO proceeded with an investigation without support from the Vice President. From the GAO final report:

> According to our analysis of agency documents produced under court order, stakeholder involvement in the NEPDG process included private citizens offering general energy advice to the President, industry leaders submitting detailed policy recommendations to NEPDG, and individual meetings with Principals as well as the Vice President. The extent to which submissions from any of these stakeholders were solicited, influenced policy deliberations, or were incorporated into the final report is not something that we can determine based on the limited information at our disposal. Nor can we provide a comprehensive listing of the dates or purposes of these meetings, their attendees, or how the attendees, when solicited, were selected, because of OVP's unwillingness to provide us with information ("Energy Task Force," 2003, p. 15).

The Office of the Vice President (OVP) provided information that meetings were conducted with "companies or industries, including those in the electricity, telecommunications, coal mining, petroleum, gas, refining, bio-energy, solar energy, nuclear energy, pipeline, railroad and automobile manufacturing sectors; environmental, wildlife, and marine advocacy; state and local utility regulation and energy management; research and teaching at universities; research and analysis at policy organizations; energy consumers, including consumption by businesses and individuals; a major labor union; and about three dozen Members of Congress or their staffs" ("Energy Task Force," 2003, p. 16). The OVP did not reveal the frequency of the meetings or the details of the participants with regard to name or represented organization. The OVP did

reveal that Enron Corporation representatives were consulted during the "development of the final report" ("Energy Task Force," 2003, p. 16).

It is possible that the US Congressmen were correct in their assessments of the Energy Task Force; it is probable that Bush campaign contributors (energy companies, for example) stood to benefit from the National Energy Policy. The Congressmen were most concerned with the domestic production of oil in the ANWR. However, domestic drilling issues have never been one of the key goals of the Bush Administration. The advisers to the Energy Task Force could benefit in a way that Congressmen Waxman and Dingell had not imagined; energy companies could benefit from a US invasion of Iraq and the "energy security" issues outlined in the NEP.

Fox News reported in July 2003 "that conservative legal group, obtained a batch of task force-related Commerce Department papers" related to Energy Task Force proceedings ("Cheney Energy Task Force Documents Detail Iraqi Oil Industry," 2003). There were two revealing documents obtained from the Commerce Department: a map of Iraqi oil fields and reserves and a list of contracts that Iraq had made with countries other than the United States to access Iraqi oil. The president of the watchdog group that obtained the information said that "opponents of the war will argue that Iraq oil was on the minds of at least some members of the task force long before the war; supporters might argue they couldn't talk about the Mideast oil situation without talking about Iraq" (Sperry, 2003).

A case can be made that the United States was aware of the fact that others were promised access to Iraqi oil. Undoubtedly, the Energy Task Force addressed this issue. It is probable that the industry experts representing private companies who consulted with the Energy Task Force would stand to benefits financially if oil rights shifted from foreign countries to US based energy suppliers. It is probable that references and recommendations in the NEP were directly related to the threat that non-US entities had been promised access to Iraqi oil. If the US were to protect oil interests in the Middle East, they would have to be proactive, not reactive. This had been stated by the PNAC and was now solidified as the US National Energy Policy within the first six months of the Bush Administration.

Actions Speak Louder than Rhetoric

A news source from the UK reported in January 2003 that "on the future of a post-Saddam Iraq…the State Department stressed that protection of the oil fields was issue number one" (Walsh, Patton, Boerger, 2003). A Chinese new source reported that the US desire to protect Iraqi oil fields was related to past experience in dealing with Saddam Hussein. At the end of the Persian Gulf War, Saddam set fire to approximately 75% of Kuwait's oil fields and intentionally released 5 million barrels of oil into the Persian Gulf ("US Military Prepared to Secure Iraqi Oil Fields," 2003).

A senior US defense official said that "it cost Kuwait and the coalition partners over $20 billion to restore oil infrastructure that was destroyed by Saddam during the Gulf War. And it's believed that it would cost us $30 (billion) to $50 billion to repair and reconstruct the Iraqi oil infrastructure" if Iraq sabotages its own oil fields ("US Military Prepared to Secure Iraqi Oil Fields," 2003). The People's Daily story also reported that the US intended to use special forces, conventional forces and mobile forces to protect the Iraqi oil fields ("US Military Prepared to Secure Iraqi Oil Fields," 2003).

At the beginning of the invasion, the United States implemented the plan to protect the oil fields. The US invasion of Iraq began on March 18, 2003. On April 14, 2003, the US reported that all Iraqi oil fields had been secured ("War in Iraq," 2003). CNN reported: "The United States has received widespread criticism in Europe, as well as in Iraq, for having taken steps to protect Iraqi oil fields but failing to take similar steps to protect the museums in Baghdad that house treasures dating back thousands of years" (Bitterman, 2003). Scholars around the world were outraged at the looting that took place in Baghdad museums at the expense of protecting oil fields (Bitterman, 2003).

The issue of energy security was buried in the eighth chapter of the National Energy Policy, but the implementation of energy security was on page one of the US strategy in planning for an invasion of Iraq. With all of the rhetoric in the NEP regarding conservation, alternative fuels and environmental issues, the action of US Special Forces protecting the oil fields in Iraq speaks volumes about the intent of the United States with regard to energy security.

Summary

One of the main purposes of this thesis is to explore answers to the question, "Why did the United States invade Iraq in 2003?" This chapter has explored oil as a reason for the invasion. In his book <u>Blood and Oil</u>, Michael Klare claims that oil is the most important resource in our global economy and that "it has more potential than any of the others to provoke major crises and conflicts in the years ahead." While Klare provides evidence that proves oil is an important commodity to the United States, his analysis is only a framework. Klare writes that the US may use military power to protect oil interests, but this particular book does not make a direct connection between oil and the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Other sources, however, validate that oil was a foundational reason for the war in Iraq.

Chapter 5

Globalization: A Different Perspective on Oil

In <u>Blood and Oil</u>, Michael Klare views oil as a commodity, a resource that is fundamental to the US and the global economy. Klare used statistics to validate the US dependence on oil, and he used statistics to validate the world's oil production numbers and amount of oil in the world's reserves. Expanding on Klare's foundation, the case can then be made that the United States needs oil and will do whatever it takes to ensure that the flow of oil is not disrupted. Building on the foundation presented by Klare and supplemented with other facts, one could infer that one of the reasons that the United States invaded Iraq in 2003 was because of oil.

If asked, "Why did the United States invade Iraq in 2003?" Neil Smith would respond that it was oil; however, he comes to his conclusion for a very different reason than Klare. In his book <u>The Endgame of Globalization</u>, Neil Smith suggests that the war in Iraq is part of a century-long pattern of the United States efforts to shape the world in the image of US liberalism. Smith suggests that the neo-con movement is not revolutionary but that the principles embraced by the Bush Administration have been fundamental throughout America's history. The personalities and leadership styles of individual presidents make it appear that there have been different globalization strategies throughout the centuries, but in reality, America has always had globalization as a goal.

Smith never offers a definition of globalization, but in order to analyze his argument, it is important to define it. In January 2007, a BBC reporter wrote an in-depth article on globalization. The article reports that "globalization refers to the growing economic integration of the world, as trade, investment and money increasingly cross international borders (which may or may not have political or cultural implications)" (Schifferes, 2007). Smith writes that the current philosophy regarding the American globalization is one of American entitlement; the United States is the sole superpower and, by default, is the major influencer of globalization.

Smith states, "oil is clearly a central calculation in the decision to invade Iraq and topple the Saddam Hussein regime, but as many have remarked, its relevance goes well beyond Iraq or simply the control of supplies of the US market" (Smith, 2005, p. 24). Smith makes a case that Iraq is strategically important to the US goal of globalization, and therefore, the US focused attention on controlling the country in order to control the oil. The control of Iraq and its oil provides the US with leverage when competing against Europe and Asia for resources, regional influence and global power.

Endgame Globalization: Neil Smith's Theory

Globalism and Nationalism

Central to Smith's thesis is that there is a relationship between globalism and nationalism. Smith advises against viewing globalism and nationalism as opposites. Instead, he argues that "in the economic sphere as in the political, the crucial argument is that global ambition is constitutively nationalist, and by corollary, American nationalism is founded on globalist claims" (Smith, 2005, p. 15). Smith suggests that while globalization may be American led, it is not the same as "Americanization" (Smith, 2005, p.16). He also writes that "American nationalism infuses the arteries of globalizing capitalism like no other" (Smith, 2005, p.16). Smith's book illustrates that US globalism has been repeatedly unsuccessful because nationalism becomes an impediment.

A History of US Globalism

The shift from neoliberalism during the Clinton era has been starkly contrasted by the neoconservative movement of the Bush era. Neil Smith argues that "while these Democratic and Republican administrations were led by quite opposite personalities, voiced different rhetoric, and were fired by radically divergent intellectual traditions—over a longer term and in international perspective, the continuity since the 1980s era, which first announced globalization, far outreaches the discontinuities" (Smith, 2005, p. vii).

Smith goes on to write that Iraq should be viewed in context as part of US globalism. Smith suggests that George W. Bush should be compared to other wartime presidents like Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt who managed wars that became vehicles for their global

ambitions. Smith does, however, concede that neither Wilson nor Roosevelt began the wars in which they were involved; Bush launched an invasion against Iraq. Smith promotes the idea that wars since 2001 should be seen as expressions of "endgame global America" (Smith, 2005, p.12). Smith defines the "endgame" by stating that it is the "culmination of a US-centered political face of globalization, leading to nothing less than a US-centered global hegemony" (Smith, 2005, p. 12).

Smith does not view George W. Bush as an anomaly, rather, he suggests that all American presidents of the 20th and 21st centuries have had the same goal: "American globalization" (Smith, 2005, p. 13). Smith does recognize that the leadership styles make Clinton and Bush appear as polar opposites, but in reality, Smith believes they have the same goal. Smith writes that it was the policy of the Clinton Administration to work with existing organizations to influence change. He cites the Clinton influence in the world economy when "the Clinton Administration had mobilized the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to liberalize—deregulated and re-regulate—the financial sectors of economies across the world" (Smith, 2005, p.13).

Smith goes on to write "after 2000, the Bush administration, impatient with the calculated incrementalism of the Clinton globalists, sought more direct means of economic dominance" (Smith, 2005, p.13). Whereas Clinton worked to alter the world economy by influencing change in the IMF, Bush used the WTO to influence the global economy. The approach of the two presidents was markedly different. The Bush Administration "focused on dismantling import tariffs in other economies and challenging export subsidies on goods and services coming to the US" (Smith, 2005, p.13).

Smith commented on the Bush approach:

> Couched in the language of freedom, equality and rights, these measure and agreements were actually proposed on terms heavily favorable to US economic interest. They were aimed, bluntly, at opening up the world economy for exploitation while maintaining the privileged position of the world's largest economy (Smith, 2005, p. 14).

The WTO and the nations it represents did not acquiesce to the United States global economic proposal.

"New American Century, New Imperialism?"

In 1941, <u>Time</u> magazine publisher and creator of <u>Life</u> magazine, Henry Luce, published an

editorial in <u>Life</u> in which the phrase "American Century" had its beginnings.

> Luce's concern for the world began with the Second World War. Like many members of
> the Eastern Establishment - an informal collection of publishers and political and
> financial leaders - Luce viewed the early victories of Nazi Germany with alarm. No
> longer, Luce argued, could America afford her traditional isolation from the world. Even
> if Britain stopped Hitler, Luce correctly surmised, the war would leave her too exhausted
> to play the great world power. Americans had to be made to accept the "inevitable":
> armed intervention to save Europe and a new postwar order dominated by the United
> States - Luce called it the American Century (Baughman, 2001).

In Chapter Two of this thesis, the goals, initiatives and influence of the Project for the New

American Century were detailed; the "New" American Century is a reference to the article by

Luce in the 1940s. Luce said that the United States should take global power because it could.

Specifically he said, that we should "accept wholeheartedly our duty and our opportunity as the

most powerful and vital nation in the world, and in consequence to exert upon the world the full

impact of our influence, for such purpose as we see fit and by such means as we see fit" (Smith,

2005, p. 18).

Smith suggests that the PNAC and the neo-con movement are less revolutionary as they are

retro. He writes that the PNAC promotes "a strident nationalist globalism from the

neoconservative movement." Smith asserts that the PNAC strategy is one of global ambition

intertwined with a nationalist vision (Smith, 2005, p. 18). He also views the PNAC strategy (the

adopted strategy by the Bush Administration) as one that embraces empire without apology.   It

is for the good of the world that the United States must become an imperialist; it is the global

duty of the United States as the lone superpower (Smith, 2005, p. 19).

The PNAC outlined a vision and strategy that it published on a public website. Smith assesses

the rhetoric with the following commentary:

> The fruition of US power represents the continuity in this vision: the new American
> Century will be like the old except better, complete, a pure crystallization of legitimate
> power. The mistakes of the past will be corrected, American power—knocking on the
> door of the past century—will be unselfconsciously deployed, and the role of the US as
> world policeman will be accepted with honor and pride rather than embarrassed half-
> heartedness. The discontinuity of the vision is already implicit in this continuity: the
> delusions of the past—neoliberal incrementalism and global compromise, a certain

74

penchant for reconciling global conflicts diplomatically rather than militarily—are all eschewed in this unbridled ambition for a forceful American globalism. Might, again, makes right (Smith, 2005, p. 19-20).

Smith provides insight into the philosophy of the Bush Administration. Whether justified or not, the Bush Administration has functioned under the presumption of entitlement to employ foreign policy initiatives that aggressively advance the US global position. Smith would label this an effort in American globalization.

Energy Security: A Strategic Move toward American Globalization

Smith writes that the US strategy for increased control of the global oil supply would result in "global economic hegemony" (Smith, 2005, p. 24). If the United States can control the oil, the United States can secure its global position and advance the agenda of American globalization. Quite simply, Smith states, "For all that war in Iraq has to do with oil, it is not simply a war for oil but a larger war to control the global economic infrastructure, practices and relations that orchestrate the global economy (of which oil is a significant part). In short, it is about the endgame of globalization" (Smith, 2005, p. 26).

How does having control of oil advance the US goal of American globalization? Smith provides some possible connections between the control of the coveted commodity and US ambitions of globalization. Smith states that price and control of oil is more about the control of the supply than fear of oil scarcity (Smith, 2005, p. 183). He writes that "governments owning reserves can open or close the spigot" thereby literally controlling the flow of oil (Smith, 2005, p. 183). He further states that governments who control oil have strong economic power to determine which multinational corporations are awarded drilling rights (Smith, 2005, p. 183). Without question, control of oil rights and the issuance thereof directly correlates to an economic advantage. Finally, a sovereign benefits from control of oil resources because that government can affect taxation of the oil and maintenance of the reserves (Smith, 2005, p. 183). If the United States were to gain control of Iraq, the US would benefit financially and in such a way to have a permanent affect on the global economy. This far-reaching global economic impact is fundamentally what Smith terms as "American globalization."

75

If the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 was only about oil, then why was it necessary to dispose of Saddam Hussein and install a puppet government? Smith asks this question in his work, and he answers it with the theory of American globalization (Smith, 2005, p. 185). The definition of globalization extends beyond control of economic resources. The invasion of Iraq was not only about the economics of oil; the invasion was also about US political influence in the Middle East. Smith writes:

> In addition to the geopolitics of oil and the centrality of oil to imperial expansion, two other issues are pivotal. The first concerns the ebb and flow of US power in the Middle East. The second involves the shifting relations between Arab states, the multinationals, Islam and western governments (Smith, 2005, p. 185).

This statement by Smith strengthens the case that the US invasion of Iraq about more than oil; it was also about political influence in the region. Smith makes a very compelling case that the US invasion of Iraq was an effort at American globalization, and oil was simply the resource that allowed the United States to advance its goals in the region.

Near the end of his book Smith writes:

> The true target [in Iraq] was not terrorism, therefore, nor even Saddam, nor just Iraq, but the perceived threat that the "Greater Middle East" might consolidate a competing globalism that could obstruct the liberal democratic globalization emanating from Washington and New York, Tokyo and Frankfurt, London and Milan" (Smith, 2005, p. 191).

Others Concur with the Principles of Smith's Theory

When seeking an answer to the question, "Why did the United States invade Iraq in 2003?" Smith's theory can be applied to obtain an answer. If we understand that globalization "refers to the growing economic integration of the world, as trade, investment and money increasingly cross international borders," then the case can be made that the US invaded Iraq to advance the principles of American globalization (Schifferes, 2007). First, since Iraq is a major producer of oil, the US sought to expand economic interest in the protection, control and usage of the natural resource. Second, since Iraq is a major Arab nation located centrally in the Middle East, the US sought to expand global political and geographic influence by invading Iraq in 2003 and establishing a government that could be controlled by the US. American globalization is cited by others who have commented on the reason for the US invasion of Iraq in 2003.

US Economic Interest in Iraq

The United States found evidence that Iraq had signed oil production contracts with Russia and France in 1997 (Sperry, 2003). If Russia, France and other nations or multinational corporations were allowed resource rights in Iraq, this would greatly impact the ability for US to gain control of oil resources in Iraq. When the US gave indication of war plans with Iraq, France was a notable objector to the war. A US invasion of Iraq followed by an occupation and control of a new government would invalidate any contract made between France and the Saddam Regime.

James Woolsey said, "It's pretty straightforward. France and Russia have oil companies and interests in Iraq. They should be told that if they are of assistance in moving Iraq toward decent government, we'll do the best we can to ensure that the new government and American companies work closely with them" (Morgan, Ottaway, 2001). This statement was intended to use the US power position to influence France and Russia as members of the UN Security Council. However, this statement was also a clear message. The message was that the United States was going to invade Iraq thereby invalidating any previous arrangements for access to Iraqi oil, and furthermore, if France and Russia wanted any opportunity at Iraqi oil in the future, it was in their best interest to support the United States war effort. The US leveraged Iraqi oil as a pawn to influence power and control against competitors like France and Russia.

In February 2001, a BBC reporter wrote that a plan "was crafted by neo-conservatives intent on using Iraq's oil to destroy the OPEC cartel through massive increases in production above OPEC quotas" (Palast, 2005). A second source verifies that one of the goals of the United States was to weaken the dominance of OPEC in the global economy (Renner, 2003). Essentially, production of Iraqi oil could open up the spigot and flood the market with oil thereby lowering the per barrel price of oil. Historically, the OPEC nations have controlled oil production and oil prices.

In 2003 an article written by Michael Renner appeared in Foreign Policy in Focus. Renner wrote:

> The impact on world markets is hard to overstate. Saudi Arabia would no longer be the sole dominant producer, able to influence oil markets single-handedly. Given that U.S.-Saudi relations cooled substantially in the wake of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks rifts that may widen further a Saudi competitor would not be unwelcome in Washington. An unnamed U.S. diplomat confided to Scotland's Sunday Herald that a rehabilitated Iraq is the only sound long-term strategic alternative to Saudi Arabia. Its not

just a case of swapping horses in mid-stream, the impending U.S. regime change in Baghdad is a strategic necessity (Renner, 2003).

Renner also states that US control of Iraqi oil could have economic impact that extends beyond the Middle East and Europe. Renner writes that a massive influx of Iraqi oil could marginalize the importance of oil from countries such as Mexico and Venezuela. Additionally, lower oil prices could cripple the Russian economy that relies heavily on oil exports for national revenue. Control of oil in Iraq extends much further than US dependency on oil. Control of oil in Iraq would enable the United States to affect the global economy in an unprecedented way. Control of oil in Iraq will help America achieve the goal of American globalization.

US Political Interest in the Middle East

Gaining and maintaining control of Iraq would enable the United States to influence the politics of Iraq and the Middle East. One author wrote that "Iraq is just the beginning of a revolutionary plan that involves the very face of the Middle East. The neo-conservatives who run the US no longer support the status quo—they want quite literally to change the world as we know it" (Hartcher, 2003). Hartcher compares the US objectives of the Gulf War to those of the war in Iraq. In 1991, he states that the US was interested in restoring the status quo by restoring the sovereignty of Kuwait and ensuring the safety of Saudi Arabia (Hartcher, 2003). In contrast, he suggests that the US under the Bush Administration (Bush 43) has become a revolutionary power intent on changing the status quo (Hartcher, 2003). Smith provided some insight into the neo-con ideals by suggesting that the neo-cons are not an anomaly but rather are part of a continuum of liberalism that has been part of the thread of American foreign ideals since the early 1900s. Hartcher expresses the sentiment of many Americans when he wrote that the new "approach to power and foreign policy is so profound that the wider world is having a great deal of trouble absorbing its reality and its implications" (Hartcher, 2003).

 An October 2002 article from the Sydney Morning Herald notes, "The White House decided that diplomacy was not an option in the Middle East" ("Oil Has Always Been Top of Bush's Foreign Policy Agenda," 2002). The same article states that "US military circles have watched as Iraq became "the tactical pivot", Saudi Arabia "the strategic pivot", and an agenda of "not just a

78

new regime in Iraq" but a "new Middle East" has been increasingly discussed" ("Oil Has Always Been Top of Bush's Foreign Policy Agenda," 2002). This statement creates a word picture of concentric circles representing the US goal for influence in Iraq, the immediate region, and the Middle East.

Summary

In his book The Endgame of Globalization, Neil smith offers a theory that suggests that the United States invaded Iraq in 2003 because of oil. Smith does not focus on the commodity of oil. Instead, he focuses on how oil can be leveraged to advance the US ambition of American globalization. Smith makes a case that Iraq is strategically important to the US goal of globalization, and therefore, the US focused attention on controlling the country in order to control the oil. The control of Iraq and its oil provides the US with leverage when competing against Europe and Asia for resources, regional influence and global power. Smith states, "oil is clearly a central calculation in the decision to invade Iraq and topple the Saddam Hussein regime, but as many have remarked, its relevance goes well beyond Iraq or simply the control of supplies of the US market" (Smith, 2005, p. 24). Smith theorizes that Iraq is part of the US vision for what he calls "Endgame Globalization" and the actions by the United States would indicate that there is truth to this assessment.

Conclusion

Findings

This thesis has been an exercise in evaluating available evidence to build a case that will provide insight for the US invasion of Iraq in 2003. Based on an understanding and assessment of the evidence, the following findings are presented:

The first contention is that the key officials in the United States government planned and to remove Saddam Hussein from power since the conclusion of the Gulf War. This plan was postponed for eight years during the Clinton Administration, but shortly after the election of George W. Bush, the plan was revitalized. Plans were made to remove Saddam Hussein from power during the early months of the Bush (43) administration.

This thesis argues that an unexpected catalyst occurred when terrorist attacked America on September 11, 2001. The American desire for revenge and the residual emotion of 9/11 provided a perfect window of opportunity for the Bush Administration to advance its military and political agenda for Iraq. While the US was never able to prove a definitive connection between Saddam Hussein, terrorism and 9/11, the Bush administration leveraged the terrorist attacks to redefine standards of analysis, proof and justification for foreign policy decisions and to advance an aggressive agenda against Iraq.

The US government worked to build a case for war incriminating Iraq as a threat to the United States. Evidence was shaped to coincide with the government's desire to invade Iraq, and consequently, much of the evidence was faulty and found to be unjustifiable. Because the war began under faulty pretenses, it is important to consider *why* the US chose to engage in this war at this particular time in history. While there are not definitive answers, there are several theories, which have merit, and this research began to explore them. In short, this thesis proposes that the US was interested in protecting its oil interests and what the White House saw as US geo-strategic position in the Middle East. To support this claim the analysis relied on the theories of two contemporary authors: Michael Klare and Neil Smith.

In <u>Blood and Oil</u>, Michael Klare outlines the importance of oil as a commodity to the US economy and to the global economy. First, there are historical evidences that validate the importance of oil as a foreign policy issue. Second, the attributes of oil and its importance to the American economy make it a vital resource worth protecting. Finally, the United States has shown little progress to lessen our oil dependency thereby perpetuating the need to protect oil interests. Klare states that "that petroleum is unique among the world's resources—that it has more potential than any of the others to provoke major crises and conflicts in the years ahead" (Klare, 2004a, p. xiii).

To validate Klare's theory, this thesis analyzed the National Energy Policy of the Bush Administration. This policy details the importance of energy security and the US plan to acquire and protect foreign oil sources. Additionally, this thesis discussed some pre-invasion information that indicated the intent of the US to secure and protect Iraqi oil fields. This information validates Klare's claim that the US would rely "on military means to ensure the uninterrupted flow of energy" (Klare, 2004a, p. 23-24).

In <u>The Endgame of Globalization</u>, Neil Smith concludes that the US invaded Iraq because of oil. However, his theory is less about oil as a commodity and more about how oil can be leveraged to advance the US ambition of American globalization.

Smith makes a case that Iraq is strategically important to the US goal of globalization, and therefore, the US focused attention on controlling the country in order to control the oil. The control of Iraq and its oil provides the US with leverage when competing against Europe and Asia for resources, regional influence and global power. Smith states, "oil is clearly a central calculation in the decision to invade Iraq and topple the Saddam Hussein regime, but as many have remarked, its relevance goes well beyond Iraq or simply the control of supplies of the US market" (Smith, 2004a, p. 24). Smith theorizes that Iraq is part of the US vision for what he calls "Endgame Globalization" and the actions by the United States would indicate that there is truth to this assessment.

Limitations with the Research

The obvious limitation with the research is that there is not one definitive answer to the research question, "Why did the United States invade Iraq in 2003?" This thesis is only one assessment of the evidence. Another researcher might approach the same topic and draw different conclusions. History will allow us more valued insight into the answers, but absent of an official statement by the Bush Administration, we are left to answer the question by constructing the evidence and drawing conclusions based on an assessment of the evidence.

This thesis focused on one "reason": oil. However, oil is a reason for two very distinctly different, yet related theories. One theory explored oil as a commodity to be acquired, managed and protected; the other theory explored oil as resource that the US could use to leverage its global position to advance ambitions for American globalization. There are other theories that advance reasons for explaining why the US invaded Iraq in 2003; however, because these two theories recurred in the literature, they were the focus of this thesis.

Recommendations for Future Research Efforts Related to this Research Topic

If indeed the war in Iraq is ultimately "unsuccessful," it is probable that scholars will take a closer examination of the question "Why did the US invade Iraq in 2003?" It would be interesting to approach the topic of the US invasion of Iraq at the conclusion of the war. Neil Smith makes the statement that US ambitions for globalization have been unsuccessful because of nationalism. This would be an interesting research topic. If the war in Iraq is "successful," this would invalidate Smith's claim. If the war in Iraq is "unsuccessful," it would validate the claim. It would be an interesting study to compare the Vietnam War (an "unsuccessful war") to the war in Iraq. In each war, Smith's theory of American globalization could be applied and explored.

It will be interesting to see if future Presidential candidates are queried about their strategies for foreign policy, diplomacy and ambitions for US globalization. Will the overwhelming sentiment that we have all been misled prompt us to change our behavior when choosing a new President? There are many possible research opportunities, and many of those opportunities will be clearly defined when the war concludes.

<div align="center">

Appendix A

</div>

Source: http://www.yale.edu/strattech/92dpg.html

Key Sections of Pentagon Document on Post-Cold-War Strategy

Initial Draft (Feb. 18, 1992)

1) Our first objective is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, either on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere, that poses a threat on the order of that posed formerly by the Soviet Union. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to general global power.

2) The U.S. must show the leadership necessary to establish and protect a new order that holds the promise of convincing potential competitors that they need not aspire to a greater role or pursue a more aggressive posture to protect their legitimate interests. In non-defense areas, we must account sufficiently for the interests of the advanced industrial nations to discourage them from challenging our leadership or seeking to overturn the established political and economic order. We must maintain the mechanism for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role.

3) Like the coalition that opposed Iraqi aggression, we should expect future coalitions to be ad hoc assemblies, often not lasting beyond the crisis being confronted, and in many cases carrying only general agreement over the objectives to be accomplished. Nevertheless, the sense that the world order is ultimately backed by the U.S. will be an important stabilizing factor.

4) While the U.S. cannot become the world's policeman, by assuming responsibility for righting every wrong, we will retain the preeminent responsibility for addressing selectively those wrongs which threaten not only our interests, but those of our allies or friends, or which could seriously unsettle international relations.

5) We continue to recognize that collectively the conventional forces of the states formerly comprising the Soviet Union retain the most military potential in all of Eurasia; and we do not dismiss the risks to stability in Europe from a nationalist backlash in Russia or efforts to reincorporate into Russia the newly independent republics of Ukraine, Belarus, and possibly others....We must, however, be mindful that democratic change in Russia is not irreversible, and that despite its current travails, Russia will remain the strongest military power in Eurasia and the only power in the world with the capability of destroying the United States.

6) In the Middle East and Southwest Asia, our overall objective is to remain the predominant outside power in the region and preserve U.S. and Western access to the region's oil.

Latest Draft (April 16, 1992)

1) Our most fundamental goal is to deter or defeat attack from whatever source. . .. The second goal is to strengthen and extend the system of defense arrangements that binds democratic and like-minded nations together in common defense against aggression, build habits of cooperation, avoid the re-nationalization of security policies, and provide security at lower costs and with lower risks for all. Our preference for a collective response to preclude threats or, if necessary, to deal with them is a key feature of our regional defense strategy. The third goal is to preclude any hostile power from dominating a region critical to our interests, and also thereby to strengthen the barriers against the re-emergence of a global threat to the interests of the U.S. and our allies.

2) One of the primary tasks we face today in shaping the future is carrying long standing alliances into the new era, and turning old enmities into new cooperative relationships. If we and other leading democracies continue to build a democratic security community, a much safer world is likely to emerge. If we act separately, many other problems could result.

3) Certain situations like the crisis leading to the Gulf War are likely to engender ad hoc coalitions. We should plan to maximize the value of such coalitions. This may include specialized roles for our forces as well as developing cooperative practices with others.

4) While the United States cannot become the world's policeman and assume responsibility for solving every international security problem, neither can we allow our critical interests to depend solely on international mechanisms that can be blocked by countries whose interests may be very different than our own.

Where our ally's interests are directly affected, we must expect them to take an appropriate share of the responsibility, and in some cases play the leading role; but we maintain the capabilities for addressing selectively those security problems that threaten our own interests.

5) The U.S. has a significant stake in promoting democratic consolidation and peaceful relations between Russia, Ukraine and the other republics of the former Soviet Union.

6) In the Middle East and Persian Gulf, we seek to foster regional stability, deter aggression against our friends and interests in the region, protect U.S. nationals and property, and safeguard our access to international air and seaways and to the region's oil. The United States is committed to the security of Israel and to maintaining the qualitative edge that is critical to Israel's security. Israel's confidence in its security and U.S.-Israel strategic cooperation contribute to the stability of the entire region, as demonstrated once again during the Persian Gulf War. At the same time, our assistance to our Arab friends to defend themselves against aggression also strengthens security throughout the region, including for Israel. (pg. 14)

Appendix B
Abridged Timeline
UN Attempts to monitor Iraq's weapons program

1991 **April 6, 1991:** Iraq accepts U.N. resolution requiring it to end its weapons of mass destruction programs and allow for ongoing monitoring and verification of compliance.

1997 **Oct. 29, 1997:** Iraq demands that Americans on the U.N. Special Commission inspection team leave; the Americans leave temporarily but return Nov. 20.

1998 **Jan. 13, 1998:** Iraq temporarily withdraws cooperation, claiming that the inspection team had too many U.S. and British inspectors.

Jan. 22, 1998: Iraq refuses inspection of presidential sites.

Feb. 20-23, 1998: U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan secures Iraq's cooperation and unrestricted access to inspectors.

Oct. 31, 1998: Iraq ends all forms of cooperation with UNSCOM. UNSCOM withdraws.

Nov. 14, 1998: Iraq allows inspections to resume.

Dec. 16, 1998: UNSCOM removes all staff from Iraq after inspectors conclude Iraq is not fully cooperating. Four days of U.S. and British airstrikes follow.

June 30, 1999: Richard Butler completes his two-year term as executive chairman of UNSCOM.

Dec. 17, 1999: U.N. replaces UNSCOM with UNMOVIC, the U.N. Monitoring Verification and Inspection Commission. Iraq rejects the resolution.

March 1, 2000: Hans Blix assumes post of executive chairman of UNMOVIC.

November 2000: Iraq rejects new weapons inspections proposals.

July 5, 2002: In talks with Annan, Iraq rejects weapons inspections proposals.

Aug. 1: In a letter to Annan, Iraq invites Blix to Iraq for technical discussions on remaining disarmament issues.

Aug. 6: Annan writes to Iraqis pointing out that what they are proposing is at odds with U.N. resolutions and asks that Iraq accept inspections.

Sept. 12: President Bush tells the United Nations it must rid the world of Saddam's biological, chemical and nuclear arsenals, or stand aside as the United States acts.

Sept. 16: Iraq unconditionally accepts the return of U.N. weapons inspectors.

Sources: U.N. Monitoring Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC); State Department; U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM).

Bibliography

"A Female Conspiracy Theorist Took America to War." 31 August 2005. Aljazeera.com
   Website. 10 December 2007.
   <http://www.aljazeera.com/cgi-bin/conspiracy_theory/fullstory.asp?id=256>

Al-Faisal, Prince Turki. "The State of Saudi-US Relations." 12 January 2007. KUER FM 90
   Website; streaming audio. 1 February 2007 <http://www.kuer.org/2005Hinckley.html>

About Halliburton. n.d. Halliburton Corporate Website. 31 March 2007.
    <http://www.halliburton.com/Default.aspx?navid=337&pageid=706>

About PNAC. n.d. Project for the New American Century. 19 February 2007.
   <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>

Aburish, Säid K. "Secrets of his life and Leadership: An interview with Säid K. Aburish." 25
   January 2000 (Television Broadcast Date of Interview). PBS Frontline Website. 26
   December 2006.
   <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/saddam/interviews/aburish.html>.

Aldouri, Mohammed. Interview with PBS Frontline. 29 October 2001 (interview date). PBS
   Frontline Website. 10 January 2007.
   <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/gunning/interviews/aldouri.html>.

Alfonsi, Christian. Circle in the Sand. New York, NY: Doubleday, 2006.

Aziz, Tariq. "Iraqi Memorandum to the Arab League." 15 July 1990. The Middle East Institute
   of Japan Website. 19 April 2007. <http://www.meij.or.jp/text/Gulf%20War/iraqiMemo.htm>

"BP Statistical Review of World Energy." June 2005. British Petroleum Website. 19 April
   2007.
   <http://www.bp.com/liveassets/bp_internet/globalbp/globalbp_uk_english/publications/energ
   y_reviews_2005/STAGING/local_assets/downloads/pdf/statistical_review_of_world_energy_
   full_report_2005.pdf>

Babington, Charles and Michael Abramowitz. "US Shifts Policy on Geneva Convention."
   12 July 2006. Washington Post.com Website. 2 April 2007.
   <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/07/11/AR2006071100094.html>

"Background Note: Iraq." October 2006. Official Website US Department of Stated. 6 April
   2007. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/6804.htm>

Baker, Peter. "Bush Says U.S. Pullout Would Let Iraq Radicals Use Oil as a Weapon." 5
   November 2006. Washington Post.com. 19 March 2007.
   <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/04/AR2006110401025.html>

Bamber, David. "Bin Laden: Yes, I did it." 11 November 2001. Telegraph.co.uk website.
21 December 2006.
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2001/11/11/wbin11.xml>

Barry, Tom. "DIY Energy Policy." 19 September 2006. International Relations Center
Website. 31 March 2007. <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/rw/3526>

Baughman, James L., Henry R. Luce and the Rise of the American News Media. The Johns
Hopkins University Press: Maryland, 2001. Essay adapted from the book found on PBS
Website. 1 April 2007. <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/americanmasters/database/luce_h.html>

Berke, Richard L. "The Republican Debate: The Overview; Confident Bush Takes No Risks in
First Debate." 3 December 1999. The New York Times Online. 10 April 2007.
<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C04E3DF143EF930A35751C1A96F958260&sec
=&spon=&pagewanted=print>

Besheer, Margaret. "Saddam Hussein Ruled Iraq with Iron Fist." 29 December 2006. Voice of
America Online Website. 5 April 2007.
<http://www.vnis.com/story.cfm?textnewsid=2238>

Bergen, Peter. "Armchair Provocateur." December 2003. Washington Monthly Online.
15 December 2007.
<http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2003/0312.bergen.html#byline>

Bitterman, Jim. "Antique Experts: Some Looting was 'Commissioned'." 18 April 2003.
CNN.com. 31 March 2007.
<http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/europe/04/17/sprj.nilaw.artifacts/index.html>

Boot, Max. "What the Heck is a 'Neocon'?" 30 December 2002. The Wall Street Journal
(Online) Editorial Page. 21 February 2007.
<http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110002840>

Broad, William and Judith Miller, "Germs, Atoms and Poison Gas: The Iraqi Shell Game,"
20 December 1998. The New York Times. 31 March 2007.
<http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F40A14F63F5F0C738EDDAB0994D0494D81>

Bush, George, H.W. "Address to the Nation Announcing the Deployment of United States
Armed Forces to Saudi Arabia." 8 August 1990. George Bush Presidential Library and
Museum Website. 19 April 2007.
<http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/papers/1990/90080800.html>

————. "The President's News Conference." 8 August 1990. George Bush Presidential
Library and Museum Website. 19 April 2007.
<http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/papers/1990/90080801.html >

Bush, George H.W. , (n.d.), Official Web Page of the White House. 10 January 2007.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/history/presidents/gb41.html>

Bush, George W. "Remarks by the President to Capital City Partnership." 17 May 2001.
    Official Web Page of the White House. 3 April 2007.
    <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/05/20010517-2.html>

————. "Statement by the President in His Address to the Nation." 11 September
    2001. Official Web Page of the White House. 19 February 2007.
    <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html>

————. "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People." 20
    September 2001. Official Web Page of the White House. 15 January 2007.
    <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>

————. "President Holds Prime Time News Conference." 11 October 2001. Official Web
    Page of the White House. 8 April 2007.
    <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011011-7.html>

————."President Bush, Prime Minister Blair Hold Press Conference." 6 April 2002.
    Official Web Page of the White House. 29 March 2007.
     <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/04/20020406-3.html>

————. "President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point." 1 June 2002. Official
    Web Page of the White House. 6 April 2007.
    <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html>

————. "State of the Union Address" 28 January 2003. Official Web Page of the White House.
    December 2006. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>

————. "President Bush Addresses the Nation." 19 March 2003. Official Web Page of the
    White House. 7 April 2007.
    <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030319-17.html>

————. "National Strategy for Victory in Iraq." 30 November 2005. Official Web Page of the
    White House. 29 December 2006.
    <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/iraq_strategy_nov2005.html>

Butler, Richard. October 2001. "Interview with Richard Butler." PBS Frontline Webpage.
    20 December 2006.
    <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/gunning/interviews/butler.html>

Carter, Hooding. "The Mind of Hussein." 26 February 1991. PBS Frontline Series: The Long
    Road to War. Transcript of television broadcast found on PBS Website. 7 April 2007.
    <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/longroad/etc/mind.html>

Carter, Jimmy. "State of the Union Address 1980." 23 January 1980. Jimmy Carter Library
    Online. 19 March 2007.
    <http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.org/documents/speeches/su80jec.phtml>

Cave, Damien. "The United States of Oil." 19 November 2001. Salon.com Website.
    <http://archive.salon.com/tech/feature/2001/11/19/bush_oil/index.html>

"Cheney Energy Task Force Documents Detail Iraqi Oil Industry." 18 July 2003. Associated
    Press Article presented on Fox News.com. 31 March 2007.
    <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,92372,00.html>

"Cheney's Halliburton Ties Remain." 26 September 2003. CBS News Online Website. 31
    March 2007. <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/09/26/politics/main575356.shtml>

Cirincione, Joseph and Alexis Orton. 18 March 2004. "One Year Later: It Wasn't Us."
    Carnegie Endowment for Peace Website: Nonproliferation. 10 February 2007.
    <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/npp/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=15124>

Clarke, Richard A. Against All Enemies. Free Press: New York, 2004.

Clinton, William Jefferson. "1998 State of the Union Address." 27 January 1998. Washington
    Post Online. 20 February 2007.
    <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/states/docs/sou98.htm>

Conduct of the Persian Gulf War. United States of America: Department of Defense, April 1992.
    National Defense University Website. 19 April 2007.
    <http://www.ndu.edu/library/epubs/cpgw.pdf>

Davidson, Spencer. "War in the Persian Gulf." 6 October 1980. Time Magazine Online
    Archives. 6 April 2007. <http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,954563,00.html>

Deans, Bob. "Key Highlights in the Life of Saddam Hussein." 31 December 2006. Washington
    Bureau Online. 5 April 2007.
    <http://www.coxwashington.com/hp/content/reporters/stories/2006/12/31/SADDAM_LIFE30_COX.html>

Donnelley, Thomas. "Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources For a
    New Century." September 2000. The Project for the New America Website. 20 January
    2007.
    <http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf >

Drash, Wayne. 7 October 2004. "Report: No WMD Stockpiles in Iraq." CNN.com
    Website. 23 December 2006.
    <http://www.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/meast/10/06/iraq.wmd.report/>

Duelfer, Charles. 30 September 2004. "Comprehensive Report of the Special Advisor to the
    DCI on Iraq's WMD." 28 December 2006.
    <http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/pdf/duelfer1_a.pdf>

"Energy Task Force: Process Used to Develop National Energy Policy." August 2003.
    GAO Report to Congress. 31 March 2007. <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03894.pdf>

Engdahl, F. William. "The US's Geopolitical Nightmare." 9 May 2006. Asia Times Online.
6 April 2007. <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/HE09Ad01.html>

"G.A.O. Suit Against Cheney's Energy Task Force Is Dismissed." 9 December 2002.
Associated Press News Story. 31 March 2007.
<http://foi.missouri.edu/execprivilege/gaosuit.html>

Galbraith, Peter W. The End of Iraq. Simon and Schuster: New York, 2006.

⸺. "The Ghosts of 1991." 12 April 2003. Washington Post Online. 20 December 2006.
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A10874-2003Apr11?language=printer>

Garamone, Jim. "Just who is Saddam Hussein?" 22 January 2003. United States Department of
Defense Website. 26 December 2006.
<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=29547>

Gellman, Barton. 11 March 1992. "Keeping the U.S. First; Pentagon Would Preclude a Rival
Superpower." The Washington Post. Transcribed version on the Internet. 20 February
2007. <http://www.yale.edu/strattech/92dpg.html>

Goodenough, Patrick. 29 August 2001. "US-Funded Satellite TV Targets Iraqi Elite." CNS
News.com. 10 February 2007.
<http://www.cnsnews.com/ForeignBureaus/archive/200108/For20010829d.html>

Hamza, Khidhir. October 2001. "Interview with Khidhir Hamza." PBS Frontline Webpage. 20
December 2006.
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/gunning/interviews/hamza.html>

Hartcher, Peter. "The First of Many Wars." 22 March 2003. The Australian Financial Review.
2 April 2007. <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/27c/141.html>

Hatfield, Mark O., Vice Presidents of the United States, 1789-1993. Washington: U.S.
Government Printing Office, 1997.

Henry, Ed and Barbara Starr. "Bush: 'I'm the decider' on Rumsfeld. 16 April 2006. CNN.com
Website. 2 April 2007. <http://www.cnn.com/2006/POLITICS/04/18/rumsfeld/>

Hilsum, Lindsey. 18 September 2005. "They Day They Tried to Kill Saddam." Channel 4
Website (UK). December 2006. <http://www.channel4.com/news/special-reports/special-
reports-storypage.jsp?id=739>

Hussein, Saddam. "Extract from Iraqi President Saddam Hussein's Speech." 17 July 1990. The
Middle East Institute of Japan Website. 19 April 2007.
<http://www.meij.or.jp/text/Gulf%20War/irqkwt900717.htm>

"Investigations: Cheney Energy Task Force." 15 March 2005. Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Website.31 March 2007. <http://oversight.house.gov/investigations.asp?Issue=Cheney+Energy+Task+Force>

"Iraq." 27 March 2003. A Newsweek Poll conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates. 22 February 2007. <http://www.pollingreport.com/iraq12.htm>

"Iraq Celebrates 'Downing' US Plane." 28 August 2001. BBC News Website. 10 February 2007. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/1511540.stm>

"Iraqi Defectors and Iraq's UN Ambassador." Gunning for Saddam: A PBS Frontline Website. 20 December 2006. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/gunning/interviews/>

"Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs." October 2002. Official CIA Webpage. 11 April 2007. <https://www.cia.gov/cia/reports/iraq_wmd/Iraq_Oct_2002.htm>

Johns, Dave. "The Crimes of Saddam Hussein." 24 January 2006. PBS Frontline Website. 6 April 2007. <http://www.pbs.org/frontlineworld/stories/iraq501/events_kuwait.html>

Judis, John B. and Spencer Ackerman. 30 June 2003. "The Selling of the Iraq War: The First Casualty." Global Forum Policy Website. 30 December 2006. <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/iraq/unmovic/2003/0630selling.htm>

Kay, David. October 2003. "Interview with David Kay." PBS Frontline Webpage. 15 December 2006. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/wmd/interviews/kay.html>

————. "The October '02 National Intelligence Estimate (NIE)." 20 June 2006. PBS Frontline Webpage: Transcript segments of television program. 10 December 2006. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/darkside/themes/nie.html>

"Killing of Iraq Kurds 'Genocide'." 23 December 2005. BBC News Online. December 2006. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4555000.stm>

Klare, Michael T. Blood and Oil. Henry Holt and Company: New York, 2004.

————. "Bush-Cheney Energy Strategy: Procuring the Rest of the World's Oil." January 2004. International Relations Center Website. 31 March 2007. <http://www.peakoil.net/iwood2003/paper/KlarePaper.doc>

————. "The Bush/Cheney Energy Policy: Implications for US Foreign and Military Policy." 27 May 2003. Information Clearinghouse Website. 31 March 2007. <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article4458.htm>

Koppel, Ted. "Blueprint for War." 5 March 2003. ABC Website. 8 April 2007.
  <http://www.abcnewsstore.com/store/index.cfm?fuseaction=customer.product&product_code=
  N030305%2001&category_code=28>

Kristol, William. House Armed Services Committee Website. 21 March 2001. "Statement of
  William Kristol." 20 February 2007
  <http://armedservices.house.gov/comdocs/openingstatementsandpressreleases/107thcongress
  /01-03-21kristol.html>

Kurtz, Stanley. "Consider This." 26 September 2002. National Review Online. 20
  February 2007. <http://www.nationalreview.com/kurtz/kurtz092602.asp>

Lardner, Jr. George and Lois Romano. "Bush Name Helps Fuel Oil Drillings." 30 July 1999.
  Washington Post Archives Online. 8 April 2007.
  <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/campaigns/wh2000/stories/bush073099.htm>

"Life Under Saddam Hussein." 4 April 2003. The Official White House Website. 7 April 2007.
  <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/04/20030404-1.html>

Madhani, Aamer. "Hussein legacy: Megalomaniac, nationalist leader." 29 December 2006.
  Chicago Tribune Website. 31 December 2007.
  <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-061229obit-saddam,0,726871.story>

Mallery, Jim. "On the Brink: Understanding the US-Iraq Conflict." 26 January 2003. The
  Seattle Times Online. 5 April 2007.
  <http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/news/nation-world/usiraq/timeline/03.html>

Marcus, Jonathan. "America: An Empire to Rival Rome?" 26 January 2004. BBC News
  Online. 6 April 2007. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3430199.stm>

McCarthy, Andrew C. 17 June 2004. "Iraq & al Qaeda." National Review Online. 15
  December 2006. <http://www.nationalreview.com/mccarthy/mccarthy200406170840.asp>

McCool, Grant. 23 June 2003. "UN Arms Inspector Blix Criticizes U.S. Over Iraq." Reuters
  News Service. 20 December 2006.
  <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines03/0623-10.htm>

McIntyre, Jamie. 1 August 2001. "Two US Carriers Now in Persian Gulf." CNN.com. 20
  February 2007. <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/US/08/01/us.carriers.gulf/index.html>

———. "US Planes Bomb Iraqi Rocket Launcher." 7 August 2001. CNN.com. 20
  February 2007. <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/meast/08/07/iraq.strike/>

———. "Iraq Attacked in 'Operation Desert Fox'." 16 December 1998. CNN.com. 6 April
  2007. <http://www.cnn.com/WORLD/meast/9812/16/iraq.strike.03/>

McLaughlin, John. 7 October 2002. Letter from CIA Director to Bob Graham. 15 December 2006. <http://www.fas.org/irp/news/2002/10/dci100702.html>

Milhollin, Gary. 25 November 1990. "A Mideast Dilemma: What Is Saddam's Nuclear Timetable?" The Washington Post, Outlook. 20 December 2006. <http://www.iraqwatch.org/wmd/timetable.htm>

Morgan, Dan and David B. Ottaway. "In Iraqi War Scenario, Oil is Key." 15 September 2001. Washington Post Online. 2 April 2007. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A18841-2002Sep14?language=printer>

Moubayed, Sami. "Saddam's Life After Death." 3 January 2007. Asia Times Online. 5 April 2007. <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/IA03Ak04.html>

Mylroie, Laurie. "US Policy Toward Iraq." January 2001. Middle East Intelligence Bulletin Website. 10 January 2007. <http://www.meib.org/articles/0101_ir1.htm>.

————. Winter 1995/1996. "The World Trade Center Bomb: Who is Ramzi Yousef? And Why It Matters." The National Interest. 15 December 2006. <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/iraq/956-tni.htm>

————. "The Saddam-9/11 Link Confirmed." 11 May 2004. FrontPageMagazine.com. 20 December 2006. <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=13323>

"National Energy Policy." May 2001. Official Whitehouse Website. 31 March 2007. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/energy/National-Energy-Policy.pdf>

"National Security Directive 45." 20 August 1990. 10 January 2007. <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsd/nsd_45.htm>

Nelan, Bruce W. 18 January 1999. "Bugging Saddam." Time.com Website. 7 April 2007. <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,18060,00.html>

"Oil for Food." 19 November 2003. Official UN Website: Office of the Iraq Programme. 11 January 2007. <http://www.un.org/Depts/oip/>

"Oil Has Always Been Top of Bush's Foreign Policy Agenda." 7 October 2002. Sydney Morning Herald Website. 2 April 2007. <http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2002/10/06/1033538848021.html>

"O'Neill: Bush planned Iraq invasion before 9/11." 14 January 2004. CNN.com Website. 30 January 2007. <http://www.cnn.com/2004/ALLPOLITICS/01/10/oneill.bush/>

Palast, Greg. "Secret US Plans for Iraq's Oil." 17 March 2005. BBC Newsnight Website. 2 April 2007. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/newsnight/4354269.stm>

Pillar, Paul. "Interview with Paul Pillar." 20 June 2006. PBS Frontline Webpage: Transcript
　　segments of television program. 10 December 2006.
　　<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/darkside/interviews/pillar.html>

Powell, Colin L. "Press Briefing." 1 February 2001. Secretary of State Website. 20 February
　　2007. <http://www.state.gov/secretary/former/powell/remarks/2001/73.htm>

————. "Interview on ABC's 'This Week'." 4 February 2001. Secretary of State Website.
　　20 February 2007.
　　<http://www.state.gov/secretary/former/powell/remarks/2001/516.htm>

————. Powell, Colin L. "Interview on CBS's 'Face the Nation'." 11 February 2001.
　　Secretary of State Website. 20 February 2007.
　　<http://www.state.gov/secretary/former/powell/remarks/2001/549.htm>

Project for the New American Century. 26 January 1988. "Letter to President Clinton on
　　Iraq." 10 February 2007. <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqclintonletter.htm >

Project for the New American Century. 29 May 1988. "Letter to Gingrich and Lott on
　　Iraq." 10 February 2007. <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqletter1998.htm>

Renner, Michael. "The New Oil Order." 20 February 2003. Hartford Web Publishing
　　Website. 29 March 2007. <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/27c/156.html>

"Report on the US Intelligence Community's Prewar Intelligence Assessments on Iraq." 7
　　July 2004. Select Committee on Intelligence: United States Senate. 15 December 2006.
　　<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB129/senateiraqreport.pdf>

"Republican Presidential Forum." 2 December 1999. Project Vote Smart Website. 19
　　February 2007. <http://www.vote-smart.org/speech_detail.php?speech_id=3039>

" Resolution 661." 6 August 1990. "The Situation Between Iraq and Kuwait."
　　Official Website of the United Nations. 25 April 2007.
　　<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/596/23/IMG/NR059623.pdf?OpenElement>

"Resolution 687." 3 April 1991. United Nations Web Site.   7 April 2007.
　　<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/575/28/IMG/NR057528.pdf?Open
　　Element>

 "Revolutionary of the 14th of July." The Heritage of the Great War Website. 26 December
　　2006. <http://www.greatwar.nl/bagdad/qasim.html>.

Rice, Condoleezza. "Rice Discusses Role of U.S. Military Overseas" 29 July 2001. CNN Late
　　Edition with Wolf Blitzer; CNN Transcripts. 10 January 2007
　　<http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0107/29/le.00.html>

Robertson, Adam. "Secrets Untold by Saddam Hussein Now Uncovered." 28 February 2007. Aljazeera Website. 7 April 2007. <http://www.aljazeera.com/me.asp?service_id=12918>

Roosevelt, Franklin Delano. "Pearl Harbor Speech." 8 December 1941. From Revolution to Reconstruction Website. 7 December 2006. <http://www.let.rug.nl/~usa/P/fr32/speeches/ph.htm>.

"Saddam Hussein's Deception and Defiance." 17 September 2002. Official Web Page of the White House. 7 April 2007. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020917-8.html>

Sale, Richard. "Exclusive: Saddam was key in early CIA plot." 11 April 2003. United Press International Online. 26 December 2006. <http://www.upi.com/archive/view.php?archive=1&StoryID=20030410-070214-6557r]>

Schwartzkofp, H. Norman. Interview by David Frost. 27 March 1991. USA Today Website: "Interview with General Schwartzkopf on Gulf War Aftermath" Transcript dated 3 September 1996. Accessed on Web 10 January 2007. <http://www.usatoday.com/news/index/iraq/nirq053.htm>.

"Schwartzkopf's 100 Hours: Too Few?" Time Newsmagazine Website. 8 April 1991. 10 January 2007. <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,972690,00.html>.

Sciolino, Elaine. "Interview with Elaine Sciolino." October 2001. PBS Frontline Webpage. 20 December 2006. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/gunning/interviews/sciolino.html>

Shank, Duane. September-October 2003. "The Project for a New American Empire." Sojourners Magazine. 20 February 2007. <http://www.sojo.net/index.cfm?action=magazine.article&issue=soj0309&article=030911>

Schifferes, Steve. "Globalisation Shakes the World." 21 January 2007. BBC News Website. 8 April 2007. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/6279679.stm>

Scowcroft, Brent. "Interview with Brent Scowcroft. October 2001. PBS Frontline Website. 30 December 2006. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/gunning/interviews/scowcroft.html>

Smith, Neil. The Endgame of Globalization. New York, NY: Routledge, 2005.

Sperry, Paul. "White House Energy Task Force Papers Reveal Iraqi Oil Maps." 18 July 2003. World Net Daily.com Website. 31 March 2007. <http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=33642>

Stahl, Leslie. "Bush Sought 'Way' to Invade Iraq?" 11 January 2004. CBS News Website: 60
  Minutes Section. 6 April 2007.
  <http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=33642>

"Statement of Principles." 3 June 1997. Project for a New American Century Website. 19
  February 2007.
  <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>

Suskind, Ron. The One Percent Doctrine. New York: Simon and Schuster. 2006.

————. The Price of Loyalty. New York: Simon and Schuster. 2004.

Tenet, George. 9 October 2002. "CIA Letter to Senate on Baghdad's Intentions." The New
  York Times. 10 December 2006.
  <http://foi.missouri.edu/terrorintelligence/cialetter.html>

"The Plan: Were Neo-Conservatives' 1998 Memos a Blueprint for Iraq War?" 10 March 2003.
  A Nightline Report transcribed on ABC.com. 1 February 2007.
  <http://www.radioislam.org/islam/english/iraq/iraqplan-pnac.htm>

United States. Joint Resolution from the 107th US Congress. Public Law 107-243:
  Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq. 16 October 2002. C-SPAN Website.
  19 April 2007. <http://www.c-span.org/resources/pdf/hjres114.pdf>

"US Military Prepared to Secure Iraqi Oil Fields." 25 January 2003. People's Daily
  Website. 31 March 2007.
  <http://english.people.com.cn/200301/25/eng20030125_110744.shtml>

"US Warplanes Strike Site in Southern Iraq." 15 August 2001. People's Daily Online Website.
  6 April 2007. <http://english.people.com.cn/english/200108/15/eng20010815_77319.html>

Von Drehle, David and R. Jeffery Smith. "US Strikes Iraq for Plot to Kill Bush." 27 June 1993.
  Washington Post Archives Online. 6 April 2007. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-
  srv/inatl/longterm/iraq/timeline/062793.htm>

Walsh, Nick Paton, Julian Boreger, et.al. "US Begins Secret talks to Secure Iraq's Oil
  Fields." 23 January 2003. Hartford Web Publishing, World History Archives.
  30 March 2007.
  <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/27c/157.html>

"War in Iraq." 14 April 2003. CNN Website; War in Iraq Main Page. 31 March 2007.
  <http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2003/iraq/war.tracker/04.14.index.html>

Weiner, Bernard. 26 May 2004. "How We Got Into This Imperial Pickle: A PNAC
  Primer." 30 January 2007. <http://www.crisispapers.org/Editorials/PNAC-Primer.htm>

Woodward, Bob. Plan of Attack. London: Simon & Schuster, 2004.

Woolsey, R. James. October 2001. "Interview with R. James Woolsey." PBS Frontline
   Webpage. 10 December 2006.
      <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/gunning/interviews/woolsey.html>

Yacoub, Sameer N. "Iraq Claims 2nd US Spy Plane Downing." 12 September 2001. The
   Boston Globe Online. 20 February 2007.
      <http://www.boston.com/news/packages/underattack/globe_stories/0912/Iraq_claims_2d_US
      _spy_plane_downing+.shtml>