

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

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

N°:.....



DOMAIN: FOREIGN LANGUAGES

STREAM: ENGLISH LANGUAGE

OPTION: LITERATURE & CIVILIZATION

Post-Cold War American Foreign Policy

Bush Doctrine as a Case Study

Thesis Submitted to the Department of English in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master Degree

By: MOUNA OUM ELKHIER

MOKRANE IMANE

Publically defended before the following jury:

Mrs Amirouche	University OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA	Chairperson
Mrs Abadou	University of MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA	Supervisor
Dr. Baghdadi	University OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF- M'SILA	Examiner

Academic Year : 2016 /2017.

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

N° :.....



DOMAIN: FOREIGN LANGUAGES

STREAM: ENGLISH LANGUAGE

OPTION: LITERATURE & CIVILIZATION

Post-Cold War American Foreign Policy

Bush Doctrine as a Case Study

Thesis Submitted to the Department of English in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master Degree

By: MOUNA OUM ELKHIER

MOKRANE IMANE

Academic Year : 2016/ 2017.

Declaration :

We hereby solemnly declare that the work we are going to present in this thesis “Post –Cold War American Foreign Policy Bush Doctrine as a Case Study”, is our own, and to the limits of our knowledge. It has not been submitted before to any other Institution or University or Degree and all sources that we have used and quoted from have been indicated by means of complete references. This work is to be carried out and completed at Mohamed Boudiaf University – M’sila, Algeria.

-Acknowledgements-

All our gratitude is to Allah almighty, for help and guidance.

We wish to extend our sincere thanks to the English Department at the University of M'sila.

A special and heartfelt note of gratitude must go to our supervisor “*MrsAbadou*”, who guided us with her outstanding patience and insight.

Possibly no words could accurately convey our profound gratitude and heartfelt thankfulness for our dear families.

We are thankful to all our teachers from primary School to University who participated in our success.

To our friends, colleagues, and to every single person who, in a way or another-backed us up.

Thank you All.

-Dedication-

To the dearest people to my heart;

To my parents, **My Father** and **Mother** for their incomparable
Sacrifices, deepest love, and boundless patience.

To my brothers and sister for their help and support

Special thanks to a special person "*khaled*" for his greatest
Encouragement

I LOVE YOU ALL
Mouna Oum Elkhier

-Dedication-

I would like to dedicate this work to all my beloved ones who have Shared me my hard times; to my parent that i have felt their love and support since my eyes saw the light of this life. As I offer my honest and deep gratitude to my husband for his encouragements.

MokraneImene.

Abstract:

The present paper discusses the American foreign policy after the Cold War, with a particular interest to the forty-third American president George W. Bush, his administration, policy, and political decisions during his two terms. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 that ended the Cold War, the world was considered as a unipolar world, with the United States as the only remaining superpower with no one to compete, till the terrible event of the 9/11 which is a historical reference in changing the direction of the American foreign policy, because the history of US foreign affairs is one of the most debatable topics in the field of international relations and chiefly the George Bush presidency. So this work is about the analysis of the president foreign affairs that earned his name as “the Bush Doctrine “. This doctrine which is a new instrument of the American political history after the Truman Doctrine of deterrence and containment, the Bush Doctrine as preemption and prevention has resulted two major wars the invasion of Afghanistan and the War on Iraq, for this purpose the study searches whether this new policy is considered as a legitimate or illegitimate. This dissertation objectively uses the technique of qualitative research through using the descriptive analytical method , to explain the historical events after the demise of the Soviet Union and the emergence of America as a hegemonic power, through describing the different events that shaped the period then analysing each one .

ص ٤ م

تقوم هذه المذكرة بمناقشة السياسة الخارجية لأمريكا بعد الحرب الباردة، و تركز على الرئيس الأمريكي الثالث و الأربعين " جورج والكر بوش "، إدارته، سياسته و كذا قراراته الإدارية طيلة فترة حكمه بعد انهيار الاتحاد السوفيتي عام 1991 مما أدى بدوره إلى نهاية الحرب الباردة ، فقد شهد العالم قوة أحادية تتمثل في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية بدون منازع إلى غاية الأحداث المأساوية للحادي عشر من سبتمبر ، و التي تعتبر مصدرا تاريخيا في تغير اتجاه سياسة أمريكا الخارجية . ولان تاريخ علاقات أمريكا الدولية من أكثر المواضيع جدلا و خاصة خلال عهدة الرئيس جورج بوش ، فإن هذه الدراسة تقوم بتحليل سياسة الرئيس الخارجية و التي حملت اسمه " مبدأ بوش " . المبدأ الذي يعد منعرجا بعد " مبدأ ترومان "، الذي يقوم على سياسة الاحتواء و الردع إلى الاستباقية و الوقائية لبوش ، والتي انعكست في خوض حربين مهمين، حرب أفغانستان و حرب العراق ، و عليه تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة مدى شرعية هذا المبدأ في العلاقات الدولية.

Table of Content:

Declaration.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Abstract.....	v
General Introduction.....	01
Chapter One: Historical and Ideological Background.....	07
1- Cold War Order.....	07
2- The Collapse of the Soviet Union.....	14
3- The United States as a Hegemony Power.....	17
4- The theoretical approaches that drive the American Foreign Policy ...	5
4-1 Realism.....	26
4-2 Liberalism.....	28
4-3 Idealism.....	29
Chapter TWO : Bush Doctrine and Strategic Adjustment in the	
Post-Cold War World.....	32
1- George W.Bush Policy , Personality , and beliefs	32
2- Terrorism and Bush doctrine.....	37
3- The 9/11 as the new Pearl Harbor.....	40
4- The Effect of the 9/11 attacks on the Bush Administration's policy...	42
5- The pillars of the Bush grand strategy.....	58
5-1 Democracy and Liberalism.....	58
5-2 Threat and preventive war	61
5-3 Unilateralism.....	63
5-4 American Hegemony.....	65
6- The International response to the bush doctrine	66
General Conclusion.....	70
Bibliography	73
Appendix.....	83

General Introduction:

The end of the Cold War seemingly portended the end of an era and the beginning of another in the history of the world. The fact that the Cold War ended in a peaceful way meant for the American policy makers that America actually won the Cold War, and it deserves the booty of war world leadership. This created a shift in the international power balance and led to a domestic debate that annoyed after 9/11, a national trauma that pushed the Bush Administration to adopt a grand strategy as a reaction to an attack on American soil; this strategy encompassed in the Bush Doctrine, a one of the most criticized foreign policies among political scholars and the American public. This new doctrine appreciably influenced the Middle East, specifically the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Actually, in the aftermath of the Cold War, the United States became the world's sole superpower, a hyper power with global reach and global influence; one that seemingly can, for better or worse, determine the fortune of the globe. The end of the Soviet threat meant that American policy makers had to devise a new foreign policy strategy, where the dimension of security and militarization to be revised to adapt to the new world order exigencies.

An important event in the history of the United States of America that surprised the world, the 9/11 Attacks, the ruthless, tragic, and terrible event. These attacks might have an effect on the American foreign policy; the attacks might be a historical reference in changing some strategies and affairs towards the world. So, after the attacks the direction of the American foreign focus has changed from the USSR to the Islamic countries under the Slogan of "Global War on Terror". So, America cannot live without an external enemy.

America under the Bush administration remains the vital superpower, but the global terrorism no longer could create a doubt in its power which was considered as a strong

challenge towards American policy makers. The American administration under the president George W. Bush had to react against this new, terrible and dangerous enemy. The president's main focus became on finding a way for punishing those terrorists in order to prove that the US intelligence policy had not failed for protecting the American citizens. The president George W. Bush had to change the American foreign policy, the American Strategy, and the American making decision, all that was reflected to the world as a new policy known as 'the war on terror'.

So, International terrorism has long been recognized as foreign and domestic security threat. The tragic events of September 11th have dramatically re-energized the nation's focus and resolve on terrorism. The world examines international terrorist actions and threats, and looks to the US policy response. Terrorism for the American Administration became the first enemy that should be fought, and the terrorist incidents in United States have brought the issue of terrorism to the fore front of American public interest.

The terrorism threat to America takes many forms. It has many places and regions to hide, and is often invisible which might make it more difficult to fight. The war on terrorism cannot be pinpointed in time and place since both are of the terrorist's choosing. America faced a new enemy with a new war strategy; this had profound effects on US foreign policy, the Bush administration had to pursue the criminals through following the system of law enforcement, a less emotional system based on intelligence cooperation. Bringing about series of changes in American policy, system and focus could earn the president's name as "the Bush Doctrine"; the doctrine that left many responses and debates among historians and policy makers over times.

The Bush Doctrine can be best understood as the Bush Administration's grand strategy, in which many studies discuss grand strategy and specifically analyse the Bush doctrine and explore the factors that influence US grand strategy. However, regarding American Grand

Strategy in the aftermath of the Cold War, Ole RHolsti in his book *'making American foreign policy'* analyzes the Bush Doctrine and argues that US foreign policy was notably consistent throughout the 1990s. Although, the US shifted its focus from containing communism to other foreign priorities in the region, the US continued to view the Middle East as a critical region for American interests.

Whereas, Thomas Donnelly in his book: *the Underpinnings of the Bush Doctrine ;national Security Outlook*, explains the principles of the Bush doctrine and the policy of preemption that was essentially the response of the Bush doctrine. Another book deals with this doctrine, it is *'Understanding the Bush Doctrine'* by Robert Jervis who tackled the main elements of Bush Doctrine “ Democracy and Liberalism, Preventive and Threat, Unilateralism, American Hegemony” .

Gerry Warren in his article: *'The Bush Doctrine'* examines the preventive and preemptive warfare arguments and its response to this new Security Strategy doctrine. He believes that the Bush Doctrine is an important and necessary policy for our times, but it depends on the understanding of the public, he means that such terrorist group creates a threat that demands an unprecedented response rather than waiting until the other side starts its attacks, because it is considered as a risk; according to the president George W Bush waiting for threat , it means waiting long too ..Anup Shah also, in his article *'The Bush Doctrine of Preemption war Strikes ;A global Pax America'*, claims that Bushrebuilt America's Defenses in shaping the security for US in which he provided a secure basis for US power projection around the world ,and also to insure the long-term superiority of US conventional forces.

this dissertation attempts to touch another side of the Bush Doctrine , through giving more and better understanding about the new strategy of the American president, thisresearch will examine the main important elements of the doctrine , and identifying the

Bush Administration and its usage of power to serve international Security and treating the “Preemption” as a new strategy in the Bush Doctrine against terrorism , for this, the study will discuss whether it is legitimate or not, and what are the justifications claimed by the president Bush to act in this way. So the main focus of this study is based on giving a balanced critical analysis of the Bush Doctrine and its profound effects on global politics and international security, this research looks for the global consequences and responses to the American policy under George Bush, through providing a detailed examination of the post-September 11 events by analyzing the key features of the Bush Doctrine.

International terrorism is a crime against humanity, more than violating national independence of countries, it also violates the right of individuals to security. However, the use of force or intervention must be justified. Starting from this point, the main problem of this work that needs to be solved is whether the Bush doctrine of pre-emption as a mean of security against terrorism is considered as a legitimate reaction or not?

Also, this study tries to solve the following questions:

- Was the Doctrine a departure from the past American foreign policy or it emerged as a reaction to the 9/11 attacks?
- Should the Bush doctrine be theoretically classified as a realist, liberalist, or neo-conservative grand strategy?
- How did the Bush administration justify the use of power to serve the International Security?
- How the International response was toward the doctrine?

A descriptive analytical method is adopted in this dissertation to explain well the historical events that shaped the new world order after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990 and made the United States a unilateral power through describing the different events that shaped the period and, then tries to analyse each one alone in a detailed way to form a clear idea about all the period. Since the work deals with an issue of American civilization, the historical method will be followed in this research. Any historical research is based on describing the past events and the different circumstances that shaped the period. In addition, this work is an analysis of the American administration under the president George W. Bush; it tries to explain the other side of the Bush doctrine and the American policy in the war on terror, and whether this war was a legitimate one.

This dissertation objectively uses the technique of qualitative approach, since it treats a historical event, through collecting data to reconstruct the political history of the period under study in order to help solving the main problem of this study ‘the Bush doctrine and its legitimacy’, and answering the questions to have by the end of the work a full and clear idea about the topic.

The study is divided into two chapters; the first chapter takes an overview about the historical and ideological background, following the chronological order starting from the cold war order and the main events that shaped the period to the main reasons that led to the collapse of the Soviet union and remarks the beginning of a new era. The post-cold war world was sometimes considered as a unipolar world with the United States As a hegemony power; with this change in the world it is important to have a look on the theoretical approaches that drive the American Foreign policy with a particular focus on Realism, Idealism, and Liberalism.

The second chapter directly treats the case study of the research, it is so logical to start the work by giving a clear idea about the president’s personality and beliefs which are reflected later on ,in his political making , before discussing the element of the terrorist events of the 9/11 , it is important to help the reader understands first the meaning of terrorism and the Bush doctrine, then the relationship between each other, also, this chapter tries to know to what extent has the 9/11 affected the American foreign policy during the presidency of George Bush, after that the study analyses the main pillars of the doctrine , in order to finish by the world’s view and the international response to the policy.

The research strategy and methodology is based on data collected, obtained and acquired mainly from primary sources as addresses and speeches and other sources like books, reports, articles from journals and magazines, and web sites. All the data collected is analyzed in a detailed way by using a descriptive analytical approach.

Chapter One: Historical and Ideological Background

1-Cold war Order:

The aftermath of World War Two was marked by the beginning of a new era in which the world witnessed the defeat of the old great powers. It was a time that saw many political changes with the rise of two superpowers that divided the world into two blocs; the Capitalist democracy dominated by the United States and the socialist communist adopted by the Soviet Union, the United States and the Soviet Union became competitors on the world stage and engaged in what became known as the Cold War.

This ideological struggle started due to multiple reasons which caused the outbreak of the Cold War. the Soviet Union had increased its military strength which was a threat to the western countries, so America began to manufacture the Atomic bomb , Hydrogen bomb and other deadly weapons .Moreover, the Nuclear program of America was responsible for another cause to the cold war .After the bombardment of America on Hiroshima and Nagasaki ,the Soviet Union were anxious from the America's power .(Maynes 5)

The Western power had the Bomb and they showed the world that they weren't hesitant to use it, although they had defeated Germany as an ally. The relations between the Soviet and the West were already strained. The Soviet worried that the US would exploit the nuclear weapons to push their interest on the rest of the world, especially when the President Truman decided to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in order to force Japan to surrender (Holloway 03).

From 4 to 11 February 1945, The three great leaders, Winston Churchill, Joseph Stalin, Franklin Roosevelt met in Yalta, to raise the issue of German defeat, Roosevelt was anxious to secure the cooperation of Stalin, while Churchill wanted to avoid the Red Army from its influence over central Europe .At the same time, the Soviet troops had already

reached the centre of Europe .The three Great powers at first agreed on the arrangement for the occupation of Germany. Yalta Conference seemed to be the final attempt to reorganize the world on basis of cooperation and agreement. The world was not yet divided into two hemisphere of influence, but the Western power were obliged to accept Stalin's role. The three powers met again in Potsdam from 17 July to second August,the climate had changed significantly, Germany had surrendered on 8 May 1945 and the war on Europe comes to an end. At that time Harry Truman had replaced Roosevelt. (Lukacs 61)

The Three Great Powers continued their discussion that was began in Yalta on how to handle Germany, so they decide to divide it into four occupied zones, in which France, Britain and United States occupied the western parts. But after this discussion, the main issue is who would control the whole Europe. Truman and Churchill worried because of Stalin's desire to expand his power and communism into Western Europe in order to overcome Capitalism, his priority was to secure the Soviet Union and to gain control over Europe (Clowes 10).

After the Potsdam conference period, the Soviet Western saw different problems concerning its relations. At the Council of Foreign Minister (CFM) meeting in London, there was a Western resistance to Soviet expansion of Communist into Western Europe, in which Communist parties were very dominant over countries such as: Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Poland, France, Belgium, and Italy.(Leffler and Painter 168).

By 1946, it was the creation of Iron Curtain, which was used by the Prime Minister of Britain Churchill to describe the line of demarcation between Western Europe and the Soviet zone of influence. He declared his' Iron Curtain Speech 'by 1946, which increased the tensions between Soviet and US, this speech made Stalin worried because he considered it as a declaration for a war (Egan 04).The next US political policy was the Truman Doctrine. By 1947 Truman presented his policy of Containment which aimed to

provide financial and military aid to the countries threatened by Soviet Communist. This Doctrine aimed at stopping the spread of Communism (Leffler and Painter 170).

On March 12 1947, Truman asked the Congress to appropriate 400 million Dollar for immediate assistance to Greece and Turkey, he declared that it would be the policy of his administration to give such aid to any nation that was threatened by Soviet aggression and Communism, after the discussion of the congress on this issue, the congress to give assistance to Greece and Turkey. Truman Doctrine toward this policy was to gain more allies and friends in order to weaken the spread of communist expansion as a policy, but nothing to do with legitimate Communist that was in Western Europe, mainly in France and Italy (Woods 14).

Despite the Second World War and the beginning of the Cold War, the United States' economy still developed. The Congress was a combination between Republicans and Conservative Southern Democrats known as the Conservative coalition. All members of the coalition believed on the foreign commerce that enriched the US at the expense of its trading partners. Truman Administration want to convince the congress that US interests needed a European Recovery Program, therefore, George Marshall interested on the economic difficulties in Europe. In the aftermath of the Second World War, internal trade was obstructed by a lack of foreign exchange and the absence of international economic authority, the US, whose interests lay in promoting such trade in order to increase its own exports, decided to help the European economy through a Recovery Program, the US wanted to protect its prosperity. The Fear of communist expansion in Western Europe was a main factor to what is known by European Recovery Program or Marshall Plan (20).

By 1948, the three Allied powers ; the United States, France, and Great Britain created a unified zones. As a response, Stalin established the Berlin Blockade in all roads and

railways into West Berlin in order to prevent the United State from delivering supplies (Egan 06).

On 4 April 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed as a way to promote peace in the world, and prevent new wars, in which its members states agreed to mutual defense in response to attacks by any external party. Its main goal was to keep” the Russian out, the American in and the Germans down” said by NATO’s first Secretary General. The alliance began with 12 members: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Netherland, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States, this organization improved and developed the military plans. In response to that, the Soviet Union created the Warsaw Pact, NATO’s continued its military expansion and nuclear forces through the Cold War in order to protect its members from the threat of Soviet Communist (Kurakaa 06).

The growing development of tensions between Soviet Union and United States was exemplified by the two wars of the Cold War, the Korean War and Vietnam War. Firstly, the Korean War, which was a military conflict between the Republic of Korea, supported by the United Nation, with the United States against North Korea, and Democratic people who were supported by China and the Soviet Union, which gave aid and assistance to North Korea. (Schemidt240). As a result of tensions between Soviet Union and United States on Cold War, Korea was divided into two parts. By 1950, North Korean forces invaded South Korea, and it was the first significant armed conflict of Cold War (241).

The situation of Korea was similar to Germany; Communist came to occupy political position in North of Korea. Before the invasion, Korea was not included in the Strategic planned by United States, military Strategist were more concerned with the security of European against Soviet Communist, but by 1950, when US Secretary informed Harry Truman, that North Koreans had invaded the South, he declared that Korea was the place

to draw the line against Communist expansion, so the president and the Secretary of State obtained the consent of Congress to give financial aid to pay for military expense (243)

The period between 1953 to 1962 in which Nikita Khrushchev became the leader witnessed many crisis such as; Berlin Crisis of 1961. During the 1950s, the city of Berlin was still divided into a Western zone, consisting of the American, British, and French sectors, and a Soviet zone. In 1953, Production levels in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) were poor. Later on, strikes broke out in East Berlin and spread rapidly throughout East Germany. These uprisings were put down by Soviet troops, leaving many dead and injured. The defeat of 1953 resulted in several hundred thousand East Germans fleeing to the West, in order to stop them from crossing the West, because it weakened the country's economy, the (GDR) prevented people from crossing to the West. by 1961 East German workers built a Wall between east and West to prevent the encounter between the member of the region(Carmichael 04).

Moreover, the Cuban Missile Crisis was a confrontation among the Soviet Union, Cuba and the United States in October 1961; after some unsuccessful operation by US to overthrow the Cuban regime (Bay of pigs), the Cuban and Soviet government began to build basis in Cuba for a number of medium-range and intermediate-range ballistic nuclear missile (MRBMs and IRBMs) with the ability to strike most of continental US. This action followed the 1958 deployment of IRBMs in UK and Jupiter IRBMs in Italy and Turkey in 1961. The US built Missile having the capability to strike Moscow with nuclear weapons. On 1962, US Air force plan mission captured proofs of Soviet Missile basis under construction in Cuba(McAuliffe 22).

The confrontation ended on October 28 1962, when President John F Kennedy and United Nation Secretary reached a public agreement with Khrushchev, the Soviet would break up their offensive weapons in Cuba, in exchange for a US public declaration to never invade

Cuba, the US agreed that it would dismantle all US built weapons deployed in Europe and Turkey (Lebow473) .

The United States drew conclusions from the Cuban Crisis, it had shown how dangerous the Cold War was. By 1963, a direct line, which called the “Red Telephone” was established between Washington and Moscow, the two powers opened the discussion in order to limit the arm race, and to reduce the usage of nuclear weapons by both US and Soviet Union. By 1970, there was relaxation tension between the two superpowers, the pressure made both power accept these international changes, in which, they attempt to regulate and stabilize their relations for mutual benefits, this policy called «détente», to increase trade also, because the US economy was crippled by the huge cost of the Vietnam war, the USSR had low living standard and poor industrial level (Westad 04).

The period of détente was not without any conflicts, the most notable of these was the Vietnam war , which was between 1960s and 1970s, it was a part of the end of the cold war, and American struggle against the spread of Communism, the US justify its military intervention in Vietnam by stating that if one country fell under the influence of Communism, the surrounding countries would intervene (Kemble 70).

However, the invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet Army on December 1979 provoked more reaction from the Western World. The USSR was seeking to support the ruling Communist. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was one of the most significant causes of the collapse of détente. Brezhnev, the leader of Soviet Union was worried about the growing power of Islamic, led by the Mujahedeen, because they want to establish a Muslim state, the Soviet Union itself contained 30 million Muslims in its area, and Brezhnev worried that Muslims in Soviet Union will support Mujahedeen and make threat to Soviet power (Gibbs 233) .

As a response, the US President Carter issued the Carter Doctrine. This policy based on the use of military force if necessary to defend its national interests in the Persian Gulf region. The USA wanted to protect the routes, which supplied oil from the Middle East to the USA and Western Europe. Carter saw the Soviet invasion to Afghanistan a step to Soviet control of most of Middle East, so USA promised to support the Mujahedeen; in which the state of Union stated that: “An attempt by an 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” (237).

After the Watergate Scandal which led to the resignation of the US President Richard Nixon, the defeat in Vietnam war, and loss of international impact, after all this failure, the US voted for another President called Ronald Regan who pushed for arms race, his period of presidency was marked by the rise of military forces, the policy of détente was neglected, in which there were many new interventions by the US and USSR, this new tensions between the East and West power fuelled the arms race. The president Regan’s strategy was based on the star wars or the strategic defense initiative (SDI), this program will protect the US from enemy nuclear weapons, US intended to develop an anti-ballistic missile system in order to prevent attacks from the Soviet Union. The US program drew Soviet union into arms race which make it saw a financial and economic collapse (Lazzari 03).

By 1987, the United States and the Soviet Union signed the International-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, in which this treaty ended the US- USSR nuclear arms race, and provided the destruction of all nuclear, and both sides agreed to eliminate missiles. This treaty marked the end of the arms race between the two powers(06).

The late 20th century was a time of major geopolitical upheaval in Eastern Europe. The Fall of Berlin Wall in November 1989 put an end to the Cold War and its divisions. The fall of Communist bloc brought the end of a bipolar world built around the rivalry between the US and USSR, the events of late 1980s marked the beginning of improved relations between the two parts of the continent which was divided.

2-The collapse of the Soviet Union:

The fall of the Soviet Union is an important event in the history, it is often seen as the fall of one of the most dominant doctrines of its time that is socialism or Communism, The Soviet Union was dissolved on December, 26, 1991 .In the 1980s, the Soviet Union appeared stronger than ever, they showed signs of recovery from their invasion of Afghanistan. Decades of poor decisions and corruption created an unsustainable system that lead to the collapse of the nation.

There are different factors that played a role in the fall of the Soviet Union. The Soviet leader Gorbachev believed that a better Soviet economy depended on better relationships with the rest of the world, especially with the United States. Ronald Regan entered the White House in 1981 as an opponent of Soviet Union, calling them the “evil empire”. Regan’s leadership led to an increase in American military spending, as well as research for new and better weapons, Regan did not just attack the soviet with military spending, he also attacked their economy(Pfiffner 03).

The fall of the Soviet Union can be also linked to the structure of the nation itself. In 1989, Nationalist movements in Eastern Europe brought regime change in Poland, and later on in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the other Soviet Satellites in Eastern Europe, these republics exerted their independence and break up from the Soviet Union, and by 1991, the Soviet Union was no more existed (Beissenger332).

The political events and economic changes in Eastern Europe at the end of 1980s changed the geopolitical situation in Europe, Communist governments already weakened, and quickly collapsed. Mikhail Gorbachev, the last leader of the Soviet Union came to power in 1985, with a vision of reforms his plan for the future was considered with two ideas; Perestroika, and Glasnost. Under Gorbachev's plan for Perestroika, the Soviet Union would start to move toward a Communist- Capitalist system. It was the best way to revive the Soviet economy, Gorbachev believed that private initiative would lead to innovation, so individuals and cooperative were allowed to have businesses for the first time, and they were given the right to strike in order to get better wages, Gorbachev also supported foreign investment, for that reason, people grew more and more frustrated with this policy. Gorbachev envisioned a democratically elected Communist party for the Soviet Union. The second set of reforms was known as Glasnost; which gave new freedom to Soviet citizens, newspapers could print criticism of the government, and gave the opportunity to other parties than the Communist Party to participate in elections. But Gorbachev's reforms did more to fasten the fall of the Soviet Union than they did to save it. By losing control over people which made the Soviet government very weak, and by 1991 ended the Soviet rule (Martin 04).

In July 1991, before the fall of the Soviet Union, after Gorbachev's exit from the Cold war, Ronald Reagan states the following:

"We knew, however, that the Soviet was spending such a large percentage of their national wealth on armaments that they were bankrupting their economy. We also knew that, if we showed the political resolve to develop SDI, the Soviet would have to face the awful truth: they did not have resources to continue building a huge offensive arsenal and a defensive one simultaneously. At the same time, in 1983, the West German government decided to proceed with deployment of cruise

missiles, checkmating Soviet forces NATO in Europe.....Gorbachev concluded that the only practical thing was to embark on basic reforms at home, and without delay. Today, we see a Soviet Union undergoing fundamental change, politically and economically” (qtd.in Lizzar09).

The Warsaw Pact start to dissolve with the spread of the Revolutions of 1989 over the Eastern Bloc, starting with the Solidarity movement in Poland, the Soviet Union started to break up into independent republics, the economic reforms in Poland led to strikes, the Solidarity movement called for Trade Union, by the beginning of 1980s, Poland become the first independent labor union in Soviet Bloc, in which this movement gave rise to non-Communist social head of government in Eastern Europe, it contribute to the fall of Communism. Solidarity movement led to the spread of anti- Communist ideas over Eastern Europe (Kozlowski 05).

The fall of Berlin was considered as the end of a divided Germany, the border control still existed, but with less strict, like before, these make people cross to West, by July 1.1990, Germany was returned into one single country, the building of the Berlin Wall was a symbol for the division of Germany and the whole Europe, whereas, the fall of the wall symbolized the fall of Communism and this is due to the economic and United State’s power(Guofinnson 02).

After twenty three days from the fall of Berlin Wall on December 3,1989, the United States President George H.W. Bush and the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev declared that the Cold war was over at Malta Summit, the two men discussed the changes that emerged in Europe after the collapse of Berlin Wall and the end of Iron Curtain, in which, Mikhail Gorbachev promised the United States President that, he would never start a hot war with America, whereas, President George H.W. Bush confirmed that the Malta Summit would be the starting a lasting peace, it was considered the most important

meeting between United States and Soviet Union since the Yalta Conference in 1945. The Malta Summit was followed by the fall of the Soviet Union on 25 December 1991, when Gorbachev resigned from his position and passed the leadership of the Soviet Army to Russian President Boris Yeltsin (Benton 58)

3 - America as a hegemony power:

American purpose from beginning , to be number one and the most powerful country in the world.

‘’ The twentieth century is the American century; the twenty-first
Century will be another American century; America, winner of
The cold war; America, number one! ‘’ (Hanson 03)

The Cold War ended without any direct military conflict between the two superpowers. The Soviet Union had lost the Cold War in one side, in the other side, everything seemed that America had won it. In fact, America appeared from the conflict as the sole global empire. In the first time an empire without limits to its sphere of influence, no other power might have such a military and technological influence in the new era. The cold war is over, the Soviet Union failed, and the United States emerged as a number one, being the winner for Americans meant being the stronger, the powerful power with no one to compete. (Hanson 03).

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 that led to the end of the Cold War, the post-Cold War world was considered as the unipolar world, with the United States as the world's sole remaining power. Powerful countries always had the ability and the desire to control and influence the international system of which they are a member in. What is remarkable about the post-Cold War era is that one country –the United States of America – is far more influential than any other .(Beeson 02) The United States has a unique procurement to shape the rules and regulations of the international system. Consequently,

in this era of a unipolar power America earned the name of the hegemonic power with one pillar, it is the age of hegemony.

According to Agnew the word “hegemony” is a Greek word, “hegemonia” giving the meaning of domination or leadership, of one specific power over many countries, however this domination practices is not obligatory to be dealt with territorial control, this word is more larger to the use of geography. The word hegemony can be explained in the countries’ most superpower in term of military, economy, ideologically as well as culture. (20). Exactly as Cox claimed:

“To become hegemonic, a states would have to found and protect a world Order which was universal in conception. . . World Hegemony is described

As a social structure, an economic structure, and a political structure; and it simply cannot be one of these things but must be all three”. (qtd.in Beeson 04).

The concept of hegemony refers to the better understanding of the present international relations and power relations in the world, according to Antonio Gramsci in his explanation to the concept, it indicates the domination of the most powerful country in the international system over the world, for him hegemony is a concept that is combined the use of power with social and political supervision (Yilmaz 193).

The beginning of the American hegemony started in the aftermath of the Second World War, when the United States emerged as the most powerful power politically, economically as the same with culture, in fighting the Soviet Union.

The concept of hegemony and its implications still exist today, since those reflections give a clear idea about the understanding of how the world is ruling today. The history of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century for American hegemony

has a common dominators in the side of military, economic and ideological conflict, in which America being mostly the protagonist actor and the winner, through pushing its primacy over the rest of the world . in the U.S' global supremacy , the technological and scientific advances become one of the keys in the American power , in addition to the ideological and military battle against terrorism in the aftermath of the September 11th ,were once again the U.S global hegemonic role in the contemporary era. (Hanson 43).

In the beginning of this century, being the global or the regional power through controlling the global money and completing the international agenda and being the center of the international affairs had became something necessary. Yilmaz Claimed that the first quarter of the twenty-first century is fundamentally signed by aspect of the unipolar security environment as well as the new concept of globalization that appeared due to the technological developments.(192). Yilmaz added that some scholars have explained the world globalization as the world's expansion economic, social and cultural norms, from this point the president Clinton saw the necessity for America to lead this process through being the world wide superpower, the hegemonic power, he states:" Clinton envisaged 'globalization' as the propulsive element maintaining peace and security in the world through increased political relations and economical ties" (Yilmaz 193). The most important thing in the globalization lies in its power to control nations and people communities, new kind of power which directly destroys the third world or the developing countries.

The demise of the USSR gave America to control the world and being the sole remaining power, and no longer needed to worry about the Soviet's reactions towards its foreign policies, in which the American invasion in Iraq and Afghanistan are a good example of that. America as a unipolar power without the Soviet Union gave America much more freedom to act in the world. Americans have seen the fall of USSR as victory, and as being

the victorious after long battles, the victory of the capitalism over the communism, and democracy over totalitarianism, America as a hegemony power ideologically, military, and economically,

however America in the beginning of the post –cold war suffered from some internal problems as the employment and the division between the poor and the rich. (The Impact of the Soviet Union)

Moreover, the historian Paul Kennedy examined the new world order in the social and the economic problems of the United States including the decline of the American economic products, he argued that the American focus on the military aspect was the primary reason for the previous problems, which had a negative influence in its economy in comparison to newly developed countries as Japan and Germany. The historian Kennedy added to say that the fact that the Soviet Union had declined the world moved from a bipolar to a unipolar with the United States as the superpower, however the illness of its economy might be as an obstacle to achieve its supremacy. (665-92).

In the same point Tucker and David believed that the military performance was given a high attentions during the Cold War and even the aftermath of cold war as the example of the Gulf War, and the use of the military power had reflected the assumption that the use of power will remain in the new world order exactly as it was used before in the old world.

(14) the United States today is the most dominant military power in the world , American force is being compared to some previous empires in the history as , the Roman empire which had controlled the world beyond the Mediterranean, as well as the PaxBritanica, in which the British Navy ruled the seas, the United States in the New world order emerged as the hegemonic power with the most technological advanced arms, that are used by professionals skilled who know how the art of war must be taken.

Following these circumstances, the new world order remarks the shift in the world's ideologies; the shift from East-West conflict to the North-South conflict. The two historians Tucker and David believed that in the Post-Cold War, the developing world has to be replaced the cold war in significance, it is now the most important world in the eyes of the west to take it in consideration, it became the more serious to the developed states. For Tucker and David, the relationship between the developed states and the developing world in the aftermath of the Cold War is not only because of the need of the industrialized states to the natural resource which characterized the South world, but the more than that is their power, the power of the weak to transmit the sufferance of misery into a war power. So, the poor world was seen as a dangerous enemy for the superpowers. (37). America in all these circumstances, and after its victory over the Soviet Union wanted to show its force towards the new regions "the developing world", and to move its ambition to build an American empire, as a hegemony power.

In the same path, many historians disagreed about the two terms of "empire" and "hegemony", in which there are who see the same meaning of the two terms, while others not. Mark Beeson suggests that the word "empire" or the empyreal relationship has a specific meaning, it refers more to the territorial meaning; the desire of one power to rule other country (03). Also, Adam Watson refers in his explanation to the word empire to the ancient civilizations and its empires, in which it is the idea of having a direct system of different communities from one empyreal centre (17),

in the other side, the word "hegemony" in the eyes of the realist tradition is used to describe the state's power in dominating other states, and this can be measured of the material resources and the power of military, from this point the word hegemony is the synonym of domination. The domination without neglecting any factor, in which, addition to Cox's thoughts of political, economic and social elements, the Bush's administration's

of pre-emptive policy agenda in the aftermath of September 11, hegemony also has another important element; the military one, in which America has to show the world its military power through the war on terror. (Beeson 3.4).

John Agnew states:

“If this were an ‘empire’, then it would be the only decentred one in history, Which seems to suggest that it is something else. Second, this world has not been brought about predominantly through direct coercion or by territorial Rule, but rather through socio-economic incorporation into practices... The best word to describe these processes is ‘hegemony’”. (13)

So, for Agnew the United States of America and through his analysis of the American principles the world empire does not reflect America. However, the two words give an image of the American domination over the rest of the world. To prove that the previous words have different meanings, Agnew said that it is possible to have empire without hegemony, as the example of Spain and Portugal who had both territorial possession but without much control over world politics after 1600. In the same way having a hegemony without empire might be also possible such as the influence of the United States during the Cold War over the world politics as a world power but with a little or nothing in the side of territory.

Furthermore, the word ‘hegemony’ is also the economic, cultural and social superior power of one state or social group. So, American hegemony might be a form of social domination, which becomes as a transnational in going beyond the state’s sponsorship or power; however, the ‘empire’ still one form; the geographical form that hegemony might take. So, Empire has a Roman root in which group of territories are united under one ruler with an absolute power. This empire could be in two different aspects, either in the

territory aspect as the Russian and the Roman empires or it can be overseas empire as the French and the British empires through depending on the naval power (Agnew 21)

For many historians ,the image of empire appeared clearly after the American invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, when it moved from ideological and political power to the invasion of territories, however this might not be true for others , as the president George .W.Bush , when once declared ‘’ America has never been an empire’’ (qtd.in Auyang ,01). So, instead of the word empire, it would be better for them to be replaced by the word hegemony with its positive meaning, for presenting America as a unipolar power, as the world superpower, that dominates the world from different forms not as an empire which might be decline one day, as the history shows with the previous empires that declined even after along time of ruling.

Despite the meaning of the concept hegemony, as the discipline of ruling the international relation, it seems to get deeper for studying this word. Hegemonic power as a concept of domination one power over the rest of the world, it has been studied by many scholars and different approaches. According to Andreas Antoniadis there are four approaches to hegemony: the Conventional approaches, the Neoliberal approaches, the Gramscian approaches and, the Radical approaches. Starting with the Conventional approaches, in the international relation (IR), hegemony is used to signify the conditions of unbalanced powers , in which one states as the superpower practicing leadership over the other , it dominates the structure of the international system as well as the behavior of its constitutive. Hegemonic power has conventionally been used in the state’s superiority including geography, natural resources, industry, moral and unity, diplomacy and technology, and the control over markets and capital.

The second and the third approaches came as a reaction to the Conventional, in which both of the Neoliberals and Gramscians criticized them, starting with the Neoliberals, who

criticized the over dominance of hegemony in the different aspects. So, the idea of an open economy requires the existence of hegemonic power is being challenged by this approach, since it may destroy the economic development in the world, however economy as an important field needs a multipolar powers rather than a unipolar one.

In the other side, the Gramscian approach was the second challenge to the conventional approach, according to Antonio Gramsci, there are two types of political control: domination that is based on coercion as a negative term, and hegemony that is based on consent as a positive term. Gramsci suggests that the world hegemony refers to the transition of the leading group's interests and values into 'common sense' to the members of that society. The Gramscian approach places hegemony as a social, economic dominance depending on the natural resources and industrial materials, so, it indicates the meaning of consent rather than the coercion, while according to Robert Cox it might be combined the two meanings.

Finally, the Radical approach treats the world hegemony as a set of activities including the social, economic, cultural superpower of one power over the different powers, it is also a set of practices that is used independently. This approach locates hegemony on the social aspect in a direct way, and the influence, domination or the control are based directly on the individual rather than the social group. From these theories, the world hegemony has been studied differently to bring different meanings for scholars to get a clear idea, and going beyond its meanings. (Antoniades 03-04). Generally, all scholars might agree that America in the aftermath of the Cold War was the unipolar power, the most successful nation, and the world's superpower; the country that has enough military, political, and economic strength to convince nations across the world to take even actions they would not, it is the power of hegemony.

4-The theoretical approaches that drive the American Foreign Policy:

International Relations need some theories to depend on, however in America the most used theories are: Realism, liberalism, and Idealism.

Walter Lippmann states:

“ We can best separate appearance from the reality, the transient
From the permanent, the significant from the episodic, by looking
Backward whenever we look forward. There is no great mystery why
This should be. . . . The successive generations of men tend to face
The same recurrent problems and to react to them in more or less
Habitual ways” (qtd.in H. Hunt 01)

All powers in the world, all countries that rule men, each state and leaders who have the power to control, there is a need for a theory to follow, a theory of the international relations and to be guided for making decisions, those decisions are set of beliefs and principles that are adopted by the policy makers; the leader may use power, arms in his policy, or may believe in democracy and freedom, (Machiavelli 01). This can be done on depending on one of the theories of the international affairs. Principles and ideas help policy makers, universities and professional association to be more organized and to distinguish the diversity of scholars. (Holsti 313).

For over two hundred years, American Foreign policy has been controlled by different theories of international relations, in which each theory could influence for a time through pushing the leader to adopt its principles, realism, liberalism and idealism are such three theories. So, American foreign policy has always been a blend of these previous theories.

According to Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater, the beginning of the international relations was as a theoretical discipline. Two important works: *The Twenty Years' Crisis*

by E.H Carr and *Politics Among Nations* by Hans Morgenthau which studied theories and developed a framework analysis to examine the international politics and putting the state's making decisions under study and this according to the different events that the state may witness. Both thinkers were being motivated in their works to add something to policy making and to improve the weaknesses that the international relations has known in the past. At the same time, they wanted to correct some mistaken ideas in order to create a discipline system; both of them see that the idea that pursuit of self interest must be replaced by the shared benefits for all people. So, to move from individualism to serve the need of the whole community, their main claim was to reform the international system.

(01)

In addition, a theory of international relation can be defined as a set of ideas that explains how the international system is working; each theory has specific principles backed up with concrete evidence. American foreign policy has known two major theories: realism and idealism. Most of the international theories believe in the idea that the state has to act according to its national interest, and its benefits which include such as self-preservation, economic prosperity, military security and influence over other states; however, each theory has its means , ways and, principles that are used to achieve those aims.

4-1Realism:

Realism has numerous meanings, appeared in different fields as art, literature, philosophy and politics. The term realism can be described as an approach that focuses on the use of force and the effects of power. The origin of realism can be traced back to the ancient world exactly to the Greek historian Thucydides, however the most important American figures that viewed international relations (IR) and could affect the American scholarship were: the historian E.H. Carr, geographer Nicholas Spykman, and political theorist Hans Morgenthau and others.

According to Jack Donnelly, realism is a theoretical approach to study and practice international relation. it focuses on the restraint on politics that is forced by human nature; realism is an opposing approach to idealism. (09).

Hogan and Thomas G Paterson discussed realism in four principles , for them realists believe that human by his nature is strong ,and has the desire to control and dominate , the objective laws that govern politics have their origins from human nature. Second, they assume in the importance of collectivism in the international politics that is shaped in the state which is represented by a powerful authority. Third, realists believe in the strong relationship between politics and power, they see it as a natural phenomenon relied on armies, military and navies. Fourth, the most important in international relations is interests. (51).

Jack Donnelly in his work *Realism and International Relation* discussed the main principles of realism by the prominent figures of realists. According to him, the greatest realist Morgenthau considers power and interest as variable in content, and universal moral principles and ethics must be ignored in world politics. While, the realist Mearsheimer sees that the international system as an anarchic one needs a set of strict rules, and laws to organize it, in one side in the other side , power and military relations are the key features in politics affaires. In addition, according to the two realists Frankel and Schweller, the state is the world center, it seeks to maximize its power and security; the only way for achieving that is the use of force. For them, the international interactions are conflicted by its nature and there is no relationship between politics and ethics. According to Thomas Hobbes, international relations remain a state of wars, and having government is something necessary otherwise the world would be more anarchical. (07-08).

In the same point, Machiavelli, in his book *the prince* , argued that man by his nature is evil and egoistic often can be removed by force, Machiavelli advises leaders for using

power , violence and strict laws against other states for organizing the anarchical system (14). Also, he sees that the prince should have nothing to use except his art, the art of wars, there must be a good laws and a good arms to be a good state. (12). Machiavelli maintains that the power is behind every success ,and to be a successful leader the prince should know how to use this power , for him even good must know how to enter evil (18).” Because in all the country there is no one who is recognized as superior to him” (Machiavelli 16)

4-2 Liberalism:

As realism, liberalism is an approach, in which its origins return to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as a new theory and it developed during 1970s. liberalism has many principles; the main one is to spread democracy, as the historian Rengger states: ‘In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries , of course, there were many who believed that liberalism –especially economic liberalism- would bring with it a decreasing salience of war.’ (115) .for him the term ‘liberalism ‘is often combined with the term ‘peace ‘saying ‘the liberal peace’ or the democratic peace. (116).

The liberalists as contrast to realists oppose the use of power as means in the international relations, so, as a challenge to realism; liberalism aims to spread democracy in the world and supports the states cooperation and good relationship, this can be done through economic, free markets and trade. Liberalists aim for creating a peaceful world. The president Woodrow Wilson argues that spreading democracy is the key for a world without problems and the state is the prominent player in the international affairs while the liberal ideas are the source of peaceful world. (Walt 32).

The historians John charvet and Elisa Kaczynsk-Nay believe that the basis of liberalism is the human rights, those natural rights must be equal and respected by all people since are rewarded from God, and ,the state’s role is to guarantee this rights to its people as a kind of

protection. So, the international politics should be based on this principle. (03-04). However, the idea of 'equal liberty' and 'equal rights' have been criticized by others since people are naturally different from one to another. (05).

Liberalism in politics uses the policy of 'the liberal democratic peace' a compound word of the liberal states with the system of democracy. The liberal democracies do not see war as the appropriate mean of power but there are other forms as: economic power, social power and technological power. (Rengger 103). Liberalists believe that the world is anarchical, severe and dangerous, but the results will be worst if there was use of power and military. International relations should be built through trust, good interactions and cooperation between all the states rather than power, arms, soldiers and military.

4-3 Idealism:

“Idealism is an optimistic doctrine which seeks to transcend

The international anarchy, and create a more cosmopolitan

And harmonious world order.’ (Wilson 01).

Idealism is a specific school in Liberalism, their principles are too closed. Idealism and realism are two main theories in American foreign policy; they are always fighting each other, since their principles are totally the opposite. Idealism principles emerged in America from the earlier times, during the declaration of independence with the founding fathers 'all people are equal', when they called for respecting the human rights, as well as the values of morals and ethics, liberty, rights and property, and then to be more effective with the bill of rights. So, in one sentence idealism is the contrary of realism.

The most famous figure in idealism is the president Woodrow Wilson, when he played a big role for ending the World War I through negotiating a treaty and applying the idealism's principles and spreading peace over the world. Wilson's Idealism helped him for creating the League of Nation; the first international organization in the world that

protects the weak. Scholars and from that time stated using the name of “Wilson” to describe a person or people who believes in the idea of spreading peace overseas as “the Wilsonians”. Woodrow Wilson applied this theory in the American foreign policy during his presidency, in the same time he disagreed with the realists, claiming that international policy should be built on moral goals. (Deconde 617).

The historian Wilson states that Idealists believed that education and democracy can do what weapons cannot, so instead of military and power there are other effective forms, such as science, technology and education that can make the world stronger. He adds ‘they view war as a disease of the international body politic’ (01). According to the idealists, policy makers should adopt the moral goals and ethics in the international arena and should avoid any kind of dishonesty, sew or trickery. Even though idealists have been criticized by the realists and mainly by the attack of E.H.Carr’s *The Twenty Years Crisis*. (Wilson 01).

Realism, liberalism and idealism all were theories that drive the American foreign policy; each theory has its own principles and is practiced in a different time. The one can observe the opposition and the fighting between each others. But all of them have contributing for building the American foreign policy. Realists disagreed with idealism in the moral goals and ethics that blinded the policy makers in a side, in the other side the idealists blame realists for all disasters that U.S foreign policy witnessed over times. Furthermore, realists blamed the Bush administration for following the liberal ideas in the invasion of Iraq.

To sum up , despite the fact that those approaches : realism, liberalism , and idealism disagreed in many pointes chiefly realism and idealism ,since liberalism and idealism are too closed theories, but all of them contribute for the constitution of American foreign policy. So, to understand the American foreign policy, the one must understand their

principles. However, those realism, liberalism and idealism are not the only theories that drive the American foreign policy, still others.

Chapter Two: Bush Doctrine and Strategic Adjustment in the Post-Cold War World

1-George.W. Bush, Policy, Personality and beliefs:

Generally, any President's personality and beliefs are reflected on his making and on his foreign policies .

“I am here to lead the executive branch of government. You

All are here because you have my fully confidence. And we are here with the same basic purpose, to serve the American people.

We have all taken an oath, and from this moment on it is our job

To honor it.”(Speeches of Bush 2001)

Among the many different influences on presidential foreign policy decision-making , the president's personality. And the most debatable American president in foreign affairs , the forty third president “George W. Bush”. He came into office January 2001, to be re-elected on November, 2004, and avowed in for a second term on January 20, 2005. He came to lead America believing in the American unipolar power, the power that no one can compete. The president Bush has worked to develop American society, progress its economy, and to build its security . The American president has worked to strengthen military and provides America with different services; he had the desire to create the perfect country for the American citizens.(George Bush Whitehouse.archives)

“I believe God wants me to run for presidency” (qtd .in Pfiffner 167). This what George Bush has told his friend , religiously speaking , the president George Walker Bush as a Christian man , often takes the Christian values more seriously in his personal or political lives, and mentioning his faith publicly is something necessary for him . According to James P.Pfiffner, the president Bush once stated that heaven is created only for those who believe in Jesus, his participation in the Bible study groups has influenced and strengthen

his beliefs as well as his actions in which, during the Republican debate in Iowa (December 13, 2000) , George Bush was asked to name his preferred 'political philosopher' then he answered: 'Christ, because he changed my heart' (qtd .in Pfiffner 167). In the same time, he argued that human history and politics are under God's intentions.

Moreover, the reflection of the Christian faith in Bush's political life was something clear in the White House when the cabinet meetings were opened with his prayer .(167) The Christian faith guides his personality and political actions, it strengthens his decision making, being clear with a strong personality, avoids ambiguity and leads him into moral certainty. Because Bush believes that he is in mission to spread security and to fight evil in the world , this faith has given him the right to use military in some cases for achieving the God's will, the Bush president believes that history and even politics are guided by God and he is fighting for him. (168)

In addition to the religious beliefs, Fred I. Greenstein argued that, the president's personality can influence the decision-making, as well as his beliefs, his way of dealing with his advisers, public communication, political skills ,the charisma, and time restrictions those external influences make each president unique to his presidency which can be reflected then in his political actions.(02). The president's way in the political leadership was remarked by a sureness and moral certainty and these two characteristics according to James P.Pfiffner were as helpful to deal in some vital events such as the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Towers and the Pentagon. The Bush's moral certainty is reflected in his religious beliefs as was mentioned above. At the same time, it is reflected in his faith that the United States of America is the most powerful country, and his capacity can make America as a hegemonic power and the American military as a unique power in the world. (167).

The president Bush described himself as “a gut player”(qtd.in Neely42). Another characteristic of the forty third American presidents George W Bush is the emotional intelligence, Victoria Neely adds that the president Bush could go beyond the emotional intelligence when it came into some important decision-making, and the Iraq war is a good example of that. In the view of Victoria Neely, despite the fact that he holds the Master ‘s degree in Business Administration and his ability for appointing a highly qualified cabinet his foreign policy making still had a lack in organizational capacity and in creating a structured system of policy and information management which led him to receive a set of critics .(Neely44,47).

President George Bush was known by the public communication throughout his policymaking, he has the ability to convince his people, to communicate with them emotionally ,and how to be skillful in addressing the hearts of American citizens. His speech was effective with force mainly in some important cases such as the 9/11 attacks. (Greenstein 21).

“On September 11th, great sorrow came to our country. And

From that sorrow has come great resolve. Today, we are a nation

Awakened to the evil of terrorism, and determined to destroy it.

That work began the moment we were attacked; and it will continue

Until justice is delivered”. (Speeches of Bush)

This political skill , for Jason Berggren and NicolC.Rae is directly reflected from his strong faith ,as it was noted before ,in which they argue that to understand the president’s policy it is necessary to understand his religious faith, (01). George W. Bush declared ‘Faith changes lives. I know, because faith has changed mine’ (qtd. in Berggren and Rai 614). The president Bush has an ‘Evangelican (Jason and Nicol 611)’ style that influences his political vision, in which it gave him the sense that he is in mission to do, and God gave

him this responsibility to achieve ; to rule the United States of America ,and improve it in the world . (616). The evangelical president is certain that the Bible is the God's words , he believes that the Christ sacrificed for their sins in order to be rewarded, so these religious principles that George Bush believes in had influenced his personality and political leadership over his presidency.(624).

"One of the attractive sides of President Bush was his personal approach to people" (James P.Pfiffner 173). Another characteristic that the American president is so notable is his good relationship with the American people as well as with his administration's members , in which he could break the formal relationship through calling them by nicknames, joking with them ,and be closed to them through creating an image of a " good president "this skill that the president Bush is a special with, could give him the American support ,and

to see him as a "regular guy"(173). As contrast to many previous presidents and mainly his father who was known by his strict work, and he distance between him and his members. (173).

Also,Pfiffner states that another characteristics of George W. Bush is his reaction to the international relations in personal terms, in which the one can observe that in many cases; such as, in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, when the Senator Charles Schumer went to the president, Bush has taken the event in personal term when his fear was clear to his daughter. In another case with the Russian president Putin when he told him about a cross of his mother that has a great value for him, then the president Bush could trust the man "We had a very successful meeting. And I had convinced him that I no longer viewed Russia as an enemy." (qtd.in Pfiffner 173). Moreover, in early years with the war against terrorism, and when the American president failed to capture Osama bin Laden, he turned

to the president of Iraq Saddam Hussein. And he states:” After all, this is the guy who tried to kill my dad” (qtd .in Pfiffner 174).

To sum up, the president’s policy is a reaction to his beliefs, cultural background, and his personality, so it is important to know the president’s character before dealing with his political achievement. And the American president George W.Bush that this study is dealing with, his personality, moral certainty, religious beliefs, and his bias to action had influenced his political decisions overtimes during his presidency. (Pfiffner 176). George W.Bush , and whether his personality is harnessed in a good or bad political service, he still as a skillful and wise president for the Americans through addressing their hearts and achieving his principles as in his declaration:

“I will live and lead by these principles: to advance my conviction

With civility, to pursue the public interest with courage, to speak

For greater justice and compassion, to call for responsibility and try

To live it as well” (Speeches of Bush 2001)

2-Terrorism and Bush Doctrine:

“Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest

Buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America.

These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of

American resolve” (Speeches of Bush 2001)

This speech was declared by the American president after the tragic events of September 11th, with sureness, moral certainty and full of confidence, he declared that America will not give up. The president Bush tries to show that there is nothing worse than terrorism , and there is no evil as the evil of terrorism and there is no enemy as the terrorists to be fought , the American president’s attacks towards terrorists were so clear in his different speeches .

The 9 of September obliged the president George Bush to show his charisma through addressing not only the responsible of the tragic events , but also his speech can be understood to all the world and to everyone who can even think about touching the American soil.

Bob Woodward in his book *Plan of Attack* believed that the president Bush, as man of politics and man of war, often takes the events more seriously in his reactions, depending on his security of defense Donald H. Rumsfeld in which after the 9/11 attacks ,George W. Bush asked him about a plan for attacking and invading Iraq (01). Woodward explains the Bush's certainty in making political decisions as follow:

“Rumsfeld realized how focused Bush was about Iraq. “He Should have”the president recalled.”Because he knew how Serious I was”. (Bob Woodward 04).

The terrorist incidents on the September 11th have brought the issue of terrorism to the fore front of American public interest ,terrorism becomes the enemy number one that the Bush's Administration has to fight .So international terrorism has no universally agreement definition but the US government used to define it as attacking people or properties of many countries , it is group of people who employ terror and practice violence against innocent targets, most of times is a group of work rather than an individual work .The use of threat of violence by the terrorist group has many objectives to obtain political, religious or social objectivities; although, the basic assumption today consider the political motivation as the main reason behind the terrorist acts. (Perl 03)

Furthermore , Daniel G. Arce and Todd Sandler argued that terrorism can be explained as kind of asymmetric conflict where terrorists are acting strategically using violence against non -combatants in indirect way instead of direct struggle for achieving whether political or ideological goals.(333). Terrorists are often rational people who practice terror against

civilians for political gain, those terrorist organizations are prepared for motivating individuals by a desire for social solidarity with their members of their organization which is reflected in the political platform”(Abrahms 87). So, the Terrorist organization becomes from the dominant interests in George W.Bush policy.

Relating this to the Bush’s grand strategy, the 9/11 attacks has surprised almost every American and everyone in the world, , the president abandoned his previous policy and created an approach to foreign affairs that seemed to be a revolution in US international foreign affairs . For the first time, the American President declares his doctrine in a speech he delivered on September 20th, 2001 only nine days after the events.

GeorgeW.Bush’s foreign policy is known as “the Bush Doctrine” based in the preemptive war and the focus on spreading democracy. This new doctrine has brought a radical change with the previous strategies in national security, in which this doctrine was applied in the president’s two terms 2001 to January 2009, and the invasion of Iraq is a result of this new policy.(US Foreign Policy of Bush Doctrine)

The Bush Doctrine remarks the end of the “ deterrence and containment “ policies that the United States of America was following since the end of World War II which focused on the nonintervention , the containment policy for the first time was declared by the diplomat George Kinnan to prevent the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) from expanding to the west . However, after the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, and during the presidency of George H.W.Bush and Bill Clinton, American foreign policy continued with the same policy.(Bush Doctrine).

So, this transition in the American foreign policy was due to the September 11 attacks, in which the president Bush could bring a new policy that deals with a new enemy called “terrorism”. (Lafeber 548) On the tragedy night and through the national television, the president declared “we will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed

these acts and those who harbor them” (qtd. in Lafeber 543). This declaration gives a clear idea about the Bush’s will to remove terrorism not only from the American soil but from all the world and his war will not be against those who terror people, but any country that helps them or supports them. In the view of Lafeber the Bush doctrine aims to destroy the terrorists groups whenever and wherever they are.

This new policy became related to the Bush’s name , and the president’s administration tried to convince the American people for this new foreign affairs since the word “doctrine “ has

the meaning of beliefs or something true that people can believe , in dealing with the meaning of the word ; according to *the Oxford EnglishDictionary* in volume 4 defines the word “doctrine as “ that which is taught or laid down as true concerning a particular subject or department of knowledge ,as religion ,politics, science ,etc (qtd in Lafeber 549). So, in different aspects it is something true and reliable.

Furthermore, the author Christopher Preble argues that the Bush doctrine is composed of three points : pre-emption , democratization ,and dominance .Starting with the first point ,‘pre-emption ’means the government is ready to act before the enemy attacks ,here the government depends on the fast in action before the threat can grow or even happen ,exactly as the president said “ we must take the battle to the enemy ,disrupt his plans and confront the worst threats before they emerge ” (qtd. in Preble 28).The second point concerning ‘ democratization ’,the government tries to give much more importance for spreading democracy in the world ,and it can be observed clearly in removing Saddam Hussein and establishing a democratic government in Iraq , however the element of ‘dominance’ , the author believes that the Bush doctrine failed to be sustained. (27, 28).

3-The 9/11 as the New Pearl Harbor:

Japan attacked the United States of America at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii on December 7th, 1941. This action pushed America to declare war on Japan the following day. Similarly on September 2001, America received a surprised attack into the World Trade Center in New York and Pentagon. Both attacks shocked the American citizens and both of them pushed the American presidents ‘‘Rosevelt’’ and ‘‘Bush’’ to interfere in war as a reaction. (Markgraf 02) Adam Markgraf believes that both tragic events that America witnessed will never be forgotten in the American history, and both leaders used religion as reference in their speeches, also protecting American soil was the most important aim for both leaders, in addition, the two governments in 1941 and 2001 reacted in similar way through using force. (09)

So, the 9/11th attacks are always referred to as the new Pearl Harbor. The president Bush himself, on the night of the 9/11, wrote in his diary ‘‘The Pearl Harbor of the 21st century took place today’’ (qtd. in Ray Griffin xii) through reminding Americans for their history of the tragic event of 1941, when America was attacked by Japan, in which the American reaction was so aggressive. In the same way many Americans said that The American Administration should respond to the attacks of the 9/11 in the same way it had responded to the attack on the Pearl Harbor. (Robert Kagan)

Furthermore, the tragic events of the 9/11 have often been compared to the Pearl Harbor attacks, in which the American power has been tested, the two attacks were considered for many historians as two challenges to the American administrations. Many writers wrote about this comparison, the reporter James Bamford stated ‘‘In the middle of modern-day Pearl Harbor’’, also, an Australian journalist John Pilger has written in his article ‘‘The attacks of 11 September 2001 provided the new Pearl Harbor’’

at the same time, many who were calling the American administration to react similarly as the Pearl Harbor's reaction in world war two , in which a member of the US Army 's Institute for Strategic Studies reported that after the 9/11 attacks , there was the same levels of public support for military action as the same after the Pearl Harbor attack . (Ray Griffin xii).

However, this terrible event in the American history has seen differently by Noam Chomsky who considered the events as the first in the history of America since the War of 1812 that attack the American territory, as contrast to the Pearl Harbor by Japan, which was a direct

attack to the military bases in an American colony even "Hawaii" on the day of December 7, 1941. While the 9/11 events the case is so different, since the attacks were directly toward two main cities in America, the most victims were innocents people who have no relation with military, the terrorists attacked two main buildings that symbolize the American power over the world as well as the American cultural hegemony and globalization. (Chomsky 17). So, the most important that all historians agreed that the 9/11 attacks were as a ruthless, terrible, and catastrophic events in the American history over times.

4-The Effect of the 9/11 attacks on the Bush administration's policy:

Before the tragic events of the 9/11 in America , American foreign policy was known by "deterrence and containment" , in which all American presidents were following this kind of policy in their foreign affairs and, before dealing with the American foreign policy and the strategy of containment ,it is important to know the meaning of this term and its origins .Containment is an American foreign policy that was appeared after the end of World War Two during the presidency of Truman ,its aim was to prevent the spread of the communism

in the western block as well as the world through using political , economic , and military strategies . The first use of this term was in a telegram written by an American diploma George F. Kennan in 1946.

So, during the cold war, the American foreign policy was focusing on the containment of the Soviet Union. The top official George Kennan in the American embassy in Moscow sent the State Department a long telegram in 1946 through defining the new approach , however when he returned home he analyzed that in a report that was published by pseudonym “X” in *Foreign Affairs* journal . In the telegram, George Kennan focused in the Russian traditional logic of insecurity, in which he believed that Russia will not be away from its attitude under any conditions or circumstances. by this way , George Kinnan was sending the news and in the same time he was sending messages about the danger of the Soviet Union in order to depend on this policy “containment”.

Furthermore, the first use of this policy appeared in the eastern Mediterranean, in which America started fighting the communism, when Great Britain was helping Greece; the ruling monarchy was menaced by communist forces, and in Turkey, where the Soviet Union could hardly press for territorial concessions and to build naval bases on the Bosphorus. So, in 1947 Britain told America that it could not pay longer for any aid. directly after that, this was a good opportunity for America to prepare a plan for supporting those two countries in order to be against communism. The president Harry Truman asked the congress for \$400 million as an economic and military help for Greece and Turkey, this action in American history came to be known as the Truman Doctrine.(Containment and Deterrence)

In addition, McKeever and Davies in their book “Politics USA” believed that the real beginning of the use of American Containment towards the Soviet Union was in 1947 in both Greece and Turkey, when America was providing the two countries by an economic

and military assistance, so, Truman Doctrine is considered as the first application of the American Containment. (328). However the American benefit from that assistance that , the American president Harry Truman had gained the American support to the policy of containment ,which meant the victory of the capitalism over the communism .This policy could prevent the spread of the Soviet ideologies in Greece and Turkey and led to the emergence the ant-communism in all the country.

As a result , Containment policy was considered as the most important policy that America dealt with the Soviet Union in the cold war , and it is the most important policy that shaped the history of American foreign affairs , So, America depended in this doctrine in order to achieve its external interests politically and economically , and after Truman , the American presidents continued in the same path focusing in the nonintervention, however , after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, and even the communism was ended , American presidents George H.W Bush and Bill Clinton continued with the same policy till the surprise attack of the 9/11.

“ The pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, fires burning, huge structures Collapsing, have filled us with disbelief, terrible sadness, and a quite, unyielding Anger.....But they have failed; our country is strong.” (Speeches of Bush 2001).

This speech was declared by the American president George W.Bush after the 9 of September attacks , in this speech the president described the image of the attacks in intelligent way , through passing a strong address to the responsible that America by its economic power and its hegemonic power will never give up .

He tried to conveyed a clear message not only to the terrorists but the world also about the American power, this speech resulted many questions about the American view to this incident and how the president ‘s reaction will be.

The 9/11 attacks started in autumn morning In New York city, when a surprised terror was observed from the sky. When the president was in visit in the Emma E.Booker Elementary School for spending time with children and to discuss about education, in this time, the president was told by his adviser about the terror that attacked the World Trade Center by the Islamic hijackers using an American Airlines at 9:00 .a m , and at 9:05 Andrew Card; the president's chief of staff , told the president “ A second plane hit the second tower, America is under attack”(q td in .Caldwell 87)

The president's reaction to this terrorist attack that New York city witnessed , was directly in the following day , when he said “ The deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday against our country were more than acts of terror . They were acts of war” (q t d in. Caldwell 87), by this words, George Bush has seen the attack as a sign of war that America has to interfere, the Bush's message to the terrorists was clear that the American soil should never be touched, the attack in the president's eyes was as a strong test to the American security and the American power, in which, America has to prove herself. (87)

Dan Caldwell compared the feelings of George Bush when he received the news about the attacks as the same, when Harry S.Truman heard about the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that all the stars, moon, and planets had fallen on him. What happened in the day of the 9/11 left a deep effect on the president, it was not just an attack, George Bush considered it as the Pearl Harbor of the 21st century. The 9/11 attacks led to a new war that was not declared before “the War on Terror”, and taking the responsible on the attacks to justice , was one of the most important missions that the president has taken as a reaction .(Caldwell 87). he considered the terror event as a direct attack to the human freedom saying that “freedom itself was attacked this morning” (q td in. Schmidt 326), since the blood of innocent people was spilled on the American soil and many victims died in that severe attack on the World Trade Center and on the Pentagon. (326).

So, the tragic event of the 9/11 attacks was not the first terrorist work in America or even in the world, however it was special and different, since the enemy can be unknown as the so called "terrorism", in which the Professor Walter Laqueur in his definition to terrorism has said "the illegitimate use of force to achieve a political objective when innocent people are targeted" (qtd in Caldwell 71). So, the phenomenon of terrorism is not something new in human history but it is an ancient fact. Dan Caldwell believed that terrorism cannot be grew up or increased without some external or internal supports, in his view; terrorism might be sponsored by government or nongovernmental organizations (71). And according to him terrorism in the contemporary era has its root directly after the Afghan War, which was divided into two main groups, the first one was so organized and its members were experts in terrorist attacks under their leader Osama Ben Laden, while the second group was less organized in doing some terrorist operations. (71).

Because the tragic event of September has left deep negative results for Americans, about three thousand people were killed and many victims, the enemy attack in the American soil has led The United States into sufferance in largest loss of life, property, incomes, and even in buildings, the reaction of the government, businessmen, local charities and also individuals was never seen before in America. Lloyd Dixon and Rachel Stern in their book *"Compensation for Losses from the 9/11 Attacks"* discussed the positive side of the event; the human side that was discovered in Americans through giving help to the victims, both authors believed that the 9/11 is the reason behind the unity that was observed among Americans. In which, the payments of the private insurance was considered as the largest for every single loss in the history of United States, and in the side of charitable reaction to the event was so remarkable in the American society, according to some surveys, about two-thirds of American households were contributed to charities for helping victims, and

the charitable participation passed \$2.9 billion. In addition to that, the federal government gave promise to help the New York City by \$20 billion to recover what was lost. (01).

Furthermore , the government of agencies , was helping the workers of New York city who lost their jobs , through the establishment of different economic programs as kind of compensation for losses from the terrorist attack (Dixon and Stern 99), however , all these human supports came as a direct response to the role of media , in which , it played a vital role in conveying the information not only in America but in all over the world , such as the CNN, Fox News, network organization's news as the NBC and the BBC , in addition to the Internet news sites.....etc .however, the media coverage of the events of September , most of time is different from one country to another ,the way reflecting the news differs due to many reasons but mainly for the political side . (McNair 33) , the UK media focused in the American reaction , and its intervention in a new era _ an era of global war against the Islamic world .(33) in the case of journals , the *times* focused in the hijackers of the American airplanes and their hit on the World Trade Center (B.Marron 46), while the *Guardian* immediately , its interest was on the leader and the responsible of the attack “ Osama Ben Laden ” in one side , in the other side the journal gave an attention to the victims from the fall of the largest building in the world .(47). Generally most media frame is the focusing in the initial key words of the news such as “where, when, who, what, and how ...” (B. 51).

So, the 9/11 attacks has taken the international interest, and this due to its importance in a hegemonic country that leads the world. Many, who have compared the attacks as the same of the Pearl Harbor, as the president “the Pearl Harbor of the 21st century”,however, Noam Chomsky has considered the attacks as the first since the War of 1812 that attacked the national territory, while the Pearl Harbor attack was directly to the military bases ,on December 1941. For Chomsky the American policy is reason behind every attack, and the

9/11 is also the same. (11). He added to say that the event has changed many issues in American society or in the American political scene, now America is interfering in a new kind of war that was never used before (14), which is toward those terrorists who attacked two main buildings that symbolize the American cultural hegemony and globalization to achieve their aim of Holy War (Chomsky17).

So, after the collapse of the Soviet union, when America has won the struggle of the Cold War, now America and after the strike of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, it enters in another war with terrorism, this new war with a different enemy, the so called “Global War on Terror”. American President declared war against terrorists directly after nine days from the event when he said:

“We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another,

Drive them from place to place, until there is no refuge or no rest. And

We will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism.” (George W. Bush)

From his speech, the Bush’s administration takes a new strategy and a new policy with all countries in the world, George Bush’s address was not only to the terrorists only, but to all nations in the world as follow:

“Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either

You are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward

Any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded

By the United States as a hostile regime”. (Speeches of Bush 2001)

George Bush through his words he gives the world’s nations a direct choice that each country has to choose, by this words he created a new world system with more complicated relationship in foreign affairs among countries. In this address the president Bush has

created a black and white world, a bad and good, America or terrorism. A division that put many countries in difficult situation .

This policy earned the president's name to be known as "the Bush Doctrine", according to the National Security Strategy of the United States that was published on 2002 , the Bush Doctrine based on the Preemptive action in its defense to the American security , even the attack timings is not clear or not defined .So, in order to avoid the aggressive threat from the American territory and to avoid any danger that can touch American security , America has the right to attack the enemy whenever and wherever is , the preemptive attack requires the fast in action before the enemy threat can happen (Khattak 157)

Furthermore, the Bush Doctrine; the response policy to the 9/11 attacks, depends on two main elements: the first one, it remarks the end of the previous policy of containment and deterrence in American foreign affairs that was used by American presidents since WWII, to move into new policy of preemption and preventive war, exactly as the declaration of the president George Bush in the US National Security Strategy 2002:

“The United States cannot always entirely depend on a reactive

Defense policy as we have been practicing in the past . . . We shall

Not permit our enemies to endanger our national interests” (qtd in, Khattak 157).

Also, the second element is that America has to be the first who attacks as was said above, to act independently, and has the right to go out and beyond its borders rather than waiting the threat happens in the American territories, George Bush brought this policy to protect liberty, freedom as well as to defend the American lives as he says:

“Our security [American security] will require all Americans to

Be forward looking and a resolute, to be ready for preemptive action

When necessary to defend our liberty and to defend our lives” (qtd in, Ali Khattak 158).

So, the first reaction by George Bush to the terrorist event that put America under attacks was in war on terrorists, then to be extended after that to all countries that support or harbor them, he promised Americans to take them to task and punish the responsible of the deadly attacks as he mentioned “today we and our allies stand together to win this war against terrorism” (qtd in, Ali Khattak 161), the first American strike of this war was with Al Qaeda and Osama Ben Laden. (161). The main key words in the National Security Strategy 2002 of the Bush Doctrine are: preemption, military, and hegemony, this was said clearly by the Vice President Dick Cheney “Only we [America] can lead. . . . We are in a unique position because of our unique assets” (qtd in, Ali Khattak 163). George Bush in the document of the NSS 2002 reminds the world by the American victory upon the totalitarianism during the 20th Century, and gives a sign for the American power, as a hegemonic power to win the War of the 21st Century (Ali Khattak 164).

Furthermore, the Bush Doctrine as the new American foreign policy depends on the Preemptive and preventive war, the real and imagined war. Starting with Preemption, the preemptive war is an attack when the enemy strike is proved and believed to be taken against the country, and in this case the most important is to be the first who acts rather than waiting the enemy starts attacking. However, Preventive war is something different, the attack in this case is depended on imagination and hypotheses, it can be true or false, and the most important is not to be the first or the last but it is matter of timing, the action should be sooner not later, they believe in the idea that if the enemy is strong now, in the future will be stronger so, it is better to strike him sooner not later(Preemption and Prevention).

The new strategy of Bush to act preemptively was applied in War of Afghanistan where Al Qaeda lies, and it did not stop there but it continued in the War on Iraq 2003 which was purely preventive war.

So, the war in Iraq was supported by the neoconservatives who were around his administration, and could convince George Bush for the American invasion depending on two main ideas in Bush Doctrine: the first, the neoconservatives believed that the consequence of the nuclear or biological weapons would be catastrophic, in this case America would be justified to act preemptively in Iraq, the second, they argued that the reason behind the 9/11 attacks was the lack of political culture “freedom” in the Islamic World, America should do the opposite through spreading the freedom culture among Muslims. As a result, on March 19, 2003 the American military forces started the “Operation Iraqi Freedom” to remove Saddam Hussein; however, the occupation of Baghdad by the American troops received a large opposition in the international world, and was considered as illegitimate war, the Bush’s preventive war believed in the ability of Iraq to endanger the American security in the future in case Iraq produces the nuclear weapons. (Ali Khattak 165).

Generally, the government’s reaction to the attacks can be concluded into three main acts: the Global War on Terror, the Patriot act, and the 9/11 Commission in the end of 2002. Starting with the first act, which represents a new kind of war as was said above. America declared war on Terrorism starting from Al Qaeda.

The second is the USA Patriot act, is the US Congress act that was signed by the George Bush on October 26, 2001 as an American law that was created as a reaction to the previous events, the USA PATRIOT act as an abbreviation word aims to “Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism”.

While the third one is” the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States”, this act was created by the congressional legislation as response to the attacks, it was signed by the president Bush by the end of 2002, it aims to prepare a full report about all the circumstances that was around the September 11th inside, on the other side it tries to prepare for being ready for any future attacks. So, the 9/11 attacks left a deep impact on the Bush’s administration, and the reaction was so harsh and fast because Americans did not expect to be attacked on their soil.

From all what was said about the new policy and the government’s reaction of the administration of George W .bush in foreign affairs, many historians in the world and many foreign policy experts have been criticizing it ,and considered the Bush Doctrine, the preemptive and preventive war as “ Illegitimate Policy ”. some experts in foreign policies argued that the preemptive action in the National Security Strategy of the United States is an diplomatic earthquake that led into a radical change in the previous American foreign policies of Containment and Deterrence , and the War on Iraq was as a test to this new doctrine .

Generally, George Bush, in his declaration to the response of the deadly attacks, argued that the preemptive war in Afghanistan will not end there, America in this case opens a direct war not only against one enemy but against all the world, America by this policy creates an excuse to break every State’s borders to achieve its purposes in the name of” fighting terrorists”. In addition, the preventive war on Iraq received many opposition, America has declared war that was based on a wrong idea, in which after thousands of innocents people who have been killed, and after all, America discovered that its hypothesis of the nuclear weapon was false. (Ali Khattak 165).

Also, the Bush Doctrine aims to protect the American National Security, in addition to strength the US supremacy over the world these goals can justify the military use by the

American forces whenever and wherever America wants, for these reasons Noam Chomsky has said:” Perhaps the most threatening document of our time is the U.S. National Security of September 2002.” (qtd in, Ali Khattan 166)

He added to say that the Bush Doctrine as a new policy can help the spread of arms and military use in the world and supports the use of force as contrast to the policy of containment which is based in nonintervention, Chomsky considers the Bush Doctrine as a preventive more than preemptive that is based in imagined threat which can kill many innocent people and destroy several countries (166).

Perhaps the Bush Doctrine has created many Anti-Americans in different countries and has endangered its National Security more than strengthened it. America by this policy has created a division in the international community and put the whole international security in danger not only USA, in which each country can adopt this policy and use it as an excuse to strike other countries in the name of fighting terrorism or stopping the threat now before it happens in the country for securing their national interests (167).

The surprise attacks by al-Qaeda on America has shocked many people over the world , but the American reaction towards this event and the hard decisions that were taken by the Bush’s administration led also many people for being against America and even Americans, this what is called by “ anti- Americanism”. Starting with the Arab and Islamic World, most of American attacks after the 9/11 were directly toward the Arab and Islamic World as response many Arabs and Muslims disliked the American administration for that and mainly after the invasion of Iraq, in addition to the American support to Israel .(Glant 512).

Also, anti-Americanism has emerged for many countries when they saw the American new policy aims to make America as a hegemonic power and as only leader of the world since WWII, and mainly after the collapse of the Soviet Union. (511), furthermore the

main causes of this new movement in all the world “anti-Americanism” is that, most of countries believe that the new foreign policy of George Bush gives the right to America to interfere in other’s business in the name of fighting terror in one side, on the other side, they see as a kind of contradiction in the Bush’s policy when it support freedom and aims to spread democracy, but in the same time this policy supports violence and the military interventions.

Many countries in the world were against the American Wars, the policy of preemption as well as prevention, and the USA PATRIOT act, many saw that America exaggerated in its response to the 9/11, which led her to make wrong decisions as the War on Iraq which resulted for many countries the loss of the Bush’s credibility .(516). However, Americans themselves feel that they are disliked by the rest of the world, according to the Pew’s 2005 survey, about the question “How Others Feel About your Country?” For 16 countries, the result shows the highest percentage of Americans who believe that their country is being disliked by others, in which 69% of the American public feel so. Also , another survey about asking people from many countries as USA, Poland, Russia, Great Britain, Canada , Spain ...etc, of their support to the US War on Terror, the results were decreasing from 2002 till 2005, American’s percentages decreased from 89% IN 2002 to be 76%, and this was the same for the most of other countries , which shows the fall of the Bush Policy in the aftermath of the 9/11attacks .(Anti Americanism).Another survey was done , aims to know the problem in the United States , through asking people from different countries and the results were as below :

What's the Problem with the U.S.?*

Mostly America in Both DK/

Bushgeneral(VOL) Ref

%%%

Spain76 14 7 3 (N=374)

2003 50 37 72 2

Germany 65 29 5 1 (N=424)

2003 74 22 3 1

Netherlands 63 30 6 1 (N=403)

France 63 32 5 1 (N=429)

2003 74 21 4 .

Pakistan 51 29 1010 (N=730)

2003 62 31 2 5

Britain 56 35 8 1(N= 285)

2003 59 31 8 3

Canada 54 37 90(N=188)

2003	60	32	6	2	
Lebanon	47	32	191	(N=572)	
2003	51	32	16	1	
Turkey	41	36	17	6	(N=671)
2003	52	33	12	3	
Indonesia	43	42	0	15	(N=517)
2003	69	20	7	4	
India	35	35	14	16	(N=349)
Jordan	22	37	41	1	(N=798)
2003	42	28	30	.	
China	16	34	42	8	(N=1,197)
Poland	27	49	14	10	(N=236)
Russia	30	58	9	3	(N=401)
2003	43	32	15	10	
* 2005 Survey of those with an unfavorable opinion of the U.S.					

Table 01: Pew Surveys: What's the Problem with the United States?

Source: "Report of the Working group on Anti-Americanism". <http://www.princeton.edu>.

07/04/2017. At: 22:05. P05.

According to the results of the survey, many people from different countries believe that the president George Bush and his policy are the main reason behind the problems in America. So, the Bush's new policy received many critics mainly after the invasion of Iraq.

Furthermore, George Bush as an American president lost his credibility by many people in all over the world even by Americans themselves, mainly after the emergence of the truth behind invading Afghanistan. American people were unaware about the real reasons of the war, in which they believed what the political leaders were saying. The Afghan War according to the Bush administration was declared after the 9/11 attacks when Osama Bin Laden was the responsible and the Taliban government refused to turn him over to the US authorities since there was no proof about him. However, the truth was totally different, the United States has made the decision of invading Afghanistan two months before the attacks, the origins return long time before when America was supporting a project of pipeline for transporting oil and natural gas from the Caspian Sea to the Indian Ocean that pass through both Pakistan and Afghanistan.

But, this project has stopped after the decline of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the civil war in Afghanistan, in the mid – 1990s the US government supported the Taliban government for uniting the country and creating a stable government in the hope of protecting the pipeline, to be ended with the Clinton's administration, however, with the coming of the Bush administration, the president gave Taliban one last chance during four-day meeting in Berlin July 2001, Bush's representatives obliged Taliban for being friendly to US government or declaring war on its soil, either to accept a carpet of gold, or carpet of bombs. After the refusal of Taliban to the American offer, the American leaders decided to declare war on Afghanistan on October after 27 days of the attacks using it as an excuse to its

war. So, it appears for the entire world that American war on Afghanistan was just to capture Osama Bin Laden.(The War in Afghanistan)

To conclude, the Bush doctrine has received many critics , the two wars of Afghanistan and Iraq were clear prove to the failure of his policy , the nature of preemption and prevention war and their negative consequences on the world security, indicate that they are illegitimate policy that any country may adopt in its foreign affairs .

5-The pillars of Bush Doctrine:

In “ Understanding the Bush Doctrine” , Robert Jervis states the four main pillars of Bush Grand Strategy which are: 1- Democracy and Liberalism

2-Threat and Unilateralism

3-Preventive war

4-American Hegemony (Jervis 2003).

5-1 Democracy and Liberalism

The US foreign policy was based on the idea of Democracy promotion, in which the founding fathers considered America as an exceptional nation that cares about human rights and values. Democracy appeared as an exceptional notion among American presidents, especially after the US emerged as a global power. The main components of the US foreign policy was spreading freedom, democracy and protecting human rights in order to achieve global stability and security. In the other side , Democracy promotion was an excuse and justification for its interventions and foreign affairs (Mousavi and heydari 111).

After 11 September, President George W Bush shifted quickly from being realistic and involved in democracy promotion along his presidency, Bush showed the importance of Democracy in his memoire.

“We are led, by events and common sense, to one conclusion: the survival of Liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of Liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the freedom in all the worldso it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world” (Bush 2010).

The Bush Administration believed that the spread of democratic and liberal values throughout international community would support government and enhance global security, with the expansion of liberal democracies, and that because domestic regimes play an important role in formulating foreign policies. The Bush Administration asserted that by spreading values of “freedom, democracy, and free enterprise”, America would make the world “ not just safer; but better”, because the promotion of democracy will minimize Terrorism and will make the international stability. However, this element “Democracy and Liberalism” of the Bush Doctrine was started before the United States discover weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and this later led the Bush Administration to be forced to justify the war on Iraq(Jervis 366).

“In the roots of the bush Doctrine “the United States assumed that by the spread of liberal political institutions and values, the US Political and security interests were advanced. This approach was characterized as democratic realism; national security liberalism; democratic globalism and messianic universalism, in which the Bush grand strategy focused on the application of US military and political power in order to promote Democracy in strategic regions. The desire of Bush was to spread liberty around the world to insure the US security, according to Bush, “because the advance of freedom leads to peace “, this statement touch specifically the case of Terrorism, the US took the opportunity to extend the benefits of such values of freedom across the world (Monten 112).

Promoting Democracy was a key element of Bush Administration; September 11 made “security and stability” the central objective for Bush and “Democracy promotion as a goal to reach it. By 2003, US invaded Iraq in order to overthrow Saddam Hussein and to take from him weapons of mass destruction and to cut any relations between Saddam and Al-Qaeda. September 11 changed the US grand strategy and creates new life into American Exeptionalism (Mousavi and Heydari 118).

The role of democracy was very essential for the Bush Doctrine to apply it under which the invasion of Iraq was prepared. For Santos and Teixeira ‘Preemption war was the rocket, Democracy is the fuel, Terrorism was the target (131).

The American foreign policy in the post- cold war era composed of principles; firstly, the Western Liberal democracy’s values and principles are universal, that is to say that all people in the world want to be democratic; secondly, no fight between democracies, that is exporting democracy means promoting global peace and security; thirdly, the democratic world would be safer and more flourishing for the US , so democracy is related to the security and the economic interests of US, as if the Americans want to hold the mission to bring freedom and democracy for the whole world (134).

After the attacks of September 11, the exporting of democracy became an important part as an American response to the terrorist attacks, the Bush Administration had applied the third principle as a justification to the military invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. Bush and his secretaries of state and defense thought that when rouge states became democratic, the US and the world would be safe and more secure(135). Iraq was invaded in March 2003. by 2004, they recognize that weapons of mass destruction(WMD)had not plotted in Iraq against US (137).

Bush states the importance of democracy promotion in Middle East; “As long as there is no freedom in the Middle East, the place will be a breeding ground for violence and animosity, which can be harmful to the USA and its allies” (Bush, 2003)

On March 19, 2003, President Bush launched “Operation Iraqi Freedom”, they push Saddam Hussein to leave Iraq, USA and its allies; Britain and Australia, invaded Iraq and overthrow the government of Saddam Hussein claiming that Saddam was linked to Terrorist, Bush seeks to end Saddam’s rule and search for Iraq’s Weapons of Mass Destruction. Bush government justifies his invasion that he want to secure the oil fields of Iraq and help Iraqi people and provide to them a suitable environment and democratic government.

5-2 Threat and Preventive War

The 9/ 11 Attacks led the USA to proclaim a new use-of –force doctrine known as the “Preventive War” against” the rogue states” to look for nuclear weapons, because they lost confidence in conventional nuclear deterrence, they stated that traditional deterrence which are during Cold War, would be ineffective to protect the US, by which Bush Administration insisting in using prevention (Record 02).

“Today our enemies see weapons of mass destruction as weapons of choice. For rouge states these weapons are tools of intimidation and military aggression against their neighbors. These weapons may also allow these states to attempts to blackmails the US and our allies to prevent us from deterring or repelling the aggressive behavior of rouge states, such states also see these weapons as their best means of overcoming the conventional superiority of the US”(Bush 2002).

Robert Jervis identifies “Threat and Preventive war” as the second pillar of Bush doctrine, the fear of another attacks on American soil led the Bush Administration to adopt new security strategy, President Bush confirms that the US need to use prevention in order

to address threats that cannot be contained by deterrence (368), the new notions of preemptive and preventive war which was created by President Bush was criticized by American citizens and the whole community(369)

President Bush referred to utilize preemptive action in his speeches, but in a description of his military plans, he intended to use preventive not preemptive, the difference between them, preemptive is a legitimate form of self-defense and was known in international law , whereas preventive war was rejected(Daldar and Lindsay 125).

Preemption is the employment of military force in case of any attack that is underway or very close, this concept was used by both superpowers in the cold war, in which both great powers tried to apply their nuclear power(Gray 08).Preemption is the right of any nation that feel danger of attack to defend its citizens(10).

The US President Bush declared new policy of preventive war after the dreadful terrorist attack on September 11, 2001. the first war appeared in Afghanistan, USA tend to punish Al-Qaeda terrorist and aimed to give aid to the people of Afghanistan, in which they liberated and saved them from the Taliban by promoting democracy and freedom. But its purpose was to prevent attacks on USA soil by terrorist from preparing camps in Afghanistan, Bush confessed that there were no imminent threat by Afghanistan, so the war was preventive defense, the next war was against Iraq (Sinnott and Armstrong 202).

The United Nation prohibited any state to employ power against other states, except in case self – defense, but the Bush Doctrine rejected to the United Nation doctrine especially in the case of terrorist attacks. As the President Bush stated” the war on terrorism will not be won on the defensive. We must take the battle to the enemy.....and confront the worse threats before they emerge “(McMahan 169) .

By March 2003, the USA claimed self-defense as justification for its second war against Iraq. Because the legitimacy of preemption was considered legitimate in case of

imminent threat , but the employment of force to prevent a perceived future danger or threat that is not imminent ; that is to say close and near, is Preventive defense or Preventive war, so the debate was about the justification of preemption and whether Preventive defense is illegal. But in case of USA and Terrorist attack they justify their war on Iraq by stating that it posed no imminent threat before strike US (McMahan 170).

Bush Administration depends on three claims to justify the second war against Iraq, they claimed that it had the Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) that threatened the USA, second, that it had a long history with aggressive war, third, Iraq had enjoyed in aggressive and threatening directed against USA, critics are with this all claims, and that USA was true in declaring war against Iraq, Iran and North Korea (McMahan 174).

5-3 Unilateralism

Jervis stated the third pillar of bush doctrine, which is Unilateralism, and showed the relation between the second pillar,” Preventive war and threat “ and Unilateralism that preventive war is announced unilaterally, because it is hard to gain international support for this aggressive action, at the same time, they accept assistance from other for military involvement in Afghanistan and Iraq, the United States focused on building coalitions rather than alliance (374).

George W. Bush defined a new powerful global role in ruling the world and making the international stability, in which the USA would make its affaires unilaterally in order to defend their national interests, there were many who supported the US war against Al-Qaeda, in Afghanistan, but later on, they change their mind concerning Baghdad and Saddam Hussein. Its known that the US and Great Britain claimed that Saddam Hussein possessed (WMD) which enforce United Nation (UN) to make the war justified in using preventive policy as response to terrorist attack, to avoid the use of horrific weapons on the world (Ramirez 04).

The members of Security Council were opposed to the doctrine of preemption and unilateralism against Iraq, in which many of countries were opposed to the use of force against Iraq as France, Germany and Russia(06).

President Bush had denied the assistance given by the alliance in Afghanistan, except Great Britain and Australia, the President preferred to act in unilaterally rather than multilaterally in the international community, claiming that there was a danger surrounding the American security, that could not be stopped with the global cooperation but with the employment of the American military power (Daalder and Lindsay 115).

Because of the non- support of the alliance to the invasion of Iraq and forcing Saddam Hussein to leave his government, Bush decided to deny their objection, the United States showed to the world that on one could hinder the American objectives , these decisions strengthened “ the Bush Doctrine “ , as Bush said “ We are trying to lead the world”(Jervis375).

The Bush’s goals was to make sure of the security and stability of America, because acting in multilaterally would satisfy the global community not to defend American soil, but Bush preferred to declare the war against Iraq to secure the US rather than making strong relation with alliance, according to Bush America is their priority, Despite the disagreement of the war against Iraq, Bush continued his policy by ignoring the alliance and others opinion(Daldaar and Lindsay 13).

The United States adopted this strategy to act alone with many purposes which are to make other countries feel pressure, so they would adopt American values, concerning human rights and democracy, and to make other countries cannot get military abilities and power, that would make threat and danger for American superiority (Griffiths 67)

5-4 American Hegemony

Jervis defines the last element which is “American Hegemony”, it was the unification of the three pillars, the Bush doctrine attempts to establish American Hegemony and primacy. The US strategy refused the universal norms and institutions, for the USA, in order to ensure the global order, they have to operate and behave differently, because they want to expand liberal values and stability over the world. Bush had asserted in his speech at West point , the need of strengthening military power and high defense in order to stop arm races and ensure that other nations could not enhance their military , by this way , the US would limit rivalries and competitors, this mean , possessing a high position concerning military spending over the universe (376).

Bush defines this military as “ implicit endorsement of hegemonic stability theory” ,he believe that the world could not return back to the traditional multipolar balance which would become destructive, because they believe on the American hegemony and authority over the global community (377).

The Bush Administration can be summarized in three concepts: Preemption, Unilateralism, and military Hegemony, the Bush Doctrine clearly states that: “We cannot let our enemies strikes first.....We will not hesitate to act aloneWe must build and maintain our defenses beyond challenges” (Bush, 2002).

6- International Response to the Bush Doctrine:

The 11 September Terrorist made significant changes in US foreign and security policy, the 9/11 makes the US ensure its role and position in the world as super power and the main element that was used in Bush Doctrine was “policy of preemption” in order to find

(WMD), and also gave the right to itself to act unilaterally, claiming that they react against any imminent threat that could be a threat for America. From this perspective, there were international debate about Bush Administration and its application to Iraq, in Which some important nation are refused and criticized them for using force.

Bush Doctrine had some critics from different nations, some of them were allies to the USA, especially the idea of “preemption”, because America gave the right to itself to employ force preemptively against Terrorist, those who support them, and rogue states to look for (WMD). US goal with the making of “coalition” is to ensure its influence and impression to act alone against the will of the global community. The United Kingdom and Australia troops were the only partners of the coalition with fewer other states that encouraged US policy. Global community considered the war as the final option. As the President of France states:” War is always admission of defeat and is always the worst of solutions. And hence everything must done to avoid it”. The Russian Foreign Minister also states:”Most countries believe that opportunities for a diplomatic solution are far from exhausted” (Dombrowski and Payne 398).

The international reaction toward the Bush preventive war was distinguished at two levels, governmental and public level over Western Europe, in which the first group of states including the United Kingdom that supported the US new regime, the second group including Germany and France, both opposed the war against Iraq (Buckley and Singh 32).

As a member of global community, the West Europe reveal its sharp support within North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to encourage the US military action against Taliban in Afghanistan, but everything it changed within Transatlantic relationship, when Bush Administration has taken its decision to initiate unilateral attack against Iraq in order to expel Saddam Hussein and damaged (WMD). Italy and Spain declared their support for

American's Preemption strikes, by contrast, the NATO allies preferred the diplomatic and peaceful ways, they considered that military intervention must be the last solution to ensure the destruction of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and of course with the permission of United Nation Security Council(33). Britain was the only European nation that encouraged the policies of Bush Administration against Terrorism and mainly against Middle East, Britain was in rivalry with Iraq, so Tony Blair agree with the invasion of I(34).

Germany and France were the most critics of using force against Iraq. Chancellor Schroder stated that invading Iraq was as an adventure “ that could destroy the international alliance against terror “ , with time, France joined Germany, in criticizing America engagement in Preemptive action (36). French position was the same as Germany. President Chirac refused to participate in the military intervention against Iraq, he joined Schroder in initiating a statement in Paris, rejecting military action. . Chirac's purpose was to ensure France position and to confirm its political leadership and influence over Europe (37).

Wilhelmsen and Flikke examine in their article “the Russian response on war on terror”; it was known that the position of Russia is not as before during Cold War in international relations. The military engagement of Russia against Terrorist zones on Georgian territory, and its policy in central Europe shows that Russia didn't give up and stop its interventions internationally to save its position and influence (388). Since Russia was experienced with Terrorist threat from 1999, especially in these two regions, Caucasus and central Asia, so the Russian perception of international terrorism was seen as global problem. By 2002, Russia declared its support for the United Nation convention to resist or counter Terrorism

(390). Russia attitude of international terrorism was seen as an imminent threat, this paved the way to Russia to establish relation with Europe(391).

After 11 September, President Putin stated his support for Bush's anti-terror, in which Russia depends on military force to resist terrorism, but Russian military forces didn't participate with them in Afghanistan, claiming that joining with them would make an opposition to the constitution of Federation. In 2002, when Bush adopted his policy of preemption, Moscow showed no negative comment, they support its policy and they consider it legitimate to conduct it in order to avoid any other threat (392)

Russia response to Bush Doctrine was seen as a collection of reactions, in which they are formed by priorities of Russian Foreign Policy, because Russian leaders' purpose was to pursue Russian interests to get benefits from making relationship with US (Buckley and Singh 7) .

The relation between US and China was unstable during 1990s, but the events of 9/11 made the opportunity for both sides to cooperate against Terrorism, Chinese leaders were wondering on the vast expansion of USA over the world and this was shown on the removal of Taliban rule in Afghanistan, this shows the ability of America of using its great military power to counter any threat, Chinese believe that America would use 9/11 to improve its international position (Buckley and Singh 75).For that reasons, the Chinese Foreign Minister notifies that efforts must be done, in order to prevent the expansion of the war on terror. According to Chinese leaders, America was looking for global dominance. Presidents of China, France and Russia look for peaceful way to Iraq issue (76). Chinese leaders analyze that US attempt to reform the world order depended on its strategies, the policy of preemption, that is included in Bush Doctrine could be applied on other countries (77).

The Japanese regime had some reservation about the Strategy of military of Preemption practiced by Washington but it stood by the side of Bush Administration in its decision to attack Iraq (78).

Pakistan showed its sharp support for America in “war on terrorism”, instead of encouraging Afghanistan or “Taliban regime”. But later on Pakistan changed its policy and opinion about the Bush Doctrine, there were many critics that have showed the negative implications of the doctrine. At The global level, critics believed that the Doctrine was growing since the Gulf War. America’s policies were the seen as contradicting the international law. America was mainly attacking the Rogue States, the critics had notify that the Doctrine was directed against Muslim States (Buckley and Singh (97).

Critics saw that the doctrine had focused on the Muslims Terrorist and ignored other kind of terrorism, this was due to the presence of the USA in Afghanistan and Middle East, its aim was to neutralize the strongest Muslim states. Since Pakistan had the nuclear power and the large population, Bush had preserved Pakistan to join US on” War on Terrorism”, the US were with India’s side against Pakistan, concerning their struggles of “Kashmir”. The US started to put pressure on Pakistan to keep its nuclear capability away. Bush had push Pakistan to sign a treaty against as a non- nuclear state. Due to Pakistan’s weakness, it took no stand on US pressure (100).

General Conclusion:

After the September 11, 2001 attacks, the world has changed completely, the attacks could be considered as the breaking point in both the American foreign affairs and the world history. It remarked the emergence of new and different policy by the American president George W. Bush. America after the attacks opened the door to the military activities abroad, through engaging in a new kind of war, as it is declared “the War on Terror”. In which, the Bush Doctrine remarks the end of the previous policy of containment and deterrence in American foreign affairs that was used since WWII,

It has been reasoned that:” We need to invoke the past to make sense of the present and to imagine the future” (JonneMeyerowitz 2002), this statement is pertinent to the study of the US foreign policy since 9/11. George W. Bush has merely invoked the policies of the past.

The Bush Administration’s pursuit of America global hegemony has motivated US foreign policy since the beginning of the Cold war. In subscribing to the view that American global leadership and the expansion of American power overseas are beneficial to US Security. Bush has simply reaffirmed the policies of his predecessors. The Bush Doctrine as a grand strategy that seeks to balance American ideals and interests is wholly consistent with the US Strategic tradition.

The impact of the Bush Doctrine on international society over the years since 2001 has been immense. The “war on terrorism” has offered a very different portrait of the US in terms of internationalism and commitment. US military forces destroyed the Taliban regime in Afghanistan in 2001, scattered the al-Qaeda network, and in the face of widespread international opposition invaded Iraq in 2003. 9/11 has demonstrated that the US, the only remaining superpower will act unilaterally in international relations.

The US interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, the declaration of a “war on terror”, the use of unrivalled military power of USA, the regime change for rogue state, preventive and preemptive war together generated unprecedented divisions in the international community. The US must realize that the Bush policy of preemption have made things more different and dangerous for the whole global community and not just the USA. In the future any powerful state can make preemptive policy against its adversary due to fear of perceived threat.

It is now beyond any doubt that the gravity and immediacy of the threat that Iraq posed to the US was clearly exaggerated. Preemptive needs a high standard of proof that can stand up to world scrutiny and allies have failed to provide it. Given the absence of any credible evidence of an imminent and overwhelming threat indicate the failure of the policy itself.

This work has explained the main principles of the Bush Doctrine and the policy of preemption that was essentially the response of the Bush Administration to the 9/11, by giving the arguments of supporters of the Bush Doctrine by exploring the position of opponents as well.

To conclude, the Bush Doctrine has received many critics, since it endangers not only the world security, but America itself more than it protects it. The policy supports violence and the use of arms, the nature of the two policies “preemption” and “prevention” indicate that the policy is illegitimate, and the two wars of Afghanistan and Iraq are good proof for that.

So, America in its history shows the will of its presidents to lead America as a hegemonic power even the policy was changed from era to era. Starting from the cold war, the policy of containment and deterrence that was used against the enemy of “communism”, to be shifted in the post cold war to the policy of “preemption” and

“deterrence” against “terrorism”, this leads to the questions if America changes its policy due to the nature of the enemy or according to its president. In addition, since the present study has arrived to the point that the policy of George W. Bush as illegitimate one so, it asks whether the following presidents will continue using it or will do exactly, as George Bush has done.

Work Cited:

1. Books

Agnew, John. Hegemony the New Shape of Global Power. USA: Temple University Press,

2005.

Antoniades, Andreas. 'From theories of Hegemony 'to' HegemonyAnalysis' In International Relations. USA: University of Sussex.2008.

Arce, G. Daniel and Todd Sandler. Strategic Analysis of Terrorism. Springer Vienna, 2009.

Beeson, Mark. The Rise of the 'Neocons' and the Evolution of American Foreign Policy. London: University of Queensland, 2004.

Buckley, Mary and Singh, Robert. The Bush Doctrine and War on Terror: Global Responses and Global Consequences. New York: Rutledge, 2006.

Burchill, Scott, et al. Theories of International Relations.3RDed, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Caldwell, Dan. Vortex of Conflict: U.S. Policy Toward Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq. USA: The Board of Trustees of the Stanford Leland Junior University, 2001.

Charvet, John and Kaczynska Elisa -Nay. What is Liberalism?. Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam.9-11. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2011.

Daalder, Ivo and James M. Zinsay. America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy, 2005.

Dixon, Lloyd and Rachel Kaganoff Stern. Compensation for Losses From the 9/11 Attacks.

RAND Corporation, 2004.

Donnelly, Jack. Realism and International Relations. United Kingdom: Syndicate of the

- University of Cambridge, 2009.
- Greenstein, I.Fred. The Leadership Style of George W. Bush. woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, April 25-26, 2003.
- Hanson, Jim. The Next Cold War? American Alternatives For the Twenty-First Century. London: Praeger, 1996.
- Hogan, Michael and Thomas G. Paterson. Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations. 2nded, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hunt, Michael.H. Ideology and U.S foreign Policy. Yale University Press, 2009.
- Jerus, Robert. Understanding the Bush Doctrine. Political Science Quarterly, 2003.
- Kennedy, Paul. The Rise and fall of Great Powers –Economic change and Military Conflict
From 1500 to 2000. London: Fontana Press, 1989.
- Leffler, Melvyn P and David S. Painter. Origins of Cold War – An International History. New York: Rutledge, 2005.
- Lukacs, John. A History of Cold War. New York: Doubledy Z Company, 1961
- Machiavelli, Nicola. The Prince. Translated by W.K. Marriot, New York: Constitution Society, 1958.
- Markgraf, Adam. Comparing Reactions to the Attack at Pearl Harbor and the Attacks on September 11, 2001. CIEP475 Workshop – Teaching with Primary Sources Course, spring 2004.
- McKeever, Robert and Philip Davies. Politics USA. 3rded, London and New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Monten, Jonathan. The Roots of the Bush Doctrine. International Security, 2005.
- Pfiffner, James .P. George W.Bush: Policy, Politics, and Personality. USA: the School of Public Policy George Mason University, 2002.
- Ray Griffin, David. The New Pearl Harbor Disturbing Questions About the Bush

Administration And 9/11. Olive Branch Press, 2005.

Rengger, N.J. International Relations, Political Theory and the Problem of Order: Beyond International Relations theory?. London: Routledge, 2000.

Selected Speeches of President George W. Bush 2001-2008.

Schmidt, Donald.E. The Folly of War: American Foreign Policy 1898/2005. New York: Algora Publishing, 2005.

Tucker, Robert.W and David C. Hendaichson. The Imperial Temptation the New World Order and America's Purpose. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1992.

Walt, Stephen.M. International Relations: One Word, Many Theories. USA: University of Chicago, 1998.

Watson, Adam. The Evolution of International Society. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Wilson, Peter. Idealism in International Relations. USA: AGE Publications, 2011.

Woodward, Bob. Plan of Attack. Simon and Schuster, 2004.

2. Articles

Abrahms, May. Quarterly. *What Terrorist Really Want: Terrorist Motives and Counterterrorism*. Journal: International Security, vol.32.no.4, Spring, 2008.

AlikhattakShahid. *The Bush Doctrine of preemption and the US response after 9/11*
Attack: Invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq . Journal of political studies,
vol.18, Issue-2, 2011.

Beissenger, Mark R. “*Nationalism And the Collapse of Soviet Communism*”.
Contemporar European History. 2009.

Benton, William.”*Russian and Soviet History: From the times of Troubles to Collapse of Soviet Union*”. February 4, 2008.

Berggren, Jason, and Nicolc.Rae. “*Jimmy Carter and George w. Bush: Faith Foreign Policy And An Evangelical Presidential Style*”. Presidential Studies Quarterly;
vol.36.no.4, 2006.

Carmichael, Neil. "A *Brief History of the Berlin Crisis*". National Records and Archives Administration, Autumn 2011.

Dombrowski, Peter, and Rodger A. Payne. "Global *Debate and the Limits of the Bush Doctrine*". University of Pittsburgh, 2003

Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History?". The National Interest, 1989.

Gibbs, David N. "Afghanistan: The Soviet Invasion in Retrospect". International Politics. June, 2000.

Glant, Tibor. "Terrorism And Anti-Americanism: 9/11 Ten Years After". Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies, vol.18, 2012.

Gray, Colin S. "The implications of Preemptive and Preventive war Doctrines: A Reconsideration". Strategic Studies Institute, 2007.

Griffiths, Martin. "Beyond the Bush Doctrine: American Hegemony And World Order". Australian Journal of American Studies. 2015

Guofennison, Eniar K. "The Fall of the Berlin Wall: A Symbol of the Fall of a Socialist Empire." The Parliament of Ireland.

Holloway, David. "Nuclear Weapons and The Exaltation of The Cold War 1945-1962". Vol. 1, Cambridge University Press, Sep 2010.

Koslowski, Rey, and Friedrich V. Kratochwill. "Understanding Change In International Politics: The Soviet Empire's demise And The International System". vol.48.No.2, International Organization, 1994.

Kurakaa, Manuela. "North Atlantic Treaty Organization". The Greater Washington University International Affairs Society, November, 1st, 2014.

Lafeber, Walter. "The Bush Doctrine". The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, vol.26.No.4, 2002.

Lebow, Richard Ned. "*The Cuban Missile Crisis*". Vol,09, Political Science Quarterly, August 2000.

Lazzari, Luigil. "*The Strategic Defense Initiative And The End Of Cold War, Defense Technical Information Center*" Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School, 2008.

Martin, Brain. G. "*The Soviet Union at the Crossroads: Gorbachev's Reform Program*". Foreign Affair Research, 1990.

Maynes, Charles William. "*The Nature Of The Post-Cold World*". Foreign Policy journal, 2012.

Marron, Maria B, "*Elite British And Irish Newspapers Reflect Ideology In Framing The 9/11 Catastrophe*". How The World's New's Media Reacted to 9/11, Marquette Books, 2007.

McMahan, Jefferson. "*Preventive War And The Killing Of Innocent*". University of Illinois, 2003.

McNair, Brain. "*UK Media Coverage of September 11*". How the World's New's Media Reacted to 9/11, Marquette books, 2007.

"*National Security Council*". [http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/nsc /](http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/nsc/).

Retrieved in 03/04/2017. 15:20.

Neely, Victoria. "*Presidential Personality And Foreign Policymaking*". Hofstra University, 2015.

Perl, Rphael F. "*Terrorism, The Future, And US Foreign Policy*". Congressional Research Service The Library Congress, September 13, 2001.

Pfiffner, James P. "*The Paradox of President Reagan's Leadership*". University of Southern California, 2002.

Preble, Christopher. "*The Bush Doctrine And Rogue States*". Foreign Service journal,

October, 2005

Ramirzer, Jorrge Alberto. "*Iraq war: Anticipatory Self- defense or Unlawful*

Unilateralism? Vol. 34. 2003.

Record, Jeffery. "*Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counter*

proliferation". 2004.

Rosto, Sebastian and John Schuessler. "*A Realist Foreign Policy for the United*

States". vol.9, No 4.

Santos, Maria Helena De Castro, and Ulysses Tavares Teixeira. "*The Essential Role of*

Democracy in The Bush Doctrine: The invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan". 2013.

Smith, Tony. "*Wilsonianism, Encyclopedia Of American of American Foreign Policy*".

New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Westad, Odd Arne. "*The Fall of Détente Soviet-American Relations during The Carter*

Years". Scandinavian University Press, 1997.

Wilhelmsen, Julie and GeirFlikke. "*Evidence of Russia's Bush Doctrine in the CIS*". 2005

Vol.14.No.3.

3. Web Sites:

Presidential and Foreign Policymaking www.hofstra.edu/neelyulrawinner2005. Accessed in

22/02/2017.22:02.

Holsti, Ole R. Theories of International Relations. Holsti-pfeaver people.duke.edu.

Accessed: 22:50.

Yilmaz, State, Power, and Hegemony. Turkey, Beykent

University.www.ijbssnet.com. Accessed: 15, 12, 2016. At: 22:03

Usforeignpolicy.about.com/od/defence/a/The-Bush-Doctrine.htm. Accessed in:

23/02/2017 15:05.

“*The 9/11 Commission Report*” [http:// 9-11 commission .gov](http://9-11.commission.gov). Accessed: 06/04/2017.

22:05.

“*USA Patriot Act of 2001*” Office of Extramural Research. <http://grants.nih.gov> .

Accessed: 06/04/2017. 19:29

www.peace.ca) bush doctrine. Accessed in: 23/02/2017.19:05.

Robert Kagan “We must Fight This War “, *Washington Post*, September 12, 2001

([http:// washingtonpost .com](http://washingtonpost.com)) accessed 05/03/2017.15:07.

[Https// usa.usembassy.de /etexts/his](https://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/his)

www.errolmorris.com/content/election04/blog-102804.html accessed: 29/03/2017. 23:55.

Tory/ ch.htm.

“ Report of the Working Group on Anti- Americanism “.’<http://WWW.princeton.edu>.

06/04/2017 .At:23: 30.

Source:” Report of the Working group on Anti-Americanism “. <http://www.princeton>

.edu. 07/04/2017. At: 22:05. P05.

Y. Auyang, Sunny. Empire And Hegemony. www.chinaandrome.org

/English/essays/hegemony.htm.Accessed: 15/12/2016. At: 22:10.

War on Terror – Global Issues.

‘www.globalissue.org.<http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/nsc> /. Retrieved in

03/04/2017.15:20.

What's the Problem with the U.S.?*

Mostly America in Both DK/

Bushgeneral(VOL) Ref

%%%

Spain76 14 7 3 (N=374)

2003 50 37 72 2

Germany 65 29 5 1 (N=424)

2003 74 22 3 1

Netherlands 63 30 6 1 (N=403)

France 63 32 5 1 (N=429)

2003 74 21 4 .

Pakistan 51 29 1010 (N=730)

2003 62 31 2 5

Britain 56 35 8 1(N= 285)

2003 59 31 8 3

Canada 54 37 90(N=188)

Table

Pew

2003	60	32	6	2	
Lebanon	47	32	191	(N=572)	
2003	51	32	16	1	
Turkey	41	36	17	6	(N=671)
2003	52	33	12	3	
Indonesia	43	42	0	15	(N=517)
2003	69	20	7	4	
India	35	35	14	16	(N=349)
Jordan	22	37	41	1	(N=798)
2003	42	28	30	.	
China	16	34	42	8	(N=1,197)
Poland	27	49	14	10	(N=236)
Russia	30	58	9	3	(N=401)
2003	43	32	15	10	
* 2005 Survey of those with an unfavorable opinion of the U.S.					

01:

Surveys: What's the Problem with the United States?

Source: Report of the Working group on Anti-Americanism ". <http://www.princeton.edu>.

07/04/2017. At: 22:05. P05..