

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

BACHELOR THESIS

BRATISLAVA 2012

Alexandra Tóthová

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

**Idealism and Realism in Foreign Policy Rhetoric of the United States
of America
Bachelor Thesis**

Study Program: Liberal Arts

Field of Study: 3. 1. 6 Political Science

Thesis Advisor: Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD.

Qualification Degree: Bachelor of Science (abbr. „Bc“)

Handed in: 30. 4. 2012

Date of Defense: 13. 6. 2012

Bratislava 2012

Alexandra

Tóthová

Declaration of Originality

I declare that this Bachelor Thesis “Idealism in American Foreign Policy” is my own work and has not been published in part or in whole elsewhere. All used literature and other sources are attributed and cited in references.

Bratislava, 30 April 2012

Signature: _____

Author: Alexandra Tóthová

Thesis Title: Idealism in American Foreign Policy

University: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts

Under Thesis Advisor Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD.

Head of the Defense Committee: Samuel Abrahám, PhD.

Defense Committee: Samuel Abrahám, PhD., Prof. František Novosád, Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD.

Place, year, length of the thesis: Bratislava, 2012, 36 pages (12,125words)

Qualification Degree: Bachelor of Science (Bc.)

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to identify realism and idealism of the international relations in the foreign policy of the United States. The methodology of it is collecting theoretical background and that apply it into case studies.

This study is divided into four chapters. The first chapter discusses idealism of international politics, where the ideals and their origin is discusses; realism of the international politics, where the realist point of view is discussed which emphasis the struggle for power. This chapter also illustrated the method of levels of analysis.

The second chapter is the application of the theoretical background displayed in the first chapter. By the end of the chapter we come to the conclusion that there is a discrepancy between idealist and realist approach on the foreign policy of the United States.

The third chapter is a presentation of presidential rhetoric in the case of Iraq war. The chapter makes an exhibition on idealism in practice and the public opinion on the real politics behind the rhetorical justification.

The last chapter will sum up the previous chapters and come out with a conclusion at the synthesis of idealism and realism in the foreign policy of the United States, the difference but also similarity.

Autor bakalárskej práce: Alexandra Tóthová
Názov práce: Idealizmus v rétorike americkej zahraničnej politiky
Názov vysokej školy: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts
Meno školiteľa: Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD.
Vedúci komisie pre obhajoby: Samuel Abrahám, PhD.
Komisia pre obhajoby: Samuel Abrahám, PhD., Prof. František Novosád, Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD.
Miesto, rok, rozsah práce: Bratislava, 2012, 36 strán, 12125 slov
Stupeň odbornej kvalifikácie: Bakalár (Bc.)

ABSTRAKT

Cieľom tejto štúdie je identifikovať realizmus a idealizmus medzinárodných vzťahov v zahraničnej politike Spojených štátov. Metodológiou je zbieranie dát o teoretickom zázemí a následné aplikovanie na prípadové štúdiá.

Táto študijná práca je rozdelená na štyri kapitoly. Prvá rozoberá idealizmus v medzinárodnej politike, kde ideály a ich korene sú preskúmané; realizmus v medzinárodných vzťahov, kde realistický pohľad je diskutovaný a ktorý vyzdvihuje zápas o moc. Táto kapitola ilustruje aj metódu úrovni skúmania.

Druhá kapitola ukazuje aplikáciu teoretického zázemia. Ku koncu kapitoly prichádzame k záveru, že je určitý rozdiel medzi idealizmom a realizmom aplikovane na zahraničnú politiku Spojených štátov.

Tretia kapitola prezentuje prezidentskú rétoriku na prípade vojny s Irakom. Kapitola ukazuje, že idealizmus prakticky ovplyvňuje verejnú mienku o reálnych krokoch zahraničnej politiky, ktorá je za rétorickou snahou oprávniť tieto kroky.

Posledná kapitola zosumarizuje predošlé kapitoly a príde k záveru v ktorom je uvedená syntéza idealizmu a realizmu v zahraničnej politike Spojených štátov, rozdiely ale aj podobnosti.

PREFACE

What drives the foreign policy of the United States-- the noble ideals or the struggle for power? Could the two approaches be combined? This study is discussing two approaches -realism and idealism- as a tool for the analysis of the international system.

This study combines inductive and deductive approaches. The original American democratic ideals will be clarified by analyzing the primary texts thanks to which the ideals became a part of cultural heritage and identity, like *The Federalists* or Thomas Paine's *The Rights of Men* (1792). These texts are compared with the texts written today, public speeches, documents, articles, etc. The ideals which are used also in rhetoric of today's foreign policy are defined by these sources. Analysis of the two approaches- realism and idealism- will require the same methodology. The aim is to prove/disprove that the foreign policy of the United States could be analyzed only by application of both approaches. Realism discusses the concrete policies that are effected by the struggle for power while idealism is needed in rhetoric in order to seek legitimacy in the eyes of the citizens (by effecting the public opinion). A deduction is made here from the collected data. In this section the main methodology will be hermeneutic.

The thesis also contains a case study, which is focusing on the war in Iraq from the perspective of the United States. Here, the most significant is the motivation of the U.S. to get involved into the domestic politics of Iraq. After collecting all the data necessary for this study, the thesis will be proved (or shown that it is false).

This study will clarify firstly the role of ideals in American foreign relations. It will also show the fact that justification and legitimacy do play an important role not only within the country, but also towards other democratic states. Secondly, the real policies are usually made upon the given circumstances and the calculated possible ends, while idealism in the rhetoric of the administration is used primarily for legitimization of the real policies. Idealistic goals are not the real goals of foreign policies, even though they might be affected by it. The study will explain how.

Obsah

ABSTRACT	IV
ABSTRAKT	V
PREFACE	VI
INTRODUCTION	8
CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: IDEALISM OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS	11
REALISM OF THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	18
LEVELS OF ANALYSIS:	19
CHAPTER 2: AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE CASE OF IRAQ	25
THEORIES IN PRACTICE- ANALYZING THE IRAQ WAR:.....	25
LEVELS OF ANALYSIS	25
REALIST INTERPRETATION:.....	26
IDEALIST INTERPRETATION:	28
DISCREPACY BETWEEN IDEALS AND REALISTIC APPROACH IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY.....	29
CHAPTER 3: PRESIDENTIAL RHETORIC.....	34
G.H.W. BUSH SPEECH—ATTACK IN IRAQU FORCES IN 1991	34
SPEECH OF PRESIDENT G. W. BUSH ON WAR AGAINST TERRORISM IN 2001	35
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY:	42
RESUMÉ:.....	45

INTRODUCTION

The rhetoric of a foreign policy of the US is more motivated by democratic ideals than that of any other country. It is used to gain legitimacy for –sometimes disputable– foreign policy, in the eyes of international society and mainly of its citizens. This thesis examines the relation between idealism and realism in the foreign policy of the United States. Idealism is connected to a justification of political actions and realism to the actions itself in order to keep the United State in the position of world's most powerful state.

The ideals of democracy, adopted by the American people, are defined in the works of Thomas Paine and his work *Rights of Men* or in the *Federalist Papers*, all of which had a great influence on the process of creation of the Constitution of the United States. These ideals are mainly in favor of freedom, rule of law and rights such as the right to private property, life and pursuit of happiness.

Another important ideal shared by members of the U.S. society is a belief, that America is a democratic “beacon on the hill” (idea by John Winthrop) for the rest of the world, a country which's foreign policy is in favor of democratization and peace-keeping operations. There are no doubts about the fact that the United States is one of the most powerful countries of the world, even some claim that its power is declining. For the next decades, however, its' power will remain particularly strong.

The United States spends an enormous amount of money to support the military, also has very strong navy. U.S. military and economy is highly capable and efficient, while at the same time U.S. have significant influence in many intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations (UN) or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and has certain connections to the financial institutions on Wall Street.

However, there were (and still are) some countries, which are important actors in the international system, as they want to act in opposition to goals favorable for the United States. Such states risk possible military intervention, as we could see on the case of Iraq.

On the other hand, there are countries that are risking their position in the international system for having a good relationship with the United States. Egypt was

excluded from the League of Arab Nations because of the favorable politics held towards Israel. That might be dangerous for their security and also for an achievement of economic goals set by long-term strategists.

According to the realist theory of international relations, a state mainly tries to achieve power, security, self-preservation and stability. The United States are often depicted as the state with a sole hegemony over the Western world. This position is not easy to maintain and cultivate. Therefore, the goals in foreign policy should have their basis in pragmatism in order to preserve the status quo.

However, without justification in the eyes of its citizens, the administration would not get the support needed for legitimate and successful achievement of these goals. To provide a justification to the real actions, the foreign policy rhetoric relies on idealism. The US uses the idealist rhetoric to justify its actions and to gain support from its allies. Without the support of NATO it would not be able to act as the global hegemon.

The ideals are a part of cultural identity. The American exceptionalism has a strong tradition and citizens certainly respond to a foreign policy based on the democratic principles. People are deeply convinced about, that democracy is the best regime humans ever invented. Thus a justification of actions might be based on spreading the “good” cultural values with regards to a popular theory, stating that no war will emerge among countries with democratic regime and the global spread of democracy might bring so desperately needed worldwide peace.

Another important element for the legitimacy in democratic regimes is public opinion. No politician could win the elections without the support for his or her program. People would not be convinced about the question whether he or she will really act in the name of the country. That is the main reason why rhetoric plays an important role in the politics including the foreign policy.

The goal of this study is to show how these ideals are used for legitimacy of the foreign policy in the United States and to show the limits of such justification. The key research questions are: Are the realist goals superior in decision-making process to the idealist? What conditions must a given country fulfill in order to have a good

relationship with the United States? Why is it important for the United States to be perceived as a “good cop” of the international system?

The foreign policy of the United States is driven by two approaches: realism on the one hand, which is characteristic by a direct motivation behind the actions towards other countries, and idealism on the other hand, which is necessary for the justification and legitimacy in the international system but also for the domestic public opinion.

CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: IDEALISM OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

The belief of the Americans to have a special role in the international system is deeply rooted within their cultural heritage. Citizens of the United States are convinced that they are the guardians of democracy and so the peace, stability and prosperity of the world should be preserved. Why it is so? The approach of idealism gives an answer.

Idealism is an approach in the theory of international relations. Idealism emphasizes the inherited ideals of a given society. The essence of it is the conviction of human being as a rational being. Following this premise can help in understanding of the universal law, which is reflecting on human being's nature. Society is driven by the universal law. By a rational capacity to understand the natural law people have aptitude to improve the condition of their society in order to maintain justice in it. The deficiency of a just society is the fault of its institutions and of the environment, which might be corrupted. However, by utilizing a special civic education, people may create a more just society. In short, idealism is a behavior which is shaped by the belief, that justice or equality could be reached, provided that we are following the ideal of good (McLean & McMillan, 2009).

Idealism in international relations has an impact on the mechanisms of creating peace among states. It has been the formative force in creation of the international system in the 20th century. For example, the principle of collective security was affected by idealistic approach. Collective security is "a system maintaining world peace and security by the concerned action and agreement of all nations. The central idea of collective security is to institutionalize a permanent arrangement creating a balance of power, in which the entire international community agrees to oppose military aggression by any member. The logic of the scheme is that no state can stand up to all of the other members of the system together, and that aggression will therefore be permanently deterred" (McLean & McMillan, 2009). Examples of such institutionalized collective security are the League of Nations and the United Nations. For liberals, institutions are essentials, because „they facilitate cooperation by building on common interests, hence maximizing the gains for all parties. Institutions help shape state preferences, solidifying cooperative relationship“ (Mingst, 2011, p. 79). Security is essential and institutions provide a help to create it by imposing a

communicational framework among states about international issues, such as human rights, environmental questions, common security, etc.

Immanuel Kant believed that wars in the international system can be triumphed over by collective actions, such as federation, and this might bring stable peace for the states willing to give up their sovereignty.

The greatest practitioner of idealism of the twentieth century was Woodrow Wilson, the U.S. President. He was among the creators of the League of Nations, organization, which had the prevention of war as the key goal.

We can clearly identify the beliefs of idealism in Woodrow Wilson's War Message to Congress from 1917. He believed in same standards of morality for mankind and in the partnership of democracies in the world, which could preserve peace. "No autocratic government could be trusted to keep within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion" (Wilson, 1917). He also claimed that the United States were involved in the World War I only for the purpose of defending human rights, to free people from oppression of an autocratic regimes like Germany. To govern in civilized way is the interest of mankind. Defending rights—not only human rights but also the international law—is, as Wilson wrote "more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest to our hearts—for democracy, (...), for a universal dominion of right by such concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make to world itself at last free" (Wilson, 1917). Americans should fight for the principles without seeking own profit, as the only nation, which is privileged to do so, because upon these principles the United States were established. It is a kind of American altruism, the base of the belief that Americans have special role in the international system and that they defend democracy and spread it just because only in democracy people are free and have guaranteed the basic rights given by birth—the right to live, the right to liberty, the right to property and the right to pursue happiness.

The American exceptionalism is in the cultural heritage of citizens of the United States. When a president claims that it is a national interest to free the people of the world by spreading democracy, he usually meets with the strong positive sentiment of his citizens, by which he gains support for his foreign policy in case of war. "Though Americans do not put "extending democracy" near the top of their list of foreign policy objectives (preventing terrorism is their chief goal), few would deny that if a

popular rule is extended, it would improve lives around the world” (Wilson , 2002). As James Q. Wilson writes in his article, three-fourths of Americans would claim that it is a good idea to spread democracy all over the world including their ideals, views and values. The belief of American exceptionalism is so evident that if any member of the Armed Forces is asked what the reason of fighting in Iraq or Afghanistan is, the answer would probably be “defending freedom”. ”And this view means that American tends to define the issues that divide them as a contest of rights more that as a matter of choice” (Wilson J. Q., 2002).

The belief of human being as rational who is able to create just society with equality of all its members is in the cultural heritage of the United States. Liberty and equality are the most appreciated values; however, not every regime is constituted in balance of political freedom and equality in from of the law.

Since the times after USA became independent, the new confederation was set up in the name of certain ideals—ideals of the republic. The Federalist Papers collects the beliefs thanks to which the Constitution of the United States was made. In these essays the most significant values of the Americans are presented. Thomas Paine in his work *The Rights of Man* claims, that the revolutions of America and France are repairing the system of principles. These principles fit to human nature, because the new political order, the republic, is „combining moral and political happiness and national prosperity. (...) Monarchical sovereignty, the enemy of mankind, and the source of misery, is abolished; and the sovereignty itself is restored to its natural and original place, the Nation“ (Paine, 1792, p. 77). Wrong regime imposes slavery by creating a fear to think. A good regime, such as the republic is, is lead by reason. In Paine’s view, America was the only place where the reformation of regime in favor of republic could begin. The first settlers came from different countries, had different qualification and religion, however they did not consider each other as enemies, moreover as new companions in the creation of the American society. The American pluralist society gave us the heritage of tolerance, equality and freedom.

The Federalists believed that nations from their nature have a nature to accumulate power or territory. By unification, these problems are avoided, probability of a war or invasion is lowered and a general happiness arises, if unification is combined together

with security and respect to human rights. The interdependence of democracies among each other could bring such a kind of unity, because they might give up fighting in the name of cooperation and general prosperity. Cooperation eliminates the security threats, thus the states could concentrate on a more beneficial activities like economic growth. States in constant war or threat from its neighbors have to focus on the armament so they cannot concentrate on a standard of life of its citizens. This is the reason why the Federalists urged for unity of the American states. And, this might be the reason behind the belief of democratic mission provided by the United States nowadays.

The American states also profited from the union. With its navy power they could control the world business by controlling the transport lines. The strength of the United States is in its geopolitical position, but only if it is united. The united American states were able to compete with the rest of the world, especially Europe, which was economically stronger at that time. “It belongs to us to vindicate the honor of the human race, and to teach that assuming brother, moderation. Union will enable us to do it. Disunion will add another victim to his triumphs. Let Americans disdain to be the instruments of European greatness! Let the thirteen States, bound together in a strict and indissoluble Union, concur in erecting one great American system, superior to the control of all transatlantic force or influence, and able to dictate the terms of the connection between the old and the new world (Hamilton, 1797).

Democracy brings the possibility of choosing the best representatives to lead the political affairs, who will be wiser and more talented, in order to represent the federation as the whole. „Hence, it will result that the administration, the political counsels, and the judicial decisions of the national government will be more wise, systematical, and judicious than those of individual States, and consequently more satisfactory with respect to other nations, as well as more SAFE with respect to us” (Jay, 1787).

Another voice in favor of the union was George Washington´s, as he expressed in his Farewell Address. He knew that the only way how to make the American state strong is to be united. He also claimed that this is the only possible choice how to make freedom protected. Freedom is the most important value of the Americans. It is a

hobbesian heritage, the belief that the state should only pass laws and protects peace among people. If there is no law about a certain action, you are free to provide it. The Constitution includes four basic rights that every citizen has, and freedom is among them: right to live, right to freedom, right to property and right to pursue happiness. Washington saw the importance of the united democratic and liberal political system. A good political system can avoid ambitious but power-loving men to get the lead. However, participant citizens are a prerequisite, because they have to control the system itself. A good politician is a moral and responsible being. A good politician also should be religious otherwise his promises are not trustworthy. God is present in the today political rhetoric as well, even though the state and the church are formally separated in USA. Good, moral and religious politicians form a good and moral government because that is required in order to lead well.

John Winthrop is one of the most cited actors in presidential speeches. In his work *A Model of Christian Charity* (1997) he expresses the belief of importance of community work as all the members have the same goal. “We must uphold a familiar commerce together in all meekness, gentleness, patience and liberality. We must delight in each other; make others’ conditions our own; rejoice together, mourn together, labor and suffer together, always having before our eyes our commission and community in the work, as members of the same body. (...) For we must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us. So that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken, and so cause Him to withdraw His present help from us, we shall be made a story and a by-word through the world“ (Winthrop, ROK).

John Quincy Adams, who was the Secretary of State during the presidency of James Monroe, in his Address from 4th July speech expresses his belief, that the United States were established on general and voluntary agreement of its citizens upon certain elementary idea of the community, which respect the rule of rights in name of justice. The new, independent state determined by republican values will defend honest friendship, equal freedom, equal justice and equal rights and will respect the right for self-determination of other nations while maintaining its own: „the motto upon her shield is Freedom, Independence, Peace“ (Adams, 1821).

First, Adams was skeptical about the involvement in wars, because that would be dangerous for the preservation of the values upon which the Constitution was set. “The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. The frontlet upon her brows would no longer beam with the ineffable splendor of freedom and independence; but in its stead would soon be substituted an imperial diadem, flashing in false and tarnished lustre the murky radiance of dominion and power. She might become the dictatress of the world: she would be no longer the ruler of her own spirit” (Adams, 1821). Adams, as the Secretary of State under the president James Monroe created a doctrine guided by “non-colonization” and “non-interference” during the wars of independence in Latin America. The Monroe Doctrine allowed involvement into wars only if American interests and security are threatened. However, Americans declared that every war in the American continent is a security danger to the United States. Obtaining international influence by helping the Latin American states to independence was closer to the national interest. “Only when the United States had grown to such a stature that it could support its principles by effective force did Monroe Doctrine win assent or command respect among the nations of the Old World” (Pratt, 1972, p. 88).

Idealism is present in the rhetoric of the presidents of the United States because it is the best way how to justify certain policy and mobilize masses and resources required to provide for these policies. In a democratic regime, public opinion plays a crucial role. Public opinion is “the aggregation of the views of individuals in society. (...) Traditional definitions of public opinion had stressed the influence of elites and those best informed in society” (McLean & McMillan, 2009). Rhetoric has an impact on public opinion, and thus politicians frequently influence citizens in order to gain legitimacy for certain political actions. Legitimizing political actions by the citizens requires specific ability of politicians. However, without the support of the public, the lack of legitimacy in democratic regimes makes the policies, also foreign policies, ineffective or even impossible. Support of the public may be obtained through appropriate rhetoric. The rhetorical use of ideals inherited in the society is probably the best way of getting the public support.

Democracy is a political regime. Often it is defined as the rule of the people, but this definition is criticized by scholars. According to Schumpeter, democracy is the method of choosing the rulers.

Interests groups are electing their representatives, political subjects, who will stand for their interests in political decisions. In democracy, people can be a part of the political decision-making process through elections. It is often said that only democratic regimes are responsible to the citizens.

Political parties in fact work as business companies. They focus on success and power. The power can be achieved by regular elections where. Political parties also have bureaucratic apparatus, which is dealing with the organization of the party and creates strategies for the future success in elections.

Public opinion is crucial in democracies-- especially before elections-- therefore no good politician can ignore it. However, there are cases when politicians had to ignore the public opinion or even try to change it. The main method of convincing the masses is provided by the media. Through media, people can catch up with the current affairs- by watching the news or political discussions or reactions of political party leaders to the current affairs of the state (Sullivan, n.d.).

The strategy of the administration has to take into account not only the short-run goals of the party, but also the long-run goals. Such a successful long-term policy may provide credibility of the country for the outside world, especially for business corporations. The long-run goals of the strategy have to make the agenda of the party or of the leader of the party stronger. It is hard to think in the long-run, especially if one has to react to the current state of affairs. Short-run crises can damage the long-run strategy quite effectively.

A good politician expresses himself or herself only in harmony of the ideals and their understanding. Any campaign conducted through the media has to be founded in the democratic ideals. The goals must be consistent. For example, if the leaders make a decision to focus on creating a better economic situation, they have to make a reliable reasoning why the citizens have to be patient and suffer a bit in order to create

prosperity in the future. If the public does not understand the imposed policies, the party or the leader may not survive the election term.

REALISM OF THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Idealism is needed for justification of foreign policies for the public in order to gain legitimacy for these policies. On the other hand, providing national security requires a different point of view on the international relations, namely the realist viewpoint. Realism is a theory, through which the certain policies can be interpreted-- why they are needed, what are the goals which they follow and so on. The realist point of view gives us the realistic answer to a question, why the United States invaded Iraq by defining what kind of national interest led the U.S. to do so.

The theory of realism considers the international system as an anarchic struggle for power. The United States, however, gained special position in this struggle. It is a hegemonic power of our days with special national interest: to keep this power for as long as possible.

After the World War II, two superpowers had emerged: the United States and the Soviet Union. Both had huge military and economic influence, while Europe was ravaged by war. The two superpowers became the creators of the international system based on bipolarity and the principle of mutually assured destruction. However, the United States supported free trade and expanding capitalism, the Soviet Union took socialism as the base for economic production.

The new superpowers did not engage in a conflict directly; they preferred support to third parties, as the direct military conflict would make enormous damages on both sides, not only on the side of the defeated. This period is well-known as the 1945-1989 Cold War. "The Cold War itself can be characterized as forty-five years of overall high-level tension and competition between the superpowers but with no direct military conflict. The advent cautiously, only once coming close to the precipice of direct war. As nuclear technology advanced it became increasingly obvious to both sides that in a nuclear war each would be destroyed beyond hope of recovery" (Karen A. Mingst, 2011,p. 48). The Cold War era finished when the Soviet Union had fallen

apart thanks to economic exhaustion and (on average) peaceful revolutions in Eastern Europe, where the states were willing to change the communist government into democratic. The bipolar era ended and the United States raised up as the only superpower in the new world order.

The United States became a global hegemon. Even though some scholars say that its power is declining, in these times it is still the strongest state of the world and it will keep its position for some time. Friedman claims that by militant control of three oceans of the world, the United States control the world business. Not only by that. The interdependence of Western world is enormous, not many bilateral or multilateral treaties were signed without the presence of the United States. To keep this position in the world community requires well-thought out and well-implemented strategy. The U.S. foreign policy's strategy was to create regional conflicts by which the powers neutralize themselves, so they lose the energy to fight against the United States interests. Without war on its territory the U.S. was able to rise economically and to gain influence. Friedman claims that economic and military power goes hand in hand. However, after the direct terrorist attack against the U.S. on September 11, 2001 the U.S. had to give aside its successful strategy of foreign policy in order to respond immediately to show the ability and the strength of the military power. People were desperate so the government had to react on the attack. Thus the USA started to wage wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

LEVELS OF ANALYSIS:

Political power has certain levels. It functions differently on international level, on the level of a state, and on individual level. All three levels are important for the analysis of the world politics.

The first level is the international one. The system exerts pressure on states by which they have to behave in a certain way, and which can be also predicted to some extent. According to the theory of balance of power, if a nation-state seeks hegemony, other states join in some kind of union to balance out the hegemon's power. The basic focus of analyzing the international system is the redistribution of power following from the characteristics of this system, which are the following: the international system is

mainly anarchic. There is no institution with collective decision making power. The states manage their conflicts in accordance with capability of using their power. The more power a state has, the more it can be successful in fulfilling its interest. For a state to survive in the system, it needs to be able to self-help. The state has to protect its security and independence.

The second level refers to the actor in the international system. From the realist point of view, the key actor is the nation-state. Unlike other theories, there are also other important actors, the non-state actors like intergovernmental institutions, non-governmental organizations, international corporations, etc.

However, states are sovereign entities, which act relatively independently. States are a part of the same system, therefore their actions and reactions are the key, by which they cooperate or have conflict. In the level of the state the mostly emphasized premise is the nature of the political regime. Democracies act differently than authoritarian regimes. Accordingly to the democratic peace theory, democratic states do not lead wars against each other.

Another example of how differently act countries with different regimes we might see if we look at the behavior of totalitarian regimes. They usually work out aggressive foreign policy strategy in order to make the citizens focus more on other nations as the cause of their suffering within their state, and not to see what their government actually is doing against their interests. The great example is the Nazi Germany, which was trying to enslave the Slavic countries, which were taken account as the inferior race.

The third level of analysis is the individual level, where the mostly emphasized actor is the leader of the nation-state. This level refers to the decision-makers who decide the question of peace and war, conflict and cooperation, such as individuals, organizations, institutions within the state. “Real people make decisions that determine the pattern of behavior among states in the international system” (Dorff, p. 7).

From the realist point of view, state is the key actor in the international system. The interactions among the states define the international system. Following this, we have to focus on the state, its interests, its strategy towards other states, study the political trends in a given state in order to understand what is happening in the world - in the international system.

First, we have to define what a state is. Commonly, a state is understood as a group of human beings living in a given territory ruled by a government. "The state represents the physical and political aspects of a country. Sovereignty refers to the ability of a country to exercise preeminent control over the people and the policies within its territorial boundaries" (Dorff, p. 3). The state is free to exercise its own control over its people without interferences from external forces executed by other states. According to popular sovereignty, people of a state are not simply ruled by this state, but the legitimacy of ruling over them comes from the citizens. People give the government the right to rule over. War and peace is therefore a national question.

The behavior of the state is determined by its interests. First is the survival of the state, what is related to the territory, people who are living in it and the state's sovereignty. From this aspect, protecting of the sovereignty is the most important, because no government can exercise its power over the people if it lost its sovereignty. "Historically, states and their people have been willing to risk much, including death and destruction, in order to protect and promote their sovereign rights" (Dorff, p. 5). As we can see, sovereignty is the key goal of the state. It is essential for the survival of the state and figures as a premise for self-help of a state.

The essentials of realism are founded in Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*). Firstly, the state is a principal actor. Even though there might be also other actors, like international organizations, their impact on international politics are marginal. Following this, the second assumption is, that the state is an unitary actor, what means, that in questions of war and peace it speaks with one voice. Thirdly, the state is a rational actor, because it calculates the possible ends before acting. Fourthly, the state needs to protect itself from not only the outside threats but also from the inside. A state can manage its protection by building domestic capacities and its economic power, but also by forming alliances with other states (Karen A. Mingst, 2011, p. 71).

Thucydides in the most famous part of the History of the Peloponnesian War, The Melian Dialogue, describes the behavior of states in time of war. This dialogue is illustrating the argumentation before the Athenians took control over the island. Dialogue is taken as the oldest text of the discipline of International Relations, because some aspects are still relevant for the study of war and peace. The behavior of states did not change much in respect to power. States with equal power would not go into war because of the fear from total destruction.

“Athenians: For ourselves, we shall not trouble you with specious pretences- either of how we have a right to our empire because we overthrew the Mede, or are now attacking you because of wrong that you have done us- and make a long speech which would not be believed; and in return we hope that you, instead of thinking to influence us by saying that you did not join the Lacedaemonians, although their colonists, or that you have done us no wrong, will aim at what is feasible, holding in view the real sentiments of us both; since you know as well as we do that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, **while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must**” (Thucydides, 431 BC).

Another early realist is Saint Augustine (354-430). He claims that wars are natural for human beings, because they are basically power-seeking and self-absorbed. Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) also agrees with this claim, and in his work *The Prince* he wrote advices, about the way how to lead in accordance of the claim, that human beings are by nature evil beings. The leader needs to protect himself and the security of his state. “Since a prince must of necessity know well how to use the beast, he ought of the beast to pick the fox and the lion; for the lion cannot defend himself from snares, and the fox cannot defend himself from the wolves. (...)... if all men were good, this precept would not be good; but since they are wicked, and would not be faithful to you, you also do not have to be faithful to them. Nor does a prince ever lask legitimare causes to color his inobservance” (Machiavelli, Chapter 18).

Thomas Hobbes argued that men are in a constant state of war with each other, unless a single power, which is much stronger and who everyone fears, ends the perpetual war. He called this power – the state - the Leviathan.

Every realist agrees with the claim, that politics can be characterized by the struggle for power. Hans J. Morgenthau in his work *Six Principles of Political Realism* (1985) gives us a nice overview of this problem. Realism, as a political theory, believes that society is governed by general rules. These are built upon the reason and experience and in accordance to human nature, excluding opinion. A statesman has to be able to rationally predict the foreseeable consequences of his alternative decision before acting in foreign policy. The calculation must be based on the facts determined by time and place given by the international system. Morality in political realism is judged by the consequences of the leader's decision. The morality of the statesman differs from the morality of an ordinary man, because the politician bears the morality of consequence.

Henry Kissinger, scholar and foreign policy advisor, was the ambassador of the United States in the Soviet Union. In the 1970's, he promoted the theory of balance of power by supporting China and Pakistan as weaker powers against the Soviet Union and India, a growing power and a supporter of the Soviet Union. He is representing the *realpolitik*, which means, that the foreign policy is led by the given circumstances and not by any ideology or theory.

Kenneth Waltz, a neorealist, believes that the structure of international system itself has big effect on the international politics. The structure itself determines the times of peace and war. States in a bipolar international system behave differently than in the conditions, where a single authority, a hegemon, is present. Under unipolarity, according to the neorealists, there is a chance for peace, even if it is never certain. Because of the anarchy among the states, cooperation is really difficult and states have to protect themselves from possible threats, even from the constituted allies.

The United States is presently claimed to be the only hegemonic power in nowadays structure of the international system. Even though some scholars might argue, that its power is declining, in the next ten years we can still count the United States to remain the biggest superpower.

After the Cold War the U.S. became the most powerful state of the world. Keeping this status is not an easy task. After the 9/11 attack the U.S. had to respond immediately to show, that the attack on American soil has to be avenged. "American

decision makers believed that the US interests necessitated the invasion. They were aware of the fact that it was feasible to occupy Iraq rather than Iran or North Korea in terms of military power capabilities and it wouldn't be appropriate to take the moral concerns, namely whether there were really weapons of mass destruction or not, into account in the decision making process. An attack on Iran or North Korea could have cost more for the USA in respect to casualties and military expenses, so they must have found it more possible to attack Iraq when they took the power relations into account. Therefore, we can say that they did what the national interest asked them to do from the perspective of realism“ (Özdemir, 2011).

CHAPTER 2: AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE CASE OF IRAQ

THEORIES IN PRACTICE- ANALYZING THE IRAQ WAR:

LEVELS OF ANALYSIS

In the case of the War in Iraq, the levels of analysis approach could be applied in the following way:

Individual level:

Saddam Hussein was considered by the West as irrational and evil leader, who violated the human rights of his own people. He also resisted the Western interests and the UN Security Council's decisions. According to Pollack in his essay *Next Stop Baghdad?*, Hussein miscalculated his power, because he had only a little information from the world outside. The reason was that his intelligence service told him what he wanted to hear. "These pathologies lie behind the many terrible miscalculations Saddam has made over the years that flew in the face of deterrence -- including the invasion of Iran in 1980, the invasion of Kuwait in 1990, the decision to fight for Kuwait in 1990-91, and the decision to threaten Kuwait again in 1994" (Pollack, 2002).

George W. Bush and his administration perceived Hussein's regime in 2001 as a threat to the international system, as he might have possessed the weapons of mass destruction on one hand, and that he threatened U.S. as the hegemonic power on the other, since Hussein had interests in becoming a regional power in the land with vast amount of crude oil.

State level:

The U.S. had to protect its national security and interests. The indication of the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq was taken as a security threat.

Iraq, according to the American secret services, also supported terrorist groups. However, this consideration was not proven. After the 9/11 attack, it was unthinkable for the U.S. to support regimes, which might give access to weapons of mass destruction to terrorist groups.

Building a stable, democratic Iraq was the intention of the U.S. foreign policy from the beginning of war against the Hussein's regime.

International system level:

The United States lobbied for the United Nations resolution in 2002, but the case of Iraq was not declared as priority. At last, the UN Security Council was convinced enough to declare arm embargo, but it was not claimed as sufficient, following which the United States launched the intervention against Iraq.

The U.S. hegemony of the international system is providing stability to the system, because it is able to react immediately to possible threats. The power of the United States is showcased also for the future aggressors, who might stop their intentions to attack the U.S., its allies or to thwart U.S. interests in particular area.

The international system defines democracy as morally superior to dictatorships-thus the moral imperatives for humanitarian interventions are legitimized.

REALIST INTERPRETATION:

Iraq under the leadership of Saddam Hussein was a threat not only to the United States, but the U.S. was the only country willing to invest resources needed for the change of regime. Hussein was mainly a security threat. The U.S. assumed that with weapons of mass destruction in his hands, Iraq may become a danger to the West. The oil supply from this country and Hussein's demand to sell oil for euros was also a considerable problem. This kind of action would promote precedent for other oil rich countries, thus a shift from petrodollars to "petroeuros" would cause huge disturbances in the world economic system. These disturbances could be a lower price of the dollar, lower international dependency of the U.S. dollar (most international trade is conducted in USD), lower ratings of USA resulting in higher yields of national bonds, in the worst case a complete dissolution of international monetary and financial system with dire unforeseen consequences (Davidson, 2003).

The only way to evade these events was to get rid of the Baathist regime and of Saddam Hussein. "Having escalated its threats and amassed its troops on Iraq's borders to coerce the regime to give up power, the United States had no other choice but to act militarily when the coercion failed" (Mingst & Arreguin-Toft, 2011, p. 86).

As Özdemir writes in his essay *Invasion of Iraq: A Reflection of Realism* the presence of weapons of mass destruction and the connection of the regime to terrorists groups was not proven, so the invasion of Iraq was perceived by many as unjust. However, from the realist point of view, justice is only marginal in the international system because the survival of the state and its position in the hierarchy of power is far more important. The United States has the power, but it also had to show that it will use the power against any state even without the UN approval, if its security and economic power is endangered.

Iraq agreed to let UN inspectors into the country in 2002, having ousted them in 1998, however, the U.S. reputation suffered after the attacks of the 9/11 and it wanted to appear again as the strongest as a calculation in the future, because being the strongest lowers the risk of an attack. “Had the Bush administration mainly sought to discover threatening weapons or weapons programs, then its non-cooperation with U.N. inspectors’ requests for more time to finish what was likely the most intrusive inspection regime ever undertaken (and the concomitant forfeiture by the U.S. of possibilities for a more inclusive U.N. authorized coalition against Iraq) would seem counter-productive” (Lieberfeld, 2005).

Saddam used chemical weapons in the past on the minority of Kurds, which also strengthened the fear of the United States that he will use such weapons also against them.

Iraq has an exclusive geopolitical position for the United States. Stationing of troops in Iraq reduces the distance from the U.S. to Iran and Syria, who are the most likely aggressors against Israel. Israel is the only democratic state in the Middle East, protecting Western, especially U.S. interests in the region. “The need of the USA to have a strategic position in the Middle East in its broad meaning covering the Central Asia and North Africa to control the potential American adversaries may also be used to explain American attack on Iraq which has very attractive rich oil reserves to be used for the benefit of the United States. After the Bush administration identified Iraq as state with terrorism, it was easier to conclude that it would be better to drain the swamp - Iraq - than killing the flies-terrorists” (Özdemir, 2011).

The U.S. often claims that its interest is the interest of the world, because its policy promotes peace, security and stability. „Bush, like the Athenian leader in the ‘Melian Dialogue’ who insisted on conquering the Melians to enlarge Athenian empire’s size and security, indicated American determination and willingness to increase the international peace and stability. He implied that American leadership will serve both the interests of America and the world in general. This is indeed American way of thinking” (Özdemir, 2011). However, the primary goal of the U.S. interests is to promote its own security, while keeping also the position in the international system. In the practice of foreign policy, American presidents are more akin to the machiavellian Prince. Machiavelli’s advice is more useful in *realpolitik* decision-making process than any other theory of international politics. Machiavelli claims that the only art that a statesman has to do on the highest level is the art of war. During the office term, a politician has to have a different type of morality than ordinary people have, because he has to look at the consequences of his decision. Sometimes an immoral action can lead to the benefit of the nation and sometimes an action affected by morality can make huge damages for the country.

IDEALIST INTERPRETATION:

Saddam Hussein was a vicious leader who was practising violence on the domestic population. His regime became a threat also for the states located in the region. He also supported terrorists who were the enemies of the West. The replacement of a cruel authoritarian regime with a democratic one would bring stability to the Middle East – Iraq being as a democratic beacon for other Muslim states. The U.S. would welcome the democratization of the Middle East, as it is easier to cooperate with a democratic country than with authoritarian one.

The urgency of regime change was felt most significantly when Saddam’s governance had or was very close to obtaining weapons of mass destruction. However, this fact was not proven sufficiently, otherwise the UN Security Council would support collective action against the Iraqi regime. Countries such as France, Russia and Germany were not in favor of the collective action because they did not see the need for immediate action (Mingst & Arreguín-Toft, 2011).

Another argument for the U.S. invasion in Iraq is the fact that human rights were violated. The position of the U.S. is very important, or one might even say that it is exceptional. “To this day, the United States remains the only superpower capable, and at times willing, to commit real resources and make real sacrifices to build, sustain, and drive an international system committed to international law, democracy, and the promotion of human rights. Experience teaches that when the United States leads on human rights, from Nuremberg to Kosovo, other countries follow. When the United States does not lead, often nothing happens, or worse yet, as in Rwanda and Bosnia, disasters occur because the United States does not get involved“ (Hongju Koh, 2003, pp. 1487-1488).

DISCREPANCY BETWEEN IDEALS AND REALISTIC APPROACH IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

The clash between the American ideals and values and the American foreign policy is complicated. The two main theories- idealism and realism, through which most of the descriptions are made might be in conflict at first sight. But if we look closer, they are not at odds, as George Friedman describes, which is illustrated in the following section.

According to idealists, the main goals of the American foreign policy have to be the application of traditional values, principles and ideals of American democracy. The United States should take only those states which share the same or at least similar principles as allies, and should fight against the ones with military means with those, who ignore them. On the other hand, realists claim that the only goal of the foreign policy should be pursuing the national interests, like economic benefits, thus the U.S. should support regimes from which they can benefit, without mixing questions of moral profile into the issue. Idealists also argue that by ignoring the moral imperative, the creators of foreign policy disrespect the American tradition and its history. Idealism is present in the American political spectrum from left to right. The leftist version is in favor of protection of human rights, while the rightist would value the spread of democracy, which bears American values. In fact, both versions agree that foreign policy should follow moral principles. The answer of realism is simple: we are

living in dangerous times and if we concentrate on the moral issues we can turn away from the real interests, from which follows the threat to existency of the American republic, which bears the ideals and values. Geopolitics do not allow the leader to follow the moral principles in every case (Friedman, 2011).

It is hard to say which approach is more “correct” in the analysis of U.S. foreign policy. Friedman says that they are like two faces of one coin, which is power. As Machiavelli wrote in *The Prince*, every statesman, no matter whether he or she is leading a new state or one with a long history, needs two things: “The principal foundations, which all state have, whether new, old, or mixed, are good laws and good arms, and where there are good arms, there needs must be good law (...)” (Machiavelli, p. XXII.).

The United States prefers to support democratization in such states, where they do have national interest involved. That is why the U.S. is not in direct war with any African state or with any South American one. In the future, they might find their interest there, but for now it is not urgent, as in the Middle East. The Arabic countries are rich in oil - in fact they are great providers of this resource for the world. It is in the national interest of the United States to have cheap oil constantly. Any radical leader of the Middle East might be dangerous for the U.S., not only militarily but also economically. By democratization of the Middle East, the U.S. would have an impact on their policy also through international and supranational organizations, because democratic states in most cases follows the international law set by the institutions. It is always easier to control a democratic country by a democratic country, on the other hand an authoritarian leader may say no to the controlling body of international organizations. Such a leader may have an impact on the world economy, also on the set of the prices. For the United States and other Western countries, it is better to have a leader who is pro-Western.

Looking at the documents of presidential directives from the White House, we can see the presence of idealism in American foreign policy, one might even claim that it is evolving. Under the presidency of Bill Clinton, the *Presidential Decision Directive/NSC-25* clearly defines that the U.S. will join the UN in peace operations only if U.S. national interest is integral to the conflict, or if there is an international

aggression, or a humanitarian disaster which requires urgent action, or an unexpected interruption of democratic state or violation of human rights often followed by violence.

In the office of the President Barrack Obama, the *Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocities* acknowledged that

“Our security is affected when masses of civilians are slaughtered, refugees flow across borders, and murderers wreak havoc on regional stability and livelihood. America’s reputation suffers, and our ability to bring about change is constrained, when we are perceived as idle in the face of mass atrocities and genocide. Unfortunately, history has taught us that our pursuit of a world where states do not systematically slaughter civilians will not come to fruition without concerted and coordinated effort. (...) our options are never limited to either sending in the military or standing by and doing nothing. The actions that can be taken many they range from economic to diplomatic interventions, and from non combat military actions to outright intervention”(PSD-10, 2011).

The war in Iraq was a preventive one with high significance. On the one side, opponents were against it because they feared the unexpected consequences, like the higher cost or the worse reputation of the U.S. in the international system. On the other hand, its significance lays in the possibility to shape the international order as it is in the national interest of the United States. For the United States to stay the only super power in the world order is a very central goal in order to spread democracy efficiently. On September 17 2002, *The National Security Strategy of the United States* asserted: „The U.S. national security strategy will be based on a distinctly American internationalism that reflects the union of our values and our national interests. The aim of this strategy is to help make the world not just safer but better. Our goals on the path to progress are clear: political and economic freedom, peaceful relations with other states, and respect for human dignity. . . “(Kaysen and co., 2002). In order to attain this mission, the U.S. claims to fight against terrorism and prevent weapons of mass destruction to get into wrong hands, liberalization of markets and trades all over the world, strengthen democracy and its institutions. As we can see from this document, the U.S. foreign policy rhetoric leans towards idealism by peace preserving interventions or peace keeping operations or peace enforcement operations.

The U.S. forms alliances with “freedom-loving nations”, under which states with liberal democratic governance are meant. The U.S. seeks their support in the war

against terrorism, not because it is their interest but because terrorists might attack also their state. It is a global war of the West, which is directed by the United States.

As mentioned above, freedom is the most appreciated value in the political culture of U.S. citizens. However, the rule of law is also deeply rooted in the tradition. The rule of law is present also in the international system, as the liberal (or ideal) ideologic tradition claims. An aggressor who does not respect the international law is also blamed in the rhetoric of American politicians, because they gain the support of the public. Terrorists definitely are such kind of an aggressor. Despite of what public might support, the international organizations might not, because that could be the violation of the international law.

President Bush and his administration sought war against Iraq for several reasons. Beside the fact that plenty of national interests were threatened by Saddam Hussein's policy, they also had to have an evidence of violation of human rights, in order to make the reasons for war more coherent with the Western values and principles.

Saddam Hussein violated human rights massively, he was one of the most brutal tyrant of our times. He was also involved in the war against his neighbors, disobeyed the international law and ignored the international treaties. There was also evidence that he was supporting terrorist activities against the West, however, this was not proven properly.

“In the past, he has used chemical weapons, both in the war with Iran and against his own citizens. Without question, he is one of the most unattractive leaders of modern times. For all these reasons, the Bush administration is correct to argue that Saddam's removal from power is a desirable objective. The world (and the population of Iraq) would certainly be better off if Saddam's regime were replaced by a more civilized and less violent government. (...)The Bush administration is also correct that the response of the United Nations to Saddam's defiance, to his prolonged noncompliance with numerous UN Resolutions that were agreed in the aftermath of the 1991 Gulf war, has been disappointing, if not disgraceful. At least in the American political context, this has raised the most profound concerns about the will of the international community to enforce arms control and nonproliferation agreements and has reinforced skepticism about the value of treaties and other legal instruments ”(Kaysen, Miller, Malin, Nordhaus, & Steinbruner, 2002, p. 7-8).

President W. Bush also argued against Saddam Hussein by claiming that he might be even more dangerous for the international community than he was at the time, if he

gained more power or obtained nuclear arms beside the chemical or biological weapons. If so, it would be difficult to deal with such a kind of aggressor in the international system in order to prevent him from destruction of the order in which the U.S. is the hegemon. The United States decided to take a military intervention to accomplish regime change into one more aligned with the Western interests.

The fact that Saddam Hussein's regime was brutal, convinced the United Nation Security Council, however, to persuade the public in order to attain support for the expensive war might prove to be a difficult task. This argumentation would fail, but not after the terrorist attacks in New York on September 11, 2001.

CHAPTER 3: PRESIDENTIAL RHETORIC

With regards to using rhetoric in pursue of achieving public support, the following examples of presidential speeches together with a commentary are described below:

G.H.W. BUSH SPEECH—ATTACK IN IRAQU FORCES IN 1991

„Just two hours ago, Allied air forces began an attack on military targets in Iraq and Kuwait. These attacks continue as I speak. Ground forces are not engaged. This conflict started Aug. 2, when the dictator of Iraq invaded a small and helpless neighbour. Kuwait, a member of the Arab League and a member of the United Nations, was crushed, its people brutalized. Five months ago, Saddam Hussein started this cruel war against Kuwait; tonight, the battle has been joined. (...)

This military action, taken in accord with United Nations resolutions and with the consent of the United States Congress, follows months of constant and virtually endless diplomatic activity on the part of the United Nations, the United States and many, many other countries.(...)

As I report to you, air attacks are under way against military targets in Iraq. We are determined to knock out Saddam Hussein's nuclear bomb potential. We will also destroy his chemical weapons facilities. (...)

Our objectives are clear: Saddam Hussein's forces will leave Kuwait. The legitimate government of Kuwait will be restored to its rightful place, and Kuwait will once again be free. (...)

Iraq will eventually comply with all relevant United Nations resolutions, and then, when peace is restored, it is our hope that Iraq will live as a peaceful and cooperative member of the family of nations, thus enhancing the security and stability of the Gulf. (...)

While the world waited, Saddam Hussein systematically raped, pillaged, and plundered a tiny nation no threat to his own. He subjected the people of Kuwait to unspeakable atrocities, and among those, maimed and murdered innocent children. (...)

I've told the American people before that this will not be another Vietnam, and I repeat this here tonight. Our troops will have the best possible support in the entire world, and they will not be asked to fight with one hand tied behind their back. I'm hopeful that this fighting will not go on for long, and that casualties will be held to an absolute minimum. (...)

This is an historic moment. We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict and cold war. We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order, a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations. (...)

Our goal is not the conquest of Iraq. It is the liberation of Kuwait. It is my hope that somehow the Iraqi people can, even now, convince their dictator that he must lay down his arms, leave Kuwait, and let Iraq itself rejoin the family of peace-loving nations.(...)

And let me say to everyone listening or watching tonight: When the troops we've sent in finish their work, I'm determined to bring them home as soon as possible. Tonight, as our forces fight, they and their families are in our prayers. (...)

May God bless each and every one of them, and the coalition forces at our side in the Gulf, and may He continue to bless our nation, the United States of America“ (BUSH, 1991).

Bush in his speech seeks for public support to justify the use of the American military force against Saddam Hussein. He claims that Hussein, as a great dictator, attacked a small and weak country – Kuwait and terrorized the civilians. The UN Security Council decided to send peace-enforcing troops. The president in respect of this decision set the main goal which is self-defense operation against the aggressor (Saddam Hussein), who also potentially might use nuclear and chemical weapons of mass destruction.

G. H. W. Bush acted accordingly with the United Nations' mandate. His policy goal was to return Hussein's regime among the peaceful states of the UN. Enforcing the will of the UN regime was the only way how to bring peace to the region, as diplomatic missions were largely unsuccessful.

The invasion of Kuwait was not directly a threat for the United States, but if such an aggression progresses, a hegemon in the region of the Middle East may threaten the national interest of the U.S. Kuwait is an oil-rich country and US ally. Free Kuwait is therefore in the national interest of USA.

G.H.W. Bush in the end of speech shows his religiosity. He uses religious rhetoric as he addresses prayers to the military and to the families of the soldiers.

SPEECH OF PRESIDENT G. W. BUSH ON WAR AGAINST TERRORISM IN 2001

“Tonight we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. (...) Whether we bring our enemies to justice or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done.(...) Americans have known surprise attacks but never before on thousands of civilians. All of this was brought upon us in a single day, and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack. (...) Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists and every government that supports them. Americans are asking, why do they hate us? They hate what we see right here in this Chamber, a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms - our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.(...)This is not, however, just America's fight, and what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom. (...) I ask you to uphold the values of

America and remember why so many have come here. We are in a fight for our principles, and our first responsibility is to live by them. No one should be singled out for unfair treatment or unkind words because of their ethnic background or religious faith (...) Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them” (Bush, 2001, Sept. 20).

In G. W. Bush speech regarding the war in Iraq in 2001, we can identify the application of idealism in order to gain justification for war against terrorism. War against terrorism is not an exact term because it is not easy to clearly identify who is a terrorist. What if a terrorist group serves the national interest of the United States? This of course was not the case in war with Afghanistan and Iraq.

G. H. Bush wanted to oust the Saddam regime. As a potential hegemon of the region it represented a threat against the national interest. Iraq is oil-rich country-- in fact its economy is dependent on the oil. What is the interest of the United States is the interest also for the West.

As the costs of war shows up, the support of the public is also decreasing as we can see from the Gallup survey illustrated by the table below:

„In view of the developments since we first sent our troops to Iraq, do you think the United States made a mistake in sending troops to Iraq, or not?” (Gallup survey) (IN PER CENT (%)).

DATE	YES	NO	NO OPINION
2010 AUG 5-8	55	41	3
2010 JUL 8-11	54	44	2
2009 JAN 9-11	56	43	2
2008 APR 18-20	63	33	1
2007 NOV 2-4	58	39	1
2006 OKT 6-8	56	40	4
2005 DEC 9-11	48	50	2
2005 JAN 7-9	50	48	2
2004 OKT 14-16	47	52	1
2004 AUG 23-25	48	50	2
2004 JAN 12-15	42	56	2
2003 NOV 3-5	39	60	1
2003 MAR 24-25	23	75	2

“In the long run, how do you think history will judge the U.S. invasion and subsequent involvement in Iraq -- as [ROTATED: a total success for the United States, mostly successful, mostly a failure, (or as) a total failure for the United States]? (Gallup survey).

	Total success	Mostly successful	Mostly a failure	Total failure	No opinion
	%	%	%	%	%
2010 Aug 5-8	3	39	39	14	5
2008 Feb 21-24	4	38	36	18	4“

At the beginning of the Iraq war the support of the public was high. Until 2010 it changed significantly. Now, the majority thinks that it was a mistake to involve in the war with Iraq.

The Gallup survey on Iraq also shows us that people do not think that war with Iraq is making U.S. safer from terrorists attack. The question whether “Do you consider the war in Iraq to be part of the war on terrorism which began on September 11, 2001, or do you consider it to be an entirely separate military action?” (Gallup survey) from the answers we can see that only the half of the asked believes war with Iraq is a part of war on terrorism.

	Part of war on terrorism	Separate military action	No opinion
	%	%	%
2006 Sep 15-17	48	49	3
2006 Mar 10-12 ^	44	53	3
2005 Dec 16-18	43	55	2
2005 Jun 24-26 ^	47	50	3
2004 Oct 1-3	50	47	3
2004 Jul 19-21 ^	51	47	2
2004 Mar 26-28	50	48	2
2003 Aug 25-26	57	41	2

Another poll question shows us that the majority of asked shares the realist point of view on the international policy. They believe that it is more important to be a friendly state with the U.S. than being democratic. “If you had to choose between the following, what should be the primary goal of U.S. foreign policy toward Iraq and other countries in the Middle East -- [ROTATED: to establish stable governments in

these countries that are not enemies of the U.S., (or) to establish democratic governments in these countries]?” (Gallup survey)

	Establish stable governments, not enemies of the U.S.	Establish democratic governments	No opinion
2006 Sep 15-17	58%	33	10

The idealism applied in the rhetoric provided approval of citizens of the U.S on the attack on Iraq. Ideals won, but in the end, citizens became more realistic. Ideals gave credibility to the realist background oust a potential hegemonic aggressor against the United State and its allies.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

To sum up, the aim of this study was to show the relation between the two approaches of the international relation, idealism and realism and their application on the foreign policy of the United States. The methodology was collection theoretical background which was able to apply on the foreign policy of the United States, then applying the theories into the case of Iraq.

The four chapters dealt with the origins of the ideological background, as well as with the levels of analysis and the discrepancy between idealism and realism in the American foreign policy. The third chapter gives us the example for presidential rhetoric followed by opinion polls provided by the Gallup Poll. The synthesis is explained below.

The United States is an empire, but within its borders, it is a republic with certain principles and ideals. The American presidents have to harmonize the moral and traditional principles with the necessary actions in order to seek legitimacy for these actions. The public has to believe that the interests of the foreign policy and the ideals of Americans are equal, which is not an easy task for the American presidents of the next decade. They have to create an illusion that they fight for the ideals but, at the same time, protect the power, interest, security and sovereignty of their homeland by any means.

Idealism is necessary for justifying the policies for the citizens. However, the foreign policy of the United States is effected by this theory. The democratization of chosen countries provided under the leadership of the U.S. is clearly a proof of it.

Democracy itself is not enough—the United States spreads the American style of democracy which is liberal. Democracy does not equal with political freedom and the rule of law provided by several institutions. Liberalism and democracy have different roots. Even the regime might be tyrannical, if it is elected, it is democratic, because democracy is the method of choosing the leader or leaders. To achieve democracy in a certain state is not the hardest part of the foreign policy of the United States, but to constitute liberalism is a long-run process with uncertain end. “The “Western model” is best symbolized not by the mass plebiscite but the impartial judge” (Zakaria, 1/1998, p. 7). Zakaria claims, that democratic regimes are more likely to go in war against other states than liberal democracies or liberal autocracies.

To spread the “Western model” of democracy is the key goal of the U.S. foreign policy. Chomsky says that it is logically impossible to oppose U.S. aggression, as such category does not exist (Chomsky, 1989, p. 42). Also the allies of the United States cannot be posed as aggressors of the international system like in the case of Israel.

However, it is hard to say that spreading the liberal democracy is only effected by idealism. It is the national interest of the United States. Liberal democracies are not likely to go into war against each other. Democratic peace in fact is liberal peace. Republicanism in fact mean the separation of powers, checks and balance and the rule of law, protecting individual rights. “If democracy does not preserve liberty and law, that is a democracy is a small consolation” (Zakaria, 1998, p. 23).

“If they use the freedom we accord them unwisely, then naturally we entitled to respond in self-defense. (...) It follows that the use of force can only be an excessive in self-defense and that those who try to resist must be the aggressors, even in their own lands. What is more, no country has the right of self-defense against the U.S. attack, and the United States has no natural right to impose its will, by force if necessary and feasible.” (Chomsky, 1989, p. 59) What is the interest of the United States is the interest of the West. If the West is imposing force against a state it is in the name of democratization in a liberal sense. Democratization is taken as plausible policy, because in the end it will bring the benefit for the world and peace among the countries.

The thesis set at the beginning, that the two approaches, realism and idealism, drive the foreign policy of the United States in a different way. Realism as the motivation behind concrete short-term foreign policy goals and idealism as the justification of these policies. In fact, the thesis should be moderated in order to be correct.

Idealism is used for justification, but not only—it is forming the goals of foreign policy at the same time, because the United States believes as a country they have special role on the world--- to promote peace by spreading liberal democracation.

Realism, on the other hand serves the national interest, which is connected to the question of power of the United States. The U.S. is the hegemon of our times, the leader of the West, the greatest opinion-leader of the Western culture. Gaining power or keeping it sometimes requires policies which are against the idealist view, so it is also against the tradition of the US. However, these policies are required by the

situation and will bring benefit in a long-term perspective. The presidents have to look into further distance in time, not only to their immediate interest. The *status quo* of the United States—the only hegemonic power—is in constant threat from those who would prefer to ruin it or at least weaken.

A liberal democratic country does not present a security threat to the United States because countries with such a regime are more cooperative with each other than in favor of creating conflict. Democratization in liberal sense could also serve the national interest. Democratization and liberalization of a society by an outside force is a long and hard process. The results do not show up immediately.

To conclude: the two approaches can clearly agree on a fact that the United States has an exceptional position in the international system. Its power is enormous, as we saw from the different angles of view, being the only hegemon in the system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Adams, J. Q. (1821, July 4). *An Address*. Retrieved 3. 1, 2012, from University of Missouri- Digital Library: www.digital.library.umsystem.edu
- Arendt, H. (1992). Communicative Power. In S. Lukes, *Power- Readings in Social and Political Theory* (pp. 58-71). New York: New York University Press.
- Bush, G. (1991, January 16). *President George Bush announces the U.S. Attack of Iraq, stating "this will not be another Vietnam"*. Retrieved 4. 10, 2012, from The History Place: www.historyplace.com
- Bush, G. W. (2001, Sept 20.). *President Bush Declares "War on Terror"- Speech to a Joint Session of Congress*. Retrieved 1. 8., 2012, from The New York Times Company: www.middleeast.about.com
- Clinton, B. (1994, May 3). Presidential Decision Directive/ NSC-25. *The White House- Washington D.C.*
- Cooper, R. Hard Power, Soft Power and the Goals of Diplomacy. In D. Held, & M. Koenig-Archibugi, *American Power in the 21st Century* (pp. 167-180).
- Davidson, K. (2003, March 20). *The Age*. Retrieved May 6., 2012, from Fairfax Media: www.theage.com.au
- Dorff, R. ". (2004). Some basic concepts and approaches in the study of international relations. In J. B. Bartholomees, *Giude to National Security Policy and Strategy* (pp. 3-13). U.S. Army War College.
- Friedman, G. (2011). *Nasledujúce desaťročie- Kde sme... a kam sa uberáme*. Bratislava: IKAR.
- Gallup survey*. (dátum neznámy). Cit. 6.. 2. 2012. Dostupné na Internet: Iraq: <http://www.gallup.com>
- Hamilton, A. (23. November 1797). *The Utility of the Union in Respect to Commercial Relations and a Navy*. Cit. 2012. 1. 30.. Dostupné na Internet: Founding Fathers: [www.foundingfathers.info/federalist papers](http://www.foundingfathers.info/federalist_papers)
- Held, D. (2006). *Models of Democracy*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Hongju Koh, H. (2003). *On American Exceptionalism*. Yale Law School Legal Scholarship Repository.
- Chomsky, N. (1989). *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

- Jay, J. (1787, November 3). *The Same Subject Continued (Concerning Dangers From Foreign Force and Influence*. Retrieved 10. 23, 2011, from Founding Fathers: www.foundingfathers.info/federalistpaper
- Kaysen, C., Miller, S. E., Malin, M. B., Nordhaus, W. D., & Steinbruner, J. D. (2002). *War With Iraq- Costs, Consequences, and Alternatives*. American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Lee, U. R. US Military Casualties in Iraq and Public Opinion-- With CBS-NYT, ABC-WP and Fox News Polls. Royal Holloway, University of London, Department of Economics.
- Lieberfeld, D. (2005, Volume 10 No. 2). Theories of Conflict and The Iraq War. *International Journal of Peace Studies* .
- Lukes, S. (1992). *Power, Readings in social and political theory*. New York: New York University Press.
- Machiavelli, N. (n.d.). *The Prince*. Retrieved 1. 8., 2011, from Planet PDF: www.history-world.org
- McLean, I., & McMillan, A. (2009). *Concise Dictationary of Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mingst, K. A., & Arreguín-Toft, I. M. (2011). *Essentials of International Relations*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1978). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace, (Six Principles of Political Realism) Fifth Edition*. In A. A. Knopf. New York: www.mtholyoke.edu.
- Obama, B. (2011, August 4). Presidential Study Directive on Mass Antrocides. *The White House* .
- Özdemir, R. (2011). Invasion of Iraq: A Relfection of Realism. *Turkish Journal of Politics - Vol. 2 No. 2* , 103-115.
- Paine, T. (1792). *The Rights of Man (1792)*. Retrieved 2012, from Independent Hall Association: www.ushistory.org
- Pollack, K. M. (2002, March/April). *Next Stop Baghdad?* Retrieved 2012, from Foreign Affairs: www.foreignaffairs.com
- Pratt, J. W. (1972). *A History of United States Foreign Policy (3rd Edition)*. New Jersey: PRENTICE-HALL, INC. .

- Record, J. (8. July 2004). Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation- Executive Summary. *Policy Analysis* , s. 3-4.
- Roskin, M. G., Cord, R. L., Medeiros, J. A., & Jones, W. S. (2006). *Political Science: An Introduction*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Sullivan, M. H. (n.d.). *A Responsible Press Office: An Insider's Guide*. Retrieved 20., 2012, from International Information Programs: usinfo.state.gov
- Thucydides. (431 BC). The History Of The Peloponnesian War (The Melian Dialogue). In R. Warner, *History of The Peloponnesian War* (pp. 457-467). Penguin Books.
- Waltz, K. N. (2002). Man, The State and War. In B. Plechanovová, *Úvod do mezinárodních vztahů- Výběr textů* (pp. 189-192). Praha.
- Washington, G. (2000). *Washington's Farewell Address - To The People of the United States*. Washington: Authentic U.S. Government Information.
- Wilson, J. Q. (2002, October 2). American Exceptionalism. *The American Spectator* .
- Wilson, W. (2009). *War Message to Congress (1917)*. wwi.lib.byu.edu.
- Winthrop, J. (1997). A Model of Christian Charity. In J. Breadsley. religiousfreedom.lib.virginia.edu.
- Zakaria, F. (1998, 1.). The Rise of Illiberal Democracy. *Kritika and Kontext- Bratislava* .

RESUMÉ:

Táto práca sa zaoberá vzťahom medzi idealizmom a realizmom v zahraničnej politike Spojených štátov amerických.

Američania sú presvedčení, že majú špeciálnu rolu v medzinárodnom systéme. Idealizmus ako spôsob poňatia medzinárodného systému nám znázorní, ako sa toto presvedčenie prejavuje v americkej zahraničnej politike.

Idealizmus chápe človeka ako racionálneho, ktorý má kapacitu pochopiť prirodzené právo čo riadi spoločnosť. Prirodzené právo reflektuje na prirodzenosť človeka. Porozumenie tohto práva ponúka možnosť zlepšiť životné podmienky v spoločnosti. Spravodlivosť a rovnosť môžu sa vyskytovať v spoločnosti ak človek zosúlaďí jeho konanie v mene vyššieho spoločného cieľa, čo je dobro.

Inštitúcie v medzinárodnom systéme sú formulované tak, aby umožnili spoluprácu na základe stanovenia spoločného záujmu. V medzinárodnom systéme preto majú kľúčovú rolu. Inštitúcie, ako napríklad Organizácia spojených národov vytvárajú sústavu vrámci ktorej komunikácia medzi štátmi prebieha o globálnych otázkach ako sú ľudské práva, environmentálne otázky alebo otázky bezpečnosti na rôznych úrovniach.

Immanuel Kant veril, že vojna medzi štátmi sa dá prekonať kolektívnou akciou, čo stanoví spoločný cieľ. Woodrow Wilson sa domnieval, že partnerstvo medzi demokratickými krajinami môže uchovať mier, keďže majú rovnaké štandardy morálky a rovnako chápu práva a slobody. Len štáty ktoré nasledujú spoločné dobro ako cieľ môžu žiť vedľa seba v mieri.

Spojené štáty americké sú demokratickou krajinou ktoré boli pevne stanovené na základe liberalizmu. Od začiatku zriadenia Spojené štáty veria, že majú zvláštnu rolu v medzinárodnom systéme, ktorou je obrana demokracie. Monroeho doktrína nám ilustruje túto ich domnienku. Intervencia do politik iných štátov je v súlade s celoštátnym záujmom pretože jediná cesta ako sa zabezpečiť proti útokom je šírenie liberálnej demokracie.

Idealizmus je použitý aj v politickej rétorike, najmä v demokratickom zriadení vlády. Prezidenti oprávňujú svoje politiky hľadaním podpory u občanov, preto zdôrazňujú ideály ktoré sú dedené v Americkej spoločnosti. Rétorika ovplyvňuje verejnú mienku

tak, aby sa dosiahla legitimizovanie daných politík. Bez legitimacy by politiky nemohli byť uskutočnené. Verejná mienka preto má kľúčovú rolu v demokratickom režime.

Demokratické vlády musia vytvárať ilúziu pre verejnosť, že ich politiky sú v súlade s hodnotovým systémom danej spoločnosti. Zahraničná politika nie je výnimkou spod tohto pravidla.

Na druhej strane realizmus nám ponúka inú perspektívu na zahraničnú politiku. Spojené štáty sú hegemonickou mocou, ktorá si chce udržať túto pozíciu za každých okolností. Chápanie medzinárodného systému ako anarchický eliminuje dôležitosť kooperácie a vyzdvihuje svojpomoc štátov. Kľúčovým aktérom medzinárodného systému je štát, ktorý má špecifické záujmy ktoré determinujú stratégie k iným štátom.

Kľúčovou témou realizmu je moc. Každý štát chce nadobudnúť moc, preto interakcia medzi nimi je charakterizovaná zápasom o moc. Štáty s rovnakou mocou nevedú vojny proti sebe. Ak moc nie je rovnaká, silnejší premôže slabšieho. Slabší následne musí nasledovať silnejšieho, inak bude zničený.

Podľa Machiavelliho umenie vojny je to, čo štátnik musí praktizovať. Bezpečnosť musí byť ochránená nielen z vonka ale aj z vnútra krajiny.

Na prvý pohľad sa môže zdať že dva pohľady sú v konflikte. Idealisti zdôrazňujú aplikáciu tradičných hodnôt, ideálov a princípov zahraničnou politikou kým realisti tvrdia, že cieľom zahraničnej politiky je dosahovanie materiálnych štátnych záujmov, avšak oba pohľady sú reprezentované v americkej zahraničnej politike.

Spojené štáty vedú demokratizujúce misie v tých štátoch, kde aj národný záujem je obsiahnutý, ako napríklad štáty Blízkeho Východu. Krajiny toho regiónu sú bohaté na ropu, ktorá je nutná pre americkú ekonomiku. Radikálny vodca ktorý sa snaží oslabiť moc Spojených štátov predstavuje pre ne bezpečnostnú otázku.

Vojna v Iraku bol prípadom keď sa radikálny vodca stal hrozbou pre Americký celoštátny záujem. Naliehanie zmeny vlády v Iraku je oprávnená ako z realistického tak aj z idealistického pohľadu.

Z realistického pohľadu Saddám Husajn bol hrozbou nie len pre Spojené štáty, no len ony sa rozhodli investovať zdroje, aby dosiahli zmenu režimu pre podozrenie, že nadobudol zbrane hromadného ničenia. Irak je krajina kde sa nachádzajú náleziská ropy, neracionálny líder by bol hrozbou pre Západ, keďže západná ekonomika je

závislá od ropy. Ďalším problémom bol, že Husajn sa snažil o predaj ropy v eurách, čo by mal závažný dopad na svetovú ekonomiku.

Z geopolitického hľadiska Irak predstavuje strategický bod na obranu spojenca USA v regióne, Izrael, pretože susedí so Sýriou. Ďalšou výhodou americkým vojenských základní v Iraku pre Spojené štáty je, že Irak susedí aj s Iránom, ďalším potenciálnym agresorom regiónu.

Idealisti na druhej strane vyzdvihujú brutálnosť Saddáma Husajna, keďže praktizoval násilie na domácich obyvateľov ako aj na civilistoch za hranicami. Irak ako demokratický by mohol ísť príkladom pre ostatné štáty v regióne, uľahčilo by to aj ekonomickú spoluprácu. Saddám nerešpektoval ľudské práva, čo oprávňuje USA intervenovať s cieľom brániť domáce obyvateľstvo.

V pragmatickom zmysle, zahraničná politika sa viac riadi realistickými cieľmi ako idealistickými. Idealizmus sa využíva na legitimizovanie zahraničných politík. Prezident Spojených štátov je ako vládár Machiavelliho. Musí konať tak, aby dôsledky jeho konania boli čo najpozitívnejšie, morálka politika preto sa líši od morálky obyčajného človeka. Ak sú dôsledky jeho konania pozitívne, účel svätí prostriedky.

Rozpor medzi americkými ideálmi a americkou zahraničnou politikou je komplikovaný. Na prvý pohľad sa nám môže zdať, že sú nie sa nedajú zlúčiť, no keď to preskúmame bližšie, vidíme, že sa dopĺňajú. Každý štát potrebuje pre dobré fungovanie nie len dobré zákony ale aj dobré vojsko aby uchránilo tieto zákony, no hrubá sila bez významu je násilie, nie moc. Moc je to, o čo sa každý štát snaží.

Spojené štáty majú snahu o demokratizáciu tých krajín, ktoré predstavujú určitú sféru celoštátneho záujmu, ako napríklad krajiny Blízkeho Východu, ktoré sú bohaté na ropu. Pre vojnu v Iraku sa nájde veľa dôvodov. Štátne záujmy USA ktoré boli ohrozené politikou Husajna, ktorý nerešpektoval ľudské práva a slobody. V minulosti použil zbrane hromadného ničenia, preto nebolo vylúčené že to spraví znova.

Na záver táto práca uvádza to, že prezidenti USA musia harmonizovať morálne a tradičné princípy s nutnosťou istých zahraničných politík. Verejnosť musí veriť, že záujmy zahraničnej politiky a ideály sú totožné, pretože inak nezískajú legitimitu pre zahraničnú politiku a tak neobránia moc, záujmy, bezpečnosť a suverenitu materskej krajiny.

Idealizmus je dôležitý pre oprávnenosť. Na druhej strane však nemôžeme tvrdiť že nemá žiaden vplyv na zahraničnú politiku. Demokratizácia vybraných krajín, ktoré USA vedie je jasným príkladom idealizmu v praxi. Demokratizácia je plauzibilnou politikou, pretože na konci prinesie mier a iné prínosy. Realizmus na druhej strane zaostruje na moc USA, ktorá musí byť zachovaná. V súlade s touto snahou politici musia niekedy použiť aj politiky ktoré nie sú akceptované idealistami, ale budú mať prínos v budúcnosti.