THE ESSENTIAL ROLE OF DEMOCRACY IN THE BUSH DOCTRINE

Maria Helena de Castro Santos
(University of Brasilia)

Ulysses Tavares Teixeira
(University of Brasilia)

ABSTRACT

Everyone knows that democracy played a role in the Bush Doctrine. What not everyone knows is that this role was essential for the doctrine to be put into operation under which the Iraq invasion was prepared and launched. Preemptive War was the rocket, democracy was the fuel. This is the argument of the paper I am here proposing. To demonstrate it I will recur to the analysis of the links between democracy, security and the national interests of the United States as well as to the American belief in the universal values of democracy, as pillars of American foreign policy since the post-Cold War period. The consequential belief of the Bush administration on the positive effect of exporting democracy by the use of force to Afghanistan and Iraq will be remarked. Finally, it will be shown that among the justifications for the military interventions in the two countries, exporting of democracy prevailed over other short-run objectives like destroying Al Qaeda’s headquarters, ousting Saddam Hussein from power or removing weapons of mass destruction. The paper will use quantitative and qualitative content analysis of the speeches of President Bush and his Secretaries of State and Defense.


I. INTRODUCTION

Everyone knows that democracy played a role in the Bush Doctrine. What not everyone knows is that this role was essential for the doctrine to be put into operation under which the Iraq invasion was prepared and launched. Preemptive War was the rocket, democracy was the fuel. This is the argument of the paper we are here proposing.

In fact, George W. Bush was the president of the post-Cold War era who very explicitly made use of the most radical means of exporting democracy – the use of force. He did so by placing the exporting of democracy into the core of his National Defense Policy and making of it a fundamental pillar of his foreign policy doctrine after 9/11.

For sure there were other American military interventions in the post-Cold War period, but in none of them the primary goal was that of exporting democracy to the “recipient”
country.\footnote{In a previous work we analyzed the role democracy fulfilled in the American military interventions in the post-Cold War period: Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq. See Castro Santos, MH and Teixeira, U. T., Exporting Democracy as Foreign Policy: Peace, Security and the American Military Interventions in the Post-Cold War World. Paper presented at the Third World International Studies Conference (WISC), Porto, August 17-20,2011.} This is because the basic weapon to fight terrorism as defined by Bush’s defense and foreign policies was democracy.

We will argue moreover that even an aggressive doctrine like Bush’s is totally compatible with American liberal tradition and the corresponding principles that can be identified in the foreign policies doctrines of the post-Cold War Presidents.\footnote{Those principles were empirically identified in Castro Santos, MH, “Exportação de democracia na política externa norte-americana no pós-guerra fria: doutrinas e o uso da força”, Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional, 53(1), 157-191, 2010. We will refer to them in session three of this paper.}

By analyzing the speeches of the Presidents (Bush Father, Clinton and Bush Son) and their Secretaries of State, we seek to demonstrate that among the motivations and justifications for the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq to bring democracy to those societies is the main goal and that the liberal principles can be identified especially along the Iraq war.

The first session of the paper will deal with the importance of the external variables for the promotion of democracy analyzed by the Third Wave democratization literature.

The second session will present democracy and its links to security in the Bush Doctrine as well as in the principles referred to the American liberal tradition that constitute the pillars of the foreign policies of the Presidents of the post-Cold War period, including Bush’s.

The third session will bring the empirical analysis of the speeches of the President and his Secretaries of State.

\section*{II. EXTERNAL VARIABLES IN THE EXPORTING OF DEMOCRACY AND THE UNIVERSALITY OF DEMOCRATIC VALUES}

Foreign policy decision-makers must believe in the greater importance of external vis-à-vis internal variables in the exporting of democracy. They must believe, moreover, that
democracy is not historically or culturally bound, but on the contrary it can thrive everywhere. Let us very briefly review what the literature tells us about this matter.

The American victory in the Cold War reinforced the belief that the values and principles of the Western liberal democracy were universal and, therefore, all the peoples in the world want to turn democratic. Shared by decision-makers and social scientists alike, this belief was strongly backed up by the influential ideas of Fukuyama (1989,1992), who faced the non-less important critique by Huntington (1996), who spoke of a multicultural world where cleavages along cultural and religious lines would put obstacles to democratization in Confucian and Islamic societies.

For sure, all the Presidents of the post-Cold War period believed that the triumph in the Cold War was a proof of the superiority of democracy over communism and that there was no other system of values and principles in the world that could rival with “the wisdom of our nation’s founders” (Bush Father, State of the Union, 1991). All of them rejected Huntington’s, so to speak, cultural warning in their speeches in various occasions in various ways. So did their Secretaries of State.³

Coming to the Bush administration, it certainly would be impossible to take the decision to militarily invade two Islamic countries and there establish democracies without very clearly rejecting Huntington’s thesis. In fact, in his speech of the State of Union in 2004 Bush said:

We also hear doubts that democracy is an unrealistic goal for the greater Middle East, where freedom is rare. Yet it is mistaken and condescending to assume that whole cultures and great religions are incompatible with liberty and self-government. I believe that God has planted in every human heart the desire to live in freedom. And even when that desire is crushed by tyranny for decades, it will rise again. (George W. Bush, State of Union, 2004).

Colin Powell, referring to Iraq, affirmed that the United States would there fight terrorism with all national power elements, but above all, with the values system that:

³ Cf, Castro Santos, 2010, op. cit.
(…) that is still respected around the world, a value system that has fueled this nation for so many hundred of years and is fueling so many other nations around the world, a value system that says democracy works and it is not restricted to western cultures or to the United States. (Colin Powell, Speech at the Institute of Peace on US efforts to assist the people of Iraq, Washington, 2004)

Therefore, the Secretary of the State added in another speech: “There’s no reason that democracy can’t work in Afghanistan (…)” (Remarks at the Southern Center for International Studies. Atlanta, Georgia, October, 2004).

If “democracy is not restricted to western cultures” and therefore there is no reason that democracy cannot work in Afghanistan or Iraq, it still remains to answer the question: can democracy be imposed from outside? How much do external vis-à-vis internal variables influence the construction of democracy?

The first generation of the democratization literature, which examined the cases of South Europe in the 70’s and of South America’s in the next decade, considered that domestic factors played a role much more important than external variables in the democratization process. 4 This consensus was broken with the democratic transitions of the communist countries in the 90’s, when external stimuli were prominent.

Farer (1996), an author of the exporting of democracy literature, says that foreign actors can contribute a great deal to the defense and strengthening of democracy and that after the Cold War the tolerance for external interventions grew significantly. Huntington (1996), however, warns that even when external factors create favorable conditions for democracy building this will only occur if domestic conditions exist – adequate level of economic development and political leadership compromised with democratic values.

Whitehead (2005) contests the downplaying of the external-variables influence in democracy building stated by the first generation literature arguing that this generation came to that conclusion because it based its analysis on transitions that occurred inside the limits of Westphalian-consolidated states. However, the post-Cold War democratic transitions occurred many times in weak and vulnerable states, with numerous

4 The basic reference is O'Donnell and Schmitter (1988).
fragmentations processes. In those cases, says the author, “international factors can be expected to play a stronger and more directive role in democratization” (p.6). A typical pattern is the military imposition of democracy after short wars, among which Whitehead includes what he calls Western interventions in Afghanistan (2002) and Iraq (2003).

Summing up, if there is no consensus in the literature, one can say that starting the communist-countries transitions in the years 1990, the significant influence of external variables on democracy building came to be recognized, although in different degrees.

This is an academic backup of great importance for the foreign-policy and defense-policy decision-makers who decide to export democracy by the use of force. They must believe and make the society believe that the American military interventions, even if unilateral, are efficacious as far as building democracy is concerned.

The Bush administration was for sure a believer in the capacity of military intervention for opening the way to craft democracy in the two rogue sates invaded by the United States. It believed, moreover, that democracy could thrive in any historical-cultural context.

III. DEMOCRACY IN THE BUSH FOREIGN POLICY AND IN THE DEFENSE POLICY DOCTRINES

This section will present the basic pillars of the foreign policy doctrine in the post-Cold War period and the Bush defense policy, there identifying the essential role of democracy. This will help to understand the military invasions of the Middle East and to demonstrate our argument.

THE PILLARS OF THE FOREIGN POLICIES DOCTRINES IN THE POST-COLD WAR PERIOD

In the 1970’s, based on Hartz’s *The Liberal Tradition in America* (1955), Packenham(1973) worked on the hypotheses presented by the scholars of American exceptionalism, and showed that both the foreign policy doctrines presented by the American Cold War governments and the theories produced by social scientists on the
field of political development shared the same core of values based on the American Liberal Tradition. Packenham analyzed the doctrines that regulated American foreign aid to Third World countries and the theories that guided these policies (Modernization theory) between 1947 and 1968.

Twenty years later, the fall of soviet communism and the end of the Cold War signaled a strong shift in the world order. After four decades of bipolar disputes, the American victory was interpreted as translating the superiority of the American Way of Life. The exceptionalist hypotheses seemed to be right. According to Farer (1996), one of the greatest advantages of this moment was the opportunity for America, in the absence of visible threats, to start basing its foreign policy doctrine on the liberal principles, without having to worry about alleged conflicts between American values and interests.

Following Packenham (1973), Castro Santos (2010) believes it is possible to show that both the democratization theory and American democracy promotion policies in the post-Cold War world are also based on the American liberal tradition.

Using quantitative and qualitative content analysis of 415 speeches of the first three post-Cold War Presidents and their Secretaries of State, Castro Santos (2010) identifies the pillars of American foreign policy doctrines that justify the exporting of democracy even by the use of force – the most difficult means to be used in the name of democracy. Three principles and one American mission, so to speak, were recurrent in the speeches:

1. The values and principles of the western liberal democracy are universal, that is, all peoples of the world wish to become democratic. Therefore, the promotion of democracy is for the good of mankind;
2. Democracies do not fight each other. Therefore, exporting democracy means to promote regional and even global peace. Here democracy is linked to regional and global peace;
3. The promotion of democracy makes the world safer and more prosperous for the United States. Here democracy is linked to the security and the economic interests of the United States.
**Mission:** The Americans think of themselves as having a mission to bring freedom and democracy to mankind.

In the Bush administration the third principle is crucial to justify invasions to Afghanistan and Iraq: it assumes that the US and the world for that matter will only be safe when both countries turn democratic. This is because the long run weapon to fight terrorism is democracy. Bush and his aides think moreover that democratic Iraq will help regime change in the Middle East and, by the second principle, the region will became more peaceful. Long time deserved humanitarian assistance for desperate Afghan and Iraqi people is claimed on the basis of principle one. A more detailed account of the use of those principles by Bush and their Secretaries of State will be seen in the next section.

**THE BUSH DOCTRINE**

When George W. Bush assumed the presidency of the United States in 2001 he, with his foreign policy team, decided that the liberal internationalist strategy which had prevailed in the previous government was no longer appropriate to represent the international aspirations of the American people. Marked by the promotion of an “Americanised” world order, Clinton’s grand strategy believed that a strong set of multilateral institutions, and not America’s military predominance, was the key to creating a friendlier world order characterized by the spread of democratic governments and open markets.

That was not, however, the way Bush thought about how the world worked. He criticized his predecessor for engaging in nation-building and humanitarian interventions overseas. Among his several campaign promises, he stated he would be more selective in relation to the use of force, and called for a less interventionist approach with regard to internal affairs of other countries. His National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, for example, said about the nation-building operation in the Balkans that “carrying out civil administration and police functions is simply going to degrade the American capability to do the things America has to do. We don't need to have the 82nd Airborne escorting kids to kindergarten”\(^5\). The defense of the new approach would also become very clear by the words of the President himself: “When it

---

comes to foreign policy, that’ll be my guiding question: is it in our nation’s interests?”
(Presidential Debate in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, October 11, 2000)

To summarize, Bush was skeptical of multilateralism and unrelenting toward potential adversaries. He and his advisors argued, for example, against negotiations with North Korea, for a more detached approach to Russia, and for treating China as a “strategic competitor” instead of a “strategic partner”\(^6\). They also made explicit their concern over any erosion of American sovereignty through potential membership to multilateral agreements such as the International Criminal Court or the Kyoto Protocol. The administration adopted strategic adjustments that represented a move away from the liberal-democratic values, towards a more realist foreign policy strategy, supposedly based on “vital national interests”.

There were certainly different understandings of the international system inside the government, and the press talked about divergences between the State Department and the Pentagon\(^7\). The well known neoconservative movement was strongly represented in the administration, especially by Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Armitage, Douglas Feith, John Bolton, Elliot Abrams e Lewis Libby. But they were not able to influence the foreign policy doctrine in their favor in the first few months of government. Other presidential advisers, such as Collin Powell, Richard Hass and Condoleezza Rice were openly against idealistic campaigns in foreign policy issues. Above all, the President showed little interest to the radical and aggressive neoconservative political agenda.

Every debate and criticism ceased, however, on the day of the terrorist attacks to New York and Washington. From that point on, American foreign policy would change its world view. After a dramatic review of his grand strategy, Bush decided to adopt the neoconservative approach embracing a far-reaching and proactive foreign policy based on American military power. The American military interventions in Afghanistan (2001) and Iraq (2003), although important in themselves, are even more noteworthy as manifestations of this new strategy which became known as the Bush doctrine.

This strategy represents a radical change in the President’s initial world view and, as synthesized on the 2002 National Security Strategy’s foreword, it proposed that America should “defend the peace by fighting terrorists and tyrants…, preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers…, [and] extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent”.

Obviously influenced by September 11, Bush’s first innovation was to identify both terrorists and tyrants (and perhaps a connection between them) as the new threats. The excitement brought by victory on the Cold War had discouraged American leaders to confront threats posed by this new type of enemy, whose weapon of choice (terrorist attacks), where not exactly understood by a defense system prepared for the conventional war. Weapons of Mass Destruction were the last resort during the Cold War, while today, the NSS points out, “our enemies see weapons of mass destruction as weapons of choice”.

Since containment and deterrence would not work against this new threat, an element of preemption had to be added to the defense strategy:

Given the goals of rogue states and terrorists, the United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past. The inability to deter a potential attacker, the immediacy of today’s threats, and the magnitude of potential harm that could be caused by our adversaries’ choice of weapons, do not permit that option. We cannot let our enemies strike first… We must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today’s adversaries. Rogue states and terrorists do not seek to attack us using conventional means… As was demonstrated by the losses on September 11, 2001, mass civilian casualties is the specific objective of terrorists and these losses would be exponentially more severe if terrorists acquired and used weapons of mass destruction… To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively. (NSS, 2002)

The National Security Strategy also included a preference for multilateral action: “The United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community”. Of course, multilateralism, which eventually assumed the form of a “coalition of the willing”, was never a real prerequisite of the doctrine. Actually, the American government was determined to act unilaterally whenever necessary: “we will
not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country”. To do that, defense spending increased dramatically for the first time since the 1980’s, reaching US$400 bi in 2003\(^8\). Asserting American hegemony became necessary to put into work a foreign policy doctrine based on unilateral preemptive action.

At last, the Bush Doctrine pointed to the only definitive solution to the problem of removing the causes of terrorism and tyranny: democracy. The principles and values of liberal democracy, as described by Castro Santos (2010) for the post-Cold War foreign policies doctrines, were not seen as ideals, but as effective and pragmatic tools against such threats. The American liberal tradition (Hartz, 1955) once more prevailed, this time embodied in a most radical strategy: preemptive war. Only in a democratic environment the United States would be really safe:

> The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world. (…) Advancing these ideals is the mission that created our Nation. It is the honorable achievement of our fathers. Now it is the urgent requirement of our nation’s security, and the calling of our time. So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world. (Inaugural Speech, 2005)

This direct connection established by Bush between promoting democracy and assuring American national interests became indispensible to justify his foreign policy doctrine in general, and the Iraq war in particular. Exporting democracy to the Middle East was the single solution to every identifiable threat (terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, tyranny). This idea was repeatedly defended by the President in his speeches to the Congress and to the Nation: “The advance of freedom is the surest strategy to undermine the appeal of terror in the world. Where freedom takes hold, hatred gives way to hope”\(^9\); “Our security is assured by our perseverance and by our sure belief in the success of liberty” (Address to the Nation on the Capture of Saddam Hussein.

---


\(^9\) BUSH, George W. *Address to the Nation on Iraq From the U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln*, May 1\(^a\), 2003.
December 14, 2003); “The only force powerful enough to stop the rise of tyranny and terror and replace hatred with hope is the force of human freedom” (State of the Union, 2005); “[T]he most realistic way to protect the American people is to provide a hopeful alternative to the hateful ideology of the enemy by advancing liberty across a troubled region” (Address to the Nation on the War on Terror in Iraq, January 10, 2007); “[A] free Iraq is critical to the security of the United States. A free Iraq will deny Al Qaida a safe haven,... will counter the destructive ambitions of Iran,... will marginalize extremists, unleash the talent of its people, and be an anchor of stability in the region” (Address to the Nation on the War on Terror in Iraq, October 13, 2007); “[F]or the security of America and the peace of the world, we are spreading the hope of freedom” (State of the Union, 2008).

IV. PRINCIPLES, MOTIVES AND JUSTIFICATIONS IN THE MILITARY INTERVENTIONS IN AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ

In this section our task is to demonstrate that although other short-run motives and justifications for the invasions in the Middle East existed and even prevailed over democracy, the building of a democratic system of values and principles in the “recipient” countries was the normative element which completed the Bush foreign policy doctrine and especially his defense doctrine.

PRINCIPLES

After 9/11 the Bush administration started to define American security in terms of its capacity to influence societies and domestic political structures in rogue states. The exporting of democracy was elevated to the category of defining principle of the foreign policy doctrine and, as shown by the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, became an important part of the American response to the terrorist threat. In both cases, the declared American objective was to establish a state that could “defend itself, govern itself, and sustain itself” (Address to the Nation on the War on Terror From Fort Bragg, June 28, 2005) after American withdrawal.

Just like the Cold War doctrines analyzed by Packenham (1973), the Bush Doctrine has a very optimistic vision of progress in regard of the possibilities to influence democratic transitions in the international system. Bush truly seems to believe that every Afghan and Iraqi people longed for democracy: “Our foreign policy is based on a clear premise:
We trust that people, when given the chance, will choose a future of freedom and peace” (State of the Union, 2008). Such optimism can be explained by the belief in the universality of democratic values – the first principle of American foreign policy doctrines in the post-Cold War, as proposed here. Its defense is very explicit in the speeches of the administration, as shows, for example, Condoleezza Rice: “[D]emocracy does not have to be imposed. Tyranny has to be imposed. Men and women long for liberty” (Opening Remarks by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice Before the House International Relations Committee, February 16, 2006).

And this principle was also used to respond to the critics of those who believed in the existence of obstacles to democratization imposed by cultural or religious features of certain peoples10:

And so, I think we have to fight back on the notion that somehow you have to be educated, or you have to be of a certain color, or a certain religion, or a certain nationality to want the simple blessings of liberty. That's the conceit. The conceit isn't for us to argue that every man, woman, and child wants to be free. The conceit is to argue that men, women, and children don't want to be free. And it's usually the conceit of those who want to control them, and those who want to continue in tyranny11 (Remarks At the Council on Foreign Relations, June 19, 2008).

The 2002 National Security Strategy describes this idea by saying that “Fathers and mothers in all societies want their children to be educated and to live free from poverty and violence. No people on earth yearn to be oppressed, aspire to servitude, or eagerly await the midnight knock of the secret police”. This rhetoric might look like a conceptual stretching of democracy, but the doctrine is pretty consistent. Diamond (2003) explains this relation:

Given a choice, they [the people] would like to be able to constrain the arbitrary power of government, to replace bad and corrupt leaders, to have a predictable and secure life under some kind of just rule of law. When one assembles these basic political preferences, it begins to look an awful lot like democracy, even if the word may have different (or unsure) meanings in many places.

A logical consequence of this kind of thought became a powerful justification for the military interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq: overthrowing the authoritarian regimes would mean to liberate the people from years of repression, torture and aggression.

---


11 For similar statements see: Condoleezza Rice, Remarks at the Community of Democracies UNGA Event, October 1, 2007.
According to this humanitarian justification for war, democratizing those countries would be a certain way to help their people, as Bush says:

As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror, and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free. In a free Iraq, there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms. The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near. (Address to the Nation on Iraq, March 17, 2003)

It was also believed that a democratic form of government representing all the people of Iraq would live in peace with its neighbors and be a responsible nation. That is the second principle of the Liberal Tradition on the Bush Doctrine. According to this principle, democracies are less prone to engage in wars against each other. This means that when Bush proposed to democratize Iraq he was also thinking about world peace:

The United States has no right, no desire, and no intention to impose our form of government on anyone else... Our aim is to build and preserve a community of free and independent nations, with governments that answer to their citizens and reflect their own cultures. And because democracies respect their own people and their neighbors, the advance of freedom will lead to peace (State of the Union, 2005)\(^{12}\).

For the Bush government, only democracy could guarantee that the country would no longer threaten its neighbors or serve as a refuge for terrorists. Powell links the establishment of a democracy in Afghanistan with security: “Afghanistan is a high priority for this Administration. The United States is committed to helping build a stable and democratic Afghanistan that is free from terror and no longer harbors threats to our security”. (The President's Budget Request For FY 2005, February 26, 2004)

And Rice helps constructing the justifications for invading Iraq linking the threat of terrorism to the democratic solution: “And we believe that the ideology of hatred which [the terrorists] espouse can only be met by advancing liberty and democracy”(FY 2007 Budget Request for the Department of State and Foreign Operations, March 28, 2006.).

She even says the use of force might be necessary sometimes, but just democracy can put a definitive end to terrorism:

We may, in fact, have to use military force, as for instance in Afghanistan, but it is really the development of institutions, democratic institutions, accountable institutions in these countries; the betterment of the lives of the people; the efforts that we're making through public diplomacy and exchange programs to try and pull young people away from the temptation of terrorism; the development of well-governed

\(^{12}\) For similar statements see: George W. Bush, *Address to the Nation on Iraq From the U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln*. May 1, 2003; *Address to the Nation on the War on Terror From Fort Bragg, North Carolina*. June 28, 2005; *Address to the Nation on the War on Terror*. September 11, 2006.
democratic states that can deliver for their people (International Affairs FY 2008 Budget, March 21, 2007). From the academic point of view, there’s a great debate between realists and idealists, where each group defends that American foreign policy should be guided either by its interests or by its values. But the democratization literature that validates the Bush doctrine does not see this contradiction. Diamond (1994), for example, answers to this critic:

> Realist thinkers often contend that such tangible national interests conflict with our moral or idealistic interest in democracy and human rights. Certainly we will confront painful tensions and trade-offs. But this view misses the powerful and growing linkages between our moral interest in the expansion of democracy and our ‘real’ interests in safe, secure, free and prosperous America… Precisely because they respect within their own borders competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be build.

Owen (2006), for his part, believes the expansion of American interests is only possible through the expansion of democracy: “American hegemony – the unipolar era – is extended in time by the extension in space of democracy. Democracy is not just a consequence of American primacy, it is also a cause of it”. And to convince even the most pragmatic, Fukuyama and McFaul (2007) remember us that “Not all autocracies are or have been enemies of the United States, but every American enemy has been an autocracy”.

This kind of vision is equivalent to the third principle of American foreign policy in the post-Cold War, and it connects democracy promotion and American national interests: a more democratic world is safer and more prosperous for the United States. It follows that nothing would serve Americans better than democracy promotion. This relationship is very explicit in the speeches the Bush administration used to define its foreign policy doctrine and to justify the interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq. This entailment is necessary to assure that when promoting democracy, the American government is not leaving behind American interests.

---


In an article published by *Foreign Affairs* in 2008, Condoleezza Rice expresses well how the administration understood the relationship between values and interests in their post-September 11 foreign policy:

> As in the past, our policy has been sustained not just by our strength but also by our values. The United States has long tried to marry power and principle -- realism and idealism. At times, there have been short-term tensions between them. But we have always known where our long-term interests lie. Thus, the United States has not been neutral about the importance of human rights or the superiority of democracy as a form of government, both in principle and in practice... We must insist... to promote democratic development. It is in our national interest to do so... To state... that we must promote either our security interests or our democratic ideals is to present a false choice... An international order that reflects our values is the best guarantee of our enduring national interest. *(Rethinking the National Interest*, 2008)

During the evolution of the War on Terror, this principle becomes much more important because it allows the Bush administration to tie the September 11 terrorist attacks to the existence of authoritarian countries in the world. The Middle East in general and Iraq specifically become targets of the American retaliation started in Afghanistan. The idea is that security, stability, and peace can only be conquered with democracy:

> Sixty years of Western nations excusing and accommodating the lack of freedom in the Middle East did nothing to make us safe -- because in the long run, stability cannot be purchased at the expense of liberty. As long as the Middle East remains a place where freedom does not flourish, it will remain a place of stagnation, resentment, and violence ready for export. And with the spread of weapons that can bring catastrophic harm to our country and to our friends, it would be reckless to accept the status quo15. *(Remarks by the President at the 20th Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy, November 6, 2003)*

This principle also served to explain the choice for preventive war, one of the foundations of the Bush Doctrine. It became famous the idea that September 11 had proven that while Americans lived their lives peacefully, a bloody dictator from an unknown state thousands of miles away plotted against America: “On September 11, 2001, we found that problems originating in a failed and oppressive state 7,000 miles away could bring murder and destruction to our country” *(State of the Union, 2006)*. Bush, of course, had no other alternative than to intervene in Iraq to promote democracy:

> America is a friend to the people of Iraq. Our demands are directed only at the regime that enslaves them and threatens us... As Americans, we want peace; we work and sacrifice for peace. But there can be no peace if our security depends on the will and whims of a ruthless and

15 For similar statements, see: George W. Bush, “Address to the Nation on the War on Terror”. September 11, 2006.
aggressive dictator. I'm not willing to stake one American life on trusting Saddam Hussein. (Address to the Nation on Iraq From Cincinnati, Ohio. August 10, 2002)

The last of the influences of the Liberal Tradition on the Bush doctrine concerns the strategy to defend the American mission to bring freedom and democracy to mankind. Bush chose to believe the historic metaphor of America as a “city upon a hill” and, due to the identification of new imminent dangers, associated it to the use of force. Bush establishes this relationship very clearly:

Wherever we carry it, the American flag will stand not only for our power but for freedom. Our Nation's cause has always been larger than our Nation's defense. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace, a peace that favors human liberty... Building this just peace is America's opportunity and America's duty... America has no empire to extend or utopia to establish. We wish for others only what we wish for ourselves, safety from violence, the rewards of liberty, and the hope for a better life. (Commencement Address at the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York, June 1, 2002)

The idea that promoting democracy was not only right but necessary, and that even though it was a world battle just Americans had the capacity to lead it, was fundamental to the development of the new foreign policy doctrine. The mission was repeatedly used to justify the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, emphasizing the American responsibility to answer to a call from “Providence” or from “History” and command of the cause of liberty in the world:

We did not ask for this mission, but we will fulfill it. The name of today's military operation is Enduring Freedom. We defend not only our precious freedoms but also the freedom of people everywhere to live and raise their children free from fear. (Address to the Nation Announcing Strikes Against Al Qaida Training Camps and Taliban Military Installations in Afghanistan, October 7, 2001)

History has called our Nation into action. History has placed a great challenge before us: Will America, with our unique position and power, blink in the face of terror, or will we lead to a freer, more civilized world? There's only one answer: This great country will lead the world to safety, security, peace, and freedom (Address to the Nation on the Proposed Department of Homeland Security, June 6, 2002)

We did not ask for this present challenge, but we accept it. Like other generations of Americans, we will meet the responsibility of defending human liberty against violence and aggression. By our resolve, we will give strength to others. By our courage, we will give hope to others. And by our actions, we will secure the peace and lead the world to a better day. (Address to the Nation on Iraq From Cincinnati, Ohio, October 7, 2002)
We accept the duties of our generation. We are active and resolute in our own defense. We are serving in freedom's cause, and that is the cause of all mankind. (Address to the Nation on the War on Terror, September 7, 2003)

When the liberal tradition connects democracy and the necessity to act through the use of force in the post-September 11 environment, the Bush doctrine completes itself. Together, the three principles and the mission assessed here were able to elevate democracy to the category of guiding principle of American foreign policy in the Bush years.

MOTIVES AND JUSTIFICATIONS
President G.W. Bush coherently repeated over and over again in his speeches after September 11 that the priority of this administration is to fight terrorism; that dictatorships are a safe haven for terrorists; therefore, a democratic Afghanistan and Iraq will turn the world and the United States safer. He did so in his first speech after the terrorist attack in September 20 and along his two terms in office until the very last year of 2008. Some excerpts follow:

On my orders, the United States military has begun strikes against Al Qaida terrorist training camps and military installations of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. These carefully targeted actions are designed to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations and to attack the military capability of the Taliban regime. (President Bush, Address to the Nation, October 7, 2001)

The triumph of democracy and tolerance in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and beyond would be a grave setback for international terrorism. The terrorists thrive on the support of tyrants and the resentments of oppressed peoples. When tyrants fall and resentment gives way to hope, men and women in every culture reject the ideologies of terror and turn to the pursuits of peace. Everywhere that freedom takes hold, terror will retreat. (President Bush, Address to the Nation, September 7, 2003)

To complete the mission, we will prevent Al Qaida and other foreign terrorists from turning Iraq into what Afghanistan was under the Taliban, a safe haven from which they could launch attacks on America and our friends. And the best way to complete the mission is to help Iraqis build a free nation that can govern itself, sustain itself, and defend itself. (President Bush, Address to the Nation, June 28, 2005)

The mission in Iraq has been difficult and trying for our nation. But it is in the vital interest of the United States that we succeed. A free Iraq will deny Al Qaeda a safe haven. A free Iraq will show millions across the
Middle East that a future of liberty is possible. A free Iraq will be a friend of America, a partner in fighting terror, and a source of stability in a dangerous part of the world. (President Bush, State of the Union, January 28, 2008)

Those links between terrorism and dictatorship are a crucial point of the Bush doctrine, that prescribes, as a consequence, the building of democracy as the essential tool to win the war on terror.

If military operations in Afghanistan were tacitly a consensus in the international community, this was not the case in the Iraq invasion. Soon after the Afghanistan invasion the focus of the Bush administration turned to Iraq.

“The threat comes from Iraq”, Bush stated in his Address to the nation on Iraq in October 7, 2002. Along the year of 2002 and the beginning of 2003 Bush dedicated himself to sort of preparing the American people for the next invasion in another dangerous rogue state. He would deliver several Addresses to the Nation on Iraq, where he assured that Saddam Hussein not only gave support and shelter to terrorists but also possessed and produced weapons of mass destruction. He insisted that the Saddam regime had violated all the obligations before the international community since the Gulf War, defied United Nations Security Council resolutions demanding full disarmament, threatened U.N. weapon inspectors, and continued to threatens the world and the United States (cf. The Address to the Nation on Iraq in October 7, 2002, February 1, 2003, March 17, 2003, May 1, 2003). The speeches of the State of the Union of 2002 and 2003 also denounced the danger represented by Iraq to America.

It followed a period of great American pressure on the United Nations and its Security Council to react against the “despicable and dangerous” acts of Saddam Hussein. Secretary Powell followed closely the UN Resolutions on the matter; the demand was for a preemptive action. The Bush administration, however, showed that it will act any way

Iraq has now placed itself in danger of the serious consequences called for in UN Resolution 1441. And this body places itself in danger of irrelevance if it allows Iraq to continue to defy its will without responding effectively and immediately. (...)My colleagues, we have an obligation to our citizens. We have an obligation to this body to see that
our resolutions are complied with. We wrote 1441 not in order to go to war. We wrote 1441 to try to preserve the peace. We wrote 1441 to give Iraq one last chance. Iraq is not, so far, taking that one last chance (Secretary Colin Powell, New York City, February 5, 2003)

One can go back many years to the end of the Gulf War; and when that war ended resolutions were passed that said Iraq should disarm itself of its weapons of mass destruction, and you well know the history of the last 12 years of continued Iraqi defiance of their obligations under their resolutions, a total of some 16 resolutions; and finally 1441 was passed by the United Nations where a whole international community came together. (….) some of the members of the Security Council who signed on at that time didn't understand that the United States of America was deadly serious. We were going to disarm Saddam Hussein, peacefully or, if not peacefully, through the use of force of arms. (Secretary Colin Powell, Testimony before the House Budget Committee, February 13, 2003)

(…)if the United States feels strongly that Iraq still has weapons of mass destruction and trying to develop new ones, the United States reserves the right and believes there is sufficient authority within international law, based on many acts of noncompliance, many material breaches in the past and continuing material breaches into the present, that would give us a basis for undertaking whatever might be required to disarm Iraq. (Secretary Colin Powell, Released by the Office of the Spokesman, January 16, 2003)

After the Iraq invasion Powell still referred to the American unilateral action: “We took the case to the international community, to the United Nations, reminded the world of all the resolutions this individual had violated -- Saddam Hussein. And it was time to act. Act we did. He is gone and the people of Iraq are free”.(Secretary Colin Powell,Washington DC, February 3, 2004). And he added in the same speech: “There should be no doubt in the mind of the American people or anyone else in the world that we have done the right thing, and history will certainly be the test of that”.

As seen in the previous section, unilateral action, if necessary, and preemptive war were crucial elements of the Bush Doctrine. They were used promptly and unambiguously when it came to the Iraq invasion. In this moment the existence of the weapons of mass destruction and the fear that they could end in terrorists hands were justifications for military actions very much enforced. When it became clear that the WMD did not exist Bush and Powell came forward insisting that given the “solid intelligence base” their information rested their decisions to invade Iraq was right:

And what did we know then? And what did we present? We said that this was a regime led by a dictator who had every intention of keeping his weapons of mass destruction programs going, and anyone who thinks he didn't is just dead wrong. And there is no evidence to suggest
that was an incorrect judgment. He had used them in the past and it was 
clear if given the opportunity he would use them in the future if it 
served his purpose. We also knew that he had the capability. (Secretary 
Colin Powell, New York, February 6, 2004).

There was never any doubt in anyone's mind, and no intelligence 
agency past, present or future will ever demonstrate that Saddam 
Hussein gave up the intent to have such weapons. (Secretary Colin 
Powell, Testimony before the House International Relations 
Committee, February 11, 2004).

When Condoleezza Rice became the Secretary of State in the second term of Bush 
administration, weapons of mass destruction were not anymore the American concern in 
Iraq, nor was she impelled to defend the preemptive war strategy. She was focused on 
winning the war on terror and this meant not only a definitive victory in the battle field 
but also and above all the building of democracy in the rogue states. Rice joined 
President Bush to reinforce the importance of democracy as the crucial weapon to fight 
terrorism. It follows some examples:

The President spoke of the significant progress we have made 
confronting the enemy abroad, removing many of al-Qaida’s top 
commanders, cutting off terrorist finances, and putting pressure on 
states that sponsor or harbor terrorists or seek to proliferate weapons of 
mass destruction. But in the long term, as President Bush said, "The 
only force powerful enough to stop the rise of tyranny and terror, and 
replace hatred with hope, is the force of human freedom." (Secretary C. 
Rice, President’s FY 2006 International Affairs Budget Request, 
February 16, 2005)

I want to just note that the President's budget, the ’07 budget, is in 
support of a foreign policy that is devoted to the spread of liberty and 
democracy as the best antidote to the ideologies of hatred that feed the 
kind of terrorism that we have experienced and that many others around 
the world have experienced as well. (…) Democratic processes must be 
supported. (…) Therefore you will see in this budget request continuing 
support for the new democracies of Iraq and Afghanistan. (Secretary C. 
Rice, International Affairs Budget Request for FY 2007, February 16, 
2007).

We will continue the discussions about the NATO role in Iraq and 
Afghanistan, which has been so effective and so helpful to helping those 
young democracies progress. (…) But of course we know that it is not 
enough to have a short-term solution to terrorism, that is, defeating the 
terrorists who on a daily basis plot and plan to destroy innocent life, but
also to deal with the creation -- with the circumstances that created those terrorists. And we believe that the ideology of hatred which they espouse can only be met by advancing liberty and democracy. That is the goal that we have in the support for the young democracies of Iraq and Afghanistan (…) (Secretary C. Rice, Remarks with Secretary of NATO before their meeting, March 20, 2006).

The building of democracy in the rogue states – those which shelter terrorists and keep weapons of mass destruction – is then an essential part of the Bush Doctrine.

The exam of the Figure below reinforces this argument.
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Data: Content analysis of speeches of President Bush and his Secretaries of State, 2001-2008.

Among the justifications for the Afghanistan and Iraq military invasions identified in the speeches of Bush and his Secretaries of State - Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice – two stick out and are used in about the same proportion: terrorism (20,2%) and democracy (21,5%). These results confirm the analysis above: military invasions are launched- in a radical preemptive way - to fight terrorism and to build democracy, the latter the only antidote in the long run against the former. Those are the justifications that are really important. Weapons of Mass Destruction can be real or not.

By putting the exporting of democracy as the central weapon to fight terror Bush intertwined his foreign and defense policy. The military invasions should build an environment democratic and therefore safer and more prosperous for the United States
(3\textsuperscript{rd} principle). However, America is not an evil empire, because democracy will bring peace to the region (2\textsuperscript{nd} principle) and a better life for the populations of the invaded rogue states, which, as every people in the world, wish to turn democratic (1\textsuperscript{rst} principle).

However, to craft democracy it is no easy task, especially not taking into consideration internal historical, cultural, religious cleavages. Today by the Freedom House indexes Afghanistan and Iraq are both not free countries, scoring, respectively, 6 and 5.5. The Bush Doctrine did not prove right.
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