

The Bush Doctrine: Creating Discord in International Security

The University Of Winnipeg
Candidate, BA Honours in Political Science
Ajit Singh
March 15, 2004

The Bush Doctrine: Creating Discord in International Security

I. Introduction

The Bush Doctrine of Pre-emptive Strike, as outlined in the National Security Strategy of the United States of America (NSS), may cause discord in international security and sets a dangerous precedence for others to follow. The NSS was created in September of 2002. It is derived from the independent internationalist approach. The document outlines principles that will guide American Foreign Policy. The Strategy states that the right to defend should extend to pre-emptive attacks against potential aggressors, cutting off a planned, perceived or future attack before it occurs¹. The Pre-emptive strike policy is a component of what is known as the Bush Doctrine. Because there is no clear definition of what entitles a “sufficient threat to [U.S.] national security”², the Bush Doctrine clearly allows for arbitrary implementation. Due to the United States implementing the Bush Doctrine in Iraq, a dangerous precedence may have been set for future conflicts. This doctrine could be applied to conflicts in India-Pakistan and North Korea-Japan. Instead of previous American non-confrontational strategies of deterrence, containment, and collective security, the new Pre-emptive Doctrine is built upon the concept of aggression and confrontation. The doctrine is guided by the independent internationalist approach which allows self-interests to guide actions and the ability to only use multilateralism as necessary. This will undoubtedly lead to an escalation in conflicts and a less secure global community.

¹ The Government of the United States of America. National Security Strategy of the United States of America. September 12, 2002.

² Government of the United States of America, p.1.

This paper will use the lens of the independent internationalist perspective to understand the actions of the United States of America. This paper will first look at the components and principles of the NSS: its principles, meanings and aspects of its formulation. This paper will then look at the implementation of the NSS in Iraq: the arguments used for its justification, the outcome and precedence. This part of the paper will also involve a content analysis to understand the justification of the war through public speeches from American officials. Finally this paper will test the principles of the NSS using the independent internationalist framework, as applied in Iraq, to situations in India-Pakistan and Korea. Applying the Bush Doctrine to these countries will demonstrate how these countries may be provided the justification to launch Pre-emptive strikes due to an independent internationalist approach and arbitrariness of the principles. The three parts to this paper will ultimately lead to the conclusion that the NSS of the United States of America, more specifically the Pre-emptive Strike policy, can easily be abused by independent internationalists and may lead to greater conflicts.

The theoretical approach that this paper will take in analyzing the NSS is the independent internationalist framework. This approach is described by Joan Hoff,

Most simply it means that when the United States cannot, or does not, want to solve a particular diplomatic problem through unilateral action, it seeks cooperative methods for pursuing its goals. It is in these short-lived and usually opportunistic times of cooperation that the dual shibboleths of self-determination or self-government wrapped in the rhetoric of democracy prevail in American foreign policy discourse. But the country's first inclination for most of this century

has been to act unilaterally whenever possible and to cooperate with other nations only when absolutely necessary.³

This theory fully explains the reasons and the implementation of the NSS of the United States of America. The United States has a history of being both for and against the multilateralist approach according to its national interests. The United States has been against previous multilateralist creations such as the International Criminal Court and the Anti-Personnel landmines treaty. The Bush administration has deepened and favoured the unilateral approach in a fashion that was not seen in the past. Though the multilateral approach has been dismissed in most actions by President George W. Bush administration, there is clearly an attempt to word the NSS in accordance with the principles of the multilateralist approach. This would allow the application of the NSS to be either multilateral or unilateral as the situation demands. Joseph Nye Jr. again argues that the United States should use the multilateralist approach “as a way to legitimize its power and to gain broad acceptance of its new strategy”⁴. Creating an illusionary multilateralist approach with the creation of coalitions will allow the United States to prevent itself from being scrutinized for unilateral interventions and actions. While at the same time, unilateral action is not beyond the principles outlined in the NSS. This aspect of the NSS will be explained as the paper progresses.

SECTION II: The National Security Strategy of the United States of America

i. History

Two events have significantly changed American Foreign Policy and National Security in the

³ Joan Hoff, “The American Century: From Sarajevo to Sarajevo”. *Diplomatic History*. Spring 1999 Vol . 23 Issue 2, p.285.

⁴ Joseph Nye Jr. “U.S. Power and Strategy After Iraq”. *Foreign Affairs*. Jul/Aug 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 4, p.60.

Post-Cold War. The contested election of Republican George W. Bush in 2000 was one such event. His election brought on a series of very neoconservative and aggressive policies in the United States. The Clinton administration's more multilateral approach to foreign policy and faith in international institutions were slowly retracted. This occurred in instances such as the "unsigning" of the International Criminal Court Statute⁵. This demonstrates a picking and choosing of which and when international organizations would be used by United States Government. This independent internationalist approach appeared to demonstrate a new found unilateral position with Bush's administration. Bush's election was compounded with the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington. This event changed American Foreign policy, and the Bush Doctrine was formed. Prior to the NSS of the United States came the "Bush Doctrine", based upon his speech given on September 20th, 2001 in response to the terrorist attacks. In the speech Bush stated bluntly either "you are with us or against us"⁶. Michael Hirsh describes the Bush Doctrine as one that has transformed American foreign policy, declared American hegemony in the world and redefined American relationships around the world⁷. Yale historian John Lewis Gaddis referred to the National Security Policy as "the most important reformulation of U.S. grand strategy in over half a century"⁸. The significance of the Bush administration's direction in foreign relations is visible. This administration's NSS comes at the tail end of significant developments in international security and intervention.

The concept of intervention has emerged since the end of the Cold War and the re-conceptualization of state sovereignty. Incidences in Haiti, Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia and

⁵ Michael Hirsh. "Bush and the World". Foreign Affairs. Sept/Oct 2002, Vol. 81 Issue 5 p.18.

⁶ Hirsh, p.18.

⁷ Hirsh, p.18.

⁸ Michael Warner. "A new strategy for the new geopolitics". Public Interest. Fall 2003. Issue 153 p.94.

Kosovo are argued to have changed the global perception on intervention⁹. The customary international norm of respecting state sovereignty was changing due to the atrocities that occurred in the 1990s. The based upon the urgings of United Nations (U.N.) Secretary General Kofi Annan, the Canadian government created a commission headed by Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans and Annan's Special advisor Mohamed Sahnoun, to figure out a way to respond to human rights abuses such as genocide¹⁰. In December of 2001, the commission discovered that there was a gap between human suffering and rules and mechanisms for managing world order¹¹. The commission then created what was called the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect, legitimizing interventions into a sovereign state's affairs on the concept of humanitarian responsibility. The argument used for intervening in another sovereign state's affairs is due to the immunity many nations such as the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda received while genocide, ethnic cleansing and war crimes were being conducted. Some would argue that national sovereignty should no longer be a shield for tyrants, and that nations should act more quickly to prevent atrocities from being committed. However, the independent internationalist approach of the United States, allowed it the arbitrary decision to intervene as it wished, guided by national interests.

The Responsibility to Protect doctrine, through its legitimizing of state intervention, gave way for the NSS to be created, along with the Pre-emptive strike. One writer argues that previous principals for self-defense embedded in the UN Charter were inadequate¹². A new argument was formed, arguing that the Responsibility to Protect

⁹ Lee Feinstein. Anne-Marie Slaughter. "A Duty to Prevent". Foreign Affairs. Jan/Feb 2004. Vol. 83 Issue 1 p.136.

¹⁰ Feinstein and Slaughter, p.136

¹¹ Feinstein and Slaughter, p.136

¹² Feinstein and Slaughter, p.136

should be extended to a new concept, the “duty to prevent”, a concept of pre-emption. Lee Feinstein and Anne-Marie Slaughter argue “the duty to prevent” should be allowed if three circumstances are met: (1) control Weapons of Mass Destruction proliferation and those who possess them, (2) the international community coming together swiftly to prevent particular governments before the use of force is necessary, and (3) the duty to prevent should be done collectively through an international or regional institution¹³. The whole concept of pre-emptive intervention has been one of considerable debate. For instance Madeline Albright writes that “reliance on alliance had been replaced by redemption through pre-emption; the shock of force trumped the hard work of diplomacy, and long-time relationships were redefined”¹⁴. This demonstrates a paradigm shift from collective security of the Cold War with institutions such as NATO, to crisis management through the U.N., to finally a more unilateral approach emphasizing military force over diplomacy, hard power over soft power. The shift in international relations clearly falls into the framework of the independent internationalist. Under this paradigm, the United States can manoeuvre as it pleases, with a multilateral force being an option, however unilateral action is always the ideal.

The Bush administration’s National Security Council formulated the NSS outlining the principles, desired outcomes and objectives of United States foreign policy on September 12, 2002, exactly one year and one day after 9/11. The NSS, touches on topics ranging from championing human rights to institutional reform. To Bush superpowers such as China and Russia, who he originally perceived as “strategic competitors”, suddenly became “strategic

¹³ Feinstein and Slaughter, p.136

partners” in an urge to integrate many nations in the fight against terrorism. This allowed the United States to create alliances with other world powers in order to further maximize its national interests, using the independent internationalist approach. The approach the Bush administration is taking is one deemed new unilateralist by Joseph Nye Jr., an approach that wishes to diminish the multilateralist approach and disintegrate international organizations such as the U.N.¹⁵. The argument is that these regional and international organizations should be created at an ad hoc basis, as the U.N. Charter implies, and not permanently. Once again the independent internationalist approach best explains this situation. The United States is willing to work within the framework of international organizations but only when it deems necessary.

ii. The National Security Strategy

The NSS is a 10 part document covering eight principals or areas. There are eight fundamental principles: (1) champion aspirations for human dignity; (2) strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks, against “us and our friends”; (3) work with others to defuse regional conflicts; (4) prevent “our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends”, with weapons of mass destruction; (5) ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade; (6) expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy; (7) develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power; (8) and transform America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century¹⁶. However only principles 1-4 pertinent to this essay because only they deal with the Pre-emptive Strike policy, and the case in

¹⁴ Albright, p.1.

¹⁵ Nye Jr, p.60.

¹⁶ Government of the United States of America, p.1.

Iraq.

Rule of law is the championing of human and basic rights, due process and democratic systems of governance¹⁷. In the first principal of the NSS, “championing human dignity”, there is a direct statement regarding rule of law. This is once again clearly within the interests of a liberal democratic republic like the United States of America. The United States for many decades has argued that it is a champion of human rights¹⁸. Also one of the reasons that the United States used to justify its attack on Saddam Hussein was his human rights abuses¹⁹. The rule of law approach in the United States’ rhetoric in international politics is well documented and observed. However, as will be seen as this paper progresses, there is a massive difference between the creation or proclamation of a principal and its application. The gap between the two is a very arbitrary process which is dependent upon the national interests of the United States.

A demonstration of the independent internationalist approach in the NSS is the wording. The NSS appears to be multilateralist in nature but allows for a unilateralist approach. Many times in the NSS, it states “we, our allies and our friends”²⁰, statements like these are meant to create the image of a more multilateralist approach. However, writer Michael Hirsh writes that the Bush administration “proceed from the firm ground of the national interest and not from the interest of an illusory international community”²¹. Once again the independent internationalist framework best explains this discrepancy. Joan Hoff, in explaining this framework, states that national self-

¹⁷ Fen Osler Hampson. Madness in the Multitude. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp.18-22.

¹⁸ Yong Deng, “Hegemon on the Offensive: Chinese Perspectives on U.S. Global Strategy”. Political Science Quarterly. Fall 2001, Vol. 116 Issue 3 p.343.

¹⁹ Joaquin Cabrejas. “Behind Bush's Drive to War”. Humanist. Nov/Dec 2003. Vol. 63 Issue 6. p.20.

²⁰ Government of the United States of America, p.1.

²¹ Michael Hirsh, p.18.

determination is a key objective in American foreign policy²². This would explain why the United States has swayed in the past between the multilateralist and unilateralist approaches. The stance of the United States government on an issue will depend upon its assessment of national interests and self-determination. This is also why the wording of the NSS allows the leniency for the United States to forgo the multilateralist approach when it is against their national interests.

Principle one: champion aspirations for human dignity²³

The first principle of the NSS is one that is of neo-liberal origin because it champions individual rights and freedoms. The NSS defines human dignity as “the rule of law; limits on the absolute power of the state; free speech; freedom of worship; equal justice; respect for women; religious and ethnic tolerance; and respect for private property²⁴. These are all components to a general principle that are mostly distinct from their origin in Western civilization arguably originating from the enlightenment. The problem with the origin of the premises of this principle is that they may not be able to be accommodated everywhere throughout the world, where cultures have different views on what should guide society. Already there is a conflict with the principal. The NSS states five key actions to achieve what they call championing human dignity. This involves,

“(1) speak out honestly about violations of the nonnegotiable demands of human...(2) dignity using our voice and vote in international institutions to advance freedom...(3) use our foreign aid to promote freedom and support those who struggle non-violently for it, ensuring that nations moving toward democracy are rewarded for the steps they take...(4) Make freedom and the development of

²² Hoff, p.285.

²³ Government of the United States of America, p.2.

²⁴ Government of the United States of America, p.2.

democratic institutions key themes in our bilateral relations, seeking solidarity and cooperation from other democracies while we press governments that deny human rights to move toward a better future...(5) take special efforts to promote freedom of religion and conscience and defend it from encroachment by repressive governments.”²⁵

These actions all appear to be very idealistic and admirable actions in pursuing foreign relations. However, in this case theory and practice appear to be in stark contrast. It is known that the United States has supported governments in Saudi Arabia, which have a track record of being against individual freedoms and the concept of democracy²⁶. It is noted by one author that Arabs perceive that the United States stand for human rights, democracy and freedom everywhere except in the Middle East²⁷, meaning that they are hypocrites. This principal needs to be applied universally and indiscriminately, regardless of economic or political relations.

This principal is clearly in line with the rule of law approach in international relations. The human rights of individuals are being championed making the rights of people take precedence over political clout. The NSS directly states that this principal is based upon the “rule of law”. The most legitimate argument for the rule of law approach to this principal is the atrocities committed during the 1990s. The UN doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect further legitimizes the intervention into another sovereign nation based upon the principal of championing human dignity. The problem with this principal is that it allows for arbitrary implementation. Due to the United States’ independent internationalist approach, this principal will be implemented

²⁵ Government of the United States of America, p.2.

²⁶ James Rubin. “Stumbling Into War”. *Foreign Affairs*. Sep/Oct 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 5 p.46.

²⁷ Madeline Albright, “Bridges, Bombs, or Bluster?”. *Foreign Affairs*. Sept/Oct 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 5 p.2.

according to its national interests. This could allow many nations to abuse the concept of intervention under the guise of championing human dignity. Furthermore, the lack of requirement for multilateral institutions or coalitions allow for pursuing national interests in intervention. The lack of multilateral institutions and/or coalitions may make international security more volatile due to the pursuit of national interests. Though the principal is strong it is nevertheless weakened in its application and the inconsistencies stated above, and that we shall see as the paper progresses.

Principal 2: “strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks, against us and our friends”²⁸

This principal, as stated in the NSS, recognizes terrorism as an indefinable entity. The objective state’s is to destroy terrorist communications, command, control, finances and material support²⁹. The NSS also states it will help regional partners in their attempts to eradicate and fight terrorism by the support of American “military, law enforcement, political, and financial tools necessary to finish the task”³⁰. This is a strong obligation that the United States is committing itself to. However, due to its independent internationalist approach, it will commit itself only in accordance with its national interests. Once again the answer will be needed to the question of what is a terrorist or terrorist organization. The United States may well end up supporting oppressive regimes who can label any dissident groups as terrorists, such as Israel or Russia for example. This once again falls into the problem of arbitrary implementation due to the independent internationalist approach. Nations will decide arbitrarily who is a terrorist and who

²⁸ Government of the United States, p.3.

²⁹ Government of the United States, p.3.

³⁰ Government of the United States, p.3.

is not and how to fight terrorism. Kalliopi Koufa, U.N. Special Rapporteur for the Commission on Human Rights wrote a paper that defines several different types of terrorism³¹. In the paper she distinguished between individual or group terrorism, International State terrorism, State regime or Government terror, State-sponsored or State-supported terrorism, and national liberation struggles for self-determination³². The fact that terrorism is “indefinable”, allows for the arbitrary definition of the term to anything the state desires. Any nation, organization or individual against a state’s national interests may be defined as a terrorist. The definition of terrorism is of the utmost importance in the application of this principal, and will be called upon in the third part of this paper. The NSS states that it will attack terrorism in the following ways:

(1) direct and continuous action using all the elements of national and international power. Immediacy will be given to attempts to gain or use weapons of mass destruction (WMD) or their precursors; (2) defending the United States, the American people, and interests at home and abroad by identifying and destroying the threat before it reaches our borders. While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, and will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defence by acting pre-emptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country; (3) denying further sponsorship, support, and sanctuary to terrorists by convincing or compelling states to accept their sovereign responsibilities.³³

The NSS also states that it will wage a war of information and ideas by (1) using its influence and allies and friends, (2) supporting moderate and modern governments especially in the

³¹ Marjorie Cohn, “Understanding, responding to, and preventing terrorism”. Arab Studies Quarterly. Spring/Summer 2002. Vol. 24 Issue 2/3 p.25.

³² Cohn, p.25.

³³ Government of the United States of America, p.3.

Muslim world, (3) using resources to diminish conditions that create terrorism, (4) using public diplomacy to promote the free flow of information and ideas to create dissident in terror sponsoring countries³⁴.

This section is important because what this is indirectly stating is that the United States will wage a propaganda war against states that it deems to be terrorist or terror sponsoring. Because the United States is an independent internationalist, it is fighting this war due to its self-interests. What becomes problematic due to this is that it will arbitrarily wage its war to further its influence. It should be noted that the act of spreading propaganda in other countries in the ambition of creating dissent, in itself could be seen as an act of terrorism or sponsored terrorism (sub-principal 4). Therefore it is the definition of terrorism that will play a huge role in the application of this principal. The problem with the lack of definition of this principal is that it allows for arbitrary definitions, in accord with national interests. This section also goes on to state that the United States will create massive institutional changes in creating the department of Homeland Security and a more coordinated intelligence community.

Principal 3: work with others to defuse regional conflicts³⁵

The component of the NSS acknowledges that all circumstances that the United States finds itself cannot be predicted. The United States believes that they have “finite” political, economic and military resources for the foreign policy objectives. There are two main “strategic principles” the United States has created for these circumstances: (1) invest time and resources into international relationships and institutions to manage local crises when they emerge. (2) be

³⁴ Government of the United States of America, p.3.

realistic about its ability to help those who are unwilling or unready to help themselves. The United States argues that when these countries comply, the United States will be willing to move decisively to aid them³⁶. These two principles appear to lay the ground for the United States to have some leeway in deciding subjectively where they may intervene or who they may help. These two principles appear to be somewhat of a sunset clause, that will allow the United States to enforce their actions unevenly across the globe. Once again the independent internationalist approach would help to explain this principal. The wording of this principal would allow for the United States to pursue its national interests in either a multilateral or unilateral fashion. Under the independent internationalist approach, the United States has and continues to act unilaterally when possible and multilaterally only when necessary³⁷.

Principal 4: “prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends, with weapons of mass destruction”³⁸

This principal and section of the NSS is the most important dealing with the Pre-emptive strike policy. This part of the NSS is composed of 3 key elements: (1) proactive counter proliferation efforts, (2) strengthening non-proliferation to prevent rogues states and terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and (3) consequence management to respond to WMD use³⁹. The NSS clearly states that due to the threat of rogue states and terrorists, the U.S. cannot “solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past...We cannot let our enemies strike first”⁴⁰. This statement is clearly illustrates the change of a policy of reactive deterrence to one of proactive

³⁵ Government of the United States of America, p.4.

³⁶ Government of the United States of America, p.4.

³⁷ Hoff, p.285.

³⁸ Government of the United States of America, p.5.

³⁹ Government of the United States of America, p.5.

⁴⁰ Government of the United States of America, p.5.

confrontation. The NSS speaks of the Cold War and how during that time, the position of deterrence was effective and viable. However, the NSS states that deterrence is no longer an effective strategy against “rogue states” and “terrorists” who do not care about their lives, their people’s lives or the lives of others. The NSS also states that under international law, a nation does not need to be attacked to protect itself from an imminent attack⁴¹. There is an acknowledgement in the strategy that in the past it was required that a visible imminent threat must be present, however, now the circumstances have changed, the justification of a Pre-emptive strike have changed accordingly. The NSS also states that with the concept of pre-emption it will also, “(1) build better and more integrated intelligence capabilities, (2) coordinate closely with allies to form a common assessment of the most dangerous threats; and continue to transform military forces to ensure victory”⁴². This principal is concluded by the statement that “The purpose of our actions will always be to eliminate a specific threat to the United States or our allies and friends. The reasons for our actions will be clear, the force measured, and the cause just”⁴³.

This principal is also subject to much criticism. The concept of pre-emption is against international norms. These norms are resolving conflicts through diplomacy, multilateral agreements or international institutions. John Ikenberry writes “but such an approach renders international norms of self-defense -- enshrined by Article 51 of the UN Charter -- almost meaningless”⁴⁴. Also United States Senator Robert Byrd gave a speech at the United States Senate speaking of how the doctrine of pre-emption is against established international law due

⁴¹ Government of the United States of America, p.5.

⁴² Government of the United States of America, p.5.

⁴³ Government of the United States of America, p.5.

⁴⁴ John Ikenberry, “America's Imperial Ambition”. Foreign Affairs. Sep/Oct 2002. Vol. 81 Issue 5 p.44.

to its aggressive nature⁴⁵. One writer describes the conflict as “in the name of protecting state sovereignty, international law traditionally prohibited states from intervening in one another’s affairs, with military force or otherwise”⁴⁶. It is evidence that the concept of pre-emption is one that is against previous customary international norms.

Once again this principal analyzed under the independent internationalist framework demonstrates national self-interests as a key factor. The United States will forgo Article 51 of the U.N. Charter in applying a Pre-emptive strike. The role of multilateral diplomacy is not required nor needed based upon the wording of this principle. Once again this leads to an arbitrary decision upon what would pose an imminent threat if it is one that is not traditionally visible such as a mobilization of military. This principal can once again be applied as it suits the interests of the United States administration.

Principal 5: “ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade”⁴⁷

What is of particular and peculiar interest in the wording of this principal is of its contradictory nature. It states that the United States will “remain committed to the basic U.N. Framework Convention for international cooperation”⁴⁸. The United States has had an adversarial relationship with the U.N., which has only deepened in recent years. The most obvious, recent and direct example of this relationship was the recent war in Iraq. The Security Council of the U.N. clearly voted against the resolution for the use of force in Iraq. Nevertheless, the United

⁴⁵ Robert Byrd, “A Reckless Administration May Reap Disastrous Consequences”. *Humanist*. May/June 2003. Vol. 63 Issue 3 p.24.

⁴⁶ Feinstein and Slaughter, p.136

States bypassed the U.N. decision, and used force in Iraq. The commitment of the United States to the U.N. framework is clearly open to criticism, especially in the Iraqi circumstance, which will be touched upon later in this paper.

The last of the principles of the NSS are irrelevant to the purpose of this paper. Nevertheless they have been included for informational purposes in the appendix.

iii. Overall Summary of National Security Strategy Principles

The guiding principles of the Bush Doctrine of Pre-emptive strike are the first four which will be quickly summarized: (1) champion human dignity, (2) strengthen global alliances to defeat terrorism and prevent attacks, (3) work with others to diffuse regional conflicts, (4) prevent enemies from threatening [America] and allies with weapons of mass destruction, (5) ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade (using the UN framework). As with any concept, the only way to assess the ideals and principles of a plan of action such as the NSS, is to see the precedence of its implementation.

The NSS principles outline the case for an American Pre-emptive strike. Many of these principles are worded in a fashion to demonstrate a willingness to use multilateral action, though unilateral action is not prohibited. This demonstrates how the independent internationalist approach was used in formulating the NSS. National interests seem to guide the NSS in order to arbitrarily apply the principles. The problem with the arbitrary implementation of these principles, based upon the independent internationalist approach, is that it may allow for abuse.

⁴⁷ Government of the United States of America, p.6.

SECTION III: IRAQ

i. Background

The NSS has been subject to much criticism in its aggressive and conservative approach to foreign policy. One writer describes Bush as taking a realist foreign policy approach⁴⁹, which is reckless in its application. There was significant build-up that ultimately led to the United States' war on Iraq. The United States pressed the Security Council of the U.N. to pass a resolution authorizing the use of force on Iraq. This was a result of what it deemed as lack of cooperation and compliance with disarmament measures issued by the U.N. after the first Persian Gulf War⁵⁰. James Rubin argues that many believed that the United States had the intention to go to war with Iraq regardless of its compliance with disarmament measures⁵¹. Resolution 1441 was passed by the Security Council to allow for further weapons inspection in Iraq. Rubin argues three scenarios could have emerged upon this resolution: (1) Saddam Hussein would fully comply, (2) the "smoking gun" (evidence) would be found allowing for war, or (3) Saddam Hussein would not comply leading to war⁵². But Rubin argues that a fourth scenario emerged being that Saddam Hussein partially complied therefore the United States did not know how to justify their war⁵³. From this point another vote brought forward by the United States failed in authorizing force through the Security Council. This allowed the United States, under the independent internationalist approach, to forgo the U.N. and follow its self-interests under the NSS.

⁴⁸ Government of the United States of America, p.6.

⁴⁹ Nye Jr, p.60.

⁵⁰ Rubin, p.46.

⁵¹ Rubin, p.46.

⁵² Rubin, p.46.

⁵³ Rubin, p.46.

The Bush Administration in 2003 launched what it deemed a “Pre-emptive strike” upon the country of Iraq under the leadership of Saddam Hussein. This attack is what can be seen as the first implementation of the Bush Doctrine since its creation in September of 2002. The Iraq war is clearly the situation that may set the precedence for future invocations of the Pre-emptive strike policy, and will lend it to arbitrary abuse through implementation, due to the weak grounds that were argued upon for the war. This justification for the war appeared to be generally upon the first four principals of the NSS. The assessment of the justification could be done through a content analysis of key speeches by United States government officials leading up to the war with Iraq.

ii. Content Analysis

In order to understand the justification for the United States’ Pre-emptive strike on Iraq, a content analysis was done on several speeches by United States President George W. Bush and United States Secretary of State Colin Powell. The analysis involved four key speeches en route to the war in Iraq. The first speech was President Bush’s address on Iraq in October 7, 2002⁵⁴. This speech was selected because this was the time that the war against Iraq was emerging as a key issue of United States’ foreign policy. The second speech analyzed is excerpts of Iraq from the President’s State of the Union address on January 28, 2003⁵⁵. This speech addressed the main reasons why Iraq was a case for a Pre-emptive strike and how it would be brought forward to the U.N. Security Council. The third speech analyzed was United States Secretary of State Colin

⁵⁴ Joseph Cirincione. Jessica Mathews. George Perkovich. WMD in Iraq: Evidence and Implications. Carnegie Endowment Report, January 2004, appendix 2.

⁵⁵ Joseph Cirincione. Jessica Mathews. George Perkovich. WMD in Iraq: Evidence and Implications. Carnegie Endowment Report, January 2004, appendix 3.

Powell's Address to the U.N. Security Council on February 5, 2003⁵⁶. This speech was essentially the main argument for a Pre-emptive strike against Iraq, and it attempted to justify this strike under the cloak of the U.N. Security Council. Finally, the fourth speech analyzed is President Bush's address to the nation on war with Iraq on March 17, 2003⁵⁷. This speech makes the final justification for war with Iraq and outlines the main arguments once again.

a) Methodology

In order to conduct this content analysis, the analysis involved using sentences as a tool of measurement. This analysis was done using the four main principles from the NSS: (1) championing human dignity, (2) fighting terrorism, (3) working with organizations to diffuse conflict, and (4) preventing weapons of mass destruction proliferation. Key terms in sentences were used to link the sentence to a specific principle, for example terms such as biological, chemical, nuclear or disarmament were linked to the principal 4 being preventing weapons of mass destruction.

b) Analysis

President Bush's Address on Iraq, October 7, 2002

Principal sentences referring :

1st principal	21
2nd principal:	27
3rd principal:	16
4th principal:	35

President Bush's State of Union, January 28 2003.

Principal sentences referring :

1 st principal	17
---------------------------	----

⁵⁶ Joseph Cirincione. Jessica Mathews. George Perkovich. WMD in Iraq: Evidence and Implications. Carnegie Endowment Report, January 2004, appendix 4. 3.

⁵⁷ Joseph Cirincione. Jessica Mathews. George Perkovich. WMD in Iraq: Evidence and Implications. Carnegie Endowment Report, January 2004, appendix 5.

2 nd principal:	13
3 rd principal:	10
4 th principal:	42

United States Secretary of State Colin Powell's Address to the U.N. Security Council, February 5, 2003.

Principal	sentences referring :
1 st principal	14
2 nd principal:	62
3 rd principal:	1
4 th principal:	184

President Bush's Address to the Nation on War with Iraq, March 17, 2003

Principal	sentences referring :
1 st principal	11
2 nd principal:	8
3 rd principal:	10
4 th principal:	18

Totals:

Principal	sentence referring:
1 st principal:	63
2 nd principal	110
3 rd principal	37
4 th principal	279

In the first speech the content analysis found the following results. There were 21 sentences referring to principal 1, 27 sentences referring to principal 2, 16 sentences referring to principal 3, and 35 sentences referring to principal 4. It was interesting to note that there was a fairly even spread of the use of principals within this first speech. The linking of terrorism, Weapons of Mass Destruction and Iraq was very frequent. This even distribution of NSS principals is something that eroded as the case for Iraq progressed.

The second speech analyzed was President Bush's State of Union Address on January 28, 2003.

The results of this analysis are as follows as sentences referring to each principal: principal 1 has 17 sentences, principal 2 has 13 sentences, principal 3 has 10 references, and principal 4 has 42

references. What is interesting to note is that this speech saw the case against Iraq strongly use Weapons of Mass Destruction as the main focus. There is significant difference from the first speech in which there was a more equal distribution of principals used for justification. Also, the main focus of the argument turned into the disarmament of Iraq and lack of cooperation.

The third speech was United States Secretary of State Colin Powell's address to the U.N. Security Council on February 5, 2003. The speech was broken down into the following sentences of reference: principal 1 has 14 sentences, principal 2 had 62 sentences, principal 3 has only one reference, and principal 4 has 184 sentences. This speech was of considerable interest. This speech was the first speech addressing the international community for a case of war with Iraq. The focus became overwhelmingly upon Weapons of Mass Destruction. It appears the justification focused mainly upon U.N. Resolution 1441 on the disarmament of Iraq. This also demonstrated how the United States government was changing the emphasis of its principals upon the audience it was trying to convince. There was however significant reference to terror, NSS principal 2, however the third principal of the NSS was referred to almost three times as much.

The final speech analyzed was President Bush's address to the Nation on War with Iraq on March 17, 2003. The breakdown of the speech was as follows: principal 1 has 11 sentences, principal 2 has 8 sentences, principal 3 has 10 sentences, and principal 4 has 18 sentences. Once again there was a more even distribution of principal usage in this speech. Interestingly also was for the first time, the principal of terrorism (principal 2) was referred to the least. In previous speeches the terrorism principal, principal 2, was always referred to the second amount of times

within the speech. This once again shows though the case for Iraq did not cease, the justification for the war changed as time progressed. This demonstrates arbitrariness in the application of principals of the NSS. The final speech is fairly similar to the first speech where there was an even distribution of principals used for justification. The arbitrary application of the principals outlined in the NSS demonstrates how the application of a Pre-emptive strike is too susceptible to subjective interpretation. It demonstrates how a case for a Pre-emptive strike can be accommodated under the NSS rather than being established requirements to allow for a Pre-emptive strike.

iii. Assessment of Justification

Now it appears based upon the above content analysis that the four first principals of the NSS very used, to varying degrees at different times, to justify the Pre-emptive strike upon Iraq. Similarly, Joaquin Cabrejas writes that there were three key reasons for Bush's justification of war. She argues that Bush's administration argued that Iraqi President Saddam Hussein posed an immediate threat to the security of the United States because "he had weapons of mass destruction (principal 4) and ties to al-Qaeda (principal 2)...[and] Hussein's tyranny was justification enough for a pre-emptive war (principal 1)"⁵⁸. Indian Foreign Minister Yashwant Sinha stated that America's reasons for the Pre-emptive strike in Iraq were possession of weapons of mass destruction (principal 4), export of terrorism (principal 2) and an absence of democracy (principal 1)⁵⁹. There appears to be a consensus among many about the main reasons for the Pre-emptive strike: the possession or quest for Weapons of Mass Destruction, links to

⁵⁸ Cabrejas, p.20.

⁵⁹ David Kreiger, Devon Chaffee. "Facing the Failures of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Regime". Humanist. Sept/Oct 2003. Vol. 63 Issue 5 p7.

terrorism and the violation of human rights/democracy. Based upon this observation and the content analysis above, the key principals that the United States used in its justification of the war, as drawn out in the NSS, were principals 1, 2, and 4. The first five principals will now be analyzed in the war against Iraq to further understand the reasoning behind the Pre-emptive strike and the implementation of the NSS.

(Principal 1): “Championing Human Dignity”.

The principal for championing human dignity does appear to be a valid argument for the war against Saddam Hussein and Iraq. Amnesty International has reported for several years that Hussein has committed several atrocities and human rights violations⁶⁰. Nevertheless, citizens of Iraq have been suffering for many years and there are cases around the world that are worse than the situation in Iraq. For example Marjorie Cohn writes “Human rights organizations and NGOs from the United States, United Kingdom, Israel and Palestine have accused Israel of committing human rights violations”⁶¹. Israel is a great ally of the United States, it is simply due to these relations that the United States is argued to have ignored Israeli policies towards Palestinians⁶². This principal can therefore be invalidated due to the biased nature in which it is applied. Also Marjorie Cohn writes that the weaponry that the United States used in Iraq: cluster bombs, napalm and depleted uranium, are indiscriminate killers⁶³. The United States is claiming that it is helping the people of Iraq but at the same time killing thousands of them. Furthermore, the United States has a history of being seen as an imperialist country. The United States has intervened and governed many Caribbean, Central and South American countries as well as the

⁶⁰ Cabrejas, p.20.

⁶¹ Cohn, p.25.

⁶² Cohn, p.25.

⁶³ Cohn, p. 25.

Philippines⁶⁴. These countries were then subject to great human rights atrocities such as Panama, Chile, El Salvador and many other nations. The United States wishes to champion human dignity or make an argument that another nation is violating them, when the very accuser has a well documented history in the sphere of human rights abuses. The United States is clearly observed to be a hypocrite in regards to the principal of championing human dignity. This hypocrisy can clearly be explained using the independent internationalist model. It appears that the United States is selecting to go to war with Iraq due to national self-interests. Should the reason be for championing human dignity, there would be other countries ahead of Iraq. Also, as noted in the content analysis, this reason was not used as significantly as the other principals in the argument for the war. Nevertheless it was a significant principal in speeches addressing the domestic audience and especially the final decision to go to war.

(2) Principal 2: “strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks, against us and our friends”.

This is where the United States finds itself on troubled ground. Though there was an attempt to link Saddam Hussein to terrorism, no link could be directly found nor proven⁶⁵. Another irony, Marjorie Cohn writes is the United States own involvement in terrorism, she writes “Distinctions [should] be drawn between individual terrorism (the September 11 attacks); International State terrorism (United States and United Kingdom bombing of Afghanistan); State regime or Government terror (Israel's occupation and massacre of the Palestinians); State-sponsored or State-supported terrorism (United States financial and military support for Israel); and a national

⁶⁴ Nye Jr., p.60.

⁶⁵ Cabrejas, p.20.

liberation struggle (Palestine)”⁶⁶. Cohn argues the United States is guilty of State-sponsored/State-supported terrorism. The United States is helping a state perpetuate terrorism, while at the same time it is condoning other nations for being guilty of the same acts.

This principal cannot be applied to the Iraqi situation unless it is applied to all situations and nations unconditionally, universally and unequivocally. The hypocrisy of the United States implementation of its principals creates a delegitimizing effect of its claim to rule of law. Based upon the content analysis, this principal was a significant component of the argument for war, especially to the international audience. However, in President Bush’s final speech before the war, the terrorism principal was used the least out of the three. This difference would once again demonstrate the United States’ independent internationalist approach. It appears that the United States sets two different modes for justifying the war, one at the domestic level and one at the international level. The United States appears to justify its war not in accordance with set rules, but as it deems necessary to achieve its self-interests.

(3) Principal 3: “work with others to defuse regional conflicts”.

This principal was somewhat applied in the war against Iraq. The U.N. was going to be used as a vice for the Bush administration to legitimize war through an international body, though the Security Council did not justify it⁶⁷. The United States then tried to justify its war by claiming that it had a “coalition of the willing”. Stephen Biddle claims that the use of coalitions by Americans is to give their actions legitimacy. Biddle writes that since the wars in the former Yugoslavia “any action should be cloaked in multinational coalitions to lend legitimacy and

⁶⁶ Cohn, p.25.

spread responsibility, and public scrutiny should be limited through careful control of information”⁶⁸. The creation of a “coalition” in the Iraq war was simply to lend legitimacy and spread responsibility. Not only did the use of a coalition do this, but it appeared to adhere to the principles of the NSS where the United States works with others to defuse regional conflicts. What the coalition did is mask a unilateralist approach, something that the U.N. Security Council did not allow the United States to do. It is also ironic that as stated in principal eight of the NSS, cooperation within the framework of the U.N., was clearly not adhered to in Bush’s war against Iraq.

Once again the independent internationalist framework helps to understand this action. The United States went to the U.N. to justify its war but when it did not, the United States continued on its road to war. Based upon the content analysis, the use of international organizations was never a significant component of the United States war with Iraq. Due to its independent internationalist approach, the United States launched a Pre-emptive strike with those who were willing to accompany it. This demonstrates only using the multilateralist approach when necessary.

(4) Principal 4: “prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends, with weapons of mass destruction”. This principal is one of the key elements used to justify the war against Iraq. Clearly, Bush built his argument upon the belief that Saddam Hussein posed an immediate threat to the United States, that he was in possession of weapons of mass destruction and had links to Al-Qaeda⁶⁹. None of these statements were ever proven and continue to lack

⁶⁷ Rubin, p.46

⁶⁸ Stephen Biddle. “The New Way of War?”. Foreign Affairs. May/June 2002. Vol. 81 Issue 3 p.138.

⁶⁹ Rubin, p.46.

evidence and/or validity⁷⁰. As noted in the content analysis, this principal was overwhelmingly the argument for a Pre-emptive strike upon Iraq, especially in Colin Powell's speech to the UN. It is clear that the United States does not implement this principal universally. Kenneth Pollack writes, "...although the United States preaches a policy of universal nuclear non-proliferation, in practice, Washington has consistently, and probably correctly, been much more concerned with proliferation by its enemies (such as Iraq and North Korea) than by its friends (such as Israel and, to a lesser extent, India)"⁷¹. This lack of universality allows some nations to get away with things that other nations are condemned for. There will be no possibility of a Non-Nuclear Proliferation Treaty without the universal application of its principles. This principal is not strong in its application or in its premises, especially in the case against Iraq. Once again the arbitrary nature of implementing this principal is evident through the independent internationalist approach. The United States decided upon applying this principal as it suits their national interests.

(5) Principal 5: "ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade".

The inner premises of this principle are open to criticism. Though the NSS states that it would use the U.N. framework to achieve these objectives, it fails to establish this in the Iraq war. It is clear that the U.N. Security Council did not by vote approve of the invasion of Iraq. Irving Horowitz writes, "Unlike the Yugoslav wars conducted by the Clinton administration, and with the formal cover of the U.N., the Iraq War lacked a similar sanction, and hence was deprived of

⁷⁰ Rubin, p.46.

⁷¹ Kenneth Pollack. "Securing the Gulf". Foreign Affairs. Jul/Aug 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 4 p2.

the same sense of moral force”⁷². Clearly this war, though there was a creation of a multilateral coalition, was perceived as a unilateral adventure. Once again it demonstrates how under the independent internationalist approach, the United States can forgo multilateral action when it deems necessary. This once again demonstrates that a Pre-emptive strike can be launched with a lack of international legitimacy through multilateral organizations. This may allow for Pre-emptive strikes to be launched in pursuit of national interests.

It is clear that the United States has implemented their policy of a Pre-emptive strike in a manner that destabilizes the global community. The weak grounds for a Pre-emptive strike on Iraq have caused a global consensus that previous international norms of deterrence, multilateralism and no confrontation have been substituted for confrontation, aggression and unilateralism. But once again under the independent internationalist approach, the United States decides when it shall choose which approach based upon its interests. Marjorie Cohn even argues that the United States, based upon its own policies should be considered a rogue state because it is guilty of International State terrorism (United States and United Kingdom bombing of Afghanistan) and State-sponsored or State-supported terrorism (United States financial and military support for Israel)⁷³. The argument is that the United States is guilty of perpetuating that which it is claiming to eradicate. John Swomley argues that there are three real reasons for the Pre-emptive strike against Iraq and not the principals outlined in the NSS but for another agenda. Swomley argues that the United States went into Iraq (1) to establish four military bases as Pentagon has already announced, (2) to control oil flow from the Persian Gulf to China, Japan, Korea and other countries, (3) and to create a puppet democracy similar to Afghanistan, Haiti and South

⁷² Irving Horowitz. “Cult of Dictatorship vs. the culture of Modernity”. Society. Jul/Aug 2003, Vol. 40 Issue 5 p9.

Korea⁷⁴. The objective is to insert political and military influence in a region where it is not very dominant. This demonstrates that national interests are being pursued rather than intervention for humanitarian reasons, as defined by the Responsibility to Protect doctrine. The implementation of the NSS, more specifically the Pre-emptive strike, in Iraq has set a dangerous precedence in international relations.

SECTION IV: THE THREE CASES: INDIA, PAKISTAN AND JAPAN

i. Background

The precedence set in the pre-emptive war against Iraq has opened the door for a war of pre-emption. The United States doctrine of Pre-emptive strike is capable of becoming an international norm and the precedence set in Iraq will set the grounds for its justification. More nations may choose to forgo diplomacy to solve conflicts and resort to unilateral action under the independent internationalist approach. The United States argued that they must (1) champion human dignity, (2) prevent an attack against themselves and others, and (4) prevent nations from threatening them with Weapons of Mass Destruction.⁷⁵ Ikenberry writes the concept of pre-emption in the NSS defies international norms and makes the notions found in section 51 of the U.N. Charter, regarding national self-defense obsolete⁷⁶. Because these previous international norms may become invalid, the consequences are dire. The new standard of national self-defense may lead to a significant rise in conflicts and crises around the globe. Many other nations may implement the independent internationalist approach that the United States applies. These principals outlined above, and their arbitrary application in Iraq, will allow nations to pursue a

⁷³ Cohn, p.25.

⁷⁴ John Swomley, "World Domination Via Nuclear Weapons". Humanist. Sept/Oct 2003. Vol. 63 Issue 5 p.35.

⁷⁵ Rubin, p.46.

⁷⁶ Ikenberry, p.44.

Pre-emptive strike based upon their national interests.

Madeline Albright writes in her article “Bombs, Bust or Buster”, that the Bush administration made “anticipatory self-defense the centerpiece of its strategy and that this step, however, was dangerously easy to misconstrue. Do we really want a world in which every country feels entitled to attack any other that might someday threaten it?”⁷⁷. The guiding principals of the NSS allow national interests to be pursued through intervention. Should more nations only go through multilateral diplomacy when necessary and pursue mostly unilateral action, the consequences could be dire, especially with a policy of Pre-emptive strike. This is exactly the question this paper is dealing with, what could the consequences be of the Bush administration’s policy based upon the NSS, the precedence of Iraq and its implications on other areas of conflict or crises? Extending upon that question, what would be the consequence if more nations take the independent internationalist approach, forgo multilateralism and diplomacy and act unilaterally based upon self-interest by implementing a Pre-emptive strike policy.

ii. India and Pakistan

a) Background

The United States makes reference to the situation of the nuclear arms race in South Asia in its NSS. It acknowledges that India and Pakistan must resolve its dispute. The United States argues that it has built strong bilateral relations with the two countries and will use it as leverage in this dispute⁷⁸. However, the United States involvement in the affairs of the two countries is seen as contradictory. The United States has already forgone multilateral diplomacy in its pre-emptive

⁷⁷ Albright, p.2.

war with Iraq. Should India or Pakistan implement this independent internationalist approach, they may very well forgo multilateral or bilateral diplomacy and launch a unilateral strike upon the adversary. India has already directly referred to the United States case of Pre-emptive strike against Iraq in relation to its own foreign policy. Authors David Kreiger and Devon Chaffee write “Indian Foreign Minister Yashwant Sinha stated recently, ‘There were three reasons which drove the Anglo-U.S. forces to attack Iraq--possession of weapons of mass destruction, export of terrorism and an absence of democracy-all of which exist in Pakistan’ ”.⁷⁹ Again they write “On April 11, 2003, Indian Defense Minister George Fernandes said he endorsed Sinha's recent comments that India had ‘a much better case to go for pre-emptive action against Pakistan than the United States has in Iraq’ ”.⁸⁰ The principals that the United States applied to go to war clearly apply for India to war with Pakistan: Pakistan possesses Weapons of Mass Destruction and has threatened their use, the Kashmiri liberation forces supported by Pakistan are a threat to Indian national security and Pakistan does have a record of human rights abuses⁸¹.

Conversely, India is also in possession of WMDs and threatened their use, Indian forces clash daily with Pakistani forces along its border, and India’s own record of human rights abuses especially to Muslim, Sikh and other minorities is well documented⁸². Either nation has a better case for pre-emption against the other than the United States did with principals 1, 2 and 4 of the NSS. Should they take an independent internationalist approach, there would be little to prevent these two nations from engaging in this policy of pre-emption. Because the United States has gone into Iraq, it is simply a question of whether India and/or Pakistan wish to follow the

⁷⁸ Government of the United States of America, p.4.

⁷⁹ Kreiger and Chaffee, p.7.

⁸⁰ Kreiger and Chaffee, p.7.

⁸¹ Kreiger and Chaffee, p.7.

doctrine of Pre-emptive strike. Because the precedence has been set in Iraq, it could be seen as de facto legitimization for India and/or Pakistan to follow suite. This is exactly why the Pre-emptive strike policy invites abuse.

b) The case for India

Based upon the Pre-emptive strike policy, as outlined in the NSS's implementation in Iraq, the case will be assessed according to the perceived principals for justification in the Iraq case: principals 1,2 and 4 of the NSS. It will be demonstrated that the independent internationalist approach may allow for the manipulation and arbitrary implementation of these principals.

(1) Principal 1: India argues that Pakistan is not a democracy. The principal of championing human dignity could be applied by the Indian government. Pakistan is in no way recognized for as many human rights abuses as Iraq but it recently had a military coup and is under martial law. There appears to be a curb on certain freedoms that are required to be present in a liberal democracy. Through a weak argument for human dignity, India could make its case for a Pre-emptive strike.

(2) Principal 2: India accuses Pakistan to be supporting terrorist organizations in Indian Kashmir. The link between the Pakistani government and the Muslim Kashmiri separatists is very strong⁸³. This helps to strengthen India's case for a Pre-emptive strike against Pakistan on the grounds that Pakistan is helping terrorists attack their country. Pakistan has been blunt about

⁸² Amnesty International. India: Torture, Rape & Deaths in Custody. (New York: John D. Lucas, 1992)

⁸³ Robert Wirsing. "Precarious Partnership: Pakistan's Response to U.S. Security Policies". Asian Affairs: An American Review. Summer 2003. Vol. 30 Issue 2 p.70.

its support of the separatists though after a visit from United States Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, President Pervez Musharraf agreed to temporarily suspend its aid⁸⁴. India argues that nothing has changed, and Pakistan continues to harbour terrorists that infiltrate its border and conduct terrorist activity in India. This is a direct and obvious link to terrorism and makes a very strong Indian case for a Pre-emptive strike on Pakistan, based upon principal two of the NSS.

(3) Principal 4: Pakistan is in possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Not only is Pakistan in possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction but it has allegedly traded weapons technology with North Korea⁸⁵. This poses a threat of horizontal as well as vertical nuclear proliferation. This is another reason why India could justify a Pre-emptive strike against Pakistan. Not only could India argue that Pakistan's possession is a threat to Indian national security but it is a threat to all nations due to its history to readily exchange their weapons technology with others. The content analysis demonstrates the overwhelming focus upon Weapons of Mass Destruction for justifying the war with Iraq. To this date, no Weapons of Mass Destruction have been found in Iraq. It is factual knowledge that Pakistan has Weapons of Mass Destruction. If this principal was the main force in justifying the war in Iraq, India's case for war is clearly stronger than the United States. Acting upon its own national interests under the independent internationalist model, India could forgo diplomacy and launch a Pre-emptive strike upon Pakistan.

c) The case for Pakistan

(1) Principal 1: Pakistan argues that India is illegitimately in control of Kashmir. It violates the

⁸⁴ Wirsing, p.70.

human rights and right to determination of the Kashmiri people and minority groups⁸⁶. There have been a significant amount of human rights abuses, especially in police custody, where minorities have suffered⁸⁷. Most frequent in these cases were torture in counter-insurgency operations in Kashmir. Lawyers, journalists and ordinary citizens have all been tortured in their non-violent attempts to publicize the human rights violations in Kashmir⁸⁸. This is clearly a violation of due process, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and many other rights and freedoms supposedly guaranteed in a liberal democracy. Pakistan could clearly make a case for championing human dignity with a Pre-emptive strike to liberate Kashmir from human rights abuses. Based upon the content analysis of the United States' case for Iraq, this principal is not a main focus but it is present. Pakistan could use this principal to argue for a Pre-emptive strike the same way that the United States did.

(2) Principal 2: Pakistan would have a hard time making a strong case in linking India to terrorism. The only possible way to make a link would be in arguing for State regime or government terror⁸⁹. This argument would be based upon the argument stated above for championing human dignity. India's record of human rights abuses in both Kashmir and Punjab are clearly demonstrations of State terror. Though the argument would have to be limited to within the borders of India, this very weak argument could be made. Once again this argument would be based upon the Kashmiri argument that India is denying Kashmir the right to self-determination, as was promised in the U.N. resolution for a plebiscite in the region. Nevertheless using the independent internationalist model, Pakistan could apply this principal arbitrarily upon

⁸⁵ Terrence Roehrig. "One Rogue State Crisis at a Time!". World Affairs. Spring 2003 Vol. 165 Issue 4 p.155.

⁸⁶ Wirsing, p.70.

⁸⁷ Amnesty International, pp.18-24.

⁸⁸ Amnesty International, pp.22-3.

India, basing it upon its national interests.

(3) Principal 4: India is in possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Not only has India mentioned the possibility of a Pre-emptive strike against Pakistan but it has also escalated the conflict to higher grounds⁹⁰. In December 2001 to October 2002, India amassed 700 000 soldiers along its border with Pakistan⁹¹. This is clearly an act of aggression in an effort to intimidate Pakistan. Also this act demonstrates a traditional “imminent threat”. This is a clear precondition for a Pre-emptive strike under the NSS. This demonstrates a ready willingness on the part of India to use its military to achieve its objectives. Pakistan could argue, similar to the United States in Iraq, that it does not want India to get any stronger and it must strike immediately to eliminate a possible future attack, before it is too late. Also once again, India is explicitly known to have and demonstrate their Weapons of Mass Destruction, namely nuclear weapons. India has what the United States could only claim that Iraq had. Using the independent internationalist model, Pakistan could pursue its national interests, forgo diplomacy and launch a Pre-emptive strike upon India by applying these principals arbitrarily.

Both Pakistan and India have strong cases for a Pre-emptive strike against each other based upon the principles found in the NSS of the United States of America. Their cases are further strengthened due to the weak implementation of the principles in the United States invasion of Iraq. India has already directly referred to the Iraqi case in its justification for a possible Pre-emptive strike on Pakistan. The United States has clearly further destabilized nuclear South Asia

⁸⁹ Cohn, p.25.

⁹⁰ Wirsing, p.70

⁹¹ Wirsing, p.70.

with the concept of the Pre-emptive strike and its precedence set in Iraq. If either India or Pakistan chooses to institute an independent internationalist approach, they may well forgo diplomacy and resort to military force by arbitrarily applying the NSS principles based upon their national interests.

iii. The case for Japan

a) Background

Another crisis situation where a policy of Pre-emptive strike may destabilize the region is in Korea-Japan. Though Japan has only used rhetoric, they have been provided with the justification to take unilateral action in launching a Pre-emptive Strike. North Korea has demonstrated itself to be a threat to its neighbouring countries with its pursuit of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Due to a close and immediate threat, Japan has even mentioned the possibility of launching a Pre-emptive strike against North Korea. David Kreiger and Devon Chaffee write “In May 2003 Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi publicly claimed the right to conduct a Pre-emptive strike on any country preparing to attack his nation, a statement that was likely aimed at North Korea”⁹². This statement, though rhetoric, is clearly under the independent internationalist approach. Koizumi is arguing national interests take precedence, diplomacy may be avoided and may launch an attack. Several other members of Japan’s government including Defence Minister Shigeru Ishiba made the same threat in mid-February and September 15 2003⁹³. North Korea clearly has Weapons of Mass Destruction, has threatened to use them, is considered a rogue state by the United States, and is linked to nuclear proliferation in Iran and

⁹² Kreiger and Chaffee, p.7.

⁹³ Eugene Matthews. “Japan's New Nationalism”. Foreign Affairs. Nov/Dec 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 6 p.74.

possibly with terrorists⁹⁴. Now applying the same principals that the United States uses for justifying the war in Iraq, Japan's case is very convincing for a Pre-emptive strike. It is further convincing should Japan take an independent internationalist approach allowing national self-interests to take precedence and choosing to forgo multilateral diplomacy.

(1) Principal 1: It is clear that North Korea is not a democracy. North Korea's citizens are in the midst of a famine while the government continues to spend enormous resources on its military. This demonstrates an unwillingness of a nation to look after the human suffering of its people. The safety of peoples human security approach clearly endorses some kind of intervention due to this massive human suffering. This principal is a weak argument for the Japanese case. It is further weakened because based upon the content analysis, this principal is not a significant argument for a Pre-emptive strike.

(2) Principal 2: North Korea has links to terrorist activities. James Laney and Jason Shaplen write that Kim Jong Il admitted to Japanese President Koizumi that the North had abducted 13 Japanese in the 1970s and 1980s to train its spies, though he apologized for it⁹⁵. Though the apology was given this is clearly a sign of terrorist activity. Though the argument for terrorist activity is very weak against North Korea, they have been known to infiltrate into South Korea through the demilitarized zone. The Japanese also caught a North Korean spy ship in its waters on December 18, 2001⁹⁶. North Korea has also been known to share its missile and weapons technology with Iran, Syria, Egypt, while also sharing highly enriched uranium technology with

⁹⁴ Ikenberry, p.44

⁹⁵ Eliot Kang, Yoshinori Kaseda, "Korea and the Dynamics of Japan's Post-Cold War Security Policy". World Affairs. Fall 2001. Vol. 164 Issue 2 p.51.

⁹⁶ Matthews, p.74.

Pakistan⁹⁷. All this sharing, dealing and exchanges occurred in order for North Korea to gain direly needed economic resources. It is very possible that if a terrorist or terrorist organization offers North Korea a sound economic deal, North Korea may well sell terrorists very powerful weapons or technology. In retrospect, these countries that North Korea is dealing with nations that have been known to harbour or support terrorists. Terrorists may well acquire North Korean technology or weapons due to these countries. North Korea is clearly supporting and guilty of terrorist activity, its links to terrorism are far greater than Saddam Hussein and Iraq. The content analysis demonstrated that the linking of Weapons of Mass Destruction to terrorism helped to strengthen the argument for a Pre-emptive strike.

(3) Principal 4: The case for a Pre-emptive strike against North Korea is strongest in regards to principal 4 of the NSS. North Korea is not only in possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction but is in the process of developing them further. North Korea has also tested its missiles very close to Japan. An example of this is on May 1993, North Korea test-launched the Nodong-1 missile into the East Sea/Sea of Japan.⁹⁸ This meant that North Korea was capable of landing a ballistic assault in cities located in Southern Japan. Then in late August 1998, the Taepodong-1 was launched and entered into the stratosphere of Japanese airspace⁹⁹. These missile tests demonstrate a more immediate, clear and direct threat to Japan than Iraq ever was to the United States. Japan has seen visible proof and intimidation through the testing of these weapons that can be upgraded to Weapons of Mass Destruction. Clearly the case for a Pre-emptive strike against North Korea is far more justified for Japan on this principal alone, than the United States

⁹⁷ Roehrig, p.155.

⁹⁸ Kang and Kaseda, p.51.

⁹⁹ Kang and Kaseda, p.51.

invasion of Iraq. North Korea has already been shown to be linked to other states that are considered to be in pursuit of Weapons of Mass Destruction (Iran, Syria, and Pakistan). This demonstrates North Korea as a horizontal and vertical nuclear proliferation threat. North Korea is a proliferation threat to Japan and many states around the world. Once again there is factual evidence of North Korea having Weapons of Mass Destruction whereas the United States only claimed Iraq possessed or was acquiring them. Also based upon the content analysis, this was the core of the United States' argument. Japan clearly has a stronger argument under this principal than the United States, should Japan choose to take an independent internationalist approach an attack of pre-emption is justified.

The case against North Korea seems strong. As noted in the content analysis, the role of principal 4 is strong in justifying a war of pre-emption. North Korea has demonstrated itself to be a threat to Japan's national security and it is in possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Using the independent internationalist approach, arbitrarily applying the principles of the NSS, Japan could make the case for a war of pre-emption upon North Korea.

iv. Overall Assessment of Cases

The creation and implementation of the NSS has clearly made the world less stable. Conflicts where the principals of deterrence, containment and diplomacy were the modes of conduct have given way to the principals of pre-emption, confrontation and aggression. The conflict between India and Pakistan has the possibility of reaching nuclear war and either side can justify it through the implementation of the NSS in Iraq. Japan now has the right to a Pre-emptive strike against North Korea, who has demonstrated itself to be a greater threat to Japan than Iraq ever

was to the United States. The poor application of the NSS principals in Iraq, coupled with an independent internationalist approach, where national interests lead, have created an instable global community. The dangerous precedence set in Iraq, through the implementation of the Pre-emptive strike policy, compounded by the independent internationalist approach has given way to a less stable global community.

PART V: CONCLUSION

The United States' independent internationalist approach may prevent the diplomatic process from occurring, diminish the role of international organizations and increase unilateral uses of force. It is clear that the NSS of the United States of America, the Bush Doctrine, may allow for manipulation and may have set a dangerous precedence. Kreiger and Chaffee write "Instead of warning or discouraging nuclear threshold states, such as Iran and North Korea, from developing nuclear arsenals, the lesson that these countries are most likely to learn from the Iraq example is that they must accelerate their nuclear weapons programs in order to avoid the fate of the Ba'ath regime"¹⁰⁰. The Bush Doctrine and its implementation in Iraq has led to a more fragile and less secure global community. Based upon reasons for its justification, many nations such as India, Pakistan and Japan could justify acts of aggression that have previously been against international norms. The international norm of pre-emption, confrontation and aggression may become regular aspects of international relations due to this policy. There are also several problems with pre-emption. Feinstein and Slaughter write that pre-emption strikes in the past have been disasters such as the bombing of the pharmaceutical plant in Somalia in 1998, and bombings in the Balkans and Middle East where weapons did not hit their targets and innocent

¹⁰⁰ Kreiger and Chaffee, p.7.

lives were taken¹⁰¹. If pre-emption becomes the international norm then there will be an exponential growth in conflicts around the world as more nations justify their actions through the doctrine. The consequences of pre-emption as an international norm are severe and evident. Because the United States chose to arbitrarily apply the NSS principals, based upon their national interests, other countries may follow this approach.

In a unipolar world, the world hegemony clearly has a responsibility to maintain order in global politics. The Bush administration is clearly choosing to apply that responsibility both arbitrarily and recklessly. On May 9, 2002, The Los Angeles Times was leaked a classified Pentagon document where the Bush administration had directed the military to plan for possible nuclear strikes against China, Russia, North Korea, Syria, Libya Iraq and Iran¹⁰². This clearly demonstrates the recklessness of the Bush administration and its attitude of confrontation and aggression. Due to this recklessness, the world is clearly becoming a more volatile community. Ikenberry writes “The tragedy of September 11 has given the Bush administration the authority and willingness to confront the Iraqs of the world. But that will not be enough when even more complicated cases come along -- when it is not the use of force that is needed but concerted multilateral action to provide sanctions and inspections”¹⁰³. This clearly seems like a viable alternative to the concept of pre-emption. No matter how large or powerful a nation may be, it simply cannot take it upon themselves to fight terrorism or “rogue” states alone. The independent internationalist approach creates a more unstable global community due to a lack of emphasis on diplomacy and multilateralism.

¹⁰¹ Feinstein and Slaughter, p.136

¹⁰² Swomley, p.35.

¹⁰³ Ikenberry, p.44.

A multilateral solution is what is needed to prevent the international atmosphere from becoming instable. The uses of weapons inspections were clearly seen to be effective in Iraq, which prevented the United States from passing its resolution at the UN Security Council for an invasion of Iraq¹⁰⁴. The United States clearly had its own agenda for going into Iraq. The consequence of this is that any nation may now launch a Pre-emptive strike on another simply for its own interests. As more countries adopt an independent internationalist approach, the consequences could be dire. If the foreign policies of India, Pakistan and Japan (among others), becomes further guided by national interests, they will arbitrarily interpret the NSS principals to their own like. The independent internationalist approach will further decrease the role multilateralism, international organizations and diplomacy can play in preventing such conflicts from occurring. A rise in unilateralism, guided by national interests with an easily manipulated pre-emptive doctrine could be catastrophic. The NSS of the United States and more specifically its Pre-emptive strike policy is irresponsible, has set a dangerous precedence and will allow for its arbitrary use by countries such as India, Pakistan and Japan.

¹⁰⁴ Rubin, p.46.

Bibliography

- Albright, Madeline. "Bridges, Bombs, or Bluster?". Foreign Affairs. Sept/Oct 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 5 p.2.
- Amnesty International. India: Torture, Rape & Deaths in Custody. (New York: John D. Lucas, 1992)
- Biddle, Stephen. "The New Way of War?". Foreign Affairs. May/Jun 2002. Vol. 81 Issue 3 p.138.
- Byrd, Robert. "A Reckless Administration May Reap Disastrous Consequences". Humanist. May/Jun 2003. Vol. 63 Issue 3 p.24.
- Cabrejas, Joaquin. "Behind Bush's Drive to War". Humanist. Nov/Dec 2003. Vol. 63 Issue 6. p.20.
- Cirincione, Joseph. Mathews, Jessica Tuchman. Perkovich, George. Orton, Alexis. "WMD in Iraq: Evidence and Implications". Carnegie Endowment Report, January 2004

- Cohn, Marjorie. "Understanding, responding to, and preventing terrorism". Arab Studies Quarterly. Spring/Summer 2002. Vol. 24 Issue 2/3 p.25.
- Deng, Yong. "Hegemon on the Offensive: Chinese Perspectives on U.S. Global Strategy". Political Science Quarterly. Fall 2001, Vol. 116 Issue 3 p.343.
- Feinstein, Lee. Slaughter, Anne-Marie. "A Duty to Prevent". Foreign Affairs. Jan/Feb 2004. Vol. 83 Issue 1 p.136.
- Hampson, Fen Osler. Madness in the Multitude. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp.18-22.
- Hirsh, Michael. "Bush and the World". Foreign Affairs. Sept/Oct 2002, Vol. 81 Issue
- Hoff, Joan. "The American Century: From Sarajevo to Sarajevo". Diplomatic History. Spring 1999, Vol. 23 Issue 2 p.285.
- Horowitz, Irving. "Cult of Dictatorship vs. the culture of Modernity". Society. Jul/Aug 2003, Vol. 40 Issue 5 p.9.
- Ikenberry, John. "America's Imperial Ambition". Foreign Affairs. Sep/Oct 2002. Vol. 81 Issue 5 p.44.
- Kang, Eliot. Yoshinori Kaseda, "Korea and the Dynamics of Japan's Post-Cold War Security Policy". World Affairs. Fall 2001. Vol. 164 Issue 2 p.51.
- Kreiger, David. Chaffee, Devon. "Facing the Failures of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Regime". Humanist. Sept/Oct 2003. Vol. 63 Issue 5 p.7.
- Matthews, Eugene. "Japan's New Nationalism". Foreign Affairs. Nov/Dec 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 6 p.74.
- Nye Jr, Joseph. "U.S. Power and Strategy After Iraq". Foreign Affairs. Jul/Aug 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 4 p.60.
- Pollack, Kenneth. "Securing the Gulf". Foreign Affairs. Jul/Aug 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 4 p.2.
- Roehrig, Terrence. "One Rogue State Crisis at a Time!". World Affairs. Spring 2003 Vol. 165 Issue 4 p.155.
- Rubin, James. "Stumbling Into War". Foreign Affairs. Sept/Oct 2003. Vol. 82 Issue 5 p.46.
- Swomley, John. "World Domination Via Nuclear Weapons". Humanist. Sept/Oct 2003. Vol. 63 Issue 5 p.35.
- The Government of the United States of America. National Security Strategy of the United

States of America. September 12, 2002.

Warner, Michael. "A new strategy for the new geopolitics". Public Interest. Fall 2003. Issue 153 p.94.

Wirsing, Robert. "Precarious Partnership: Pakistan's Response to U.S. Security Policies". Asian Affairs: An American Review. Summer 2003. Vol. 30 Issue 2 p.70.