

Algerian People's Democratic Republic
Ministry Of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mentouri University –Constantine-
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of Foreign Languages

Post-Cold War American Foreign Policy

The War on Iraq as a case Study, 2003

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
The master degree in British & American Studies

Supervised by:

**Mrs SEHILI Assia
Zohra**

Candidate :

BENMAHAMMED F-

Academic Year: 2009/2010

Dedication

To the Memory of my Father

To the Memory of my Father

To the Memory of my Father

Acknowledgement:

At the outset, I have to express my sincere gratitude to Allah. Without the help of Almighty Allah, these dissertation worlds never have internalised.

I am deeply indebted to my family who has been a source reassurance and strength throughout the whole research process. Above all, my deepest recognition goes to my family for their support to me and their patience.

I similarly thank my supervisor Madam SEHILI for her precious guidance.

Also, I take this opportunity to express thanks to Mr Yakhlef Abdesslem, the head of Political Sciences Department, for his generous assistance and his constrictive suggestion made at various stage of the research.

Thanks are due to my Mother, my brothers and sisters I love so much and my friends: Rima, Samira & Khadija.

Abstract:

This work presents the US foreign policy after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990, and its new strategies in unilateral system as a sole system power. I take the second Gulf war as a case study that illustrated the US's way of spreading democracy and human rights through military involvement.

Résumé:

Ce travail présente la politique étrangère Américaine après l'effondrement de l'Union Soviétique en 1990, et ses nouvelles stratégies dans le système unilatéral en tant que puissance unique .Je prends la seconde guerre du Golf comme une étude de cas qui illustre la façon dont les Etats-Unis veulent propager la démocratie et les droits de l'homme grâce à la participation militaire.



ملخص:

هذا العمل يطرح السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية بعد انهيار الاتحاد السوفياتي في عام 1990 م، والاستراتيجيات الجديدة في النظام الدولي كقوة فريدة. وتعتبر حرب الخليج الثانية كدراسة حالة لتوضيح كيف أن الولايات المتحدة تريد نشر الديمقراطية و حقوق الإنسان من خلال الهجوم العسكري.



Table OF Contents:

List of Abbreviations.....	1
General Introduction.....	2
Chapter one: “Post-cold war era”.....	4
1- Introduction	4
2- Cold War Order.....	4
3- Collapse of the Soviet Union.	5
4- The United States as a Hegemony Power.....	8
5- Characteristics.....	9
6- Conclusion.....	11
Chapter Two: “Democracy promotion”.....	12
1- Introduction.....	12
2- Background.....	12
3- Defining Democracy Promotion.....	13
4- The International Agencies of Democracy Promotion.....	14
5- Characteristics of Democracy Promotion.....	15
6- Objectives of US Democracy Promotion.....	16
6-1- Connecting Development with Democracy.....	16
6-2- Creating Stability and Security.....	17
6-3- Redefining Democracy Building.....	18

7- Three Principles for Democracy Promotion.....	22
7-1- Democracy develops organically.....	22
7-2- Democratization is the work of generations.....	23
7-3- limitation of U.S Democracy Promotion.....	24
8- U.S Democracy Promotion in the Arab world.....	25
9- Conclusion.....	27
Chapter three: “U.S.A war on Iraq as a case study”.....	28
1- Introduction.....	28
2- Background of Iraq war.....	28
3- The Iraq war or the second Gulf war.....	30
4- Arms Control after the War on Iraq.....	30
5- The U.S war on Iraq and the Arab Order.....	32
6- U.S.A’s way of Promoing Democracy in Iraq.....	33
7- Conclusion.....	36
General Conclusion.....	37
Bibliography.....	38

List of Abbreviations

NATO : North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

USAID : The United States Agency for International Development.

NDI : The National Democratic Institute

IRI : The International Republican Institute.

CIPE : The Center For International Private ENTREPRISE.

UNDF : The United Nation Democracy Fund.

DRL : The Bureau of Democracy , Human Rights, and Labour.

MEPI : The Middle EAST Partnership Initiative.

UNEAB : The United Nation Electoral Assistance Bureau.

OSCE : The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

BMENA : The Broader Middle East and North Africa.

WMD : WEAPONS of Mass Destruction.

OIL : Operation Iraqi Liberation.

NGO : Non Governmental Organization.

AFL- CIO : The American Federation of Labor- Congress of Industrial Organization.

NDI : The National Democratic Institute.

IFI : International Financial Institutions. OAS : The Organization of American States.

General Introduction:

The Cold War dominated U.S. and Soviet foreign policy from 1947 to 1990.

The cold War was characterized by mutual distrust, suspicion, and misunderstandings by both the United States and The Soviet Union, and their allies. The United States accused the Soviet Union of seeking to expand their version of communism, Throughout the world. The Soviets, meanwhile, charged the United States with practicing imperialism. The Korean War, the Vietnam War and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan were some of the Occasions when the tension between those two ideologies took the form of an armed conflict. In the strategic conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union a major arena was the strategy of technology. It also involved covert conflict through acts of spying.

Another major features of the cold war are the arms races between The Soviet Union and NATO. All of these fields required massive scientific and manufacturing investment and many identify the enormous costs associated with the arms race.

The end of the cold war allowed Europe to became whole and free and the cold war was signified a long peace characterized by the lack of military conflicts between the great powers.

The Soviet Union fell in the early nineteenth because of its inefficient economic systems, because of ignoring the civilian economy while pushing too much money on the military and because of corrupt leaders; this left the US as the single most powerful nation in the world, with no one to compete. This gave the US even more influence around the world, that witnessed a more instable period of international relations in such circumstances the United States would adopt the same previous strategies in foreign affairs or there would

be a change in America's foreign policy, or was there a continuity or a change in American foreign policy after the collapse of the Soviet Union?

I use the descriptive analyses to explain well the historical events that shaped the new world order after the collapse of the soviet union in 1990 ,that led by the united states as unilateral power.

Each chapter has an introduction and a conclusion; in this dissertation, there are three chapters; the first chapter examines the cold war order and the circumstances that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. the second chapter attempts to clarify the central American foreign policy ,democracy promotion , its characteristics , its international agencies and goals to spread democracy and human rights in the world; the third chapter attempts to take Iraq war as a case study where the U.S applied its military invention in the region to end up the dictatorship regime of Saddam Hussein.

Chapter one: “Post-cold war era”

1-Introduction: The Cold War was an ideological, political and economic tension between the soviet union and the U.S from 1945 to 1990.

2-Cold war order:

At the end of world war two, the seeds of another conflict were sworn between the 1950s and the end of the 1980s, the cold war divided the world into two ideological camps:

The communist camp led by the Soviet Union and its allies in Eastern Europe where all aspects of life were subjected to state control, and the liberal democratic capitalist, led by the United States and its allies in Western Europe and Japan.

It was an era of nuclear confrontation and state – sponsored espionage, a time when contacts between the political leaders of east and west were so limited.

The increased division between the capitalist and the communist world were reinforced by the creation of military alliances, the NATO in 1949 in the west, the Warsaw Pact 1955 in the east and the arms race increased with the star wars program in 1983 by the U.S.A president Ronald Reagan who saw the Soviet Union system of state control over economic and political life was gaining too much influence worldwide. For that, Regan increased the size of the military, strengthened the defense of European allies, and funded new Weapons system. The U.S.A’s military spending to 7% of the budget while the soviet Union increased its military to 27%; and United States self confidence have been restored The president was ready to open a dialogue with the Soviet Union which led to the denouement of the cold war which was facilitated with an active reformist leader in the Kremlin,Mickail Gorbachev who came to power in 1985,

introduced democratic reforms and negotiated a treaty with Regan reducing nuclear missiles. (Ochoa, 6).

Gorbachev faced major economic problems, he embarked on Perestroika and Glasnost as a means of integrating the Soviet Union into the capitalist world but his domestic reforms were not enough to prevent the soviet empire from breaking up.

from 1989 to 1991, communism had ended in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union had faded away.

The question that lies here what were the main causes behind the collapse of the Soviet Union?

3-Collapse of the Soviet Union:

The Soviet Union was having serious problems in the mid 1980s; since the 1950s there had been a long – term decline in the rate of economic growth for many reasons: technologically, the Soviet Union was not keeping up with other countries.

Economically, its centrally- planned “command economy” had led to inefficient use of resources and had failed to provide incentives from entrepreneurial innovation. Yet during the period of star wars program unveiled in 1983 by Ronald Reagan, while the cost of supporting overseas communist regimes also increased by its invasion of Afghanistan to meet this enormous defense burden had to be diverted away from the consumer sector, which led to an increasing shortage of goods.

Economic factors linked to political and psychological ones, as the soviet economist Latsis

Chapter One ◆————◆ *Post-cold war era*
said: “the gloomy background of the worsening market situation ... has a depressing effect on people” (Ochoa 10), in addition to the lack of honest information the Secretary and Propaganda that is central to the culture of war. It was common to hear people say that you could find truth anywhere except in Pravda and the soviet people became more and more cynical about the propaganda of government – controlled media its international credit rating was still strong by borrowed heavily from 1985 to 1988.

At the sometime, there were more well-educated. Professionals in the Soviet Union than ever before, ready to embrace a more liberal state.

Again this background, in 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev came to power in Moscow and embarked on a far -reaching reform program by establishing a new, popular brand of socialism through:

-Restricting the economy by encouraging market forces and individual initiative (Perestroika).¹

-Promoting openness (glasnost) ² in politics and the media, tolerance of religion and socialist democracy.

-Reducing defense spending by negotiating international arms – reduction treaties.

As Ochoa reported,Gorbachev said: “the promise I gave to the people when I started the process of Perestroika was kept: I gave the freedom “(Ochoa 13).

¹ - Political and economic restructuring.

¹ - Freedom of expression.

Soviet citizens were at last allowed to speak freely; they could read books such as:

George Orwell's 1984, that was critical of communism and had long been banned.

In foreign affairs, Gorbachev withdrew Soviet forces from Afghanistan, his changes led to greater demands for freedom than he had anticipated, he had hoped only to loosen the hold of the communist party on the life of the Soviet Union and the eastern block, not to do away with it altogether. However, the eastern block nations were ready to more radical change.

By 1989, a wave of protest movement spread across Eastern Europe. Economic problems and dissatisfaction with communist rule had become widespread; they demanded economic reforms, free speech and free education.

In the past, such movement for democracy had always been crushed, either by the country's own forces or by Soviet Tanks.

The Soviet Union was a union of 15 republics, and some of these republics were eager to be independent. These included the Baltic states of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia.

By the end of 1990, all of Soviet republics were pressing either for independence or greater autonomy or self-rule. (Shire, 1990).

The communism had all disappeared in Eastern Europe. The rest of the 1990s would out in a post – cold war world with the united states as the only superpower.

4-The United States as a Hegemony Power:

After the dissolution of the soviet union in 1991 that ended the cold war, the post-cold War world was sometimes considered as a unipolar world, with the united states as the world's sole remaining superpower .As Kennedy reported, the words of Samuel P.Huntington, “The United States”, of course, is the sole state with pre-eminence in every domain of power - economic, military, diplomatic, ideological, technological, and cultural – with the reach and capabilities to promote its interests in virtually every part of the world.”(Kennedy). Huntington thinks “Contemporary international politics” ... “is instead a strange hybrid, a uni-multipolar system with one superpower and several major powers”.

The questions of global order appeared to be scarcely relevant any more.

As Hughes reported that some even proclaimed “the end of history and the last man” Francis Fukuyama, argued that the progression of human history as a struggle between ideologies is largely at an end, with the word settling on liberal democracy after the end of the cold war.(Hughes, 155).

The very concept of hegemony and its implications is still alive today, because those reflections are important to our understanding of how the world is lead today. If we examine the history of the 20th century and the beginnings of this century we will find common denominators which are military, economic and ideological conflicts, beginning with first and Second World Wars, the Cold War and the Gulf War in the 1990s. In the economic aspect, we cannot forget the Great Depression of the 1930s and the oil crisis of the 1970s. Paraphrasing Francis Fukuyama, at ‘the end of history’ the U.S has emerged as the hegemony state in terms of soft and hard power. The main common factor seems

to be the US participation in world conflicts mostly as the protagonist actor and the winner, demonstrating its primacy over the rest of the world.

Today, things do not seem to have changed to a great extent in terms of the US' global supremacy and we must add the technological and scientific advances to U.S preponderance role. After September 11th, the ideological and military battle against terrorism, where once again the US is demonstrating its global hegemonic role by placing this issue high on the international agenda. Of course, terrorism is an important issue but the way the U.S is leading the fight against terror(Hanson, 43).

5- Characteristics :

Hegemony 'requires a preponderance of material resources, in terms of raw materials, sources of capital, market dominance and advantages in the production of highly valued goods'. According to this definition, the US is undoubtedly a hegemony.

However if we define hegemony in terms of its lexical meaning, it does not necessarily imply total control. In terms of common knowledge people will continue to perceive US nation as a global hegemonic power.

Following these characteristics, it is useful to observe how the international agenda has been set by US. For instance, drug issues with Latin America, nuclear disarmament with Russia at the end of the Cold War, oil revenues with the Middle East, high –tech with Asia, etc. As I have mentioned above there is a debate about America's decline and the theory of hegemonic stability, and this has been analysed by Professor Susan Strange, who has carried out a conscientious analysis of the theory, arguing that “outcomes in an international society are determined by relationships of power and far less by law, custom, or social convention”.

(Rainer, 60). At the end, she finds that even if economically the US has an economic counterweight, its predominance is centered on its structural power.

This implies that the US' strengths are its security power, production, financial and knowledge structures. (Dobson and Marsh, 11).

We will say U.S power resides in the implementation of ideals, democracy, liberty, self-determination, and national interest. There we have a combination of hard and soft power. Where national interest and self determination are covered by the military and economic issues, "hard power" and the indirect influence stemming from political, economic and cultural values is the "soft power". Deep in to the concept of soft power, Nye argues, that it means, "the ability to achieve desired outcomes in international affairs through attraction rather than coercion. soft power rests on the ability to set the political agenda in a way that shapes the preferences of Soft power arises from values, cultural expressions, in the policies a country follow internally and externally. This is the reason why US has played these cards to meet their changing interest in world politics.

According to Lyman Miller, "The basic components of superpower stature may be measured along four axes of power: military, economic, political, and cultural community that occupied a continental-sized landmass, had a huge population super ordinate capacity, including indigenous supplies of food and natural resources; enjoyed a high degree of non-dependence on international intercourse; and, most importantly, had a well-developed nuclear capacity.

6- Conclusion:

The forty five years after 1945 were dominated by a geopolitical and ideological struggle between the two super power blocs, the new era is likely to be more complicated now that one ideology ,communism, has all disappeared and the united sates is the only Superpower, adopted Democracy Promotion as a central goal of its foreign policy.

Chapter Two: “Democracy Promotion”

1- Introduction:

Democracy promotion has been a part of US foreign policy for a century since the Marshall plan that came into its own in Eastern Europe and Russia in the early 1990s, where political pluralism, rule of law, and civil society were championed as vital for consolidating the defeat of totalitarianism in Eastern Europe.

2- Background:

Democracy promotion is not a Bush administration innovation. Democracy has been a Core American value and policy principle since the founding fathers. It has been an Ingredient of U.S. foreign policy, while support for democracy in U.S. foreign policy can be traced to the country’s earliest days, in the modern era we often cite Woodrow Wilson’s vision of foreign policy grounded in principles of promoting just government based on consent of the governed. Certainly, almost every president since WWII—from Democrats Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, Jimmy Carter, and Bill Clinton to Republicans Dwight D. Eisenhower, Gerald Ford, Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush—has placed support for democracy as a central element of U.S. foreign policy.

From the Atlantic Charter to the Marshall Plan, the Berlin Airlift, and the 1961 foreign assistance Act, promoting democratic development has a long tradition in U.S. policy.

President Carter placed a great emphasis on human rights, and President Reagan’s Westminister speech took that policy further, leading to the creation of a specific U.S.

democracy promotion institution, the NED, and four core independent nonprofits institutes loosely associated with the two main U.S. political parties, the U.S.

Chamber of Commerce and the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO).

The four institutes are the National Democratic Institute (NDI), the International Republican Institute (IRI), the centre for International Private Enterprise (CIPE), and the Solidarity centre. President George H. W. Bush expanded support for democratic development by adding it to the portfolio of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). President Clinton made support for democratic development emphasis, including extending democracy as one of three central pillars of U.S. foreign policy. And George W. Bush extended democracy promotion to the Middle East.

(Cramer, 12).

3- Defining Democracy Promotion:

From World War II, the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It defined “life, liberty, and security of person” in an effort largely led by the United States. The Universal Declaration, like other human rights instruments, addresses the relationship between sovereignty and the people of a country. “Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his [or her] country, directly or through freely chosen representatives...The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections, which shall be by universal and equal suffrage...” (Cramer, 7).

The Universal Declaration and numerous treaties that the United States has joined posited that protection and promotion of human rights, including the right to democratic governance, was central to maintaining international security and peace.

4-The International Agencies of Democracy Promotion:

Democracy is legitimate governmental authority that derives from a body of citizens, regardless of gender, race, religion, national, ethnic, or social origin, or political or other opinion. These include the ability to participate directly in government and public affairs and to choose, through genuine elections, representatives to occupy elective office and exercise the powers of government. They also include the ability to benefit from structures of accountability the ability to exercise freedom of association and expression, and otherwise enjoy respect for human rights and equality of treatment. As more democracies have developed, it has become apparent that democracies are more likely to set free economic policies that lead to development and are less likely to resort to violence internally or with each other.

The Better World Campaign works to strengthen the relationship between the United States and the United Nations through outreach, communications, and advocacy. It encouraged U.S leadership to enhance the UN's ability to carry out its invaluable international work on behalf of peace, progress, freedom, and justice. In these efforts, It engaged policy makers, the media, and the American public to increase awareness of and support for the United Nations.

The International Republican Institute (IRI) is a nonprofits, nonpartisan organization committed to advancing freedom and democracy worldwide. For 25 years, IRI has been helping to spread democracy through trainings by volunteer experts from all over the

Chapter Two ◆ ————— ◆ *Democracy Promotion*
world on political party and candidate development, good governance practices, civil society development, civic education, women's and youth leadership development, electoral reform and election monitoring, and political expression in closed societies. IRI is active in 70 countries with offices in 42 countries.

The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) is a nonprofit organization working to strengthen and expand democracy worldwide. Calling on a global network of volunteer experts, NDI provides practical assistance to civic and political leaders advancing democratic values, practices, and institutions. NDI works with democrats in every region of the world to build political and civic organizations, safeguard elections, and to promote citizen participation, openness and accountability in government. (Cramer, 2).

5- Characteristics of Democracy Promotion:

Promoting democracy is a central pillar in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy.

Re-energizing U.S. alliances among democratically minded nations inside and outside of the United Nations, including within the UN's regional groupings; announcing the intent to conduct democracy promotion as much as possible by working with allies and through international organizations to give such efforts greater legitimacy and an international face. In this regard, announce continued support and funding to the United Nations Democracy Fund and the United Nations Development Program. (Bunce, 13).

- Committing diplomatic resources to fixing the UN's new Human Rights Council and/or expanding U.S. financial and political commitments to the UN's Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and its field-based operations.
- Ensuring continued financial support for and high-level participation in regional

Chapter Two ◆ ————— ◆ *Democracy Promotion*
organizations, such as the OAS and the OSCE, which are proponents of democratic principles and of which the U.S. is a member. The U.S. should also support the democratic promotion efforts of other regional intergovernmental bodies, such as the African Union.

- Enshrining democracy promotion as one of the key pillars of U.S. foreign policy in the National Security Doctrine, as was done in the Clinton and Bush Administrations.
- Continuing or expanding funding for democracy support programs by the National Endowment for Democracy, the Department of State's Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights and Labour, the Department of State's Middle East Partnership Initiative, and the U.S. Agency for International Development.
- Supporting congressionally-initiated funding for democracy support programs in Iraq.

6- Objectives of U.S Democracy Promotion:

6-1- Connecting Development with Democracy:

Over the past 15 years, there has been a sea change in the attitudes of the donor community, international financial institutions, and those supporting democratic development that recognizes the interconnectedness between political and economic reform. Even from the perspective of traditional foreign assistance, the establishment of democratic institutions was the best way to assure sustainable development. The 2002 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) presented a clarion call about the importance of the link between democracy and development. (Bunce, 14).

Democratic participation is a critical end of human development, not just a means of achieving it. The report took the democracy agenda one step further by declaring that “politics,” not just civics, is as important to successful development as economics. Today, the UNDP is continuing to build bridges between democracy and development, and other UN agencies and international institutions are advancing this approach. Making democracy work to deliver better lives for the population is a sustained and critical challenge. Taking steps beyond initial breakthroughs, such as promoting economic betterment and ending corruption, are central to maintaining popular support. The challenge, particularly in a new democracy, is to build support for democratic governance that prevents alternatives from gaining ground—whether they are autocratic regimes, populist covers for authoritarianism, or extremist ideologies that promote intolerance and violence.

6-2- Creating Stability and Security :

Every major peace agreement negotiated in the last two decades has included, as a principal goal, elections and the possibility of democratic governance. Developing democratic processes in the course of building sustainable peace is central to achieving stability and security—both domestically in those countries and internationally. The return on this investment is astronomical. The value of lives saved in places as diverse as East Timor, Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Nepal, El Salvador, and Kosovo, to list only a few, goes far beyond the expenditures that help to build inclusive political processes that cause belligerents to put down arms and engage in peaceful competition for governmental power.

The value in realized and potential economic development and the economic implications derived from international peace and stability also have to be considered in the equation. Democracies provide the best alternatives for fostering peace across borders by

maintaining internal stability and achieving economic and social development .

Conversely, autocracy, corruption, and lack of accountability exacerbate powerlessness, poverty, and intolerance and breed instability, increasing the potential for conflict and extremism, while hindering efforts to address famine, disease, and other matters essential for human development.

(Diamond, 93-95).

“Democracies provide the best alternatives for fostering peace across borders by maintaining internal stability and achieving economic and social development”

(Diamond, 96).

6-3- Redefining Democracy Building:

“Regime change” is not a goal or objective of democracy assistance. Incremental improvements and democratic reform—at a pace that each body politic sets—define the mode of operation. When those who hold power abuse it and frustrate the will of the people to such an extent that the people decide to take dramatic action to protect their sovereign rights, a regime may be swept away because of its opposition to democracy.

That cannot be orchestrated or imposed by outside forces. Dictatorship is an imposition; democracy is about choice.(Diamond, 97).

There are clear examples where those who held power breached their compact with citizens and used the powers of government to stifle the will of the people as to who should represent them. The Philippines spawned “People Power” in response to such abuse of power, as was more recently the situation in Serbia, Georgia, and Ukraine.

Chapter Two ◆————◆ *Democracy Promotion*
In each case, people worked for responsiveness and accountability of government before turning to more dramatic means of changing those in power.

The use of military force has never been predicated principally on democracy policy. Toppling a government must be reserved for exceptional circumstances where those in control of a state are abusing its powers in ways that meet universally recognized grounds for intervention, such as launching international aggression or genocide and other crimes against humanity. This action is best taken multilaterally under sanction of U.S government support for democracy programs comes from a variety of sources.

In the early 1980s, these programs were funded primarily through the NED and its core institutes, which give concrete expression to America's democratic values while serving the country's national interest by promoting political environments those are inhospitable to political extremism. Since the 1980s, support from USAID has allowed for a significant increase in democracy promotion activities, as has the Department of State's application of Economic Support Funds for these purposes. Greatly increased resources within the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labour (DRL) and the creation of the Middle East partnership Initiative (MEPI) during the George W. Bush Administration have allowed even greater opportunities for much-needed innovative democracy assistance in countries and geographic areas that are not traditional USAID recipients.(Bunce, 16).

The United States also invests in democracy building through its contributions and programs in multilateral institutions; dues to the United Nations support the general extension of the rule of law and provide direct electoral assistance to many of the world's citizens, often through the Electoral Assistance Bureau. As in 2007, about half of the World's nations had received UN assistance in holding and monitoring elections and

many more have received UN help in crafting or reshaping their constitutions. The United States also contributes to separate, voluntarily funded agencies of the United Nations that promote democracy and good governance, like the UNDP or the UN Democracy Fund, which was created on July 4, 2005, with the support of the Bush administration. The Democracy Fund provides small grants to governments and civil society organizations around the world to support emerging democracies with legal, technical, and financial assistance and advice. (Cramer, 18).

This pluralism in democracy assistance has served the United States well, allowing for diverse yet complementary programming that, over the long-term, could not be sustained by a highly static and centralized system. Funding by the NED, for example, has allowed its core institutes to respond quickly and flexibly to emerging opportunities and sudden problems in rapidly shifting political environments. In addition, the NED has been able to operate effectively in closed societies where direct government engagement is more difficult. Funds from USAID have provided the basis for a longer-term commitment in helping to develop a country's democratic institutions; while funding from DRL and other programs within the State Department, such as MEPI, have given the U.S. government the capacity to support-without cumbersome regulations—cutting-edge and highly focused democracy programs in individual countries as well as regional and global initiatives. While the U.S. government can set the tone and foreign aid can provide needed resources for democratic development, much of the work on the ground must be done by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). While the image of democracy building in the United States has suffered from association with the war in Iraq, the backlash against international support for democratic reform often comes from nondemocratic regimes.

Leaders of these regimes often make false accusations to try to undercut support for indigenous democratic movements. Using the strength gained from economic windfalls in extractive industries, certain governments are on the offensive to stymie reform movements that are seeking peaceful reform and respect for a broad range of human rights (in some cases including economic, cultural, and social rights). While the late 20th century saw an unprecedented expansion in democracy, there has been many setbacks. These include the emergence of populist demagogues, the re-emergence of authoritarianism in some states of the former Soviet Union, and the election or increasing strength of radical Islamist groups in some Arab countries. While the reasons are varied, democracy- as a system and concept—has sometimes been blamed for not delivering increased living standards or for not adequately providing the necessities of life. Authoritarian Leaders—whether in Eurasia, the Middle East, or Latin America—have used these perceived failings to push their own brand of one-party or one-man rule. To be successful, democracy cannot be just a set of concepts or processes; it must produce improvements in people’s lives. Growing recognition of the interconnectedness between economic prosperity and democracy has produced over the last decade an ever-increasing trend among nations, intergovernmental and nongovernment organizations, and international financial institutions to support democracy and human rights activities. U.S. nonprofits NGOs engaged in assisting democratic activists around the world have been most successful when they have joined with others to share democratic skills. As a practical matter, peoples making the transition to democracies require diverse experiences. Those of democrats from other nations—from new and established democracies alike—are often more relevant than our own.

(Dobson and Marsh, 101).

democracy: they are not ceding something to the United States; they are joining a community of nations that have traversed the same course. They can show that while autocracies are inherently isolated and fearful of the outside world, democracies can count on natural allies and an active support structure because other nations are concerned and are watching. In the past decade, a number of countries and intergovernmental organizations have established new democracy support initiatives.

Within the UN system, the efforts of the UNDP and the UN Democracy Fund, noted earlier, have provided international support for new or flagging democracies. The UN Electoral Assistance Bureau and other bodies have similar mandates to support emerging democracies with electoral advice, assistance, monitoring, and implementation. The Organization of American States (OAS) adopted the Inter-American Democratic Charter in 2001 and conducts initiatives through its Office for the Promotion of Democracy and other mechanisms. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights is active throughout Europe and Eurasia. The African Union put forth a draft charter on democracy, elections, and governance in 2006. The Commonwealth conducts active democracy assistance programs.

New intergovernmental institutions, such as the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, have come into existence.

7- Three Principles For Democracy Promotion :

7-1- Democracy develops organically :

While in unusual and unique circumstances outsiders may give democracy a sustained push, more often than not democratic development is driven by local actors. Even more

Chapter Two ◆————◆ *Democracy Promotion*
rare is the imposition of democracy at the point of a gun. The misperception that outsiders can force democratic.

An outcome often leads to misguided policies and incorrect assumptions. The focus on democratization in the context of the Iraq War is but one example of this. More prevalent, however, is the predisposition by policymakers, and even the public, to see democratization as a top-down, state-driven process. Democratization is largely driven by an empowered citizenry and maintained by the establishment of institutions geared toward shepherding and safeguarding democratic practices. Moreover, engaging with non-elites and civil society organizations has an important multiplier effect, spearheading a process of decentralization and local empowerment that must be encouraged in future democratization endeavors. (Cohen, A and Figueroa, 20).

7-2- Democratization is the work of generations:

While there are occasionally exceptions to the rule, democratic evolution do not occur overnight. It can take years, even decades, for democratic practices to become embedded. Nor, in general, does the occurrence of a free and fair election signals the ascendancy of democratic rule. Indeed, while free and fair elections are an important benchmark, they are only a beginning step on the road to democratization. It bears noting that, from a programmatic standpoint, U.S democracy assistance funds are now being oriented more toward governance,

rule of law, and civil society programs as opposed to direct electoral support—a wise allocation of resources. Yet, while it is generally understood that democratization takes time, the rhetoric of U.S. political leaders does not always reflect this fact, resulting in heightened expectations, and then dismay when events begin to move in the wrong direction. Worse still, policymakers too often lose interest after a first free and fair

occasionally manifests itself in great historical moments, but most often it is the accumulation of small, but critical, advancements.(Bauman, 111).

7-3- Limitation of USDemocracy Promotion:

Despite the media attention that often surrounds American efforts abroad, the ability of the U.S. to affect democratic transitions is more constrained than is generally understood. Although U.S. funding can help transitioning countries continue to move in a positive direction, create breathing space for civil society actors, and identify and empower local democratic leaders, it cannot change an illiberal regime into a democracy overnight.

Democracy occasionally manifests itself in great historical moments, but most often it is the accumulation of small, but critical, advancements.

Policymakers should recognize that not every country can or will effectively utilize democracy assistance in the same manner. For example, for FY 2009, the U.S. allocated “governing democratically and justly” funding for promoting democracy in Iran (\$65 million) and Cuba (\$20 million). It even allocated \$2 million for promoting democracy in North Korea. These are adversarial regimes where democracy assistance is unlikely to cause significant shifts toward pro-democratic behaviour. Yet, these countries are often held up as proof that

democracy promotion does not work. While successful transitions, as in Mali or Indonesia, or the incremental progress being made elsewhere, are given short shrift.(Cramer. 10). Even though American democracy assistance has increased in recent years, it still stands at a rather paltry \$1.5 billion, which is about the same amount of money the U.S spent in 2007 to train security forces in Afghanistan.

Considering the limited influence any one country can have on another when it come to promoting democracy, policymakers need to more narrowly and efficiently target U.S. efforts to generate the best possible results. We should not ignore the so-called worst of the worst (North Korea, Zimbabwe, Burma), but we also must be recognized that democracy.

Democracy Promotion must be separated from both domestic and international politics.

8- U.S Democracy Promotion in the Arab World:

The main US step in this direction was the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI), announced in December 2002 by US Secretary of State Colin Powell. MEPI's 'strategy' has been shaped, in part, by the United Nations Development Programme, Arab Human Development Report of 2002, which identified three key deficits in political Freedom: women's empowerment and knowledge. The initiative rested on four pillars : economic, political, educational and women's rights , and recommended a variety of country-specific and region-wide projects. A second democracy promotion initiative was the Broader Middle East and North Africa Partnership Initiative, announced in June 2004 at the G8 summit in Atlanta, Georgia. Although not exclusively an American project —its purpose was to make democracy promotion a cooperative enterprise between G8 and Middle Eastern governments (Diamond, 100).

The second level of US democracy promotion in the Arab Middle East has been traditional and public diplomacy. Time and again since 2001 public commentators and state officials, not to mention the top administration officials, including the president himself and secretaries of state Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice, have emphasized that democratic

Chapter Two ◆ ————— ◆ *Democracy Promotion*
reform in the MiddleEast has become a core objective of U.S policy in the region. One of the most important expressions of this policy was Bush's speech at the National Endowment of Democracy in November 2003, in which democratic change in the Middle East was a main focus .

Finally, on a third level, democracy promotion has become an integral part of an interventionist US foreign policy in the Arab Middle East, epitomized in the invasion and occupation of Iraq. As previously in the case of Afghanistan, the 2003 Iraq war was justified on the grounds of self-defense against presumed weapons of mass destruction (WMD) proliferation and terrorism (Diamond, 104-105).

But democratization was also part of the rationale for military action. It was argued by the US administration that a democratic Iraq would be a natural American ally and that its example would encourage political reform in the Arab world as a whole. The response to US democracy promotion policies across the Arab region has also become more organized and has taken the form of regional meetings which have produced pro-reform statements. In January 2004, at a large international conference in Sana'a, Yemen established the Arab Democratic Dialogue Forum. The Alexandria Conference of Arab writers, intellectuals and political activists on 'Arab Reform' in March 2004 in its final document called upon Arab governments to implement reforms that include the abolition of states of emergency. In June 2004, the Doha Declaration for Democracy and Reform was adopted at the close of a conference in Qatar attended by over 100 thinkers and politicians from various Arab countries ; in the majority of the Arab countries: Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, Algeria and Morocco, at various times and to various degrees, have improved civil rights and have allowed greater political participation, usually through elections.

Egypt is perhaps the best illustration of these ambiguous forces and influences.

Since 2001 Egypt has been a main target of US democracy promotion because of its pivotal role in the Arab world and closeness to the US. Hosni Mubarak's regime has responded by initiating reforms such as creating the Human Rights Council, reforming the National Democratic Party and introducing multiparty contestation of the presidential elections. He has also allowed some open expression of political dissent and has given more leeway to critics of the regime. Arguably this greater openness has given an opportunity to informal opposite Syria was described by the Bush administration in 2002 as part of an 'axis of evil', and the US has put pressure on it to renounce its WMD programs and desist from aiding the Iraqi insurgency. Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon would contribute to achieving these goals.

9- Conclusion:

By the end of 20th century , US democracy promotion became a world value by which U.S spread democracy and protected human rights, including the right to democratic governance in order to maintaining international security and peace.

Chapter three: “U.S.A War on Iraq as a Case Study”

1- Introduction:

Twelve years have passed since the U.S.-led coalition invaded Saddam Hussein's Iraq for the second time. In the build-up to war, many questioned the wisdom of embarking on military action without multilateral approval. This reluctance to support military intervention was built, in part, out of a fear of the impact of unilateral action on the spirit and practice of multilateralism.

2- Background of Iraq war:

The Persian Gulf War located in south-western Asia at the gulf northern is tiny, oil-rich country called Kuwait, and its northern neighbour, Iraq. It was hostile to Kuwait.

On August 2, 1990, Iraqi forces poured over the bordure into Kuwait. Iraq's President, Saddam Hussein, had prepared huge military to invade Kuwait. Six days later, Iraq announced that it had annexed Kuwait because Hussein had claimed that Kuwait was part of Iraqi territory. Also, he had been angry with Kuwait for various reasons. Both countries were producers of oil, but Iraq claimed that Kuwait was pumping out too much oil, lowering world oil prices and hurting Iraq.

On the day of the invasion, the United nation security council issued resolution condemning the attack, and demanded that Iraq withdraw from Kuwait; there was also concern that Hussein, by occupying Kuwait, controlled too much of the world's oil.

On August 8, the first US troops arrived in Saudi Arabia to defend Kuwait. There mission was called Operation Desert Shield. That day, president George H.W. Bush made speech explaining his decision to commit US forces to the region and declared, "There is no justification whatsoever for this outrageous and brutal act of aggression" (OCHOA, 23).

Bush organized an international coalition included 39 countries from western European nations such as The United Kingdom, France, Germany and Spain; Eastern European nations such as Poland and Czechoslovakia; Asian countries such as Pakistan and South Korea; Latin American countries such as Argentina and Honduras; and African countries such as Niger. Some Arab countries also joined the coalition, including Bahrain, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria. In the time, Hussein considered himself the Arab's leader against Western countries. On November 29, the UN Security Council passed resolution permitting the use of military force against Iraq if he didn't remove from Kuwait on January 15, 1991. By the time the deadline arrived, Iraq still occupied Kuwait.

On January 17, 1991, allied aircraft rained bombs on Baghdad, and US chips launched high-tech Tomahawk cruise missiles; Hussein fought back but his antiaircraft defences were not enough to defeat the US air power; allied forces invaded Iraq to cut off supply lines and prevent Iraqi forces in Kuwait from retreating. Many Iraqi troops, demoralized by the weeks of bombing; and the result was the swift collapse of Iraq forces. After the Gulf War, Hussein remained in power but his years were numbered. He was believed to possess chemical and biological weapons, and many thought he was trying to develop nuclear weapons. Hussein promised to destroy these weapons of mass destruction in the presence of the UN. Because of his supposed failure to keep his promises, the United States invaded Iraq on December 13, 2003.

3- The Iraq war or the second Gulf war:

The invasion of Iraq by multinational forces led by troops from the United States and the United Kingdom claimed that Iraq's illegal possession of weapons of mass destruction, the troops led by army general Tony Franks, under the slogan "Operation Iraqi Liberation" and the US justifications were: end the Hussein's dictatorship regime; eliminate whatever weapons of mass destruction could be found; eliminate whatever Islamist militants, distribute humanitarian aid.

The invasion was quick and decisive by using the largest special operation forces in the north since the successful attack on the Taliban government of Afghanistan just a year before. The Iraq army was quickly defeated.

4- Arms Control After the War On Iraq:

The concept of disarmament is being proposed as the solution to the problems of the middle east in the near future; "Rogue States" are also failing under instance pressure, Iraq was forcibly disarmed not only of a alleged weapons of mass destruction but through the dismantling of its army and removal of traditional military capabilities. Iran, Syria and Libya are now coming under pressure to give up alleged weapons.

While issues of arms control have traditionally been discussed through the framework of international arrangement and treaties, we are witnessing today the unilateral imposition by the US of disarmament through direct intervention.

While the US has always been an important external influence in terms of the Middle East, for all practical purposes.

Chapter Three ◆————◆ *U.S.A War on Iraq as a Case Study*
Through its military and political presence in Iraq it has become the next door neighbour to both Syria and Iran.(Abu Hamoud, 14).

The U.S has developed more detailed and invasive policy for the Middle East region than ever before, which has created a fundamental strategic shift in the region. This has immediate consequences for arms control effort in the region. In the case of Iraq the US intervened to impose defence secretary Ronald Rumsfeld's idea that the best way to disarm Iraq was to invade it; the central focus of the US approach to the Middle East has become the war on terrorism which had a drastic effect on the framework of addressing arms control in the region.(Abu Hamoud, 16).

The virtual absence of WMDs in the region, with the continuing exception of Israel, will also weaken the need for regional arms control arrangement. With the fall of Iraq, the establishment of an unprecedented number of new military bases and the emergence of new military alliances, the strategic map of the Middle East has changed.

The Iraqi Opposition: US conception and internal Crisis:

Since it invaded Iraq, the US has been preoccupied with creating stability there, and eliminating the forces that oppose its presence. Although the US has declared its wish to establish a real democratic system, and has supported the opposition and brought them back into Iraq, however the size of the Iraqi opposition has increased significantly since 1991 including Iraqi national Congress, has begun to express their dissatisfaction with US policies in Iraq after the war. They felt the US has gone back on its promise to include them as partners in leading the country during the transitional period. The US has come to realize that this opposition can not assume leadership at this point. Thus, the US is pushing ahead to create a solution to the Palestinian problem in order to create appropriate regional

conditions to establish the new Iraq. The new Iraq according to the US vision will have a democratic face, on Iraq as a case study and will make a clean break with the practices of the old regime as well as the Arab ideologies that have prevailed for the last 50 years.(Abu Hamoud, 18).

5-The US war on Iraq and the Arab Order:

The USA led war on Iraq which had a significant consequences for the Arab system; the crises has made clear that the Arab countries prioritize their commitment to the international community over those made within the framework of the Arab regional system, the Arabs have directed much criticism towards the Arab League .(Abu Hamoud, 14-15).

The most dangerous consequences of the war are the state of frustration and the sense of weakness that prevail in the Arab political arena.

The war also increased the imbalance of power between the Arabs and Israel. The US handling of the Iraqi crisis was unexpected, and there are no guarantees that such tactics will not be employed against other Arab countries; US treats against Syria provide ample proof of Washington's readiness to repeat the Iraqi scenario, the US has also outlined various visions of its own for the Middle East which indicate that it favours a rearrangement of the region in line with its own interests. Example of this include the " Road Map" for Arab-Israeli settlement. These visions effectively rule out the establishment of any independent Arab system able to express and protect Arab interests, which suggests there will be more US pressure in the coming period to dismantle the regional Arab system and substitute it with another one. Then, the Arab countries must work to defend their identities.

Despite these negative consequences to the war on Iraq, there has been one important positive aspect: the Arab countries have acknowledged the need to reform the basis of the Arab system. The Arab recognize that they must change their situations, and that future Arab policies should be based on common Arab work in accordance with new rules suited to the international environment and the nature of the challenges that the Arab countries are facing. This administration of the need for comprehensive reform on the economic, political, social and cultural levels (Collins, D, 69-80).The Arabs must consider the situation objectively, without exaggerating or understanding their problems. What is important at this point is finding the appropriate means to overcome the currant crisis.

6-U.S.A's way of promoting democracy in Iraq:

America pledged that its invasion would build democracy in Iraq, but it faces a dilemma in fulfilling this promise. There are serious questions about whether elections today would select Iraqi leaders who are really committed to democracy.

But justice and order require Iraqi leadership, and Iraqis are demanding that America should cede power. If America transfers power now to self selected leaders, without any elections, then the best chance to introduce democracy may be lost. (Lewis, B, 149).

Any democratic system that is introduced under American authority must be considered transitional, until a permanent constitution is written by Iraqi representatives and ratified by the Iraqi people. But we need to think broadly about possible structures for such a transitional democracy. Anyone who believes in democracy should understand that constitutional structure scan make a difference. Most people are not familiar with the wide variety of democratic systems, but chances for successful democracy may depend critically on introducing the right kind of transitional structure.

The best direction may have been suggested in the Democratic Principles report of the Conference of the Iraqi Opposition ,when it emphasized the importance of federal separation of power. This report boldly asserted that no future state in Iraq will be democratic unless it is federal in structure. To achieve such federalism, the report recommended that local elections should be held before any national elections.

(McFaul, 147-150).

American democracy was originally established in just this way. Under the Articles of the Confederation that governed America during its Revolutionary period, democratic state governments had a decade to develop without competition from a strong central government. In this transitional period, America's National Congress consisted only of delegates from the states, who could be replaced by their state government at any time. Thus, there was no danger of the national leadership trying to undermine the states' autonomous authority. After this transitional period, when democracy was well established in each of the 13 states, American could safely put a strong central government over the states. But the success of American democracy may owe much to the fact that it was established first at the provincial level.

Similarly, the chances of a successful democracy in Iraq can be improved if these first transitional elections are used only to elect autonomous provincial governments. There is no unified political group that stands likely to win power in all of Iraq's 18 provinces today. (McFaul, 160).

Thereafter, a political party that abused power and violated democratic principles in one province would lose much of its appeal for voters in other provinces. So, provincial autonomy can provide the essential incentives for political leaders to begin cultivating a

reputation for democratic behaviour. In this transitional period, Iraq's national parliament should be composed only of delegates from the provincial governments who can be recalled at any time.

Elections in new democracies are inevitably chaotic, as they lack accepted proven leadership. This problem can be mitigated by keeping terms short and giving voters more opportunities to re-evaluate their choices. So, the transitional constitution could stipulate that Provincial governments must return for re-election every year. Other details of the democratic system also need to be carefully considered. To guarantee that significant minorities in every region can have some representatives, provincial councils should be elected by some form of open list proportional representation. The lack of proven leadership also suggests that transitional governments should have a parliamentary structure; so that, the elected councils can replace unsatisfactory executives. The one serious risk of such strong provincial autonomy is that it could encourage secessionist movements in some regions. But if a secessionist movement in one region is opposed by a majority of other Iraqis. Then, it should be with the power of American forces to help prevent secession. Also, any political group that includes elected representatives in some provinces should have the right to sponsor candidates for election in all provinces, and all provincial elections must be free and fair. During the occupation period, if America limits its political intervention to the protection of such basic principles.

7- Conclusion:

The U.S lacks both the commitment and the capacity to Promote democracy abroad, however, US needs to look beyond the Iraqi intervention- which was after all, an unusual action, at least from an historical perspective, for the United States to take. In direct contrast to

Iraq, most American efforts to promote democracy have involved one of four models using force to end political disorder and to restore democratic politics as in Liberia and Haiti intervening in association with international organizations to end internal wars and build democratic polities basic principles, then it may hope to fulfill its promise to the Iraqi people.

General Conclusion:

The ideological and geopolitical conflict between the communist and the capitalist bloc ended by the fall of Berlin wall in 1989 and the collapse of the soviet union that was unable to make the balance between its military and economic development.

Now, the world order is completely changed and the new political map of the world would be drafted by the sole winner, the United States.

In post cold war era, the United State changed its foreign policy from containment to enlargement .At post-Cold War, this definition changed as new factors such as political, cultural, demographic, economic and financial, military and geographic , were considered With this change in the world, from being a bipolar to univocal , the definition and characteristics of super power was changed. The central focus of the U.S has become the war on terrorism by using soft and herd power till the use military intervention to defence its national security. It adopted this policy against dictator regimes and the war on Iraq is well illustrated that.

The U.S.A attempt spread democracy and especially in the Middle East by throwing out the old regime's and introduced a more republic one.

Bibliography

1- Abu Hamoud, Mohamed Saad. «U.S War On Iraq and The Arab Order».

Al Siyassa- Al Dawliya. Ed. Osama Al- Ghazali Harb. Egypt : Al Ahram Commercial Press kalioub, 2003. 14-19.

2- Bauman, Rainer. In Compatible Conception of Global Order? Empire, Hegemony, and Global Governance. University of Bremen: New York, 2005.

3- Bunce, Valerie. DEMOCRACY BRIDGE :Multilateral regional efforts for the democracy and Defense of Democracy in Africa and America .Washington, D.C,2007.

4- Bunce, Valerie. AMERICAN Democracy Promotion. New York : Sharm-Wolchic , 2005.

5- Cohen, A- Michael and Marie Figueroa Kupku Revitalizing U.S Promotion:

A Comprehensive Plan for Rreform. New America Foundation , 2009.

6- COLLINS, D- Stephen. Democracy Sanction. “An Assesment of Eeconomic Sanction as an Instrument of Democracy Promotion”. Taiwan Journal of Democracy, vol 5, No.2:69-96.

- 7- Cramer, LorneW New Direction For Democracy Promotion. Kenneth Wollack:
National Democratic Institution NDI, 2004.
- 8- Diamond, Larry. Promoting Democracy Post- Conflict and Failed States. Taiwan
journal of Democracy. .Vol 5, No.2 : 69-96.
- 9- Dobson, Alan P and Steve Marsh. US Foreign Policy Since 1945 . London : Routledge,
2001.
- 10- Gordenker, Leon. What UN Principles? A U.S Debate On Iraq. New York: Global
Governance, 2003.
- 11- Hanson, Jim. The Next Cold War? American Alternatives For The Twenty-First
Century. West Port, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1996.
- 12- Hughes, William. Ed. Western Civilization EARLY Modern through The Twentieth
Century.9thed. Guilford, CT: Dusking Graw. Hill, 1997.
- 13- Lewis, R-Adrian. The American Culture of War . Abington, New York:Taylor and
Francis Group, 2007.
- 14- MC Faull, Michael. Democracy Promotion As a World Value. The Washington
Quarterly: Washington, D.C, 2005.
- 15- Myerson, B-Roger. How to Build Democracy in Iraq. New York Times.

31 Mar. 1998: 3.

16- Ochoa, George. America in The 1990s. New York: Stonesong Press, LLC, 2006.

17- Shire, Iam Derby. “The Break- Up of The USSR”. THE Hutchinson Encyclopedia.

United Kingdom: Helicon Publishing LTD , 2001. 1o9o-1o95.