



University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

CUREJ - College Undergraduate Research
Electronic Journal

College of Arts and Sciences

3-28-2007

How the Influence of Religion Makes the Foreign Policy of the Bush Administration Revolutionary, and How This Has Affected Our Relations with European Allies

Alexandra Kougentakis

University of Pennsylvania, akougent@sas.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.upenn.edu/curej>

 Part of the [International Relations Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kougentakis, Alexandra, "How the Influence of Religion Makes the Foreign Policy of the Bush Administration Revolutionary, and How This Has Affected Our Relations with European Allies" 28 March 2007. *CUREJ: College Undergraduate Research Electronic Journal*, University of Pennsylvania, <http://repository.upenn.edu/curej/66>.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <http://repository.upenn.edu/curej/66>
For more information, please contact libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu.

How the Influence of Religion Makes the Foreign Policy of the Bush Administration Revolutionary, and How This Has Affected Our Relations with European Allies

Abstract

It is widely recognized that the rhetoric and actions of the Bush administration are strongly marked by religious terminology and principles, particularly those of evangelical Christianity. The prominence and new political sophistication of religious groups imply that its current character is a departure from the past. Yet while religious conservatives are seen as a significant force in domestic and electoral politics, their influence in the arena of foreign policy is not generally a topic of serious debate. The omission is significant; not only do domestic politics often influence the direction of foreign policy, but in the case of the religious wing of the Republican Party, there have recently been a considerable number of direct statements and positions taken with regard to international issues. The evidence that there is a political effect from the Christian evangelicals is seen in the fact that their positions have frequently been reflected by US foreign policy under the Bush administration, particularly the policies on terrorism and Iraq. More often the neoconservative wing of the Republican Party tends to be given credit for these policies, but their collaboration with religious conservatives is not often considered. One of the purposes of this thesis will be to demonstrate the alliance between these two factions. My argument that ideology, both religious and political, has been instrumental to the foreign policy of the Bush administration, will be demonstrated through a comparison of the political dimensions of these ideologies, the examination of key administration figures, and a critical assessment of alternative argument that discounts the importance of ideology. While American scholarship may be relatively unimpressed by arguments regarding the significance of the religious influence on the foreign policy arena, however, policy-makers and intellectuals in several of our traditional European allies are far less skeptical. Statements directly regarding the political influence of religious conservatives as well as the differing attitudes and policies towards religion may shed light on the various responses towards the US invasion of Iraq. Contributing to the differences on religion are the unique foreign policy traditions in Europe as they developed during the 20th century. Reductionism and a US-centric perspective have hindered a strong analysis of the different reactions. The evolution of foreign policy in Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Spain following World War II will be used to discuss for an evaluation of the broader impact that US policy in Iraq, and the political influence of religion in America more generally, may have for future relations.

Keywords

George W. Bush, religion, Iraq, foreign policy, neoconservatives, Christian Right, John Lewis Gaddis, European allies, ideology, transatlantic divide, diplomacy, terrorism, Social Sciences, Political Science, Anne Norton, Norton, Anne

Disciplines

International Relations

**HOW THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGION
MAKES THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE
BUSH ADMINISTRATION
REVOLUTIONARY, AND HOW THIS HAS
AFFECTED OUR RELATIONS WITH
EUROPEAN ALLIES**

**Alexandra Kougentakis
March 28, 2007**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	p. 2
CHAPTER 1: AN IDEOLOGICALLY DRIVEN.....	p. 13
ADMINISTRATION	
CHAPTER 2: WHAT DISTINGUISHES THE.....	p. 43
CHRISTIAN RIGHT FROM OTHER INTERESTS	
CHAPTER 3: ALTERNATIVE ARGUMENT ON FOREIGN....	p. 49
POLICY: JOHN LEWIS GADDIS AND SECURITY	
CHAPTER 4: THE EUROPEAN ALLIES.....	p. 53
CHAPTER 5: EUROPE VS. US ON IRAQ.....	p. 74
CHAPTER 6: RELIGION AND THE	
TRANSATLANTIC DIVIDE.....	p.77
CHAPTER 7: EFFECTS ON INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY	
OBSERVED SO FAR.....	p. 83
CONCLUSION.....	p. 88
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	p. 91

INTRODUCTION

The worldview and values held by the leader of a sovereign state can be instructive as to the manner in which that leader chooses to rule. Worldview is especially crucial in the case of the President of the United States, whose decisions can have a significant impact on the entire international community. From early on, George W. Bush declared religion to be fundamental to his way of thinking and to the way he understood the world: "My principles that I make decisions on are a part of me. And religion is a part of me."¹ While the most palpable impact of religion on his presidency derives from the Christian Right interest groups that have provided a strong base for him in electoral and political support, the President himself has used religion to a greater extent than any past president to justify his policy decisions and political goals. The increased political mobilization of religious conservatives in recent decades is particularly favorable to such a perspective.

The use of religious language by US presidents underwent a radical transformation with the presidency of Ronald Reagan. The succeeding three presidencies all displayed a significantly higher emphasis on God in the context of political discourse, and of all four, the current President outranks them all, a testament to the current political fortitude of the Christian Right.² Therefore it is not surprising that non-governmental allies of the President use full discretion in interpreting his positions in religiously charged terms, even if religion might not be a relevant factor. For example, the administration's stance towards the United Nations may be unreceptive, but this is hardly unusual considering that Mr. Bush is a Republican. Therefore the 2005 nomination for UN ambassador of John Bolton, a man famous for declaring, "If [the UN Secretariat building in New

¹ "George W. Bush on Faith," Third Presidential Debate, October 13 2004.
http://www.beliefnet.com/story/149/story_14930_1.html, (2 December 2006).

² Kevin Coe and David Domke, "Petitioners or Prophets? Presidential Discourse, God, and the Ascendancy of Religious Conservatives," *Journal of Communication*, 56 No. 2 (2006), p. 317-318.

York] lost 10 stories, it wouldn't make a bit of difference," was not surprising. Yet the strong suspicion of international organizations among religious conservatives motivates some to launch religiously charged attacks and thus implicate religion as a motivation of the administration as well. Religious vitriol against the UN is most blatant in the "Left Behind" books, a best-selling Christian series about the End Times, in which the organization is demonized as "the Anti-Christ." Mr. Bush's prominent public display his own religious worldview inevitably confers such perspectives with much more political significance than they would otherwise have. The potential impact for policy-making makes the issue a topic of particular relevance to political analysts and scholars.

In times of exceptional political tension or social crisis, the worldview of a national leader becomes even more important. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 marked one of the most traumatic and devastating events in the history of the US, causing the death of thousands, the demolition of a major financial center and an attack on the nation's premier center of defense, the Pentagon. [Issues of international conflict, religious fundamentalism and a clash of different traditions, already simmering throughout the entire second half of the 20th century, were inflamed yet further by the calamity] and a complex and far-reaching response by the US ensued. The immediate course of action taken was the invasion of Afghanistan, the country whose fundamentalist Muslim government, the Taliban, provided refuge and support to the mastermind of the attacks, Osama Bin Ladin, and his militant Islamist organization Al Qaeda. The international community largely rallied behind the US at this time, and a broad coalition of allies joined the US in its attack on the Taliban. Although the Taliban itself had not attacked the US, by acting as the sponsor of Al Qaeda it appeared to be the most germane non-moving target, and its downfall would arguably serve as a warning to other governments of the consequences of

sponsoring terrorist organizations. The looming threat of global terrorism made this latter point especially critical, and resulted in a reorientation of US foreign policy with staggering effects for the international community.

The Bush National Security Strategy (NSS) was declared in September 2002, a year after the attacks, and long after the invasion of Afghanistan. It sets the foreign policy goals for the administration, acknowledges, “We’re facing a different world,”³ and asserts a more aggressive strategy for American engagement abroad known as the Bush Doctrine. John Lewis Gaddis, identifies the major principles of the doctrine as preemption, unilateralism and hegemony. While the US has been recognized as the global hegemon since the end of the Cold War, the principles of preemption and unilateralism appear to deviate from the foreign policy norms developed in the 20th century. Preemption in the traditional sense, that is, military action taken to thwart an imminent threat, would not in fact be a departure from traditional American policy, as the US has a history of acting in the offensive to protect its interests. The wars in Korea and Vietnam during the 20th century in the mission to combat the spread of communism and to protect the security interests of democratic governments are among two of the more recent examples.

Yet the Bush Doctrine is arguably distinct from such earlier actions insofar as its conception of preemptive action actually translates to a policy for preventive war. The dispute over the distinctions between the two concepts is a passionate one and was particularly vigorous with regard to the invasion of Iraq. The related historic debate concerns the first just war theory, which states that a war must be morally acceptable, *jus ad bellum*, and must also be carried out

³ The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, “President Holds Prime Time News Conference,” press release, 11 October 2001: <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011011-7.html>> (2 December 2006).

through means that are proportional and discriminating, *jus in bello*.⁴ Political scientist Dan Reiter defines preemptive war as consisting of military action taken to avert “what it sees as an impending attack on itself.”⁵ Another popular description used to qualify preemptive action is the apparition of a “clear and imminent threat.” Yet such definitions are necessarily ambiguous because the identification of such a threat requires the subjective analysis of the individuals responsible for a nation’s security. To this effect, the phrase “preemptive war” is often used interchangeably with that of “preventive war;” conceptually, however, the two ideas are supposed to be quite distinct.

Political theorist Michael Walzer defines preventive war as one which “aims to ward off a much more distant threat [than preemptive war does], a speculative threat, that may or may not materialize somewhere down the road, and which might be dealt with through deterrence or alliance or diplomacy.”⁶ Preventive war was a major topic of discussion during the Cold War, when the possibility of aggression from the Soviet Union was seen as likely enough to warrant a first strike in the eyes of many. Pittman B. Potter, a legal specialist at the University of British Columbia, invoked the preventive principle and its relatively greater effectiveness compared to “mere remedial action” as grounds for taking the offensive. He ceded however that the lack of a legal structure in the international field for the determination of when and how preventive action would be appropriate posed a challenge.⁷ Justification for preventive war is far more problematic to determine than it is for preemptive action because of the greater extent of subjectivity

⁴ Neta C. Crawford, “Just War Theory and the US Counterterror War,” *Perspectives on Politics*, 1, No. 1 (2003): p. 7.

⁵ Dan Reiter, “Exploding the Powder Keg Myth,” *International Security*, 20 No. 5 (1995): p.5..

⁶ Michael Walzer, Interview by Joanne J. Myers, *Books for Breakfast*, Carnegie Council, 26 October 2004 <<http://206.252.132.104/viewMedia.php/prmTemplateID/8/prmID/5024?PHPSESSID=a5623a4e0bf7708e05e3fc6a71e67cc7>> (3 March 2007).

⁷ Pittman B. Potter, “Preventive War Critically Considered,” *The American Journal of International Law*, 45, No. 1 (1951): p. 144.

necessarily involved. As will be discussed later in the paper, the validation of such methods is increasingly being provided through religion.

The decision to adopt and intensify such foreign policy principles in the development of the Bush Doctrine was influenced by a number of different players and factions within and around the administration. The President's cabinet was comprised of a roster of veritable Republican Party stars, the most central figures to defense policy being Vice President Richard Cheney and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of State Colin Powell and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice. The more pragmatic, realist inclinations of Powell and Rice were disregarded in favor of the aggressive comportment recommended by the Vice President and the Defense Secretary. It is important to note that while these may have been the central players directly involved in the decision-making process, some of the strongest influences on foreign policy came from lesser figures of the administration, as well as by groups wholly outside of it. These entities may have been less significant in the grander context of the administration, but their views and counsel were conferred with legitimacy by the superiors who put their trust in them. In this context, adherents of the ideology of neo-conservatism, both within and outside of the administration, were particularly key.

Leo Strauss, one of the early figures crucial to the development of neoconservative ideology, is a subject of particular interest for observers of ideological influences in the Bush administration. A professor of political philosophy at the University of Chicago during the Cold War, he taught courses taken by former Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, who is best known for having provided the theoretical framework and rationale for decision-making in the invasion of Iraq. The implications of Strauss's ideas for America demanded a leader with strong convictions who would not be afraid to break convention to combat tyranny, even in the face of

international opposition; a distrust of participation in international organizations is implicit here. Communism was reviled because “it was tyranny and inherently evil,” and indeed it was the opposition to Communism that constituted the first real rallying cause of neo-conservatism.⁸ The tenets of the doctrine are of direct interest to understanding the foreign policy of the Bush administration, but in the process of defining and studying manifestations of the ideology, many scholars and experts have missed an important point.

The extent to which the basic ideas of neoconservatism stand in accord with the political ideology of conservative evangelicals is striking. The Christian Church, particularly that of the Catholics, is known for its hostility to Communism, but the militantly anti-communist nature of evangelicals during the Cold War and its influence upon US foreign policy is even more important. In urging steadfastness in the Vietnam War, the National Association of Evangelicals released a resolution in 1966 that “object[ed] to any action by our government that would weaken the security of the non-communist nations of the world.”⁹ After the fall of the Soviet Union and the unequivocal dominance of the US in global politics, both neoconservatives as religious factions were forced to focus their efforts elsewhere, such as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and global human rights, respectively. In the post-9/11 world, however, terrorism suddenly became the new communism. Part of the triumvirate forming Bush’s “axis of evil,” Iraq was depicted as a breeding ground for terrorism, and from there the support of both neoconservatives and evangelicals for an invasion came naturally. The President, has not failed to notice and make this connection. “The President’s linkage of freedom and liberty with divine wishes is indicative of

⁸ James Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans*. (New York: Viking, 2004), p. 25-28.

⁹ Ronald J. Sider, and Diane Knippas, *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy political strategies for the health of the nation*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2005), p. 46.

how central an evangelical worldview is to his conception of the US's role in the post 9/11 world.”¹⁰

The opposition of neoconservatives towards international organizations also finds a parallel with evangelicals. While the Left Behind series in which the Secretary General of the UN is depicted as the anti-Christ is a work of fiction, the animosity of American evangelicals to international organizations is very real. The UN has been a target of suspicion since its founding. There was strong opposition to Eleanor Roosevelt's draft of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which she presented as the first US delegate to the UN. In a State Department-sponsored international conference on human rights, the president of the National Association of Evangelicals, Stephen W. Paine, condemned its social and economic proposals as socialist and further disagreed with the idea of “inherent dignity and inalienable rights.” He declared, “Founders of the nation started, not with certain rights inherent in man, but described man's rights as given by God.”¹¹

A final major point on which the neoconservatives and evangelicals are in strong accord is American exceptionalism. The concept is not actually absent from Strauss's teachings, and in fact he is often interpreted as having been a strong supporter of America's liberal democracy; at the same time Strauss is noted for his lack of commentary on contemporary politics.¹² In contrast, today's Straussians and modern neoconservatives have made America a far more central aspect of their ideology. From a religious perspective, the idea of America as “God's chosen nation” is deeply embedded in American tradition, with the concept of the US's “manifest destiny” gaining particular currency during the mid-19th century. “The history of American civic religion is a

¹⁰ Kevin Phillips, *American Theocracy: The Peril and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century*, (New York: Viking, 2006), p. 207.

¹¹ Sider, and Knippas, *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy*, p. 39.

¹² Catherine and Michael Zuckert, *The Truth about Leo Strauss*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), p.2.

history of the conviction that the American people are God's New Israel, his newly chosen people. The belief that America has been elected by God for a special destiny in the world... has passed into the realm of motivational myths."¹³ There is strong support among American Protestants, particularly evangelicals, for such a notion of America's role in the world. This fusion of the civic and theological aspects of religion in America has also become one of the central tenets of the political ideology of neoconservatives as well. During the mid-1990s, in an article published in the magazine *Foreign Affairs*, neoconservative stalwarts William Kristol and Robert Kagan declared "American foreign policy should be informed with a clear moral purpose, based on the understanding that its moral goals and its fundamental national interests are almost always in harmony."¹⁴ There is some level of disagreement within the neoconservative community as to whether this is actually a universal tenet of the doctrine,¹⁵ but with respect to the ideology embodied by the Bush administration, this is the prevailing notion. The President's remarks at the 2004 Republican National Convention demonstrate as much: "The story of America is the story of expanding liberty: an ever-widening circle, constantly growing to reach further and include more. Our nation's founding commitment is still our deepest commitment: In our world, and here at home, we will extend the frontiers of freedom."¹⁶

Meanwhile, several of America's strongest Western allies on the other side of the Atlantic are becoming increasingly alienated by the uniquely aggressive and self-aggrandizing nature of American foreign policy under the Bush administration. France and Germany are the strongest critics of the Bush Doctrine, and have been especially vocal in condemning the invasion of Iraq

¹³ Phillips, *American Theocracy*, p. 129.

¹⁴ William, Kristol and Robert Kagan, "Toward a neo-Reaganite foreign policy," *Foreign Affairs*; 75, no. 4 (1996): pg. 27.

¹⁵ Francis Fukuyama, *America at the Crossroads: democracy, power, and the neoconservative legacy*. (New Haven : Yale University Press, 2006), p. 40.

¹⁶ "President's Remarks at the 2004 Republican National Convention," The White House, 2 September 2004, <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/09/20040902-2.html>> (25 March 2007).

and American policy in the Middle East. In France, then Foreign Minister and current Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin gained wide international acclaim in 2003 for his criticism of the US proposal to invade Iraq. "To those who choose to use force and think they can resolve the world's complex problems through swift and preventive action, we argue the need for determined action over time. For today, to ensure our security, we have to take account of the multiplicity of the many crises and their many facets, including their cultural and religious dimensions."¹⁷ Germany's former chancellor, Gerhard Schroeder, had declared opposition to the US position in Iraq in 2002, before Bush NSS had even been declared, because support for invasion would "amount to submission to US policy goals."¹⁸

Beyond the threat that states may feel to their own relative level of power, which would logically ensue in the face of aggressive political machinations by the reigning superpower, there is anxiety over the strong perception that religion could be a key factor influencing American foreign policy decisions under the Bush administration. In his recently published memoirs, Decision: My Life in Politics, Chancellor Schroeder describes the unease that he felt about Bush's blatant blending of religious faith with his political goals: "'In our conversations, it was constantly clear just how much this president considered himself 'God-fearing' and indeed saw God as his ultimate authority.'" Schroeder assures his readers that he has no problem with religion or the religious. "But the problem ... begins when the impression is created that political decisions are a result of this conversation with God."¹⁹ In a similar vein, Jacques Delors, a French politician who served two terms as the president of the European Commission, predicts that the

¹⁷ "Speech by M. Dominique de Villepin, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the United Nations Security Council, New York 19.03.2003," France in the United Kingdom, <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/article.php3?id_article=4917> (25 March 2007).

¹⁸ Mary Buckley and Robert Singh, Eds. *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism: Global Responses, Global Consequences*. (New York: Routledge, 2006): p. 33.

¹⁹ "Schroeder on US President Bush: 'Almost Biblical Semantics,'" Spiegel Online International, 25 October 2006 <<http://www.spiegel.de/international/0,1518,444751,00.html>> (3 December 2006).

“clash between those who believe [in religion] and those who don’t believe will be a dominant aspect of relations [between the US and Europe] in the coming years.”²⁰

Scholars of international relations, who tend to take more of a pragmatic, realist perspective, have been giving increasing credence to the notion that ideology, particularly that of neoconservatism, may in fact be having a formative influence upon the foreign policy of the Bush administration. G. John Ikenberry captures the belief of many when he says that “a set of hard-line, fundamentalist ideas have taken Washington by storm and provided the intellectual rationale for a radical post-11 September reorientation of American foreign policy,”²¹ Observers of domestic politics have noted the rise in influence in recent decades of religious conservatives upon government, and authorities on American foreign relations have noted the increasing encroachment of religion in the field of foreign policy as well. But few have made the connection between the two, and even when the Christian influence is recognized, its significance tends to be downplayed. Chancellor Schroeder has made the connection most astutely: "In my opinion, the demonizing of George W. Bush tends to divert attention from the need to critically examine a political alliance in the United States that I consider problematic for the world and America: the alliance between neoconservative intellectuals and Christian fundamentalists, which had and still has a great deal of influence over the policies of the United States and its president."²² The fact that it is a foreign leader who seems to be closest so far in recognizing this dynamic is telling in itself, and international perceptions of religion’s imprint in the public policy of the US could have significant ramifications for the future nature of alliances.

²⁰ Phillips, *American Theocracy*, p. 210.

²¹ G. John Ikenberry, “The End of the Neoconservative Moment,” *Survival*, 46 No. 1 (2004), Abstract.

²² “Schroder on US President Bush: ‘Almost Biblical Semantics,’” *Spiegel Online International*, 25 October 2006 < <http://www.spiegel.de/international/0,1518,444751,00.html>> (3 December 2006).

The purpose of this thesis is to intensively examine the range of different influences upon the foreign policy of the Bush administration, with a focus upon the neoconservatives and conservative evangelicals, to further strengthen and point to the connection and harmony between them. To do so, I will be studying the rhetoric and character of the President himself, and I plan to identify the range of ideologies that have had the greatest impact upon his policy-making style. Christian conservatives as a political force will be scrutinized in detail, and the development during the Cold War and recent resurgence of neoconservatism will be examined as well. I will also consider and critique an alternative argument by John Lewis Gaddis, who has explicated a completely different rationale for the Bush Doctrine on the basis of realist motivations and goals. The reactions of five Western European nations to America since the announcement of the Bush Doctrine will be examined as well. In order to provide an explanatory basis for why each country reacted in its particular way, the principles and development of the foreign policy orientation of each will be considered. An additional point of interest will be the electoral results in different countries, which in some cases resulted in a change of the direction of government support for America. Finally, the religiosity of the European governments, both with regard to individual leaders as well as official government policy on religion will be discussed in an analysis of how the contrast with the Bush administration may have affected relations. Any opinions or comments that may have been expressed regarding the strong presence of faith in the Bush White House and policy will be of particular interest.

CHAPTER 1: AN IDEOLOGICALLY DRIVEN ADMINISTRATION

President George W. Bush

Throughout the presidency of Mr. Bush, and particularly during his second term, the extent to which his administration has been criticized for its disregard for reality is noteworthy. Last year, the American Dialect Society voted "truthiness," a term coined by comedian Stephen Colbert of the satirical news program "The Colbert Report," the word of the year. Far more important than the emergence of an expression through ironic political commentary, however, are the statements from within the administration itself that seem to fully corroborate such claims. An aide to Mr. Bush summed up the administration's philosophy when he told reporter Ron Suskind "we're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality." Numerous political commentators and analysts, as varied as columnist Frank Rich of the *New York Times*²³ and the politically active multimillionaire George Soros²⁴, contend that the extent to which the facts have been manipulated by the Bush administration is serious cause for alarm. The factor allowing for the perpetuation of such an approach appears to be the prominence of ideological thinking within the administration. "Ideology is a lot easier [than the facts] because you don't have to know anything or search for anything. You already know the answer to everything. It's not penetrable by facts."²⁵

While political ideologies have frequently providing guiding principles for decision-making in politics, one of the dominant ideologies within the Bush administration is a religious one: American Protestant evangelicalism. To a certain extent, every president throughout US

²³ Frank Rich, "The Jerry Bruckheimer White House," *New York Times*, 11 May 2003, Section 2, p.1.

²⁴ George Soros, "Why I Have Campaigned Across America to Put John Kerry in the White House," *The Independent (London)*, 2 November 2004, p. 29.

²⁵ Esther Kaplan, *With God on Their Side: George W. Bush and the Christian Right*, (New York: New Press, 2005): p.12.

history has invoked God and Christian principles to justify certain policies or to exalt America as a blessed nation. The related concept of America's messianic role in the world also has a long history; Thomas Jefferson, third US president, legitimized expansionist inclinations when he declared the mission of the US to be the creation of "an empire of liberty." The US's "manifest destiny" was defined by Jacksonian Democrats as consisting of the conversion of the "savages" to Christianity for the establishment of a Christian civilization. While this idea was originally used to justify the westward expansion of US territory, it was later reincarnated by such presidents as Theodore Roosevelt and William McKinley to justify imperialistic foreign policy as well. In the 20th century, President Woodrow Wilson declared that it was America's God-given mission to expand democracy throughout the nations of the world,²⁶ a refrain that will sound familiar to ears accustomed to similar proclamations by the Bush administration. However, there are a number of factors distinguishing the current presidency from all those prior with respect to religion.

The relative level of political power that Christian conservatives hold under the current administration is unprecedented in US history, and the single most important reason for that is the President himself. A number of US presidents have been born-again Christians, such as Jimmy Carter and going further back, Harry Truman, but few have been quite as vocal about the role that faith has played in their lives as Mr. Bush. He made the story of his personal conversion a major theme during his 2000 presidential campaign, detailing how his discovery of evangelical Christianity during a troubled period in his life ultimately "saved" him. While it is impossible to verify the sincerity of his personal religiosity, its presence in his political rhetoric is unmistakable, and the pervasiveness of evangelical Christianity within his administration is reflected by such activity as prayer-led Cabinet meetings and the sharp increase in government support of religious

²⁶ John B. Judis, "The Chosen Nation: The Influence of Religion on U.S. Foreign Policy," Policy Brief, The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/PB37.judis.FINAL.pdf>.> (18 December 2006).

interests.²⁷ Bush's religious devotion is additionally vouched for by a number of White House aides; more interestingly, they attest to its influence on his governing style. Former Commerce Secretary Don Evans describes the President's faith as giving him "a very clear sense of what is good and what is evil,"²⁸ an observation that is backed by the President's own frequently Manichean discourse. "My administration has a job to do and we're going to do it. We will rid the world of the evil-doers."²⁹

Many have voiced skepticism as to the actual reach of the religious influence within the Bush administration,³⁰ but whether rhetorical or genuine, there is reason to believe that evangelical Christians are indeed a pivotal force. The power of a president's words should not be underestimated, as they are instrumental to his operational capacity and what political historian Richard Neustadt termed "the power to persuade." Neustadt holds that while the presidential office in itself confers a certain level of authority and prestige, the personal political strength of individual presidents is largely shaped by their discourse. The "God talk" articulated by Bush is such that it has taken the place of substantive dialogue, and especially following the September 11 attacks, the use of religious rhetoric to characterize enemies of America as "evil" has become a common theme. Political goals like the spread of democracy are justified in religious terms, and the conventional wisdom conveyed through government channels essentially equates patriotism with religious faith.³¹

²⁷ Susan Jacoby, *Freethinkers: A History of American Secularism*, (Farmingdale: Owl Books, 2004): p. 8.

²⁸ i Lawrence Davidson, "Christian Zionism as a Representation of American Manifest Destiny," *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies*, 14, no. 2 (2005), p. 168.

²⁹ Manuel Perez-Rivas, "Bush vows to rid the world of 'evil-doers,'" CNN.com, 16 September 2001, <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/US/09/16/gen.bush.terrorism/> (15 December 2006).

³⁰ Jonathan Freedland, "Big Business, Not Religion, is the Real Power in the White House," *The Guardian*, 7 June 2006, <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/Columnists/Column/0,,1791826,00.html>> (20 December 2006).

³¹ Colleen E. Kelley, "With God on his Side: Deconstructing the post-9/11 discourse of President George W. Bush," Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian and New Zealand Communication Association, Christchurch New Zealand, 4-7 July 2005, <<http://www.mang.canterbury.ac.nz/ANZCA/FullPapers/01PeaceCommKelleyFINAL.pdf>> (23 October 2006).

Beyond Mr. Bush himself, a number of other officials within the government, including former Attorney General John Ashcroft and Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence General William G. Boykin, have reflected similar Christian evangelical worldviews. In 2002, Ashcroft declared terrorism to be “a conflict between those who believe that God grants us choice and those who seek to impose their choices on us... It is a conflict between good and evil.”³² Likewise, Boykin has declared, “The enemy is not a physical enemy...[it] is a spiritual enemy. It’s called the principality of darkness.”³³ It is not difficult to imagine that the religious inclinations of such figures could have factored significantly in the decisions to make them a part of the Bush White House.

The political capital that the President was successfully able to build using religion as a vehicle is a considerable component of his popular appeal, and he has made full use of its promise in seeking to create support for his policy decisions. The apocalyptic tone set by the September 11 attacks made religious rhetoric particularly appropriate, and the extensive popularity he enjoyed in the aftermath, as well as the enduring support of the evangelical Christian base, established his electoral appeal. Further, his reliance on similarly-minded sources from administration aides to prominent right-wing think tanks strongly enhance the credibility of his policies, and having a stamp of approval from prominent Christian Right leaders did not hurt either.³⁴ The centrality of a religious influence to the ideology and policy-making apparatus of the administration is vital to a deeper understanding of the administration, but in order to understand how it is possible for religion to have attained such a level of importance beyond the president himself, it is necessary to take a look at the movement itself.

³² Kaplan, *With God on their Side* p. 19.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

³⁴ Phillips, *American Theocracy*, p. 235.

The Christian Right

*Development of the movement

The Christian Right is one of the earliest interest groups to have formed in the history of the United States. Although it has historically been a significant influence upon government policy, the level of sophistication and organization that it has attained, in the past several decades has marked its evolution from a relatively passive into a strongly activist outfit. The contemporary American evangelical movement underwent a major evolution during the 20th century, in part as a rebellion against itself. Fomenters of change decried the “rigidity, separatism and anti-intellectualism of fundamentalism [that characterized] early 20th century American religion.”³⁵ The most significant problem caused by this orientation was that it divorced religious Christians from involvement in civic politics, and some Christian leaders acted to alter this state of affairs.

Organizations such as the National Association of Evangelicals began to be formed in the 1940s, providing a voice for as well as helping to shape the views of Protestant Christians on a variety of civic issues. Morality and religious principle was used to guide opinions on topics ranging from Native American affairs and public schools to Communism and statism/fascism. The perceived evils were liberalism, the Social Gospel, Communism, and “general worldliness in lifestyle and morals.”³⁶ A series of political developments and culture forces that arose in the mid-20th century served to rally especially passionate activity among religious political activists. Supreme Court decisions legalizing abortion and outlawing school prayer were in direct violation of Christian values, and spurred strong antipathy to the political left and its liberal values. The increasing national discontent towards the Vietnam War, which many Christians saw as a reflection of a weakening of American values in the face of Communism, was another cause of

³⁵ Sider and Knippas, *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy*, p.118.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

consternation. Their support for the continuation of the War led them to champion the cause of the military, and a number of Republican Party activists, who were troubled by the decline of the Party during the 1960s and 1970s, realized that the conservative Christian community could potentially be an ideal political resource.

The leaders of what is known as the “New Right” movement, including Paul Weyrich, Richard Viguerie, Howard Phillips and Edward A. McAteer, recruited fundamentalist and evangelical preachers in what they cast as a drive against the encroachment of big government on traditional moral and economic values (Le Beau). They worked with fundamentalist Reverend Jerry Falwell and founded the group Moral Majority in 1979. Suddenly, old-time religion was becoming the new “counterculture” against the liberal values of the day, and Falwell declared its key tenets to be “pro-life, pro-family, pro-moral, pro-American.”³⁷ There is a strong emphasis on individual freedom and responsibility, the religious root of which is that the individual may be impeded from pursuing his/her salvation in the presence of an invasive government influence. This strain of thought also supports the notion that social ills are the result not of economic deprivation or inequality but of the collective sin of individuals. Therefore, traditional values and religion are posited as the solution, leading the individual away from a life of sin towards one of faith and prosperity; government programs of social welfare and regulation are seen as converse to, and even obstructive of, the amelioration of society.³⁸

* *Success: Why and how*

The remarkably maneuvered connections between the grass roots Christian conservative movement and professional political activists and politicians comprise a crucial component of the movement’s success. The preachers recruited by the New Right leaders were charged with the

³⁷ Andrew J. Bacevich, *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006): p. 127.

³⁸ Kaplan, *With God on their Side*, p.39-41.

responsibility of political advocacy to encourage their followers to support initiatives of the Republican Party, and Christian lobbying groups like Falwell's Moral Majority and the Christian Coalition of televangelist Pat Robertson became increasingly influential. They promoted their political causes through media such as radio, television, and especially through direct mail. The Moral Majority was terminated by the end of the 1980s, and though the Christian Coalition continues to exist, its influence today is much reduced from its heyday during which time it was directed by Ralph Reed, who was dubbed a "political whiz kid" at the time.³⁹ Other lobbying groups have appeared to fill in the vacuum, however, with Focus on the Family and the Family Research Council viewed by experts as the most powerful today. Both of these groups were founded by Dr. James Dobson, who is widely considered to be the most powerful current leader of the Christian movement. The influence of the Family Research Council in particular is tied to the perception that it is one of the more substantive of the Christian Right groups, thus giving it greater standing and a more credible bargaining position when it seeks to lobby the members of Congress.⁴⁰

While many such Christian lobbying groups have had made their mark on the electoral front, it is the groups of substance, the think tanks and advocacy groups, that have been of greater relevance in policy-making. The American Enterprise Institute is the oldest and most influential of the current crop of conservative think tanks. Originally founded as a business group in 1943, it has expanded to research and provide counsel for many major areas of government policy, including economic, social and foreign issues.⁴¹ As a tax-exempt, officially nonpartisan educational organization, the American Enterprise Institute is occluded from any actual advocacy

³⁹ "The Two Faces of the Christian Coalition." People for the American Way, <<http://www.electricescape.net/rr/two-faces?PHPSESSID=0c50324b54654efdcf978ded02d19236>> (17 December 2006).

⁴⁰ Sharon Keys of People for the American Way, interview with author, Washington, D.C. 20 March 2006.

⁴¹ "AEI's Organization and Purposes," American Enterprise Institute, <<http://www.aei.org/about/filter.all/default.asp>>30 December 2006.

or lobbying activity. However, it has been a major source of policy proposals for President Bush, cited by many as one of the “leading voices” on the Iraq policy, and several former scholars are actually within his administration.⁴²

On the other hand, the Heritage Foundation, founded in 1973 by New Right leader Paul Weyrich, is characterized by a much more patently partisan agenda.⁴³ Unlike the American Enterprise Institute, which can only present official research findings, the Heritage Foundation aggressively seeks to impact legislative decisions in the name of conservative causes.

Domestically, the group seeks to dismantle social welfare programs, with strong support for the philosophy of “compassionate conservatism” as advocated by Marvin Olansky and a drive for an America governed by religious values. On foreign policy, hard right Christian conservatives have argued for a strongly aggressive defense, and the use of American power to redraw the geopolitical landscape with Washington in charge is a major goal.⁴⁴ The movement away from the anti-intellectualism of previous generations of fundamentalists has strengthened the influence and effectiveness of the Christian Right; this development is being used as a model to secure the power of future generations of Christians.

In fostering a higher level of intellectualism to increase status and legitimacy, Christian universities may be the most important resource of the Christian Right. Christian gurus like Falwell and Robertson have established universities for the educational and social advancement of conservative Christians. Some schools, like Patrick Henry College of Purcellville, Virginia, draw a direct connection between politics and religion, with the mission “to prepare Christian men and women who will lead our nation and shape our culture with timeless biblical

⁴² Kaplan, *With God on their Side*, p.64.

⁴³ Andrew Rich, *Think Tanks, Public Policy and the Politics of Expertise*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005): p.53.

⁴⁴ Eric Laurent, *Bush's Secret World*, (Williston: Polity Press, 2004): p. 3.

values and fidelity to the spirit of the American founding.”⁴⁵ The economic advances that conservative Christians have made through the greater emphasis on education have enabled a literal realization of this goal. The old adage that “money is power” seems to be very much confirmed by the increased political power of Christians, as the income levels of modern evangelicals, higher than they were in the past, are without a doubt tied to the higher emphasis now placed upon education.⁴⁶

**Tying theology to politics*

Evangelical Christians are a diverse group; the subcategory of interest here comprises the religio-conservative wing of the Republican Party. There are varying estimates of the demographics of voters who are associated with the Christian Right today, with reports by Gallup indicating that 41% of Americans consider themselves to be born-again Christians, while evangelist leaders estimate that only 8% of voters are true Christian evangelicals, those who are associated with the extreme religious wing of the right. It is safe to say, however, that the Republican Party has definitely moved further to the right, especially on religious and social issues, and as for the Bush administration itself, experts avow that while the faction may not be dominant, it is hardly insignificant and should be noted.⁴⁷

The apocalyptic pre-millennialism espoused by this group has its roots in the teachings of John Nelson Darby, a 19th century evangelist of Great Britain who made several missionary journeys to North America in the 1860s and 1870s.⁴⁸ He first articulated the rapture theory in which the second coming of Christ will bring about the rapturing of true Christians into heaven,

⁴⁵ “Statement of Mission and Vision,” Patrick Henry College, < <http://www.phc.edu/about/mission.asp>>, (18 December 2006).

⁴⁶ John Geoffrey Turner, (2005), “Selling Jesus to Modern America: Campus Crusade for Christ, Evangelical Culture, and Conservative Politics,” University of Notre Dame Electronic Theses and Dissertations, <<http://etd.nd.edu/ETD-db/theses/available/etd-09122005-095241/>> (25 March 2007).

⁴⁷ Jean Liberman, *Démythifier l’universalité des valeurs américaines*, (Lyon : Parangon/Vs, 2004) : p.135.

⁴⁸ *Ibid*, p.252.

while non-believers would be doomed, though the exact nature of what that doom might consist of is debated.

While the *Left Behind* books are technically fictional, the two signs that are cited as marking the “End Times” are in fact among the divine truths that conservative evangelicals believe they have recognized through revelation.⁴⁹ The first sign is the return of the Jewish people to the Holy lands, which seems to be satisfied by the Jewish state of Israel, and the second lies in the destruction and rebuilding of the sinful Biblical city of Babylon. Coincidentally the geographic location of the ancient city places it in the area of modern-day Iraq. Apocalyptic Christianity therefore is effective as a theological treatise and also lends itself well to the political goals of its believers.

The ascendant power of Christian conservatives during the Cold War was highlighted by the political positions that they staked on a number of conditions and events, most notably that of Communism. Some evangelicals identified Soviet Russia as the Antichrist and they opposed recognition of the Communist government of China. Their support for American involvement in Vietnam was steadfast even as mainstream denominations began to doubt the morality of the war. The deviation from what had previously been more pacifist inclinations held by the devout underscores the evolution of the principles of the “just war theory.” The evangelical values of Biblical inerrancy and personal conversion were paired with a religious sense of patriotism to make the Christian criticism of Communism and the defense of the American “way of life” especially passionate.⁵⁰ Reverend Jerry Falwell described soldiers fighting in Vietnam as “champions for Christ,” and in the wake of the Vietnam War evangelical writer John Price

⁴⁹ Kaplan, *With God on Their Side*, p. 31.

⁵⁰ Bacevich, *The New American Militarism*, p. 125.

warned, “When we forgot God, we lost our national strength. If we refuse to repent we may lose our freedom.”⁵¹

The inclination towards taking the offensive in the name of being defensive was crucially linked to the inspiration that Christians drew from the example of Israel. Thus arises the religious justification for preventive action/war; for the sake of its very survival, Israel is forced to take a resolutely aggressive policy against its enemies. The kinship that American evangelicals feel with the Israelis, which rests on the belief that both groups are privileged peoples of God, cast an aura of righteousness upon the military aggression of both; the crusade theory of warfare took precedence over the just war tradition. In an assessment of US policy under the Bush administration, international relations expert Andrew J. Bacevich notes, “Christian conservatives were merely a little ahead of their time [in their advocacy of preventive war.]”⁵²

The fall of the Soviet Union and the conclusion of the Cold War created a vacuum for the politically active evangelicals in terms of a rallying political cause. Some found a calling in the international human rights cause; in 1984 the National Association of Evangelicals had launched the Peace, Freedom and Security Studies program to link efforts for peace with advances in human rights worldwide.⁵³ The problems of developing countries were given greater emphasis, but this hardly diminished the importance of the military. Defense concerns remained paramount, and soldiers were held in high moral regard for what evangelicals viewed as their self-sacrificing defense of American values.⁵⁴ American society as a whole was viewed as falling prey to moral decay, and the soldiers provided a righteous example for the citizenry to follow.

⁵¹ Ibid, p.127-129.

⁵² Ibid, p.132.

⁵³ Sider, and Knippas, *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy*, p.53.

⁵⁴ Bacevich, *The New American Militarism*. 123.

To a steadily increasing extent, when Communism fell from what was viewed as the prime threat to America and global democracy, Islam seemed to naturally take its place. During the 1980s, former Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein was an ally of the American government against Iran, but with his invasion of Kuwait in 1991, he symbolically assumed the role of the Antichrist and Iraq itself became the modern incarnation of sinful Babylon.⁵⁵ Although Hussein was a secular ruler, radical Islam was cast as the major threat to American power and, by extension, to the global forces of good. Different approaches to dealing with the “problem” of Islam were posed, with the Christian Right at times demonizing the religion itself. Diplomatic correctness of course mandated that religious rhetoric be kept out of the official political discourse.

Reduction of the Islamic threat was conflated with the other major evangelical goal of human rights advancement, a trend particularly exemplified in the reorganization of the Southern Baptists’ International Missions Board in order to focus on Islamic populations.⁵⁶ In the particular case of Iraq, aid to the Iraqis was tied to Christian evangelism, an effort encouraged by President Bush. The French newspaper *Le Monde* reported that even before Hussein had been toppled from power, American missionaries were ready at the gates of Iraq to “provide help both material and spiritual” once he was deposed.⁵⁷ The President has refused to censure Christian Right leaders for inflammatory remarks about Islam, and cites the Prophet Isaiah’s commandment of evangelism to merge the twin goals of spreading both democracy and Christianity.⁵⁸

The Bush administration and the Christian Right are a perfect partnership, as each reinforces and furthers the goals of the other. As demonstrated, the Bush administration’s positions on the Middle East, with its staunch support for Israel and its implicit deprecation of

⁵⁵ Phillips, *American Theocracy*, p.251.

⁵⁶ Kaplan, *With God on their Side*, p.12.

⁵⁷ Laurent, *Bush’s Secret World*, p. 65.

⁵⁸ Kaplan, *With God on their Side*, p.14.

Islam, at least in its radical form, through the War on Terror align perfectly with the religious worldview of evangelicals. An official measure of support for internationalist measures among evangelicals seemed to be in force as when President George H.W. Bush led an international coalition in the first Gulf War, and also in their support for international human rights.⁵⁹ Yet the decision of the elder President Bush in using the UN and other international bodies to invade Iraq was largely met with alarm in the evangelical camp. The debate on internationalism among evangelicals is very much skewed towards an interpretation of the US as leader of nations rather than as their equal partner. The unilateralist policy taken by the current president is therefore regarded with greater approval and support.⁶⁰

The intense feelings of patriotism and messianism about the US's global role create a sense of superiority that preclude the capacity for true internationalism.⁶¹ Support for a cooperative multilateral institution seems to be ruled out by interpretations of some Biblical passages that suggest the presence of a satanic one-world government in the End Times.⁶² In summary, the Bush administration exemplifies perfectly the modern power of politically active Christian conservatives, both through their electoral significance as well as by the fact that the President himself seems to be both a member of as well as a conduit for the interests of the Christian Right

Neoconservatism

The ideology of neoconservatism was born during the years of the Cold War. While Leo Strauss is credited as the founder of the movement, there is much dispute within the scholarly community about whether current bearers of his legacy can accurately be called Straussian. Born

⁵⁹ Sider and Knippas, *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy*, p.54.

⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 33.

⁶¹ Anatol Lievin, *America: Right of Wrong*, (New York: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd, 2004): p.63.

⁶² Kaplan, *With God on their Side*, p.31.

in rural Germany in 1899, it is inevitable that his thought would be influenced by the events surrounding World War II. Scholars like Shadia Drury, who tend to take an extremist view of the Straussian influence, opine that the weak Weimar Republic that gave way to Nazism was the basis for his ideas regarding liberal democracy.⁶³ He was therefore charged with favoring an authoritarian government of elites who needed to tell “[noble lies] in order to keep the ignorant masses in line.”⁶⁴ Such a notion follows from Strauss’s scholarship of ancient philosophers and his particular admiration of Plato and his ideas of “philosopher kings;” yet the claim that he was hostile to democratic principles does not accord with his own writings and opinions. When comparing the American system against its polar opposite represented by the Soviet Union, Strauss unequivocally declared, “the superiority of liberal democracy to communism is...obvious enough.”⁶⁵ His problem was more with the reductionist approach of modernity and its influence upon American politics. Strauss’s discussion of modernity posited that it had developed in a succession of three waves, consecutively engendering liberal democracy, communism and finally fascism. The first is the one that concerns America; as Strauss saw it, the modernistic lens of relativism diminishes “the moral and political problem to a technical problem,”⁶⁶ and is thus the root of the problem.

According to Strauss, communism was the product of the second wave of modernity. Conceptually, the idea of a universal morality was reduced even further as its originators, which include 19th century philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau, attributed humanity and its virtues not to nature but to the process of history. The nihilism implied here denies human beings access to a

⁶³ Shadia B. Drury, “Saving America: Leo Strauss and the neoconservatives,” Evatt Foundation, <<http://evatt.labor.net.au/publications/papers/112.html>> (24 March 2007).

⁶⁴ “Philosophers and Kings,” *Economist*, 19 June 2003, p.1.

⁶⁵ Leo Strauss, “The Three Waves of Modernity,” in *An Introduction to Political Philosophy: 10 Essays* by Leo Strauss, ed. Hilail Gilden, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), p. 98.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, p.89.

universal truth and intrinsic morality;⁶⁷ such was the basis for Strauss's criticism of the contemporary reality of Communist Russia. Within its proposed utopian project, he saw reflections of the flaws and idealism of liberal democracy. Although he placed emphasis on the character and enlightenment individual leaders, he held that the style of a regime was crucial to the character of a nation.⁶⁸

As regards state behavior, a belief that has had especial impact upon the current political practitioners who were students of his teachings is that authoritarian regimes operate in a fundamentally different manner than democratic ones. Democratic societies are more open and transparent than autocratic ones for the reason that the survival of an authoritarian regime is largely dependent upon secrecy of government activity. Therefore, spies and intelligence gathering are critical for the security of democratic societies. The vital need for awareness of the activities going on in the societies and governments of potentially hostile rivals make it especially foolish to trust the official government releases.⁶⁹ Strauss himself did not for the most part articulate such ideas, as his philosophic notions were generally of a more abstract nature; it was through the expansion of his principles, in some cases by certain of his students, that the notions developed. Allan Bloom, a prominent neoconservative scholar who was a student of Strauss is particular associated with these ideas; for other adherents, however, there is little or no connection to Strauss. , Their manifestation in contemporary politics and within the Bush administration therefore cannot be wholly attributed to Strauss himself, and it is necessary to consider the other influences to enable a robust understanding.

Though Strauss's political philosophy is often credited as the source of neoconservatism, there have been other philosophical schools that have contributed to its contemporary form. The

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans*, p. 25.

⁶⁹ Ibid, p.28.

“New York Intellectuals,” comprised of such figures as Irving Kristol. Kristol is particularly important, if not completely indispensable, to the development of neoconservatism as it is manifested today. Considered to be the “godfather” of the ideology,⁷⁰ he literally wrote its autobiography, in which he attributes much credit to Strauss in the course of developing his own political philosophy.⁷¹ His son William went on to actually become a student of Strauss. Yet while Strauss may have served as a source of inspiration, it is important to emphasize that the interpretations that the elder Kristol drew when addressing contemporary political issues are most fundamental to the practice of the philosophy, Kristol’s ideas developed in a different setting and are the fruit not only of his own thought but of an entire movement.

Political sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset describes the New York Intellectuals as “prominent intellectuals with roots in anti-Stalin left [who] were dismayed by the rise of influential New Left tendencies which they perceived as soft on Communism.”⁷² Though influenced by Straussian philosophy, the New York movement was distinguished by its direct application to the politics of the day. Like Strauss and his school of followers in Chicago, the New York school looked upon the repression in the Soviet Union with distaste. A key difference however was that many of the New York Intellectuals, Kristol included, were former Marxists and Trotskyists who were disillusioned when Communism in practice did not live up to its ideals. They channeled their strong anti-Communism into an aggressive pro-Americanism, viewing American interventions abroad as in the Vietnam War as “noble causes” taken in the defense of democracy.⁷³ They felt that it was America’s moral duty to lead the world and deliver it from anti-democratic evils; after the fall of Soviet Communism, it was thus of utmost importance to

⁷⁰ Anne Norton, *Leo Strauss and the Politics of Empire*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), p. 176.

⁷¹ Irving Kristol, *Neoconservatism: The Autobiography of an Idea*, (New York: The Free Press, 1995), p.6.

⁷² Rich, *Think Tanks, Public Policy and the Politics of Expertise*, p.51.

⁷³ Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans*, p. 53.

prevent the emergence of a new rival. For the sake of its own security and for global stability, it was necessary that America remain the sole superpower.⁷⁴

Critics of the notion that the foreign policy of the Bush administration has been taken over by a neoconservative cabal assert that the ideology is one whose place is more prominent in academia rather than in day-to-day politics. While it is true that several of the major neoconservative influences derive from the intellectualism of the Cold War era, several prominent administration officials, most notably Vice President Cheney and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, also have direct connections to the movement. While it cannot be known whether they are themselves neoconservatives in the ideological sense, the connections of their closest advisors to the movement cannot be overlooked. I have already noted the strong association of Deputy Defense Secretary Wolfowitz to neoconservatism and the school of Strauss. While a student of both Strauss and of his student Bloom, however, Wolfowitz attests that Albert Wohlsetter, another professor at the University of Chicago, was his “real teacher.”⁷⁵ With Wohlsetter there is less of an emphasis on abstract philosophy and more of a focus upon their real-world applications. Specifically, Wohlsetter’s interest was in military strategy, and the technique that he emphasized was to increase the targeting precision. With a lighter, faster and more mobile military force, US intervention would not only become easier, it would also be more likely. The resonance of this thinking with Rumsfeld’s own vision of revolutionizing the American military, a plan that resulted in disaster in the invasion of Iraq, is unmistakable.

The point to be drawn from this discussion of neoconservatism and its manifestation under the Bush administration is that it is erroneous to attribute the current ideology solely, or even principally, to Strauss, as has typically been the case in the media and other perpetrators of the

⁷⁴ George Packer, *The Assassin’s Gate: America in Iraq*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006) p. 13.

⁷⁵ Fukuyama, *America at the Crossroads*, p. 31.

Straussian legend.⁷⁶ Francis Fukuyama, a student of Bloom at Cornell University, was once a prominent intellectual flag bearer of neoconservatism. He has now disassociated himself from the movement, however, because he sees it as having moved too far away from its original ideas and principles; in particular, the over-emphasis on militarization as well as the weak exercise of the project of “benevolent hegemony” form the basis of his criticism. Fairly orthodox in the Straussianism of his views, Fukuyama is proof of the fact that neoconservatism today is not solely the brainchild of Straussian thought. In his book groundbreaking work *The End of History*, he posits a Marxist-style argument about social evolution that terminates in democracy. Admittedly, this was not a position directly declared by Strauss, yet the notion seems to be more in accord with his own teachings about the natural right of man (and therefore the natural inclination of humanity towards the freedom of a liberal democracy), than with the more historicist view articulated by Kristol. Fukuyama describes his argument as Leninist, a conception in which “history can be pushed along with the right application of power and will.”⁷⁷

It appears therefore, that the undeniable emphasis on social engineering and the conception of America’s “moral responsibility”⁷⁸ in the world makes the designation of Strauss as the progenitor of neoconservative foreign policy rather flawed. The most significant imprint of his legacy upon the Bush administration and the Bush Doctrine is the fact that so many individuals within the administration are associated with him, whether directly or indirectly. Clearly, his ideas have had an influence upon them all, but the product of their interpretations is an ideology all their own. Both on the basis of political motivation as well as the presence of additional

⁷⁶ Catherine and Michael Zuckert, *The Truth about Leo Strauss*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), p. 8.

⁷⁷ Francis Fukuyama, “After Neoconservatism,” *New York Times Magazine*, 19 February 2006.

⁷⁸ Kristol, *Neoconservatism*, p 91.

influences that have contributed to their manifestation, the neoconservative policies of the Bush administration are by nature significantly distinct from the ideas of Leo Strauss. CITE

Neoconservatives within the Bush administration

In 1992 then-Defense Secretary Cheney commissioned Wolfowitz, who was the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy at the time, to oversee the writing of the Defense Planning Guidance of 1992 in the aftermath of the first invasion of Iraq. One of the blunter points of the document was for the US “to remain the predominant outside power in the [Middle East] and to preserve US and Western access to the region’s oil.”⁷⁹ The main objective of the DPG however was to forge the post-Cold War political and military strategy of America, with language about American dominance, ad hoc coalitions and preemptive war to ward off the threat of unconventional weapons. One of the authors of the report, Abram Shulsky, further argued that the spread of democracy should be a cornerstone of American policy.⁸⁰ The other author of the report, Zalmay Khalilzad, currently the US ambassador to Iraq, had like Wolfowitz also been a student of Wohlsetter at the University of Chicago.

In a connection him to another figure who has recurred in the current administration, at the time of the writing of the DPG, Khalilzad was the assistant of I. Lewis Libby.⁸¹ As an undergraduate at Yale, Libby, now the former chief of staff to Vice President Cheney, was the pupil of Wolfowitz, a professor in the political science department. Wolfowitz apparently descried his student’s potential as a rising neoconservative and urged him to go to work for the Reagan administration, which he did. He was primarily involved in projects in the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, and as noted above, he continued working in government into the first

⁷⁹ Packer, *The Assassin’s Gate*, p. 22.

⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 15-17.

⁸¹ Paul Labarique, « Paul Wolfowitz, l’âme du Pentagone, » Réseau Voltaire, Édition Internationale, 4 October 2004, < <http://www.voltairenet.org/article15033.html> > (3 January 2007).

Bush administration, switching at that point to the Department of Defense. Libby's most notable early contribution in Washington, however, was his co-founding in 1997 of the Project for a New American Century foundation, a think tank that continues to champion neoconservative principles and American hegemony.⁸²

Libby, Wolfowitz, Cheney and Rumsfeld, among other Bush notables, at different points in time have all been linked to PNAC. It is interesting to note that a number of other notable influences to the foreign policy of the Bush administration also have connections to this organization. The intellectual founders of the group were William Kristol and Robert Kagan, both prominent neoconservative scholars and commentators. Elliot Abrams, Bush's Assistant Secretary of Middle Eastern Affairs, was a PNAC member noted for his assertion while working in the Reagan administration that America should seek to spread democracy in addition to containing Communism.⁸³ Richard Perle, who had personal links to Wolfowitz's mentor Wohlsetter, was another key member of the group who served as the Chairman of the Defense Advisory Board for the Bush administration. Abram Shulsky, a figure who has had a long career in intelligence and was one of the authors of the DPG, was a one-time Perle aide and consultant. The connections between all these individuals, among others, and the central roles that they played to the Iraq strategy of the Bush administration provide a strong argument for the significance of the neoconservative influence.

Yet the membership in PNAC of a figure far less directly involved in the policy-making of the Bush administration is resoundingly symbolic of the link between the neoconservatives and the Christian Right, the other faction with influence within the Bush administration. This appears to be an appropriate moment at which to discuss what I see as the critical alliance between the

⁸² "Libby: Lawyer, Adviser, Author," CBSNews.com, 28 October 2005, <<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2005/10/27/politics/main989970.shtml>> (4 January 2007).

⁸³ Buckley and Singh, *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism*, p. 15.

neoconservatives and evangelicals that has given the foreign policy of the Bush administration its philosophy, its force and its revolutionary character.

The critical alliance of evangelicals and neocons

Gary Bauer is the President of American Values, a nonprofit organization of the Christian Right that is "deeply committed to defending life, traditional marriage, and equipping our children with the values necessary to stand against liberal education and cultural forces."⁸⁴ He has also been associated with such major Christian Right groups as the Family Research Council, a conservative pro-family lobbying group based in Washington DC. More interestingly, Bauer's name has appeared on several letters and documents attributed to PNAC, alongside those of Wolfowitz, Perle and the rest of the neoconservative school, as well as their associates like Rumsfeld and Cheney.⁸⁵ The association of a major Christian Right activist with a think tank of eminent political scholars and practitioners is hardly surprising considering that one of the central tenets of PNAC is to champion the Israeli cause.

Perle, a major figure within PNAC, chaired the "Study Group on a New Israeli Strategy Toward 2000" within the Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies in 1996 to create an advisory report for then-Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The group was comprised of Americans with views strongly favoring Likud, Netanyahu's right-of-center political party, and it was here that the idea that Saddam Hussein's removal would benefit Israel became conventional wisdom. The report, "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm" asserted that Israel's security would best be secured by a realignment of forces in the Middle East, and within this context Iraq was seen as being of crucial importance.⁸⁶ The destabilization of Iraq was seen as instrumental to the shifting of forces that would ultimately result in greater stability

⁸⁴ "About Us," American Values, <http://ouramericanvalues.org> (5 January 2007).

⁸⁵ "Statement of Principles," Project for the New American Century, <<http://newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>> (5 January 2007).

⁸⁶ Packer, *The Assassin's Gate*, p. 30.

for the entire region. More significantly, the basis of Israel's troubles was believed to result from a perceived "confluence of interests" between the late Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and Hussein. According to this logic, Palestinian uprisings prevented Israel from dealing with Iraq, while Hussein benefited in his anti-Israel strategy from the divided attentions the Israeli government was forced to apply to the multiple problems. The supposed confirmation of this was that Arafat was allegedly most compliant "when he was isolated," most notably after the US devastated Iraq in the first Gulf War.⁸⁷ The pro-Israel stance that is ostensibly served by the deposition of the Iraqi dictator therefore is an initiative that appears to serve the purpose of both Christian Zionists and pro-Israel neoconservatives.

Zionism is indeed a key area of common ground for the Christian Right and Jewish neoconservatives. Considering the extent of their electoral punch, Christian Zionists are actually considered to have a greater impact than those who are Jewish. Doug Bandor, a senior fellow at Cato who considers himself an evangelical Christian, attests that American Zionism "colors the environment in which [foreign policy] decisions are made".⁸⁸ Beyond eschatology and Biblical initiatives, there is a longstanding basis for the connection between American Christian Zionism and the patriotism of American evangelicals. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Zionist Organization of America described the Jewish migrants to present-day Israel as modern versions of the American settlers. America's mission to protect Israel was considered to be a part of its manifest destiny, along with the goal of spreading American democracy and values all over the world.⁸⁹ Christian support for Israel tends to be more of a reflection of premillennialist thinking rather than

⁸⁷ Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans*, p. 322.

⁸⁸ Stephen Zunes, "The Influence of the Christian Right in U.S. Middle East Policy," *Middle East Policy*, 12 No. 2 (2005), p. 75.

⁸⁹ Davidson, "Christian Zionism as a Representation of American Manifest Destiny," p. 161.

philo-Semitism, but with regard to the alliance with neoconservatives, intentions are secondary if the overall goal is the same.

Yet the extent to which the US invasion of Iraq was a “war for Israel,” an argument made by numerous camps, is far from unambiguous, especially given the hardly pro-Semitic pre-millenarian thinking of some of its strongest proponents. While refusing to take an official stance, the NAE noted in 2003 “most evangelicals regard Saddam Hussein’s regime-by allegedly aiding and harboring terrorists-as already having attacked the US.”⁹⁰ In addition to support for the existence of Israel, the readiness among evangelicals to use military means to defend American interests has been noted. Polls indicated that the Israeli government and public also supported US action in 2003.⁹¹ The implication here is that the two were linked, even if indirectly, in the war in Iraq. Yet the “Clean Break” paper of 1996 paints a very different picture of the US-Israel relationship and the vision its future progression: “In recent years, Israel invited active U.S. intervention in Israel’s domestic and foreign policy...This strategy...was risky, expensive, and very costly for both the U.S. and Israel...Israel can make a clean break from the past and establish a new vision for the U.S.-Israeli partnership based on self-reliance, maturity and mutuality... [that Israel be] *self-reliant, [and] not need U.S. troops* in any capacity to defend it.”⁹²

Such an emphasis on an independent-acting Israel seems to diminish the probability that the invasion of Iraq was motivated out of US concern for its ally. While neoconservatives tend to be associated with support for Israel, it must not be forgotten that American power has historically been their top priority. The DPG of 1992 certainly reflects this latter principle far

⁹⁰ Bacevich, *The New American Militarism*, p. 145.

⁹¹ Prof. Ephraim Yaar and Dr. Tamar Hermann, “Peace Index / Most Israelis support the attack on Iraq,” *Haaretz Online*, 18 March 2003, <<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/ShArtWar.jhtml?itemNo=269674&contrassID=33&%20subContrassID=4&sbSubContrassID=0>> (5 January 2007).

⁹² Richard Perle, James Colbert, □ Charles Fairbanks, Jr., Douglas Feith, Robert Loewenberg, □ Jonathan Torop, David Wurmser, □ Meyrav Wurmser, “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm,” Study Group on “A New Israeli Strategy Toward 2000,” <<http://www.israeleconomy.org/strat1.htm>> (5 January 2007).

more accurately than the 1996 pro-Israel paper does. Even for Christian supporters of Israel, the importance of defending the Biblical Palestine relative to that of defending American interests and security is uncertain. In addition to commonalities on practical, tangible goals, evangelicals and neoconservatives share in common robust philosophic traditions. While retaining connections to its ancient roots the intellectualism of evangelicalism has become much more sophisticated over the past century. The similarities in the ideologies of the two groups provide one of the most compelling, and one of the least-examined, reasons for the sturdiness of this political alliance.

Perhaps the connection made by journalist George Packer best exemplifies the concurrence between the neoconservative and evangelical ideologies when he sums up the similar worldviews of the President “whose favorite philosopher was Jesus” and “Strauss-influenced” Wolfowitz. “They believed in the existence of evil, and they had messianic notions of what America should do about it.”⁹³ To further illustrate the connection, I will use the fictional portrayal of Allan Bloom, a prominent Straussian, made by one of his colleagues, Saul Bellow, in his novel *Ravelstein*. “He [(Bloom)] didn’t ask ‘Where will you spend eternity’ as religious the-end-is-near picketers did but rather ‘With what, in this modern democracy, will you meet the demands of your soul?’”⁹⁴ Wolfowitz is also worked into the story, complete with an accurate portrayal of his own idealistic beliefs.⁹⁵ Wolfowitz’s involvement in government began during the administration of Richard Nixon. He was repelled by the *realpolitick* dominating policy at the time under the influence of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, as he placed a greater emphasis on the morality of a regime rather than mere national interests or stability. The Iranian Revolution in particular epitomized the failure of a disinterested foreign policy for Wolfowitz, and it was around

⁹³ Packer, *Assassin’s Gate*, p. 45.

⁹⁴ Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans*, p. 24.

⁹⁵ Packer, *Assassin’s Gate*, p. 25.

this time that his involvement with Iraq first began.⁹⁶ In pressing for and in ultimately underwriting US policy in Iraq, the moral interest as he perceives it has always been his foremost priority.

One of the foremost tenets of America evangelical ideology is the necessity of freedom in order to fulfill one's God-given destiny. "Individuals simply cannot carry out their creation mandate if an all-powerful government makes all the decisions."⁹⁷ Within the Christian Right, the invasion of Iraq was justified for its stated intents of spreading liberty and freedom in the American style.⁹⁸ For neoconservatives, the importance of democracy and human rights was a major principle derived from Strauss's teachings during the Cold War, and more crucial still was the belief that American power can be used for moral purposes;⁹⁹ exactly the same notions are espoused by American evangelicals.

The single most notable point of convergence between neoconservatism and Christian evangelicalism, both in their uniquely American forms, is their conviction in the American Creed, and by extension their belief that America has a manifest destiny. "Manifest destiny" may not prevail in 21st century terminology, but the messianic notion of America as the world's liberator and savior is quite the same. Neoconservative ideology may be areligious, but in its emphasis on freedom and America's mission it hardly seems a stretch to consider it the secular twin of political evangelicalism. As Mark Lilla, a current professor at the University of Chicago wonders, "How these eschatological and Apocalyptic ideas about America's mission can exist in the same breast, without some effort at reconciliation, remains a mystery to anyone who glances at a neoconservative magazine today...[Neoconservative events in Washington consist of] older New

⁹⁶ Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans*, p. 76.

⁹⁷ Sider and Knippas, *Towards and Evangelical Public Policy*, p.188.

⁹⁸ Phillips, *American Theocracy*, p. 124.

⁹⁹ Fukuyama, *America at the Crossroads*, p.4.

York intellectuals, professors in exile from PC universities, economic visionaries, Teddy Roosevelt enthusiasts, home-schooling advocates, **evangelical Protestants, Latin-mass Catholics, Likudniks** and personalities from shock radio.”¹⁰⁰ Yet it isn’t such a mystery in light of the points of intersection that these different groups share. While motivations and ideas may be diverse and at times conflicting, this medley of interests is a sturdy coterie as far as their political goals are concerned.

Here I’d like to stop to make an important distinction. The Christian values of individual freedom and the importance of the individual are distinct from the eschatological beliefs in the End Times and the second coming of Christ. It is a mistake to try to classify American evangelicals as a single group with a homogeneous set of beliefs, and the subset that professes faith in premillennialism is a very small one indeed. On the other hand, the non-doctrinaire avowal of the American Creed is one of the fundamental points emphasized by American Christian conservatives, as it is for the neoconservatives. With respect to the 2002 NSS, a.k.a. the Bush Doctrine, there are few pronouncements in US history that ring as true to this deeply American tradition. Though the strategy itself is described by some as a departure from established foreign policy as it was practiced in the 20th century, with balance of power no longer being the top priority,¹⁰¹ the innovativeness of the Doctrine is actually to be found in its development and emergence under the Bush administration. Groups motivated on religious and ideologically moral grounds, who hold the American interest foremost in importance, have been empowered to an unprecedented extent in their influence and ability to decide American behavior and activities abroad.

The other major players on foreign policy

¹⁰⁰ Packer, *Assassin’s Gate*, p. 55.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, p.65.

Wolfowitz, Perle and the entire gang of neoconservatives would be of little importance if not for the crucial collaboration with the two individuals who have arguably been the most decisive to the foreign policy of the Bush administration, Vice President Cheney and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld. Their longtime relationship with the Straussian circle indicate that their own politics could show its influence, but the fact that they filled their foreign policy council with major neoconservatives is notable. Yet while the policy influence is widely recognized, it is also generally accepted that Cheney and Rumsfeld are not ideologically of this persuasion. Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay, scholars of the Brookings Institution and the Council on Foreign Relations, respectively, describe them instead as “assertive nationalists.” Under this classification, the Vice President and Defense Secretary are “traditional hard-line conservatives willing to use American military power to defeat threats to US security but reluctant as a general rule to use American primacy to remake the world in its image.”¹⁰² Given their association with the neoconservatives, it is difficult to know if the latter is true; they certainly seem to have reneged on the “reluctant” part of being an assertive nationalist. Like the evangelicals however, they may concur with the faction in political means and ultimate goals but to retain different intentions. The possible changes in attitudes and beliefs may lie in their early development as politicians, which coincided with the start of their own relationship.

In describing the man who also served as his official assistant and in his cabinet, Nixon said of Rumsfeld ““He's a ruthless little bastard. You can be sure of that.”¹⁰³ He was believed to have presidential ambitions of his own, and his hard-to-predict political positions imply some truth in this matter. As a Congressman from Chicago, he demonstrated himself to be a

¹⁰² Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay, America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy, (Hoboken: Wiley, 2005): p.15.

¹⁰³ “President Nixon and Bob Haldeman Discuss Donald Rumsfeld,” Miller Center of Public Affairs, 9 March 1971, <http://tapes.millercenter.virginia.edu/clips/rmn_rumsfeld.html> (9 January 2007).

conservative on economic issues and was against anti-poverty legislation, but as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity he had a reputation for being a liberal. Although he was against the Vietnam War and strongly opposed Kissinger's realist politics, he was later known for being hawkish on defense, "a change that the Kissinger clan has often described as a political opportunism."¹⁰⁴ Rumsfeld's relationship with Wolfowitz, who worked with him on Bob Dole's presidential campaign in 1996, can probably also be regarded as a demonstration of such, as he would have observed the growing force at the time of the neoconservatives in foreign policy circles.

During the presidency of Richard Nixon, Cheney served in a number of capacities, including special assistant to Rumsfeld while he was director of the OEO, and White House staff assistant as well. Indeed, he owed his early political ascendancy to Rumsfeld, and it was here that their decades-long relationship was first forged. Even more so than Rumsfeld, Cheney is difficult to peg. He is not known to have had any serious presidential ambitions of his own, and while he has shown himself to be steadfastly conservative in all his political positions from his time in the Nixon White House to his current position as Vice President, he has no clear ideological affiliation. Like Rumsfeld, he disagreed with the *détente* policy that Kissinger crafted towards the Soviet Union under Nixon. As campaign manager for Ford in 1976, during the Republican primary, he urged him to adopt challenger Ronald Reagan's "Morality in Foreign Policy," stance, because "Platforms don't mean anything."¹⁰⁵ His own political tendencies have consistently leaned in the traditionalist direction but foremost Cheney is a politician; success like his does not come without a sharp political sense and realism. He served as Secretary of Defense under

¹⁰⁴ Paul Labarique, "Donald Rumsfeld: a Machiavellian Artist in Power," *Reseau Voltaire, Édition Internationale*, 12 October 2004, <<http://www.voltairenet.org/article30042.html>> (9 January 2007).

¹⁰⁵ Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans*, p. 73.

George H.W. Bush, the period during which the neoconservative ascent really began; it is inevitable that he would have witnessed and perhaps chosen to take advantage of its potential.

Conclusion: An aggressive foreign policy suits all

Between ideologies and the motivations of individuals, there are appreciable differences. Regarding the war in Vietnam during the Nixon administration, Rumsfeld and Cheney opposed Kissinger for being insufficiently aggressive against the Soviets. In contrast, Wolfowitz's consternation was with the attitude of Secretary of State Kissinger, who declared, "Moral claims involve a quest for absolutes, a denial of nuance, a rejection of history."¹⁰⁶ To Christians, the atheistic Soviet Union was itself the ultimate embodiment of evil. Ultimately, this diverse collection of perspectives all translated into advocating for a more aggressive stance against Communism. Under the Bush administration, we have a similar convergence of different motivations into a single strategy that represents a break from the foreign policy tradition of virtually the entire post-World War II period.

Yet even though these groups hold conflicting principles in important respects, they find common ground on policy. Each was crucial to the development of the Bush doctrine and the progression of foreign policy in Iraq and the Middle East as a whole. The neoconservatives built the intellectual rationale for the Bush policies, which was then forged into a practicable defensive (or one might say offensive) strategy by such seasoned political tacticians as Rumsfeld and Cheney. But without electoral and popular moral support, the policy could never have been successful, and so the base of support that Christian evangelicals provided for the Bush administration and its policies was of crucial importance. Not only are they naturally inclined to support his policy initiatives, his declared stances on Middle Eastern issues actually coincide with evangelical goals anyway; the pervasiveness of the Christian influence in the Pentagon and in

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, p.76.

military affairs is also significant. As discussed, the idea of maintaining and perpetuating American power is not a new one, and the use of religious rhetoric to justify policies is a tried-and-true practice as well. What distinguishes this policy from others is the way in which all the different forces converged and worked together in such spectacular harmony, each lending their own flavor to the ultimate product, and making the decisions to invade Iraq and to try to revolutionize the entire Middle East almost inevitable.

CHAPTER 2: WHAT DISTINGUISHES THE CHRISTIAN RIGHT FROM OTHER INTERESTS

In general, the Christian Right is noted for its electoral significance and the potential impact on legislative activity regarding areas of importance to evangelicals, such as the “moral issues” of gay marriage and abortion, and appointments to the judiciary. While it is not unusual to hear reports from politicians and media pundits about how the Bush administration has been taken over by a “neoconservative cabal,” however, there is little talk of a foreign policy takeover by Christian radicals. While certain Christian Right leaders such as Pat Robertson or Jerry Falwell might make the occasional fiery remark about a rival country or leader, they are generally not taken seriously. I think it is a mistake to posit the foreign policy of the Bush administration as being driven by any single faction because to do so vastly oversimplifies the situation. Instead I am strongly of the opinion that the cooperation between these different factions and individuals in powerful positions has been crucial to the character and the very creation of this policy. My assertion as to the revolutionary character of the policy, however, is most contingent upon the religious half of the alliance.

There are two views regarding the President’s religious character. The first posits that he and his political adviser, Karl Rove, are cynically manipulating evangelicals for their electoral support, while the other holds that the Mr. Bush’s religious outlook and policy are genuine, a reflection of his own born-again faith.¹⁰⁷ I am inclined to believe that the reality is a little of both, with the latter possibility holding the most weight. In essence, however, the reality does not matter. Former White House official David Kuo, writing from the perspective of an evangelical Christian, asserted in a recently published memoir that the President’s faith “was the most

¹⁰⁷ Damon Linker, *The Theocons: Secular America Under Siege*, (New York: Doubleday, 2006): p. 9.

controlled aspect of his public image.”¹⁰⁸ As far as the public is concerned, religion, to one degree or another, is an important guiding principle for Mr. Bush.

Therefore, the President himself is the single most important reason for the current political clout of the Christian Right, and his very person is the most compelling manifestation of it as well. His public pronouncements attesting to the strength of his faith are well known: “There is only one reason that I am in the Oval Office and not in a bar. I found faith. I found God.”¹⁰⁹ The extent to which he honed his speeches to address specific audiences is particularly interesting, portraying himself as far more religiously orthodox in front of evangelical groups than he does in front of others. The strategy was meant to encourage an electoral appeal both on a broader scale as well as to the evangelical base. David Kuo’s resignation from the White House staff was due to his avowed disillusionment with the political use of religion, yet even he affirms a belief in the genuineness of the President’s piety in his book. “George W. Bush loves Jesus. He is a good man. But he is a politician; a very smart and shrewd politician.”¹¹⁰ As he later notes, political leaders “are just that-political.” As long as the public believes the President to be devout, that is all that matters, which is testament to the importance of the public as well as of the operative interest group.

The President’s actions in office have further served to bolster his public image as he demonstrates to his religious supporters that there is in fact substance to his talk. The Office of Faith-based and Community Initiatives is one of the most important manifestations of this point. This agency enshrined the principle of compassionate conservatism as a governing principle of the administration. Mr. Bush ran in 2000 with compassionate conservatism as a key part of his

¹⁰⁸ David Kuo, *Tempting Faith: An Inside Story of Political Seduction*, (New York: Free Press, 2006): p. 123.

¹⁰⁹ Kaplan, *With God on their Side*, p. 55.

¹¹⁰ Kuo, *Tempting Faith*, p.229.

platform, but there appears to have been confusion in the public domain as to what this phrase actually refers to. The concept is fully expounded on by Marvin Olasky, who literally wrote the book on the subject, *Compassionate Conservatism: What it is, What it Does, and How it Can Transform America*. According to Olasky, a former Marxist-turned evangelical Christian, religion and traditional values provided the answers to the major problems afflicting modern society, as churches are better-suited than the government to minister to the poor. In establishing the OFBCI, Mr. Bush, an admirer of the compassionate conservatism philosophy, sought to use federal money to encourage religious initiatives to address social problems. This is where the “compassionate” aspect of the conservatism comes in; like all conservatives, evangelicals are opposed to the system of government social welfare programs, but rather than wanting to eliminate it completely, they wish to “radically change it.”¹¹¹

Inevitably, even such seemingly sincere undertakings as OFBCI are often used in politics to sell a positive image rather than to actually affect the positive results for which the project may be intended. In the case of OFCBI, it is difficult to be certain as to just what to think. The employees of the agency were themselves all deeply religious, and the founding principle was to give the private sector-specifically religious institutions- the responsibility for social welfare; in more cynical terms, “the gospel of privatization.”¹¹² Such a principle would seem to placate both religious and economic conservatives, and therefore would be expected to have been seriously pursued.

Yet the first director of the office, University of Pennsylvania professor John DiIulio, left his post after less than a year, among other reasons for frustration with the job.¹¹³ He criticized the

¹¹¹ Ibid, p. 83.

¹¹² Kaplan, *With God on their Side*, p. 40.

¹¹³ Elizabeth Becker, “Head of Religion-Based Initiative Resigns,” *The New York Times*, 18 August 2001, A11.

administration's negligence of the program, as well as what he described as its "lack of even basic policy knowledge, and only the casual interest in knowing more."¹¹⁴ Along with a narrow agenda, part of what may have been the problem are the allegations that the program was under-funded, a notion attested to by David Kuo as well. Both former officials of the administration were discouraged by the prioritization of political impressions over actual substance, a point which Kuo sums up as "[The President] wanted [the faith-based initiative] to look good. He cared less about it being good."¹¹⁵

At the same time, while OFBCI may merely have been an instance of trying to build good publicity, it cannot be overlooked that the infiltration of religion and evangelical initiatives into the public domain is much more prevalent today than it was a decade ago during the presidency of Bill Clinton. In October 2006, New York Times reporter Diana B. Henriques published a series of articles noting the privileges accorded by law to religious organizations over private ones. She notes that every piece of legislation conferring these privileges was already in place when President Bush ascended to the White House, most in fact forged during the Clinton years. Yet she remarks "Besides regulatory exemptions and special tax breaks, some of which have been in place for decades, religious organizations have recently become eligible for an increasing stream of federal grants and contracts from state and federal governments."¹¹⁶ Each of the four articles in the series proceeds to outline the various tax exemptions and unregulated social programs (such as for child care) that an organization can enjoy if it is considered religious.

I have already discussed the support of the Christian Right for the military, but the links between the defense and security agencies of the US and religion have become far more direct

¹¹⁴ Kaplan, *With God on their Side*, p. 53.

¹¹⁵ Kuo, *Tempting Faith*, p.229.

¹¹⁶ Diana B. Henriques, "Religion Trumps Regulation As Legal Exemptions Grow," *The New York Times*, 8 October 2006, A1.

than mere advocacy under the Bush administration. The FBI has been cited by Connie Marshner, a director at the conservative Free Congress Foundation, for its “potential for proselytization.” Though not directly tied to Marshner, the work of the group Christian Embassy with the military demonstrates what sort of effect this might have. Christian Embassy is an outgrowth of the college group Campus Crusade for Christ that serves as a ministry for government and military elites. While it describes itself as nonpolitical, the group takes assertive positions on political issues and has expressed the opinion that “religion should guide politics.” A number of officials within the Pentagon not only sanction but indeed encourage the efforts of CCC to evangelize the individuals involved in setting national defense policy. Major General Jack J. Catton Jr., the Director of Requirements at Air Combat Command Headquarters in Virginia, describes his position among the Joint Chiefs of Staff as valuable for the opportunity it offers to spread the faith. The headquarters of CCC is itself in Arlington, Virginia, in close proximity of the Pentagon. Beyond ministering to the men and women of the nation’s defense, CCC is also closely linked with a number of Congressional members, making it an influential force in legislative policy as well. It is interesting to note that with regard to the US invasion of Iraq, CCC believes that the US was “Biblically sanctioned” in its actions.¹¹⁷

The point of describing all these different ways in which religion has put its mark on government operations, especially during the Bush administration, is to emphasize the fact that not only is the Christian Right an influence, but in many ways it is directly shaping and conditioning the atmosphere in which policy decisions are made. This gives evangelicals far more political power than the average constituent group. It is difficult to identify any single faction as being the most decisive over government decision-making, but clearly the Christian Right has become a very crucial one. Indeed, the synergy between the Bush administration and this faction is merely the crowning touch as to the manifestation of its current political power. “[The

¹¹⁷ Jeff Sharlet, “Ten Things I Learned From the Pentagon’s Prayer Team,” *AlterNet*, 4 January 2007, <<http://www.alternet.org/story/46262/>> (10 January 2007).

President's] is not an embrace of spirituality or ethics broadly speaking, or of faith as an important voice among many in the national debate. It is, instead, an embrace of right-wing Christian fundamentalism."¹¹⁸

¹¹⁸ Phillips, *American Theocracy*, p. 236.

CHAPTER 3: ALTERNATIVE ARGUMENT ON FOREIGN POLICY: JOHN LEWIS GADDIS AND SECURITY

While there is strong support among different camps for the beliefs that either the neoconservatives or the evangelicals (rarely are they discussed together in the American scholarship) have effected a revolution in US foreign policy through a strategic takeover, there are several voices discounting the relevance of ideology. One of these voices is that of the eminent scholar John Lewis Gaddis, a history professor at Yale University who expounds upon his theory regarding the Bush foreign policy in his recent treatise Surprise, Security and the American Experience. The book is based on a series of lectures that he gave at the New York Public Library in 2002, and in it he examines the meaning of the September 11 2001 attacks and their aftermath from a historical perspective. In the course of doing so he maps out what he sees as the patterns and evolution of American foreign policy. He compares the attacks not to the popular analogy of the bombing of Pearl Harbor during World War II, but to the British burning of Washington during the War of 1812. The ultimate response to the invasion of the 19th century, he says, was the Monroe Doctrine, which was authored by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams. Gaddis cites Adam's policy as having created the precedents for unilateralism, preservation of US hegemony, and a realist policy of preemption, of which all three are generally recognized as being the key tenets of the Bush doctrine. The Bush doctrine goes a further step by asserting American exceptionalism to justify its initiative to reorder the international system as it sees fit; Gaddis seems to agree with this notion.

Gaddis's staunch realism, paired with his intellectual background in history, is both his strength and weakness in his analysis of the underpinnings of the Bush administration's foreign policy.. Perhaps one of the strongest weaknesses of his thesis is the rather injudicious application

of important terms. He asserts that the Monroe Doctrine was characterized by the tenets of preemption, unilateralism and the preservation of US hegemony; I would counter that under the Bush administration, the policy of preemptive action has morphed into preventative war, the “unilateralism” of the 19th century would actually be better described as isolationism, and the regional ambitions of the this period hardly translate to hegemony.

To support his argument about preemption, Gaddis cites General Andrew Jackson’s assault of Spanish Florida after a series of attacks from across the border,¹¹⁹ and the associated aggressive policy to neutralize “the threats posed by Native Americans.”¹²⁰ Likening the invasion of Iraq launched by the Bush administration to the US’s actions in 1817 against a group that was actively attacking American settlements in Georgia¹²¹ seems a rather flimsy comparison. Perhaps Gaddis has been won over by the continued insistence of the administration that the action taken against Iraq constituted preemptive action. I am not the only one who remains unconvinced; my discussions of the nuances between preemptive and preventive action are notions articulated by such experts as the political theorist Michael Walzer and Canadian professor of law Pittman B. Potter. The war in Iraq has correspondingly been described as an example of preventive, rather than preemptive, attack by, among others, Fukuyama and Andrew C. Bacevich.

In building his argument regarding isolationism, Gaddis cites the Monroe Doctrine’s admonition to abstain from dealing in European interests and politics, especially to the effect of establishing formal alliances. Overturning the previous popular term for this policy, he writes “[Isolationism] is a misnomer, for the US never actually tried to isolate itself from the rest of the

¹¹⁹ John Lewis Gaddis, *Surprise, Security and the American Experience*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005): p. 17.

¹²⁰ Ibid, p. 18.

¹²¹ “Andrew Jackson, First Seminole War,” *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*, 2007, <<http://www.britannica.com/ebi/article-229744>> (18 January 2007).

world,”¹²² citing continued international trade and cultural connections. In the strictest sense of the term, no state in the modern period has been 100% isolationist; whether due to imperialist ambitions or lack of self-sufficiency, the order makes interdependence necessary, to varying extents. In fact, The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy defines isolationism as “The doctrine that a nation should stay out of the disputes and affairs of other nations,”¹²³ precisely what the Monroe Doctrine was advocating. In a world in which technological innovation had not yet reached a level of being able to connect people and ideas quickly and easily, such a policy was not difficult to implement, especially given the geographic isolation of the US from Europe. Unilateralism, on the other hand, is defined as “Action initiated or taken by a single nation rather than by two nations (*see* bilateralism) or several (*see* multilateralism).” There can be little dispute that this is precisely the action that the Bush administration undertook, but it is quite a stretch to apply that same idea to 19th century America.

Hegemony is the final tenet which Gaddis attributes to the Monroe Doctrine legacy for the 19th century, and I believe his interpretation to be flawed here as well. One of the best-known theories of hegemony was described by early 20th century Italian political leader and theorist Antonio Gramsci. A Marxist, he emphasized that man cannot be ruled by mere force alone, but that his consent and the power of ideas were a crucial aspect for leaders to consider. Thus, hegemony requires popular acceptance of the ideas of the hegemon: “An order in which a certain way of life and thought is dominant, in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout society in all its institutional and private manifestations.”¹²⁴ US action in the 19th century hardly constituted such aspirations; regional expansion through migration to the West and the South of

¹²² Gaddis, *Surprise, Security and the American Experience*, p. 24.

¹²³ “Isolationism,” Dictionary.com 18 January 2007 <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/isolationism>.

¹²⁴ Gwyn A. Williams, “The Concept of ‘Egemonia’ in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci: Some Notes on Interpretation,” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 21, No. 4. (1960): pp. 586-599.

the North American continent was motivated not by the desire to dominate other peoples, but to accommodate the growing population of the US. Along the way, there was hardly any initiative to charm the Native American peoples that were encountered; the infamous Trail of Tears comes to mind. In Iraq, on the other hand, whether sincere or otherwise, it was an explicit goal of the Bush administration to “win the hearts and minds” of the Iraqis by deposing them of their brutal dictator. Ideas of democracy, human rights and individual freedom have all been heavily promoted; on a more surreptitious level, Christian principles and religion have been as well.

It seems that much of the apparent problem with Gaddis’s position derives from his rather inaccurate application of certain terms to try to draw a connection between foreign policies asserted in different centuries. The very attempt to do this is in itself flawed, however, because while the technical definition of a word or idea may remain the same, the context in which it is applied can have considerable ramifications for its actual meaning. The world of the 19th century is almost incomparable to that of today in terms of communications, transportation military and other technologies. All of these technological changes have raised the power of ideas to unprecedented levels, but Gaddis doesn’t even take ideological considerations into account in his discussion of the decisive aspects of current US foreign policy.

CHAPTER 4: THE EUROPEAN ALLIES

Reaction towards Bush Doctrine itself

It is hardly a secret that the international reaction to the Bush Doctrine was to a large extent quite hostile. While public opinion worldwide was overwhelmingly against the war, however, the stances taken by governments were mixed. Traditionally strong allies such as Germany and France immediately denounced the plans to invade, while major ally Britain was joined by Spain and Italy in providing both moral and material support. The reasons for the different positions taken, both ideological and pragmatic, are varied and complex, often catering to the domestic audience while also taking certain strategic goals into account.

In analyzing the responses of foreign allies, I will be considering the positions taken by selected European states only. Such a Euro-centric analysis might appear biased and traditionalist by seeming to suggest that European states are the only ones of significance in global decision-making, but that is not my intention. My decision to focus on the states popularly considered to be of the West is multifaceted. The most important reason is for relative analytical reliability, that is, as a control factor; while not the same, in general terms the societies and values of Western countries tend to be similar, sharing a common legacy derived from the Enlightenment. This is crucial because, while I will consider the national culture of each state in the course of assessing their individual responses to the US, the underlying affinity assures that civilizational differences are not responsible for the possible conflicts with US policy.

Yet even while the US and Europe are both classified as part of the vast rubric that comprises “Western Civilization,” the ideological differences that evolved throughout the 20th century have compelled many to argue that differences in ideology and societal structure are in themselves significant enough to disconnect the two. Kagan makes the defining argument in his

archetypal work, *Of Paradise and Power*: “It is time to stop pretending that Europeans and Americans share a common view of the world, or even that they occupy the same world.”¹²⁵ Kagan argues that Europe’s postmodern values which strive for multilateral cooperation and governance approaches the utopian vision of Immanuel Kant. America, on the other hand, displays a more Hobbesian view of the world, eschewing global governing bodies for concerns of national import and interest. The especially hawkish actions of the Bush administration may have widened the gulf in worldviews between Europe and the US to such an extent as to hold potential for real crisis.

Yet it is naïve of Kagan to discuss Europe as a homogeneous unit in which all units share the same ideologies and approaches to foreign policy. The lack of unanimity over the response to the US’s actions in Iraq illustrates the mistake in such an approach. Further, by heightening ideology to such an extent (not surprising, considering that Kagan is one of the most ideological within the neoconservative camp), he ignores the diverse practical and political concerns that each European state weighed in deciding whether to support or oppose the action of the US in Iraq and in the Middle East in general. Thus, it is with all of these considerations in mind that I embark upon a comprehensive analysis of the five major European states of Britain, France, Germany, Spain and Poland insofar as their reactions to the US invasion of Iraq. The foreign policy of a country at a given point in time is dependent both upon the prevailing foreign policy tradition as well as on the nature of the government in power at the time. Three of the European states have experienced regime changes since the start of the war, but since the focus of interest for the purposes of this discussion regards the stances they took at the start of the war electoral changes will not be considered until later in the paper.

¹²⁵ Robert Kagan, *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005): p. 3.

In the entire international community, no opposition to the war was announced as staunchly as by the nations of Germany and France. In the European Union, the strong alliance between the two nations is a well-known fact, making their shared position on the war almost predictable within the continent. Yet while it may have seemed difficult at times to draw a distinction between their positions, there were in fact very significant differences, the most elementary of which was the fact that it was Germany that really instigated the contention with the plans of the US. The reasons for this are multifarious and complex. American observers immediately attributed the decision of Schroeder to come out strongly against the US as a matter of political ambitions, given that he was running for reelection. To a certain extent, this reason is correct; the survival of the political coalition between the Green Party and Schroeder's own Socialist Party (the Red-Green coalition) demanded a strong rallying cause, which Schroeder found in opposing the American president on Iraq.¹²⁶ While many might attribute the success of such a position as stemming from the wider trend of anti-Americanism in Western Europe, the prevalence of a pacifist sentiment in contemporary Germany is more likely the reason for its appeal.

***Germany**

Yet such a superficial claim is tantamount to attributing the motivations of the Bush administration in Iraq as seeking to distract the American public from the corporate scandals of Enron and company (a charge that has actually been made¹²⁷). Schroeder's opposition to the war not only reflected his political preferences as an individual, they further reflected an important aspect of the national character of Germany. In part, the foreign policy of Germany in the post-World War II era was greatly shaped by its alliance with France. The relationship developed in

¹²⁶ Buckley and Singh, *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism*, p.36.

¹²⁷ "Rumors of War; Axis of Oil and Iraq," Editorial, *The San Francisco Chronicle*, 13 November 2002, p. A25.

the 1960s, during the reigns of the French president Charles de Gaulle and the German chancellor Konrad Adenauer. This period in the history of the two countries has actually left a crucial imprint on the current foreign policy orientation of both countries. For Germany, a country still bedeviled by its past as the instigator of World War II and the genocidal campaign against the European Jewry as launched by Adolf Hitler, perhaps the impact has been of especial significance.

Adenauer's pursuit of reconciliation with France represented a historic break from the hostile rivalry that had dominated Franco-German relations for over a century, and this revolutionary switch in Germany foreign policy was a major aspect of the reconstruction of German identity. Moral concerns in the post World War II era were certainly part of it, but a conservative politician, Adenauer was also motivated by pragmatic and strategic concerns. The Franco-German partnership is still considered to be the main engine powering the European Union, and even in the 1950s the reconciliation with France was associated with Adenauer's belief that European integration was in the vital interest of Germany.¹²⁸

The actions of Chancellor Schroeder in opposing the US's initiative in Iraq can be seen as a continuation of the type of thinking exercised by Adenauer, stressing both the ideological and pragmatic elements and goals of foreign policy. The Red-Green coalition under Schroeder broke the traditional anti-war paradigm of the Left in its willingness to engage militarily in Kosovo during the 1990s and Afghanistan following the September 11 attacks in the US, therefore its refusal to get involved in Iraq cannot simply be regarded as pacifist politics. As previously mentioned, Schroeder was wary of being overly submissive to US foreign policy initiatives, and the strident belligerence of the Bush administration was a serious cause for concern. Foreign

¹²⁸ Martin Marcussen, "Constructing Europe? The evolution of French, British and German nation state identities," *Journal of European Public Policy* 6 No. 4 (1999), p. 623.

Minister Joschka Fischer embodied the moral aspect of Germany's policy ("Auschwitz -- never again"), while Schroeder emphasized the importance of continuity in German policy, with regard to the perceived linkage between German and European interests.¹²⁹ He has explicitly declared, "We really believe our national interests are identical with European interests."¹³⁰ On the subject of Iraq his foreign minister insisted "All possible options for resolving the Iraq crisis by peaceful means must be thoroughly explored."¹³¹ Both reflect a strong commitment to German foreign policy principles as developed in the second half of the 20th century.

***France**

The frequent mentions of France in the discussion of Germany seem to imply that France's own foreign policy is similarly inclined, and to a certain extent this is in fact the case. Coming out of World War II, France had to deal with the legacy of the collaborationist government of Maréchal Pétain. Though the French were not suffering moral debasement to the extent of the Germans, it is not too surprising that in the process of its national healing it began to follow a similar trajectory; ultimately the countries met halfway. The influence of Charles de Gaulle on the contemporary foreign policy, and indeed much of the national outlook, of France is unmistakable. De Gaulle served in office from 1959-1969, the first president of the Fifth Republic, which continues to this day. His rise to power was in no small part helped by his leadership of the French Resistance during the War. For a country that was seeking to psychologically distance itself from the complicity of many with the Nazi movement, General de

¹²⁹ Winfried Veit, "Between Realpolitik and Historical Responsibility. Between Realpolitik and Historical Responsibility. The Red-Green Coalition's Foreign Policy," *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft*, no. 1, (2006), Abstract.

¹³⁰ "Q&A with Gerhard Schroeder: "There's Really No Reason to Worry About...the Euro," *Business Week*, 11 June 2001, < http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/01_24/b3736090.htm> (28 January 2007).

¹³¹ "Statement by Joschka Fischer, □ Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, □ at the Public Meeting of the Security Council □ on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait," German Embassy Wasington DC. 14 February 2003, < <http://www.germany.info/relaunch/politics/speeches/021403.htm>> (28 January 2007).

Gaule offered the perfect symbol by which France could seek absolution. In Germany, Adenauer's association with the resistance movement, though weaker, similarly made him a "source of moral and political inspiration."¹³²

One of the elements that distinguished France and Germany in their situations during the Cold War, however, was the lingering fear in France that Germany could regain power; from that perspective, the notion of militant nationalism was quite ominous. The Gaullist ideology tends to be associated with a strongly nationalist view of France and its values of republicanism, but de Gaulle himself seemed to support a more expansive outlook that emphasized of France's place within Europe. "L'Europe des nations" was a major theme of his presidency, and his decision to form an alliance with Germany stemmed from his goals to keep German power in check as well as to promote the paradigm of a more united Europe.¹³³ De Gaulle was an unabashed patriot, declaring in his memoirs "France cannot be France without greatness."¹³⁴ Yet his wartime experience helped him to recognize that France could not survive and prosper long without strong alliances in Europe; indeed, the long peace that has generally prevailed on the continent since the War might not have been possible without the deepening political integration that has characterized the period.

As President, de Gaulle stressed a very strong message about French national identity, linking Enlightenment values and democracy with France's role in the world. It is at this point that the discussion about France starts to sound less like that of Germany and instead more like that of the United States, and strikingly so; the war in Iraq illustrates just how strong the parallel is. In taking a position on the US's plans, Germany was motivated more by the goal to prevent the

¹³² David Clay Large "'A Beacon in the German Darkness': The Anti-Nazi Resistance Legacy in West German Politics," *The Journal of Modern History*, 64, Supplement, (1992): p. S176.

¹³³ Marcussen, "Constructing Europe?" p. 620-621.

¹³⁴ Charles de Gaulle, *Memoirs de Guerre: I. L'Appel 1940-1942*, (Paris: Plon, 1954) p. 1.

disruption of relative stability in the Middle East, both to protect its own interests within those of Europe. The threat of a militant hegemon that could disrupt international stability for its own ends was also a menace to be curtailed. For France, the rationale behind objecting to the war was somewhat different. As in the US, idealism inspires the desire to be a model and a missionary of democratic values;¹³⁵ France's impression of the proper way to do so, however, stands in stark contrast to the "democracy at the barrel of a gun" strategy most prominently embodied by the Bush administration. As such, the US poses a threat not just to France's conception of its own place in the world, but it affronts the very notion of Frenchness by seeming to stand in direct opposition to it.

Unlike Germany, which was unequivocally opposed to military intervention in Iraq from the start, the French position was initially more similar to that of the US. With weapons inspectors still on the ground in the country at the time, France indicated that it was open to the possibility of supporting military intervention were the UN Security Council to find that the resolution against WMD had been violated. In a speech to the national assembly in October of 2002, then-prime minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin averred, "Apart from the danger of proliferation of arms of mass destruction, the authority of the Security Council, the cornerstone of the international security system, is at stake. This situation cannot continue."¹³⁶

Yet the impatience of the US with the slow progress of the UN (as well as the inspectors' steady denial of the evidence that the US hoped to find) ultimately impelled President Jacques Chirac to side with the German Chancellor. The nature of France's intent in objecting was slightly different from that of Germany; in addition to protecting its role within Europe and wishing to abate the threat of an uncontrollable hegemon, Chirac strongly rejects the idea that the

¹³⁵ Irwin M. Wall, "The French-American War Over Iraq," *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 10 no. 2 (2004), p 126.

¹³⁶ Sandro Contenta, "France open to war of 'last resort' with Iraq," *Toronto Star*, 9 October 2002, p. A15.

international order is a unipolar one. Like Schroeder, he is wary of ceding too much power to the American president, but his is a focus on the power balances between countries, rather than of the relative power of the one single superpower. “Any community with only one dominant power is always a dangerous one and provokes reactions. That's why I favor a multipolar world, in which Europe obviously has its place.”¹³⁷

Chirac is in and of himself another major reason for the state of French foreign policy today. Just as Schroeder broke from the traditional anti-war inclinations of the Left, Chirac, of the center-right Union for a Popular Movement Party, is hardly a prototype of the conservatives he supposedly represents. Widely heralded as a Gaullist, Chirac seems to reflect the leftist inclinations that are paradoxically associated with this nationalist ideology. One of the most distinctive aspects of his deviation from traditionally conservative inclinations is on the economic front, challenging free market initiatives like the liberalization of certain industries and championing the private sector. But in fact, the social strain of Gaullism from which Chirac derives is actually antagonistic to economic liberalism for the sake of preserving “social cohesion” and “solidarity,” which unfettered capitalism is believed to threaten. Accordingly, conflicts with American policy have a long history on both the right and left ends of the French political spectrum, and Chirac is certainly a faithful archetype of this inclination.¹³⁸ It would appear that these elements of Gaullism are the basis for a system aimed towards upholding social peace, and the influence of such an outlook upon French foreign policy is to oppose action that could pose a threat to global stability, particularly when it is advanced by America.

¹³⁷ ¹³⁷ James Graff and Bruce Crumley, "France Is Not a Pacifist Country," *Time Magazine Online*, 16 February 2003, < <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1101030224-423466,00.html>> (14 March 2007).

¹³⁸ “Jacques Chirac becomes a left-wing president,” *The Economist*, 15 March 2005, <http://www.conscience-politique.org/2005/theeconomistchiracleftistpresident.htm> (2 January 2007).

Clearly, the personality and beliefs of the French president are a major component of French foreign policy, and Chirac's emphasis on multipolarity as well as the premium that he places on global stability are fundamental to his repudiation of the US's actions. His decision to oppose the invasion of a Muslim country was also related to certain more complicated domestic factors. The Muslim population of France is the largest in Western Europe, nearly 10% of the total French population. Many immigrants of Muslim descent are from France's former colonies in North Africa, and while integration is nominally the policy, there has been substantial restiveness among French Muslims, who suffer from exceptionally high poverty and unemployment relative to the rest of the population. In the US, there is much criticism of France's strict policy of *laïcité*, or secularism, which the French use to ban the wearing of religious symbols such as headscarves in public schools. The conceptions of secularism in America and Europe are quite different; in the US there is an emphasis upon protecting the church from the state, while in Europe it is the opposite. With regard to the Muslim population, France's policies are meant to abate the threat of political Islam, which could pose a very real threat in a country where a tenth of the population adheres to this religion and is largely marginalized in French society.¹³⁹

***Britain**

Britain, America's strongest and most steadfast ally, was on board with the US on Iraq right from the start. In contrast to France and Germany, which seek to perpetuate European interests in order to further and secure their own, Britain long ago decided that its political fortunes were more secure with a strong transatlantic alliance instead. The "special relationship" between the US and the UK is legendary; the Oedipal father/son relationship of the 18th and 19th

¹³⁹ Jean-Philippe Mathy, "French-American Relations and the War in Iraq: Anything New, or Business As Usual?" *Contemporary French and Francophone Studies*, 8, No. 4 (2004), p. 422-423.

centuries was replaced in the 20th by one in which the new hegemon magnanimously worked together with its Mother country on shared goals. The Second World War and the Cold War are two examples of this collaboration, and the War on Terrorism is the new joint project upon which the two states have embarked. The partnership was seen by Prime Minister Tony Blair as particularly positive because Britain could serve as a moderating influence upon the aggressive militarism of the US. While the moderating aspect of the influence seemed to be in absence for much of the Iraq War, in the very early stages of the mobilization, the British played a key role indeed.

Following World War II, the US officially replaced Great Britain on the world stage as the superpower of the Western world. This event was perhaps most exemplified when London sent a communication to Washington in 1947 informing the government of President Harry Truman that Britain was no longer able to finance projects in Greece and Turkey for modernization and economic bolstering; implicitly, the job was handed over to the US. The concurrent onset of the Cold War meant that as the US was providing aid to Europe during the reconstruction after World War II, it was also faced with a major strategic and ideological rival. While all of Europe was allied with the US in a strong transatlantic alliance against the Communist Soviet Union, no single bilateral relationship was as strong as that between the US and Britain. In fact, it is interesting to note that the response of Britain to the US invasion of Iraq was perhaps most dependent upon the bond that they established during the Cold War, even to the detriment of certain other factors. In the case of nations like Germany and France, foreign policy dynamics other than their alliance with the US took precedence.

To this end, the role of Prime Minister Tony Blair and his interpretation of the relationship between the US and Great Britain has been decisive to Britain's support of the war in Iraq.

According to Blair, the alliance between the US and Europe is essential to securing global stability, and it is the role of Britain to ensure the preservation of that alliance. In an interview on a British news program, he declared, ““I think there always is and always should be a situation in which the British prime minister and the American president get on well together. I regard it as part of my job.” With regard to the invasion of Iraq, he said in an address to the US Congress, “I believe any alliance must start with America and Europe. If Europe and America are together, the others will work with us.”¹⁴⁰ These notions are predicated on his belief that a strong Anglo-American alliance is essential to staving off utter global disorder.

In addition to the historic emphasis on its relations with the US, another motivator for the stance of the UK is its relatively Euro-skeptical orientation. Both on the left and right of the British political spectrum (the Labor and Conservative parties) are emphatic about the importance of British sovereignty within the framework of the European Union. As recently as 1997, the Foreign Secretary for the Labor Party, Robin Cook spoke of a trip to Europe by saying, “As it happens, when *I first went to Europe*, [italics added for emphasis] the first European politician I met was Lionel Jospin,”¹⁴¹ thus clearly implying that he does not consider himself European. While the majority of the British public generally perceives benefits from being a member of the European Union, there is relatively little knowledge about it with regard to policies and institutions.¹⁴² Political parties often capitalize on the lack of awareness to make support or opposition for cooperation with the bloc part of their platform. The inclination to join with the US on major international initiatives is probably related in part to the slight tension that still exists in a country that continues to refer to mainland Europe as “the Continent.”

¹⁴⁰ Lloyd C. Gardner ““Damned High Wire,” On the Special Relationship that Unites Bush and Blair in Iraq,” *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, (2005), p.44.

¹⁴¹ Marcussen, “Constructing Europe?” p. 627.

¹⁴² “EU attitudes in UK Analytical Report,” European Commission, May 2006, <http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_185.pdf> (16 March 2007).

Beyond the foreign policy strains evinced in the United Kingdom, the person of Tony Blair also seems to be of key importance to the relationship between Britain and the US under the Bush administration. He is best known for revolutionizing the left-leaning politics of the Labor Party largely by introducing the “Third Way,” a mode of politics described by former British Labor politician and current EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson as representative of “modern social democracy.” Its critics on the other hand describe it as a centrist political strategy that “opportunistically splits the differences between left and right on every issue.”¹⁴³ According to Blair’s own contention, his political principles developed during his time at Oxford University, a period during which he also received another crucial influence to his way of thinking which affected his way of thinking on political concerns as well.

In the discussions above regarding the leaders of Germany and France, religion was completely absent as they are both strongly secular. While Blair is relatively less religious compared to President Bush, it is interesting to note that like the US president, he too found religion as an adult. While a student at Oxford, he became religious and developed a distinct moral certainty that would inform his conduct and decisions later in life. Deriving from a fairly well off family which usually would have led to a political affiliation with the conservative Tory Party, Blair instead became active in the Labor Party immediately following his graduation from the University.¹⁴⁴ An influential figure in his political thought, surprisingly, was Tory Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, and in particular it was her “leadership and moral certainty on defense and international terrorism”¹⁴⁵ that he aspired to follow. Though it is the Tory Party that is traditionally associated with support for the Anglican Church, under Blair New Labor appears

¹⁴³ Peter Mandelson, *The Blair Revolution Revisited*, (London: Politico's, 2002): p. xxviii.

¹⁴⁴ Con Coughlin, *American Ally: Tony Blair and the War on Terror*, □ (New York: Ecco/HarperCollins, 2006): p. 5.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p. 13.

to have taken on the character of a Christian Democratic Party,¹⁴⁶ Such a way of thinking would clearly accord well with the outlook of President Bush, and in fact joint prayer and religious discussion sessions between the two are not an unusual occurrence.¹⁴⁷ Indeed, if not for the common ground of religion, Blair's ability to work with the Bush administration might have been far more limited.

When Blair was elected Prime Minister in 1997, he immediately connected with then-President Bill Clinton, whose mode of politics was similar to his own. In advising Blair on how to conduct himself towards his Republican successor, Clinton advised, "Be his friend. Be his best friend. Be the guy he turns to."¹⁴⁸ Given his lack of popularity with several power White House officials, it is remarkable that Blair has been quite as successful in this endeavor as he has been. In particular, his greatest challenges have been with the Vice President, whose strong ties to the Tories caused him to immediately trust the New Labor prime Minister, and with the neoconservatives. The latter is particularly ironic, given the characterization by many of Blair as a quasi-neoconservative himself. "Blair is an Old Labour internationalist who wants to be a force for good in the world. Perversely, this fits in with the neocon view of the world. It was a case of old-fashioned Labour internationalism meets right wing neocons. In the sense that he wants to make the world a better place, Blair is a neocon himself."¹⁴⁹ Yet Blair did not share the neoconservative idolization of America, and he diverged with them significantly on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. He sought to balance the neoconservative influence on the President in order to preserve his own, and in the process offend the neoconservatives, who subsequently "[worked]

¹⁴⁶ Nicholas Huntington and Tim Bale, "New Labour: New Christian Democracy?" *The Political Quarterly*, 73 no. 1 (2002), p. 44.

¹⁴⁷ Kaplan, *With God on their Side*, p.9.

¹⁴⁸ Rupert Cornwell, "The Yo-Yo relationship," *The Independent on Sunday*, 23 July 2006, p. 48.

¹⁴⁹ Con Coughlin, *American Ally*, p. 159.

behind the scenes to undermine him.”¹⁵⁰ Blair’s ability to retain favor with President Bush in spite of the obstacles likely owes not only to his belief in the criticalness of the Anglo-American alliance to the preservation of global stability, but also to the similitude of his religio-moralistic outlook on politics.

***Spain**

The example of Spain is particularly unique when measured against the reactions of the other major American allies in Europe. At the outset of the war Spain was described as one of Bush’s most powerful allies in Europe, second only to Britain. Like the other West European nations that supported the war (except for Britain), Spain had elected a right-wing government not long before the election of Bush in 2000. Jose Maria Aznar, first elected in 1996 and reelected in 2000, belonged to the right-of-center Partido Popular, the democratic party of the Spanish right whose success is attributed to Aznar’s strong leading role within it.¹⁵¹ The achievement was particularly notable considering that the previous government, run by the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, had dominated the country for 14 years. With Aznar’s entry into office, Spanish politics was to undergo a serious revolution.

The legacy of World War II for Spain is far more recent than for most of the other nations of Western Europe; the War era fascist dictator Francisco Franco continued to rule, albeit as regent of a semi-capitalist state after 1945, until 1973. Democracy was not instilled in the political structure of the state until 1981 by the Spanish monarch Juan Carlos. The Socialist Party was elected the following year, and held power until the election of Aznar. Given that Spain’s experience with democratic rule is limited, it is not surprising that with a change in ruling party,

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 189.

¹⁵¹ Paddy Woodworth, “Spain Changes Course: Aznar’s Legacy, Zapatero’s Prospects,” *World Policy Journal*, (2004), p.8.

the foreign policy orientation ends up being overturned as well.¹⁵² Essentially comprising both the face and soul of the Partido Popular, it is necessary to examine Aznar himself in order to better understand the basis as to why Spain reacted as it did to the US's declaration of war in Iraq.

As noted in the discussion of the foreign policy orientations of the other European states, the personal character and inclinations of the leaders in question were an important factor weighing in on the state's response to the actions of the US. Germany provides a particularly illustrative example; the current chancellor, Angela Merkel, of the center Right Christian Democratic Party, has far less antagonistic relations with the American President than her predecessor did. Yet perhaps no leader demonstrates this neoclassical realist principle quite as well as Aznar did. After all, even with Chancellor Merkel, while US relations with Germany have thawed, she has not induced a significant conversion in official German policy on Iraq or related issues. With Aznar, personality is a crucial element to his governing style for the very fact that the political right-wing in Spain had not had much of a chance to develop a foreign policy outlook since the country's adoption of democracy. For this reason, Aznar's standpoint, described by Spanish journalist and commentator, Juan Luis Cebrián as "democratic fundamentalism," essentially embodies the general perspective of the Spanish right. As its name implies, this persuasion amounts to a demand for submission to democratic principles, which in reality can mean significant variation between countries. Cebrián perceives this type of thinking to be demonstrated by President Bush as well, and he implies that their conceptions of democratic principles are similar: "[Aznar and Bush] exploit democracy as a function of their power, and they are inclined to undermine democracy wherever and whenever they can."¹⁵³

¹⁵² Bernhard Stahl, "Understanding the 'Great Split' in the Iraq crisis. A Comparative Approach of the Member States' Foreign Policy," Paper prepared for presentation at the UACES conference in Zagreb, 4-7 Sept. 2005, p.25. <http://www.uni-trier.de/uni/fb3/politik/forschung/Paper_Iraq.pdf> (7 February 2007).

¹⁵³ Woodworth, "Spain Changes Course," p.8.

In assessing the character of Aznar and its pertinence to Spanish foreign policy, it is instructive to consider his past and his political education. His upbringing was marked by the strongly traditionalist values of his family, which had benefited greatly from the Franco regime. Of greater relevance was his personal avowal of respect and support for the dictatorship and his aversion to democracy, which he expressed in a series of articles written in the late 1970s after the death of Franco.¹⁵⁴ The strongly authoritarian character, which proved to be an asset to Aznar's ability to organize and run the Partido Popular, can probably be attributed in part to his background. However, such a personality hints at a degree of inflexibility and self-assurance that could conflict with the traditional democratic principle of pluralism. An institutional interview in March 2003 just prior to the US invasion was particularly illustrative of his resolute, unchangeable demeanor; this type of attitude is consistent with the strict religious education of Spanish Catholicism. His justification for his support of the US during the interview was portrayed from a moralistic perspective, and his manner of speaking revealed his messianic conception of politics.¹⁵⁵

Aznar's response to the US, especially on the particular issue of terrorism, was of course conditioned by a number of factors other than his own personality. His goal to raise the international profile of Spain by linking it more closely to the superpower is particularly crucial. Spanish political analyst Albert Moncada sums it up when he says, "He wants to have his picture taken with Bush. We're a small country, and it's a sentimental question. It's really very childish."¹⁵⁶ Making the Atlantic alliance the central tenet of his foreign policy was a radical change in the traditionally EU-leaning foreign policy of Spain, and that may have been motivated

¹⁵⁴ Ibid, p.9.

¹⁵⁵ Clara Ubaldina Lorda and Elisabeth Miche, "Two institutional interviews: José María Aznar and Jacques Chirac on the Iraq conflict," *Discourse & Society*, 17, No. 4, p.468.

¹⁵⁶ Pamela Rolfe, "For Spanish Leader, War Is a Gamble," *The Washington Post*, 20 March 2003, A21.

by a wish to move away from the EU as much as it was to bolstering the alliance with the US.

“Spanish decision-making in foreign policy has been subordinate to France [since the nineteenth century], which is no longer the case...I’m happy for Spain to be making its own decisions.”¹⁵⁷ In practice, this seems to have consisted of the freedom to choose which major power’s foreign policy to align itself with. Beyond power ambitions, however, Aznar was also compelled by security concerns. “The coordination of policy with the U.S. in [strategic] matters is essential for our own survival.”¹⁵⁸

This brings us to what is likely one of the most crucial points of Aznar’s perspectives on the matter of terrorism, and why terrorism has proved to be the ideal point on which to align himself with the aggressiveness of the US. It is safe to say that the former Spanish president’s own personal experience with terrorism had a profound impact on his thinking on the matter; a year before he was first elected to the office, Aznar was nearly killed by a bomb set by the Spanish terrorist group ETA, His brave, composed reaction was received with great admiration by a society that places a strong premium on courage, and was likely a significant factor in his electoral victor the following year.¹⁵⁹ Since then terrorism has been a crucial aspect of his policy perspectives, and in fact it was he who stressed the importance of the issue of terrorism to President Bush during his first visit to Spain in June 2001. The American President seemed rather disinterested in the issue until the threat came home just a few months later, thus opening a key channel on which the US and Spain could collaborate and bolster one another.¹⁶⁰

***Italy**

¹⁵⁷ Nora Boustany, “The View from Spain,” *Washington Post*, January 14, 2004.

¹⁵⁸ Woodworth, “Spain Changes Course,” p.19.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p.10.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid*, p.13.

Of the countries already discussed, Italy is most similar to Spain in its positioning vis-à-vis the Iraq issue, but there are a number of crucial differences. While Spain has been under democratic rule for less than three decades, the republican constitution of Italy was written immediately following World War II. Spain officially became a member state of the European Union in 1986, while Italy was one of the six original founding members. These factors immediately appear to paint a more pro-Europe stance, yet while favoring deeper European integration, Italy has also put a strong emphasis on its alliance with the US.¹⁶¹ Like Spain and the UK, the Atlantic alliance is valued in Italy for security concerns. Though Italy lacked a potent leader in the vein of Aznar, it is impossible to ignore the fact that there have been remarkable similarities in the foreign policy drift of the two countries. In spite of different perspectives on certain issues, they reached essentially the same conclusions in 2003 with regard to the actions of the US, and the backlashes that ensued in each country are so similar as to be striking. .

During the Cold War, Italy's relatively weak position in Europe obliged it to have an almost "perfunctory" foreign policy, basically consisting of its commitment to the European Union as well as to its alliance with the US within the NATO framework; the focus of politics was on domestic concerns. Following the fall of the Soviet Union, the dialogue on foreign policy shifted towards a realization that national interests would have to take higher priority, and the government became much more actively engaged on international issues, especially those regarding Italy's security.¹⁶² Italy became a strong voice for a robust common defense policy in Europe, advocating for a common foreign and security policy (CFSP) in addition to the European security and defense policy (ESDP) during the 1990s.¹⁶³

¹⁶¹ Bernhard Stahl, "Understanding the 'Great Split' in the Iraq crisis," p.23.

¹⁶² Osvaldo Croci, "The Second Berlusconi Government and Italian Foreign Policy," *The International Spectator*, 37 no. 2 (2002), p. 91.

¹⁶³ Osvaldo Croci, "Italian Security Policy after the Cold War," *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 8 no. 2

As was the case in Spain, for much of the duration following the establishment of a democratic government, the country was run by socialist or left-leaning regimes. The revision of foreign policy in Spain occurred with the switch in ruling parties, but in Italy, the switch that arose from the fall of the Soviet Union occurred during the rule of the Christian Democrats, which had ruled for the majority of the existence of the Italian republic. While not explicitly socialist itself, the Christian Democratic Party of Italy frequently forges coalitions with smaller left-wing parties, thus indicating a harmony of ideologies. The conventional wisdom of the successive left-leaning regimes of the 1990s was that a strengthened, more united EU with a clear, assertive foreign policy would be to the country's benefit, as its own voice would be strengthened in the process. Such thinking is not dissimilar from that in Germany, where a strong EU structure is seen as promoting German national interests. Notwithstanding, it was undeniable that the military power of the EU was quite dwarfed by that of its ally across the Atlantic, and so the relationship, both in terms of bilateral relations between the US and Italy as well as the US and the EU, was seen as crucial. Yet the positions of being pro-European as well as pro-American were never seen as being in the least at odds, that is until the election of Berlusconi in 2001.

Part of the reason for Berlusconi's deviation from the standard strongly pro-Europe stance of the Italian government may be related to the fact of his relative incompatibility with some standard EU positions, such as his support for Russian President Putin's policies in Chechnya, as well as his hawkishly pro-Israel stance on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. An indication of his relative detachment from Italy's traditional European-leaning policy was his roster of selections for the government ministry; his choices for the ministries of Defense and Economy in 2002 were recognized Euroskeptics. The shift in the stance and policy towards Europe was perhaps most strongly augured by a book published by Franco Frattini, who served as foreign minister for a

(2003), p. 273.

brief period in 2004. The book was titled *Cambiamo rotta*, which loosely translates to “Changing the Course of Action,” clearly signifying the direction of foreign policy under Berlusconi.¹⁶⁴ The new direction, supposedly, involved Italy taking a more active role abroad; in the introduction to Frattini’s book, Berlusconi declared “...in the last three years, Italy has become a protagonist in world politics.”¹⁶⁵

Part of that more active role also meant bolstering relations with its more aggressive ally across the Atlantic to collaborate on foreign policy initiatives. On this point, Berlusconi was in full accord with Aznar, both deeming a stronger alliance with the US as the key to raising both the security and international profile of their respective countries. As was the case in Spain, this seems to be partially attributable to the right wing orientation of the leadership; Berlusconi’s party, Forza Italia, was relatively new, and rose to power on a platform of great power aspirations. Italy’s experience with democratic government is far more extensive than is the case with Spain, reaching back to right after World War II, but the newness of Berlusconi’s party implies that any policy orientation, particularly on foreign affairs, would be weakly developed. He was first elected to office in 1994, the very year after the founding of his party for his first tenure, and then again in 2001 after having been ousted when a member of the 1994 coalition absconded in protest of electoral issues.

It is probably not a stretch to say that, in a country that holds within its territory the seat of the largest Christian church in the world, religion could also be a significant factor affecting the policies of the political right. While religious links may be a general element among right wing parties, both in Europe as well as the rest of the world, the Christian element seems to be rather

¹⁶⁴ James Walston, 'Italian Foreign Policy: Light and Shade in the Second Berlusconi Government', paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Modern Italy (ASMI), London, 26–7 November 2004, <<http://www.york.ac.uk/depts/poli/news/asmi/walston.pdf>> (2 February 2007).

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

pronounced in Italy; the speaker of the Senate under Berlusconi, Marcello Pera, is a strong defender of Europe's Christian roots,¹⁶⁶ and Berlusconi himself has ruffled feathers in declaring European civilization to be superior to Islam.¹⁶⁷ Soon after the attacks of September 11, he was quoted as saying "We must be aware of the superiority of our civilisation, a system that has guaranteed well-being, respect for human rights and - in contrast with Islamic countries - respect for religious and political rights,"¹⁶⁸ causing quite an uproar throughout the EU.

Yet it is important to emphasize that Italian policy under Berlusconi, as influenced by Christianity, was not hostile towards the European question. The Vatican is a strong advocate of Christianity not just in Italy but for the entire continent, a stance that brings it together with the political left in advocating for a stronger, more united Europe. Pope Benedict XVI has frequently lamented the decline in Christianity in the region, and it is not unlikely that he sympathizes with the American president, with whom he has met, insofar as the strong public expression of his faith. Interestingly, the pope has been described by some of his critics as a "neoconservative,"¹⁶⁹ not a complete surprise for a man who asserts, "We are moving toward a dictatorship of relativism which does not recognize anything as for certain and which has as its highest goal one's own ego and one's own desires."¹⁷⁰ In his view, it is "rapid secularization" and pretending God does not exist [that] 'compromises the future of culture and society.'¹⁷¹ While citing a different threat than the Bush administration, the thinking is strikingly similar.

¹⁶⁶ "Seeking divine help," *The Economist*, 6 June 2003, p. 283.

¹⁶⁷ James Walston, "Italian Foreign Policy."

¹⁶⁸ "EU deplores 'dangerous' Islam jibe," *BBC News*, 27 September 2001, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/1565664.stm> (18 March 2007).

¹⁶⁹ Michael Novak, "Rome's Radical Conservative," *New York Times*, 20 April 2005, p. A25.

¹⁷⁰ Ian Fisher, "Benedict: A Man of his Words," *New York Times*, 29 January 2006, p.4-18.

¹⁷¹ Ian Fisher, "Pope Visits Spain, Flash Point for Church-State Tensions," *New York Times*, 9 July 2006, p. A3.

CHAPTER 5: EUROPE VS. US ON IRAQ

Given the background for the foreign policy orientations of each of these five European countries, as well as of the nature of their relations with the US, it is now possible to begin to assess how ideology may have conditioned individual responses towards the invasion of Iraq. Within this framework, the element of religion is pertinent as a particularly strong type of ideology. Right-wing governments were running three of the five countries in 2003; the presidency of Jacques Chirac in France has hardly been typical of standard right-wing qualities, however, and the distinction is a significant one. All five of the countries have been allies of America since the end of World War II, though anti-American sentiments prevail in all to a certain degree, perhaps most strongly in France. The UK is unique in that it has long cultivated a special partnership with the US, though the countries of Spain and Italy began to draw conspicuously closer to the US with the election of their right-wing governments. The character of each nation today owes strongly to its experiences during the World War II and Cold War eras, and the governments of each reflected the same. The Cold War offered a diverse array of lessons, however, and the interpretations of the specific individuals at the helm of each government determined the course of action they took in response to the overtures of the US. Each country has its own unique foreign policy orientation, and the ideologies of the governments in power at the time were also distinctive in their own ways.

Some scholars have tried to reduce the relations between the US and its allies in the manner of Robert Kagan, essentially amounting to the “America is from Mars, Europe is from Venus” equation. Indeed, Mary Buckley and Robert Singh agree that realist power rationales are not accepted by the post-modern society of Europe. They describe Europe’s greater faith in international organizations as evidence of the “philosophical differences on the use and morality

of force” in the international system.¹⁷² While the aggressively Martian US might opt for force in settling its disputes, the pacifist Venutian Europe seeks to resolve conflicts primarily through extensive diplomacy and negotiation. Of course, beyond philosophical differences is also the more tangible fact that the US is the world’s preeminent military power. The militarily weaker European countries may favor multilateral cooperation on an ideological level, but it is most directly compatible with their interests.

Yet Buckley and Singh seem to contradict themselves when they describe the difference in the European response to the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq as indicative of different levels of acceptance of the Bush Doctrine. While the US enjoyed unanimous support for the invasion of Afghanistan, the debate on Iraq within Europe was much more polarized, at least among governments. Popular opinion on the Iraq war was strongly opposed; even in Britain, where public support was highest, polls indicated that only 45% were for and 55% were against the war. In Italy it was 28% for and 73% against, yet both countries officially supported the US; why was this the case? Buckley and Singh note that all six of the Western European nations that joined the “coalition of the willing” were ruled by right-wing governments at the time of the US invasion, (Britain is not included in this characterization).¹⁷³ Apparently, these right-wing administrations were more tolerant of the Bush Doctrine than the governments in the rest of Europe; it seems that the broad description of Europe as a post-modern utopia has some flaws to it.

Alain Joxe, a specialist in strategic affairs and contemporary wars and the director of studies at the École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, has a rather different assessment of the situation. He opines that the differences in the strategic cultures of nations are not indicative of a civilizational clash, but rather of political decisions made in the defense of different national

¹⁷² Buckley and Singh, *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism*, p.42.

¹⁷³ *Ibid*, p. 35.

interests. He notes that they are often portrayed as a conflict of ideologies, but he dismisses the possibility that this discord plays any significant role.¹⁷⁴ While his position accounts for the more nuanced picture in which Europe is not merely a single ideological bloc but a coalition of diverse interests, his complete discounting of the power of ideology threatens to miss an important point. While certain specifically national concerns could produce variation in certain types of interests, for all intents and purposes, national interests are not terribly distinct between different European countries. The ability to cooperate and work together through the association in the European Union provides evidence to this effect. In contrast, the distinct responses by the governments indicate that another factor could be at play. As ideology provides a major framework through which to perceive and assess national concerns, it seems likely that different ideological positions may have accounted for the different responses.

¹⁷⁴ Alain Joxe, "Divergences entre cultures stratégiques," in *Démythifier l'universalité des valeurs américaines*, ed. Jean Liberman, (Lyon : Parangon/Vs, 2004): p.77.

CHAPTER 6: RELIGION AND THE TRANSATLANTIC DIVIDE

While all of Europe may not speak with a single united voice, it is certainly true that as a general rule, the cultural shift in Europe has been away from religion while in the US, religious inclinations continue to be high and have made unprecedented gains in politics. European perceptions of the relatively high religiosity in America span back to the early history of the Republic. While some expressed praise for such religious virtues as volunteerism, which were in strong evidence in America, there was also a prevailing sense that religious life in the US essentially amounted to “chaos and a curiosity.”¹⁷⁵ It was only in the 20th century that European concern developed over the broader consequences that the religiosity on the other side of the Atlantic could have for the world. Similarly, the wariness towards the American President is strongly influenced by the apprehensive stance towards the expression of faith in America.

President Bush has made no secret of the fact that he uses his intuition and religious inclinations to distinguish between which world leaders he can or cannot trust, even when his assessments might seem to contradict conventional wisdom. He described his first meeting with the Russian President Putin in spiritual terms, declaring “I looked the man in the eye...[and] I was able to get a sense of his soul.” Putin’s admission to the President of the personal importance he felt for a cross given to him by his mother, and which he had had blessed in Israel, no doubt helped produce this positive evaluation.¹⁷⁶ Likewise, following his election in November 2002, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan was told, “You believe in the Almighty, and I believe in the Almighty. That’s why we’ll be great partners.”¹⁷⁷ Alongside these positive

¹⁷⁵ William R. Hutchison, “Innocence Abroad: The “American Religion” in Europe,” *Church History*, 51, No. 1. (1982), p. 74.

¹⁷⁶ Glenn Kessler, “Bush Sets the Terms in Forming Relationships With World Leaders,” *Washington Post*, 8 June 2004, p. A1.

¹⁷⁷ Kaplan, *With God on Their Side: George W. Bush and the Christian Right*, p. 9.

assessments were those that forebode tensions with less religiously inclined leaders. While lack of religious fervor was not explicitly pointed out as the problem, a more subtle explanation seems to suggest that the religious views do in fact color perceptions.

According to White House officials, Bush's parameters for assessing fellow statesmen depend largely upon their worldviews and how closely they accord with his own. Specifically, he demands that they "get" the war on terrorism, talk simply, and not break commitments. Further, he measures them in accordance to his own approach, breaking it down to "Good people or bad people? Do they have a vision for their countries or not?"¹⁷⁸ The leaders of the two European countries which have had the tensest relations with the US, France and Germany, seemed not to live up to Bush's standards. President Chirac apparently didn't "get" the war on terrorism, and the vociferous anti-war stand that Chancellor Schroeder took during his reelection campaign was perceived as betrayal. It cannot escape notice that these are also the two most broadly secular countries of the five under analysis here. The general sentiment of anti-Europeanism in the administration may owe to the fact that France and Germany are the two countries most prominent in the framework of the EU, even though a number of other member states are, or have been, allies in the Iraq War.

In an age of rapid personal diplomacy, the rapport and connection between leaders is a crucial aspect of international relations. The individual style of a leader in forging these relationships is an important element, and that of the American president tends to be a subject of great interest for other world leaders, as they are aware that their individual relationships with him will have broad ramifications for their countries. Prime Minister Tony Blair is particularly adept at the art of the personal relationship, having forged a close bond with the

¹⁷⁸ Kessler, "Bush Sets the Terms in Forming Relationships With World Leaders."

Democratic Bill Clinton, and now as well with his Republican successor. While his relationship with Clinton may have been bolstered by their political similitude, success in forging strong relations with President Bush resulted from his careful study of the American President, his goals and his manner. Blair is probably the leader who has been most effective in this endeavor, and it is not difficult to speculate that the similarity in their religious and moral perspectives has been significant in this regard. The religious influence or absence thereof in other world leaders and its effect on their relations with President Bush appears to correspond to the model set by Blair. But individual leaders are a small and temporary, albeit crucial, aspect of international relations; in democratic countries there is also the even more important factor of the population.

Beyond the nature of relations between the governments, misunderstandings among the publics of the US and Europe signify a widening gulf in the cultural norms across the Atlantic. The Foreign Minister of the European Union, Javier Solana, identifies the disparity between attitudes towards church-state relations as the major point of contention between Europe and the US. "For us Europeans, it is difficult to deal with because we are secular. We do not see the world in such black and white terms."¹⁷⁹ Even if not explicitly, the religiously tinged worldview of the US affects its conception of geopolitical relations; while the EU favors working through multilateral channels and international organizations, the US has traditionally been more content to lead the way on most issues of global reach. The more direct relevance of the influence of religion on international relations, therefore, can be described from the different perspectives that the EU and the US take on the dominant role that the US plays in global politics. Even prior to the Bush administration, much of the world resented the US for the negative consequences of

¹⁷⁹ Judy Dempsey, "Solana laments rift between Europe and 'religious' US: Foreign policy chief believes stark White House world view is widening gulf," *Financial Times*, 8 January 2003, p. 14.

globalization, a trend largely guided by its policies since the 20th century. Within the US, on the other hand, its leading global role is perceived as a responsibility as well as a benefit; it views its willingness to shoulder the extreme costs of the global project as an equitable tradeoff for directing various global affairs crucial to its own interests. Such a conception of a nation's global role is undeniably messianic.

Beyond religion: differences in geopolitical conceptions

Although it is undeniable that the trend towards unilateralism in global affairs has become more pronounced under the Bush administration, even the relatively pro-European administration of Bill Clinton encountered conflicts in dealing with the EU on a number of issues. The New Transatlantic Agenda was a declaration signed by the US and the EU in which they agreed to be partners on the various missions of promoting global peace and stability through democratic values and development, responding to global challenges and expanding world trade regimes. The goals were in place, but structural issues impeded broad progress.¹⁸⁰ While the hegemonic orientation of the US can be considered to contribute to the problems, the EU itself contributes insofar as the member states of the bloc have trouble speaking with a united voice on a number of politically critical issues, particularly those involving security. It is little wonder that the US government tends not to perceive the EU as a single entity.¹⁸¹

Yet support for dealing through multilateral means to resolve global conflicts tends to prevail across the EU, even if the method does not always work in practice, and this different attitude highlights another aspect of the divergence in worldviews. During the Cold War, it was commonly assumed that the US and Europe had common values and interests, as the stalwarts of

¹⁸⁰ Dr. Fraser Cameron, "The EU and US: Friends or Rivals?" presented at Seminar hosted by: National European Centre and National Institute of Social Sciences and Law, 11 March 2004, <www.anu.edu.au/NEC/Archive/Cameron_EU_paper.pdf> (5 February 2007).

¹⁸¹ Ibid

democracy, liberal values and human rights. More recently, conflicts have arisen on social issues and economic models, the latter substantially informed by religion in the US, and religion itself comprising a major cultural difference. To use the analogy of Kagan, if the Hobbesian worldview held in the US draws distinct differences on questions of good and evil, then threats to US security and values could be perceived as embodying evil, while religion provides a strong foundation for the moral good. In Europe, the thinking is not so Manichaean; international threats are perceived with alarm there as well, but rather than the stridently aggressive “rout out evil” approach of President Bush, dialogue and international cooperation tend to be the methods of choice for trying to find solutions. The legacy of World War II has made Europe as a whole much more averse to the use of force as the solution to a conflict, while in America, trends across different parts of society seem to have increased the inclination towards war.

There is no dispute that the Bush Doctrine provoked passionate responses from the European allies of the US, some stalwartly loyal, others adamantly opposed. It is not my intention to imply that the different conceptions of religion comprise the sole, or even the primary, reason for which these countries responded as they did. Although the aggressiveness of the US became particularly pronounced following the September 11 terrorist attacks, with the turn to unilateralism arising in the face of opposition towards stated goals for Iraq, the Bush administration had butted heads with its allies even from before. President Bush abrogated the anti-ballistic missile treaty, he spurned international accords like the Kyoto Protocol, and the fortification of NATO was a goal. The new assertiveness of US policy with the Bush administration seems to have been a result both of different priorities between the Republicans and the Democrats, as well as more directly a backlash against the milder brand of foreign policy

practiced during the Clinton administration.¹⁸² The nature of the change between administrations was a fact that European leaders had observed and grappled with even before the Iraq invasion, and depending on whether or not they felt threatened by it, their own behavior would be correspondingly impacted.

In more materialist terms, a factor in the opposition of certain countries that has been excessively trumpeted by Republican supporters of the Iraq invasion is that of petroleum. While the US and Britain had been shut out of the oil market of Iraq, France, as well as Russia and China, was favored.¹⁸³ Indeed, it is impossible to engage in a discussion of US policy towards the Middle East without acknowledging the crucial factor of energy security. Geopolitical interests essentially mean that “whoever controls the Middle East controls the global oil spigot,”¹⁸⁴ and thus the global economy as well. Indeed, from the outset of the war there was strong suspicion, even within the US, that oil was the true motivating factor for the administration’s actions, but such a notion is a broad oversimplification. The goal of bolstering American power, one shared by many factions that led the drive to war, would certainly be furthered by greater influence in a region that is home to one of the world’s most valuable resources. The many other complicated factors involved, however, demonstrate that this was hardly the sole element, and as far as international relations are concerned, it gives little hint as to the reasons why the countries discussed, all American allies, would react as differently as they did.

¹⁸² Vladimir Brovkin, “Who is with Whom: The United States, the European Union, and Russia on the Eve of the War in Iraq,” *Demokratizasiya*, 2003, p.217.

¹⁸³ David Harvey, *The New Imperialism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005): p. 18.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p.19.

CHAPTER 7: EFFECTS ON INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY OBSERVED SO FAR

Trying to explain the responses of individual US allies in Europe really seems to depend upon a combination of both the government in power as well as the country's post-World War II history. As Mary Buckley pointed out, the European countries that supported the US in the invasion were being run by right-wing governments. But the fact that France was also governed by its right-of-center party, and that the ruling party in Britain was left-of-center Labor, indicates that there was something in particular about the right-wing parties in Italy and Spain that inclined them to side with America over the rest of the EU. Indeed, following the electoral ousters of the right-wing leaders who had supported the American policy, the new left-wing administrations immediately began the process of withdrawing Italian and Spanish troops, in accordance with the popular will. The similar worldviews of the deposed right-wing leaders to the American President on the issue of terrorism, as well as the perception that a strong American alliance would be to their country's benefit, were almost certainly the principal factors. However, the connections between the political parties, as well as of the individual leaders, with the conservative religious elements in their countries is a fact that should be taken very seriously.

The state of international relations today between the US and the European Union, as well as with the specific member states, has been strongly impacted by the war, as well as by the forceful nature of the Bush administration in general. France and Germany were among the countries barred from bidding on reconstruction contracts in Iraq, though they agreed to collaborate with the US for debt relief efforts in the country. They remained steadfast against sending troops, even for peacekeeping operations, however. On other foreign policy issues that have come to the fore since the US invasion, such as on nuclearization in Iran, there has been a

relatively strong level of cooperation with the countries of “Old Europe.” The US has certainly eased its bellicose stance since the Iraq enterprise proved to be less successful than anticipated, however, and it is worth noting that even on the Iran issue the Europeans tend to tread more cautiously than the US, as official political rhetoric would have it.

For the most part, while relations with France and Germany have shown some improvement, there has been little real change in attitudes towards US policy. As recently as January 2007, President Chirac declared, “As France had foreseen and feared, the war in Iraq has sparked upheavals that have yet to show their full effects...It has undermined the stability of the entire region, where every country now fears for its security and its independence. It has offered terrorism a new field for expansion.”¹⁸⁵ Such an outlook has prevailed from the start in the perceptions of US policy in these countries. It is more interesting to consider the reorientation, or adjustment, in attitudes that has occurred in the three countries that originally supported the war. Within this discussion, noting the specific reasons why changes in official policy may have occurred could provide further clarification for why American allies in Europe might respond to certain US policies the way they do.

Presidential elections have occurred in four of the European countries discussed in this essay since the start of the Iraq War. In Germany, there were two elections, Schroeder’s reelection in 2002, and another election in 2005, called a year early as the chancellor hoped to reinvigorate his government with a strong victory (ironically the opposite occurred). In Spain, Aznar was ousted by Socialist candidate José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero after two terms in 2004, and in Italy the Parliamentary elections of 2006 led to the ascendancy of the center-left coalition of Romano Prodi. The strongly pro-European stances of each are well-known; Prodi ruled as President of the

¹⁸⁵ Elaine Sciolino, “Chirac Says Time Proves France Was Right to Resist War,” *The New York Times*, 6 January 2007, A7.

European Commission from 1999 to 2004, and was chosen for his well-known support of the EU. Zapatero hails from the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, long considered the "most European" of Spain's political parties, and since its inception in 1879 has viewed Europe as the "solution" to Spain's historical social and political problems.¹⁸⁶ Thus, it is clear that an important motivation for both of these leaders was the re-prioritization of Europe over the alliance with the US, which had shaped the policies of their predecessors.

A second point of comparison more relevant to the argument about ideology pertains more to the positions of Zapatero and Prodi on the political spectrum, particularly with regard to social issues that hold religious or moral weight. Both hail from Catholic countries that have historically been conservative with respect to the rest of Europe, and both are leaders of center-left parties. The expectation might be that even the progressive parties from these countries will be relatively restrained in their positioning on religiously charged issues, and yet this expectation is impugned by the fact that on such issues as gay marriage and abortion rights they are in fact to the left of even their center-left counterpart in America, the Democratic Party. On the issue of gay marriage, both Zapatero and Prodi have been quite vigorous in their support of its legalization, and they likewise support a woman's right to an abortion. Prodi has been described as a "devout Catholic,"¹⁸⁷ while Zapatero has been notable, and controversial, in Spain for his strong drive towards secularization on a number of fronts. Clearly, both have a far more liberal religious orientation than the Bush administration, and the difference in ideology can lead to different assessments of priorities, which can lead to policies that differ from and may come in conflict with one another.

¹⁸⁶ Paul Kennedy, "Spain's 'Third Way'?: the Spanish Socialist Party's utilization of European integration," *Journal of Southern Europe & the Balkans*, 3 No. 1 (2001), p 49.

¹⁸⁷ Ian Fisher "A tenuous time for Mr. Serenity," *The International Herald Tribune Europe*, 12 April 2006 <<http://www.iht.com/articles/2006/04/11/news/prodi.php>> (10 February 2007).

The final country that was, and the only one that has steadfastly remained, an ally of the US in the war in Iraq is Great Britain. Blair was elected to his third term as prime minister in 2005. There was great unrest among the British population of his support of the American administration's policies in Iraq, and the results at the polls were the most dismal that he'd had in his entire period in office. Yet it was hardly a razor-thin victory; the decline of the Conservative Party and the personal unpopularity of candidate Michael Howard seemed to be crucial factors to the outcome. Blair's victory in spite of his relatively low public approval would seem to contradict the phenomenon in Italy and Spain, where the ouster of the pro-American administrations appeared to indicate that the Iraq issue was more important for voters. Public support for the war was far lower in these two countries than in Britain, providing a possible explanation, and the fact that both are historically more pro-Europe than pro-America, oppositely to Britain, seems to similarly vouch for the difference. A closer analysis, however, indicates that domestic factors, including in some cases direct repercussions of involvement in Iraq, played a greater role in the decisions of populations to elect or depose their governments.

Though the reelection of Blair in 2005 seems to provide evidence that the impact of Iraq upon voter preferences in other countries was not high, no greater proof is provided other than by the ouster of the German chancellor later that same year. The relatively small margin by which Berlusconi lost in Italy likewise implies that even for a strongly opposed population, the government's orientation on the American invasion was a secondary concern at best. The largest difference in voting numbers was in Spain, where Zapatero's party secured 43.3% of the popular vote, and 164 legislative seats, to the 38.3% and 148 seats won by Aznar's party. The train bombings in Madrid just three days before the elections are widely seen to have tipped the balance in Zapatero's favor. Here then is a more direct instance of international repercussions

stemming from the invasion of Iraq, and how such events have the potential to impact domestic politics in other countries.

Neither Italy, Germany nor Britain experienced any such direct consequences of their decision to support the US prior to their elections. The London train bombings occurred a few months after Blair's reelection, and it is uncertain whether his victory would have been possible had the attack occurred beforehand. Indeed, the terrorist attacks in Spain and Britain, which hold strong parallels to the September 11 attacks in the US, are the most prominent of what have arisen as a number of tensions across Europe with domestic Muslim populations and Middle Eastern countries.

While it would be an overstatement to ascribe US involvement in the region as the sole reason for the aggravation of these problems, there can be little doubt that there is a relation to the increased wariness by European governments of Muslim populations in their countries. The riots in France in 2005 within neighborhoods predominantly inhabited by Northern African Muslims is most directly a result of the French government's failure to effectively embrace its Muslim citizens and integrate them into the social fabric of society. The demonstrations that broke out across Europe as well as the Middle East in response to the publication of cartoons that were perceived as anti-Muslim resulted from the strong offense at the sacrilegious action. Both, however, are suggestive of the increasing alienation that the Muslim world is feeling from Western society, and no other action has appeared to pose as much of a threat as the Iraq invasion.

CONCLUSION

Throughout this paper, it has not been my intention to attest to the sincerity of the expressions and justifications used by the Bush administration to invade Iraq. Weapons of mass destruction ended up being the prime material reason that was used to substantiate the aggression, but certain ideologies were also used to bolster the policy, depending on the audience in question. It is these precise ideologies, and especially their reception in other countries, that comprise my interest in writing this paper. Whether sincere in their intentions or not, it is undeniable that the strategy, the support-building and the execution of the war depended heavily on the activities of the neoconservatives and right-wing evangelicals. In certain cases, the very perception by other countries of this fact served to cause them alarm, though more dominant was the image that the US put forward, which was indirectly but substantially colored by these ideologies. Depending on the interests of the allies and the perspectives of their leaders, this lent itself to disagreement in some cases, and strong accord in others.

Perhaps the strongest unifying principle between the neoconservative and evangelical ideologies is the importance of unilateralism in American policy. Additionally shared ideas such as America's role in the world and the maintenance of American power are all related to the motivation for unilateralism, American power unrestrained by other international actors or policies. Beyond any apocalyptic notion about hastening the end times, as well as of any ambitious plans to realign the powers in the Middle East through the spread of democracy, both groups are fundamentally suspicious of and even hostile to the suggestion that American power could and should be checked. While America has asserted itself as hegemon of the Western world since WWII, and of the world at large since the fall of the Soviet Union, unilateralism has not been an explicit aspect of US policy until the Bush administration. It is this aspect of the policy

influence which should be viewed as the most significant achievement of the two factions; most revolutionary of all is the fact that the policy reorientation was driven by interests to begin with, in part by interjecting themselves directly into the administration itself.

My discussion of the responses of the allies should also not be seen so much as a constructivist argument positing that the clash in ideas is responsible for the particular positions they took vis-à-vis the US on the Iraq invasion. Certainly, the coherence or lack thereof of worldviews is an important aspect of effective diplomacy, and the culture clash was very likely a contributing factor to the hostile reactions of Germany and France. On a more pragmatic level, however, it was attitudes towards America's assertion of willingness to go-it-alone in Iraq, and in its foreign policy in general, that probably caused antagonism. On the other hand, for their own political reasons and/or visions, the leaders of Italy, Britain and Spain were more than willing to follow the lead of the US and support it in the invasion.

Political ideology is most relevant to real world events in terms of how it translates to government policy and actions. My argument is not about the particulars of the ideological notions of the interest groups that helped to craft and effect the invasion of Iraq, but rather of the potential for power that interest groups can accumulate, and how strong an impact they were able to make in the Bush administration, just when every political signal seemed to turn in their favor. For these reasons, I believe their influence on the foreign policy to have been of a revolutionary scale, leading to a foreign policy orientation and strategy that was itself rather groundbreaking. While the influence of these groups seems to have been receding with the increasingly dismal news coming out of Iraq, conservative Christian political activists remain a force to be reckoned with, and the fact that the intentions of spreading democracy and American power remain are testament to the fact that, in spite of failed policies, the ideologies themselves live on. Finally,

perhaps no other indicator is quite as poignant as that of Iraq itself. The transformation of this country, and the upheaval of the Middle East, that has occurred in the past four years are impossible to quantify. The past few years may have seen a reorientation of the original, aggressively unilateralist Bush Doctrine, but the situation in Iraq remains as a stark reminder of the revolution that the policy was, and of the revolution that it has caused.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “About Us.” American Values. <<http://ouramericanvalues.org>> (5 January 2007).
- “AEI’s Organization and Purposes.” American Enterprise Institute.
<http://www.aei.org/about/filter.all/default.asp> (30 December 2006).
- “Andrew Jackson, First Seminole War.” *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*. 2007:
<<http://www.britannica.com/ebi/article-229744>> (18 January 2007).
- Bacevich, Andrew J. *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Becker, Elizabeth. “Head of Religion-Based Initiative Resigns.” *The New York Times*. 18 August 2001: A11.
- Boustany, Nora. “The View from Spain.” *Washington Post*. January 14, 2004: p. A16.
- Brovkin, Vladimir. “Who is with Whom: The United States, the European Union, and Russia on the Eve of the War in Iraq.” *Demokratizasiya*. 2003, p.212-227.
- Buckley, Mary and Singh, Robert, Eds. *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism: Global Responses, Global Consequences*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Cameron, Dr. Fraser. “The EU and US: Friends or Rivals?” presented at Seminar hosted by: National European Centre and National Institute of Social Sciences and Law. 11 March 2004: <www.anu.edu.au/NEC/Archive/Cameron_EU_paper.pdf> (5 February 2007).
- Coe, Kevin and Domke, David. “Petitioners or Prophets? Presidential Discourse, God, and the Ascendancy of Religious Conservatives.” *Journal of Communication*. 56 No. 2 (2006): p. 309-330.
- Contenta, Sandro. “France open to war of 'last resort' with Iraq.” *Toronto Star*. 9 October 2002: p. A15.
- Crawford, Neta C. “Just War Theory and the US Counterterrorism War.” *Perspectives on Politics*. 1, No. 1 (2003): p. 7.
- Cornwell, Rupert. “The Yo-Yo relationship.” *The Independent on Sunday*. 23 July 2006: p. 48.
- Daalder, Ivo H. and Lindsay, James M. *America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*. Hoboken: Wiley, 2005.
- Coughlin, Con. *American Ally: Tony Blair and the War on Terror*. New York: Ecco/HarperCollins, 2006.
- Croci, Osvaldo. “The Second Berlusconi Government and Italian Foreign Policy.” *The International Spectator*. 37 no. 2 (2002): p. 89-101.
- Croci, Osvaldo. “Italian Security Policy after the Cold War.” *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*. 8 no. 2 (2003): p. 266-283.

- Davidson, Lawrence. "Christian Zionism as a Representation of American Manifest Destiny." *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies*. 14, no. 2 (2005): p. 157-169.
- Dempsey, Judy. "Solana laments rift between Europe and 'religious' US: Foreign policy chief believes stark White House world view is widening gulf." *Financial Times*. 8 January 2003: p. 14.
- Drury, Shadia B. "Saving America: Leo Strauss and the neoconservatives." Evatt Foundation <<http://evatt.labor.net.au/publications/papers/112.html>> (24 March 2007).
- "EU deplores 'dangerous' Islam jibe." *BBC News*. 27 September 2001: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/1565664.stm> (18 March 2007).
- "EU attitudes in UK Analytical Report." European Commission. May 2006. <http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_185.pdf> (16 March 2007).
- Fisher, Ian. "A tenuous time for Mr. Serenity." *International Herald Tribune*. 12 April 2006 <<http://www.ihf.com/articles/2006/04/11/news/prodi.php>> (15 February 2007).
- Fisher, Ian. "Benedict: A Man of his Words." *New York Times*. 29 January 2006: Section 4 p.18.
- Fisher, Ian. "Pope Visits Spain, Flash Point for Church-State Tensions." *New York Times*. 9 July 2006: p. A3.
- Freedland, Jonathan "Big Business, Not Religion, is the Real Power in the White House." *The Guardian*, 7 June 2006 <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/Columnists/Column/0,,1791826,00.html>> (20 December 2006).
- Fukuyama, Francis. "After Neoconservatism." *New York Times Magazine*, 19 February 2006: p. 62-68.
- Fukuyama, Francis. *America at the Crossroads: democracy, power, and the neoconservative legacy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.¹
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *Surprise, Security and the American Experience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Gardner, Lloyd C. "Damned High Wire," On the Special Relationship that Unites Bush and Blair in Iraq." *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*. 3 (2005), p. 43-62.
- de Gaulle, Charles. *Memoirs de Guerre: I. L'Appel 1940-1942*. Paris: Plon, 1954.
- Graff, James and Crumley, Bruce. "France Is Not a Pacifist Country." *Time Magazine Online*. 16 February 2003: <<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1101030224-423466,00.html>> (14 March 2007).

- Harvey, David. *The New Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. Kennedy, Paul. "Spain's 'Third Way'?: the Spanish Socialist Party's utilization of European integration." *Journal of Southern Europe & the Balkans*. 3 No. 1 (2001), p 49-59.
- Henriques, Diana B. "Religion Trumps Regulation As Legal Exemptions Grow." *The New York Times*. 8 October 2006: A1.
- Huntington, Nicholas and Bale, Tim. "New Labour: New Christian Democracy?" *The Political Quarterly*. 73 no. 1 (2002): p. 44-50.
- Hutchison, William R. "Innocence Abroad: The "American Religion" in Europe." *Church History*. 51, No. 1. (1982): p. 71-84.
- "Isolationism," Dictionary.com 18 January 2007
<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/isolationism>. "George W. Bush on Faith." Third Presidential Debate: October 13 2004.
http://www.beliefnet.com/story/149/story_14930_1.html> (2 December 2006).
- Jacoby, Susan. *Freethinkers: A History of American Secularism*. Farmingdale: Owl Books, 2004.
- "Jacques Chirac becomes a left-wing president." *The Economist*. 15 March 2005:
<http://www.conscience-politique.org/2005/theeconomistchiracleftistpresident.htm>> (2 January 2007).
- Judis, John B. "The Chosen Nation: The Influence of Religion on U.S. Foreign Policy." Policy Brief. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/PB37.judis.FINAL.pdf>.> (18 December 2006).
- Kagan, Robert. *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005. Kaplan, Esther. *With God on Their Side: George W. Bush and the Christian Right*. New York: New Press, 2005.
- Kelley, Colleen E. "With God on his Side: Deconstructing the post-9/11 discourse of President George W. Bush." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian and New Zealand Communication Association, Christchurch New Zealand, 4-7 July 2005.
<http://www.mang.canterbury.ac.nz/ANZCA/FullPapers/01PeaceCommKelleyFINAL.pdf>
 > (23 October 2006).
- Kessler, Glenn. "Bush Sets the Terms in Forming Relationships With World Leaders." *Washington Post*. 8 June 2004: p. A1.
- Keys, Sharon. Interview with author. People for the American Way. Washington, D.C., 20 March 2006.
- Kristol, Irving. *Neoconservatism: The Autobiography of an Idea*. New York: The Free Press, 1995.

- Kristol, William and Kagan, Robert. "Toward a neo-Reaganite foreign policy." *Foreign Affairs*; 75, no. 4 (1996): pg. 27.
- Kuo, David. *Tempting Faith: An Inside Story of Political Seduction*. New York: Free Press, 2006.
- Labarique, Paul. "Donald Rumsfeld: a Machiavellian Artist in Power." Réseau Voltaire, Édition Internationale, 12 October 2004: <<http://www.voltairenet.org/article30042.html>> (9 January 2007).
- Labarique, Paul. « Paul Wolfowitz, l'âme du Pentagone. » Réseau Voltaire, Édition Internationale, 4 October 2004: <<http://www.voltairenet.org/article15033.html>> (3 January 2007).
- Large, David Clay. "'A Beacon in the German Darkness': The Anti-Nazi Resistance Legacy in West German Politics." *The Journal of Modern History*. 64, Supplement, (1992): p. S173-S186.
- Laurent, Eric. *Bush's Secret World*. Williston: Polity Press, 2004.
- "Libby: Lawyer, Adviser, Author," CBSNews.com, 28 October 2005. <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2005/10/27/politics/main989970.shtml> (4 January 2007).
- Lieberman, Jean. *Démythifier l'universalité des valeurs américaines*. Lyon : Parangon/Vs, 2004.
- Lievin, Anatol. *America: Right of Wrong*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd, 2004.
- Linker, Damon. *The Theocons: Secular America Under Siege*. New York: Doubleday, 2006.
- Lorda, Clara Ubaldina and Miche, Elisabeth. "Two institutional interviews: José María Aznar and Jacques Chirac on the Iraq conflict." *Discourse & Society*. 17, No. 4, p.447-472.
- Mandelson, Peter. *The Blair Revolution Revisited*. London: Politicos, 2002.
- Mann, James. *Rise of the Vulcans*. New York: Viking, 2004.
- Marcussen, Martin. "Constructing Europe? The evolution of French, British and German nation state identities." *Journal of European Public Policy*. 6 No. 4 (1999): p. 614-633.
- Mathy, Jean-Philippe. "French-American Relations and the War in Iraq: Anything New, or Business As Usual?" *Contemporary French and Francophone Studies*. 8, No. 4 (2004), p. 415-424.
- Norton, Anne. *Leo Strauss and the Politics of Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Novak, Michael. "Rome's Radical Conservative." *New York Times*. 20 April 2005: p. A25.
- Packer, George. *The Assassin's Gate: America in Iraq*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006. Perez-Rivas, Manuel. "Bush vows to rid the world of 'evil-doers.'" CNN.com, 16

- September 2001. <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/US/09/16/gen.bush.terrorism/> (15 December 2006).
- Perle, Richard; Colbert, □ James; Fairbanks, Charles Jr.; Feith, Douglas; Loewenberg, Robert; Torop, Jonathan; □ Wurmser, David; Wurmser, Meyrav. "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm." Study Group on "A New Israeli Strategy Toward 2000." <<http://www.israeleconomy.org/strat1.htm>> (5 January 2007).
- Phillips, Kevin. *American Theocracy: The Peril and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century*. New York: Viking, 2006.
- "Philosophers and Kings." *Economist*, 19 June 2003: p.1.
- Potter, Pittman B. "Preventive War Critically Considered." *The American Journal of International Law*. 45, No. 1 (1951): p. 142-145.
- "President Nixon and Bob Haldeman Discuss Donald Rumsfeld." Miller Center of Public Affairs. 9 March 1971: <http://tapes.millercenter.virginia.edu/clips/rmn_rumsfeld.html> (9 January 2007).
- "President's Remarks at the 2004 Republican National Convention." The White House: 2 September 2004. <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/09/20040902-2.html>> (25 March 2007).
- "Q&A with Gerhard Schroeder: 'There's Really No Reason to Worry About...the Euro.'" *Business Week*. 11 June 2001: <http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/01_24/b3736090.htm> (28 January 2007).
- Reiter, Dan. "Exploding the Powder Keg Myth." *International Security*. 20 No. 5 (1995): p.5.
- Rich, Andrew *Think Tanks, Public Policy and the Politics of Expertise*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Rich, Frank. "The Jerry Bruckheimer White House." *New York Times*. 11 May 2003, Section 2, p.1.
- Rolfe, Pamela. "For Spanish Leader, War Is a Gamble." *The Washington Post*. 20 March 2003: A21.
- "Rumors of War; Axis of Oil and Iraq." Editorial. *The San Francisco Chronicle*. 13 November 2002: p. A25.
- "Schrader on US President Bush: 'Almost Biblical Semantics.'" *Spiegel International Online*: 25 October 2006 <<http://www.spiegel.de/international/0,1518,444751,00.html>> (3 December 2006).
- Sciolino, Elaine. "Chirac Says Time Proves France Was Right to Resist War." *The*

New York Times. 6 January 2007: A7.

“Seeking divine help.” *The Economist*. 6 June 2003: p. 283.

Sharlet, Jeff. “Ten Things I Learned From the Pentagon's Prayer Team.” *AlterNet*. 4 January 2007: <<http://www.alternet.org/story/46262/>> (10 January 2007).

Soros, George. “Why I Have Campaigned Across America to Put John Kerry in the White House.” *The Independent (London)*. 2 November 2004, p. 29.

Sider, Ronald J. and Knippas, Diane. *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy: political strategies for the health of the nation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2005.

“Speech by M. Dominique de Villepin, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the United Nations Security Council, New York 19.03.2003.” France in the United Kingdom. <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/article.php3?id_article=4917> (25 March 2007).

Stahl, Bernhard. “Understanding the ‘Great Split’ in the Iraq crisis. A Comparative Approach of the Member States’ Foreign Policy.” Paper prepared for presentation at the UACES conference in Zagreb, 4-7 Sept. 2005.

“Statement by Joschka Fischer, □Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, □at the Public Meeting of the Security Council □on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait.” German Embassy Washington DC. 14 February 2003: <<http://www.germany.info/relaunch/politics/speeches/021403.htm>> (28 January 2007).

“Statement of Mission and Vision.” Patrick Henry College. <<http://www.phc.edu/about/mission.asp>>, (18 December 2006).

“Statement of Principles.” Project for the New American Century. <<http://newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>> (5 January 2007).

Strauss, Leo. “The Three Waves of Modernity.” *An Introduction to Political Philosophy: 10 Essays by Leo Strauss*. Ed. Hilail Gilden. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.

“The Two Faces of the Christian Coalition.” People for the American Way. <<http://www.electric-escape.net/rr/two-faces?PHPSESSID=0c50324b54654efd978ded02d19236>> (17 December 2006).

Turner, John Geoffrey. “Selling Jesus to Modern America: Campus Crusade for Christ, Evangelical Culture, and Conservative Politics.” Dissertation. University of Notre Dame Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2005. <<http://etd.nd.edu/ETD-db/theses/available/etd-09122005-095241/>> (25 March 2007).

Veit, Winfried. “Between Realpolitik and Historical Responsibility. Between Realpolitik and Historical Responsibility. The Red-Green Coalition’s Foreign Policy.” *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft*. No. 1, (2006), 46-64.

- Wall, Irwin M. "The French-American War Over Iraq." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*. 10 no. 2 (2004): p 123-139.
- Walston, James. 'Italian Foreign Policy: Light and Shade in the Second Berlusconi Government', paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Modern Italy (ASMI), London, 26–7 November 2004:
<<http://www.york.ac.uk/depts/poli/news/asmi/walston.pdf>> (2 February 2007).
- Walzer, Michael. Interview by Joanne J. Myers: *Books for Breakfast*. Carnegie Council. 26 October 2004 <
<http://206.252.132.104/viewMedia.php/prmTemplateID/8/prmID/5024?PHPSESSID=a5623a4e0bf7708e05e3fc6a71e67cc7>> (3 March 2007).
- The White House, Office of the Press Secretary. "President Holds Prime Time News Conference." Press release: 11 October 2001.
<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011011-7.html>> (2 December 2006).
- Williams, Gwyn A. "The Concept of 'Egemonia' in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci: Some Notes on Interpretation." *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 21, No. 4. (1960): pp. 586-599.
- Woodworth, Paddy. "Spain Changes Course: Aznar's Legacy, Zapatero's Prospects." *World Policy Journal*. (2004): p.7-26.
- Yaar, Prof. Ephraim and Hermann, Dr. Tamar. "Peace Index / Most Israelis support the attack on Iraq." *Haaretz Online*, 18 March 2003.
<<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/ShArtWar.jhtml?itemNo=269674&contrassID=33&%20subContrassID=4&sbSubContrassID=0>> (5 January 2007).
- Zuckert, Catherine and Zuckert, Michael. *The Truth about Leo Strauss*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.¹
- Zunes, Stephen. "The Influence of the Christian Right in U.S. Middle East Policy." *Middle East Policy*. 12 No. 2 (2005): p. 73-78.