

Department of Political Science
Lunds University

STVK02
VT2022
Tutor: Martin Hall



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

STVK02

Department of Political Science

Gustav Olsson

The War Of Deception, Operation Iraqi Freedom

Abstract

This Bachelor thesis will go into depth of how the rhetorical arguments used by the Bush administration led to the justification of war against Saddam Hussien's regime in Iraq 2003. This will be accomplished through the application of normative theory and its different types of instruments, used on Bush himself and one of his colleagues in the Bush Administration, Paul Wolfowitz, who had the key influence over the decision making process. The goal of the paper is to try and explain the motives behind the invasion, and how the administration managed to justify their actions for a war, amplified through a normative analysis. In the end, the overarching goal will be to find a bigger picture of how these issues could be justified - and if they, in fact, were justified through the different normative instruments. Thus, the main focus of this work.

Key words: Iraq war, Bush administration, Paul Wolfowitz, George Bush, Saddam Hussein, Operation Iraqi Freedom, Justification, WMDs,

Words: 9278

Table of contents

1 Introduction	4
1.1 Aim and research question	4
1.2 Background	5
1.3 Demarcation	5
1.4 Eventual problems	5
2 Theoretical framework	6
2.1 Former research ?	6
2.1.1 Memory for fact, fiction and misinformation.	6
2.1.2 Misperceptions, the media and the Iraq war.	7
3 Main theoretical approach	8
3.1 Theory	8
3.1.1 Deontologism	9
3.1.2 Consequentialism	9
3.1.3 Logic of expediency	10
3.1.4 Contractualism	10
4 Material	11
5 Method	11
6 Analysis	12
6.1.1 George W. Bush	13
6.1.2 Paul Wolfowitz	14
6.2.1 Bush's and Wolfowitz view and justification from a deontological perspective	15
6.2.2 Bush's and Wolfowitz Justification and its legitimacy through consequentialism	16
6.2.3 Bush's and Wolfowitz justification and legitimacy through the use of the logic of expediency	17
6.2.4 Bush's and Wolfowitz justification seen through a contractualistic perspective	17
7 Discussion, Conclusion & future research	18
7.1 Conclusion	20
7.2 future research	20
8 References gathered from internet	21
9 Literature list	21

1 Introduction

This section tends to explain for the reader the intended goal of the paper and why the chosen topic is of interest to be studied. There is also an introduction for the reader in this section of the intended research question for the paper that will try to be answered throughout the paper.

1.1 Aim and research question

The motive behind this thesis is to investigate the arguments made by the Bush administration for the invasion of Iraq. Could they actually have been justified? As were shown after the invasion, there were no weapons of mass destruction to be found by the US military during their occupation. Neither were there to be found any direct links to Al Qaeda, which Bush had claimed were strongly linked to Saddam Hussein. How come that the administration, due to these known facts, were not even more condemned by the international community? Bush claimed that he wanted to free the Iraqi people from the dictator Saddam and spread democracy and liberty to the country. How is it possible to state that bombing the country, which results in tens of thousands of civilian casualties, all in the name of democracy and liberation of the Iraqi people, can be seen as valid? The thesis presented is chosen in order to continuously dispute hierarchical structures imposed on the world. Thus, they will not go unnoticed. In the field of Social Science, there ought to be an obligation to examine and question major events brought onto the world. These events will have an impact on generations to come. Therefore it is of importance to always evaluate historical events as they still might have a role in today's geopolitical and political envelopes that can be played for insidious gains. The main question that will be discussed and analysed will therefore be: Could the invasion of Iraq 2003, "Operation Iraqi Freedom", be justified through the use of 'logics in normative theory'?

1.2 Background

The war in Iraq that began in 2003 was started by the Bush administration on the assumption that Saddam Hussein, who was the leader of Iraq, had the ability to produce and procure weapons of mass destruction. According to president Bush this would be a threat to the United States of America. This assumption of the war was the preemptive reason leading up to the invasion of Iraq in 2003. There were also being claims made by the Bush administration that Hussein had direct contact and links to the terrorgroup Al Qaeda, which were claimed to be responsible for the devastating terror attacks on 9/11. There was however nothing to be found after the invasion which could support this claim to be true. The aftermath of the invasion led to a turbulent time, where the different groups in the country of Iraq, Sunni and Shia, began a dangerous path of hatred and polarisation. This resulted in a row of attacks on the American occupant forces, which were partly blamed on Sunni militant groups. One of the root causes for the assembly of the Sunni led insurgency was caused by bad decisions from the USA, such as the disbanding of the entirety of the Iraqi army, and removal of all members of the

Baath party. This in turn, led to a disbelief and anger towards the United States, as the motives of their occupation became more vague and unmotivated. The Iraq war had huge consequences for the entirety of the Middle East and had a great destabilising factor. The USA failed its role of influence in the region and the great, regional power-competitor Iran, instead took its role in heavily influencing Iraq and its statehood. This in turn led to upscaled tensions between many Arab nations in the region, such as Saudi Arabia and Israel. Creating a great power rift in the entire Middle East. To this day the situation in the country remains fragile and the hopes for peace in the country stays minimal. (Wong: *Overview: The Iraq War*: Feb, 15, 2008)

1.3 Demarcation

The content of this work is, as mentioned, to evaluate and review the Bush administration's different arguments and rhetoric used to justify the invasion of Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. In order to do normative research it will be of importance to gather empirical data from literature and statements made by the Bush administration, also from persons who have worked closely with the Bush administration. The main question of interest here - and the core problem - lie within a narrative of whether the war in Iraq was justified. And if so - what the key topics used were, in order to make the justification? Was the war morally justified and which key areas were discussed in the making of the justification of the invasion, what were the principles used? This will then be examined and tried to be explained through the use of the normative theory and its instruments. This work will not delve deeper into the background of the terrorist attacks on U.S.A 2001, nor put focus on the aftermath of the invasion of Iraq. The main focus will be strictly centred around the Bush administration's decision making process which led up to the invasion, and an analysis of this area. Another matter of importance is the amount of figures which shall be analysed in this work. As there is limited time for the case study, there will only be an analysis of two individuals, which through research has shown to be the most influential ones, those are George W. Bush and Paul Wolfowitz. Adding more individuals would make a stronger analysis, but would not be compatible with the time given for this study. Therefore it will be centred around these two individuals only.

1.4 Eventual Problems

When it comes to the use of different logics it will be of importance to stay as neutral as possible. This might be an eventual problem as we all tend to have a subjective interpretation of how we understand and consume certain material and methods of use. An important step in providing the reader with an as clear picture as possible intersubjectively will conclude a thorough explanation of the normative logics where the reader can repeat the case study and come to its own conclusion of the matter. A reason for this got to do with how the logics bare a philosophical spectrum and can be seen from many different ontological views.

Another aspect of interest to stay critical of, is some of the literature chosen for this case study. George W. Bush's own biography provides a key insight into the mind of the former president. There are however some aspects to bear in mind while reading this kind of literature. That is, to stay critical of what is written as Bush like any other individual tends to have a subjective view of how events unfolded. That is however something that can be seen in a good way as this work craves for information on how decisions were made in Iraq from his own angle.

2 Theoretical framework

2.1 Former Research

The intention of this section is to give the reader a broader insight on how former research was made on the subject of the Iraq war. The two aspects which are analysed in this context focus on the media's role of justifying the US government's intention of the invasion of Iraq and how they deceive the American public.

2.1.1 Memory for fact, Fiction and Misinformation

The Iraq war has since its very beginning been controversial to many researchers, authors and politicians covering the subject from different points of view. One of those is Stephan Lewandowsky with a research report titled "Memory for a fact, Fiction, and Misinformation". The report discusses the use of media during and before the invasion, which saw lots of corrections and retractions of misinformation. One of the examples mentioned are the claims of weapons of mass destruction which later on never could be confirmed. Lewandowsky and his colleagues investigated in their research report, including the U.S.A. and Australia both being pro war - and Germany, that were against the invasion - to see how their memory of these events of retractions had taken effect. The questions asked during the study were about true events, events that first were presented but later retracted as misinformation and lastly fictional events. The initial findings of this research showed that Americans were found to be less suspicious of the war's intentions compared to the Australian and German individuals, when being asked about the events. Lewandowsky explains how there were certain patterns during the invasion, where the media presented claims that were "factual", which all of a sudden could be corrected as false. The troubling part of this, according to Lewandowsky, is how the public never gets the chance to process the corrected claims, as they in psychological terms, are due to remember falsely implied information, and discount corrected information. Lewandowsky further explains how there is a term called "false memory", an example of this is when the word "sleep" is mentioned. When hearing that word we directly associate it with bed, pillow and so on. Lewandowsky explains how this might have had an effect when the media reported continuously about the claims

that Saddam Hussein's regime possessed weapons of mass destruction, (compare 'bed'). Even though these claims were made with caution, Lewandowsky stresses how that might have been enough to build a false memory with the reader. (Lewandowsky, *Memory for a fact, Fiction, and Misinformation*, p.190, 2005)

As previously mentioned, this experiment conducted in the research report took place by asking the participants involved from Australia, the United States and Germany, about which events during the war that they thought were true. Some of these events were later retracted and some even claimed as fictional. The use of the method was preceded by asking 872 participants of the countries mentioned above and presenting them with the different events.

The reason why Lewandowsky's report is of interest to this work, refers to how the general public - and hence their views of the justification of the war against Iraq - might have been misled. The question asked is, if the media reported with more clarity and avoided canalising information before being fully verified - could this have changed how the general public viewed the war in Iraq at the time? And in this case - might this have led to repercussions for the Bush administration at the given moment?

The conclusion made by Lewandowsky from his regression analysis suggests a few points being emphasised. Firstly, Lewandowsky points out that the repetition of news stories, where a subject is disconfirmed as true, still can implement a psychological factor at the beholder. In turn, this could result in the indictment and creation of a so-called false memory, at a large proportion of beholders. Secondly, he emphasises that readers who were subject to a news story, which later on was corrected, seldom grasped the change unless the reader was suspicious from the very start. Thirdly, there was a result when it came to people deciding to ignore certain corrections because of their irrespective certainty regarding the matter (Lewandowsky: p. 194: 2005)

2.1.2 Misperceptions, the Media, and the Iraq War

Another study of significance is written by Steven Kull, Clay Ramsay and Evan Lewis with the title "Misperceptions, the Media, and the Iraq War". In the introduction they declare that there are many question marks regarding the justification of the war against Iraq, and whether the entire process leading to this war is unclear. This is a subject which bears a similarity to the thesis of this work. The aim of the paper, written by Steven Kull et.al, is to first explore the amount of misperceptions that were implemented in the American public such as the "close" links between Saddam Hussein and the terror group Al Qaeda. They end up drawing a regression analysis, in which they compare the factor of misperception with other elements on a group of volunteers, in order to measure the effects.

The deduction of their work is of great concern from a democratic point of view, according to the writers. The reason for this is that their findings show that the public, who in the beginning are against an invasion, as they do not have the approval from the UN, easily can be swayed by the president's political tools at hand. Moreover, they explain that what is worrisome is not just how the President managed to persuade the public using his arguments. The worrying part rather lies in how the President basically used false claims which were ungrounded, in order to gain support from the American public. In this report S. Kull et.al, want to emphasise to what extent the use of false claims have played a critical role, and hence formed an important pattern in the mobilisation of support for the war. The regression analysis, made by the writers mentioned, shows that the use of misperception as a factor by the President, rallied him huge amounts of support for the war, followed by an increased legitimization for Bush as a President. They stress that this alone, would not grant the argument that Bush could have rallied all the necessary support for the war by means of misperceptions. It does, however, show that it played a key factor for the rally of support when it came to the invasion. It would be much more difficult for the administration to justify the invasion without these false claims being put forward to the public. To summarise, the President did not manage to have an impact on changing the public value orientations through the use of false claims. The President did, however, manage to prompt enough support in order to justify the invasion through the use of these false claims.

The role of the public media in the wake of the invasion of Iraq showed, according to Kull and his colleagues, that the effort in questioning both the administration's actions and the misperceptions being put out to the public were vague and could have been stronger. They do however mention how this could have had to do with the impact of the terror attacks on the date of 9/11. How the aftermath played a crucial role in the public opinion accepting the President's misconceptions in a way to accommodate the administration and the nation as a whole (Kull: p. 596, 597: 2003-04).

3 Main theoretical approach

This section will outline the appropriate approach for the case study and the way it will be implemented with selected theoretical tools. The tools have been selected in the belief of fulfilling the goal of this paper in reaching a conclusion for the constructed research question for this paper.

3.1 Theory

Normative methodology is based around *values* and are seen as what the reality is the way an empiricist would. What is freedom? Truth? In order to get a grip of what a value is it is firstly important to understand its correlation to the normative analyst's viewpoint. A value is seen as something that either is good or bad for us or worse to the latter and could take shape in a lot of

different ways. Such ways could be seen in values in our morals, politics and religion (Baderstén, Björn, 2006, P. 21). The importance of values lies in the expression if something is of desire or abomination. A claim of if something is good or bad, if there is righteousness or unjustness. This is the goal of a normative analyst to uncover, distinguish and problematise these values that have been claimed in a certain position. This is a technique regarding values that has been applied several times during wars, where the instigator of the war in certain circumstances sees a justification of war where the claim regards that their mere nations existence is under threat from another country. (Baderstén: p. 22: 2006). Values of judgement lie in the interest of analysing the intersubjective legitimacy. This applies to areas of moral and societal character. In summary, values of judgement can be explained as having a function of where we can do a societal analysis where we avoid having a subjective input from ourselves (Baderstén:2006:p. 23). This can be applied to this case study and provide a good operationalizing function to allocate and analyse the figures in the Bush administration's arguments for the justification of the invasion of Iraq 2003. Their values can from that point then be analysed throughout their arguments in an intersubjective way. The persons whose arguments while being analysed through the use of normative logic will be focused around Paul Wolfowitz and George Bush. These two persons have come to be of interest as they have had a huge influence on the decision of invading Iraq. Therefore they ought to be the ones to be analysed.

3.1.1 Deontology

Deontology is explained as an action that is valued as good or evil independently of the consequences it provokes. An example could be that it is always evil to kill someone regarding the pretext of doing so. The way this ethic is used stipulates that you take an action and then evaluate this on some rules that have already been written as moral principles (Badersten: p. 109: 2006). Badersten further clarifies how deontology has an ethic based on that some actions will always remain "evil" no matter the causes behind the motive and likewise the other way around, some acts will always be perceived as universally "good". Deontology plays a crucial role in human rights theory where the theorists of human rights claim that there are unconditional duties. These unconditional terms of "duties" and "repercussions"

3.1.2 Consequentialism

Consequentialism as one of the normative logics, works in the way that it vows the actions' consequences and values the actions' moral implications of this. In other words the goal in consequentialism is to achieve the most utmost good consequences from the actions taken. It doesn't really matter what the actions are in the end, the most important goal is to achieve as many good consequences as possible from these actions. This means that the actions taken can be both evil or good as long as the end goal of these actions result in the positive. Examples of this is that politicians

can lie in the reasons in the justification of a war in order for the good of the nation as the end result will benefit the inhabitants. A president could assassinate another political opponent as this opponent could be a future threat of the nation. (Badersten: p.114: 2006)

3.1.3 Logic of expediency

Logic of expediency provides us with another form of perspective as a value of principles. Which more directly indicates a diametric point of view when resonating around questions of normative theory. The way the logic of expediency works is that it is structured around the circumstances in question. What that revolves around whenever something is of good or evil, unrighteousness or righteousness all has to do with what the certain case that is to be discussed is and its circumstances at the given moment. An example made with the use of logic of expediency lies in that whatever the value in if death sentence should be allowed, never can be permanent as it changes in a fluid state. It relies on what the current circumstances are at the time the action is taken regarding the certain value (Badersten: p.119: 2006:).

3.1.4 Contractualism

The fourth logic which will be applied in this thesis is contractualism. The way contractualism works can be seen as “binding a contract” between different individuals. The individuals in question which get binded to the contract are those of logic, common sense and independence according to philosophers like Thomas Hobbes and Herbert Spencer. This contract acts as a way of agreement between these individuals in order to stray for a common good and interests for both of the parties. The thought and process behind this kind of logic is that humans are egotistical beings with self interests, and in order to sway for a positive outcome, there lies an interest to find a common ground. This, in order to prevent every being to sway for an egotistical outcome as that would be a problem for everyone in the end. This view was founded by Hobbes who had the idea that humans are evil, tough, greedy and egotistical beings. The way that Hobbes saw it was that a way for the human being to get out of this pattern lies in the use of a social contract in order for the human to avoid its primitive pattern. This social contract has a binding part in it, the “leviathan”, meaning that the state has the power of maintaining peace and to keep its power over the individual in order to let the “free” being have time to seek their self interests (Badersten: p.126: 2006).

The principal values of each different logic have its own beneficial and neglical factors that are of importance to take into account when using them as analysing instruments for the case study. One logic does not in itself exclude the other logic, they all bear some kind of resemblance depending on how they are used in a context. Badersten stresses how putting an adjudicating subjective stance on how the logic works in a certain way risks taking the use of the logic out of context. As everyone's

interpretation might differ from another. Examples of how the logic may be applied through constituting different normative standpoints can be, as above mentioned examples, such as deontology working more in the favour of Human rights condemning certain actions made by an aggressor. While another example, as with consequentialism, can justify and explain a lie or a justification for a nation's existence based on the consequences that might have been taken as a response. To summarise, there is an interest in using these logics and finding a pattern of conflicting values, which might justify or not justify Bush's actions. (Badersten: p.130,131:2006).

4 Material

This thesis and its operationalization will be accomplished through the use of normative analysis with the help of empirical data gathered through literature such as the biography of George W. Bush.

Other literature of interest includes Robert Drapers "To start a war how the Bush administration took America into Iraq ", Björn Badersten "Normativ metod att studera det önskvärda". Former research on the subject of the invasion of Iraq 2003 has also proven to be useful. In order to understand the mechanisms and factors involved in getting the American public engaged and involved in the political debate on the decision of invading Iraq. Björn Baderstens literature provides a key function in explaining and detailing the normative method and how its normative logics may be applied for the thesis. Also, in order to understand the mechanisms and factors involved in getting the American public engaged and involved in the political debate on the decision of invading Iraq, former research on the subject of the invasion of Iraq 2003 has proven to be useful. This research has been conducted through data that has been gathered from professors like Kull and his colleagues and Lewandowsky who both have done a form of regression analysis. This will for the spectator of the thesis provide interesting former analytical perspectives on the subject. This will be able to provide a clearer understanding of the general context of the work of this thesis.

5 Method

The way the method will be implemented in this paper is by using different arguments made by both George W. Bush and Paul Wolfowitz. These arguments are found in the literature mentioned. The role here, as well as, the implementation of the strategy, will work around analysing the different arguments with the use of all the four logics which have been explained in the theory section. This will be performed in the most intersubjective way, where there might appear a possible pattern from which we can see if there actually is an altruistic point of view, from Wolfowitz and Bush, that may

explain their actions. Or the latter, an unprovoked insidious invasion built upon self interest and greed. There may also be a third result which shows a more neutral stance where misperceptions and paranoia might have been a leading factor for the invasion.

However, it will be structured in the order of first giving a thorough, and in depth summarised picture, where an analytical approach of the environment, and arguments made during the years after 9/11, added by the decisions leading up to the invasion will be explained through the use of different authors with insights on the subject. Secondly, after giving the summarised analytical picture, the arguments mentioned will then be picked out and analysed through the four different normative logics, and explained in the theory section methodically; one argument at the time. Then, having been explained through the logics, a summarised view of the ontological understanding which has been perceived will follow. Thereafter in the result, there will be a conclusion trying to puzzle together the conclusions made of the logics used, and the way they can be used for an explanation of the invasion.

6 Analysis

In this section there will be a thorough analysis which will consist of the literature chosen for this case study. First presented there will be an introduction explaining and introducing the key figures of interest for the analysis. Secondly the writers of interest, namely, Bush and Wolfowitz, will be categorised into two sections, where they will be operationalized through the use of the chosen theory; logics, for this paper. Thereafter, a summarising section will explain the conclusions drawn by the logics used as analytical instruments.

“When Bush's Party was unceremoniously booted out of office in 2008, he was rated by historians as among the very worst presidents in U.S. history if not the absolute worst.”, (Stone, Oliver, Kuznick, Peter, *“The untold history of the United States”*, p.449, 2013). What led to Bush's downfall, can be explained by having a closer look at the invasion of Iraq 2003. In order to understand the key elements which will be analysed throughout this thesis, it is of importance to understand the structure and key persons in the Bush administration and its history. Who took the decisions leading up to the operation “Iraqi Freedom” 2003? Who were the persons involved in influencing George W. Bush's decision to invade Iraq? One of the sources active during the period under the Bush administration, is Scott McClellan who worked as the White House Press Secretary during the time. McClellan who wrote the book *“What happened, Inside the Bush White House and Washington’s Culture of Deception”*, accounts for his years working in the White House as the spokesperson for the administration. In the book McClellan repatriates how some decisions, such as the invasion of Iraq, were deeply misguided. The authors mentioned will be further used in this text later on. To begin with

one needs to understand the background of “Iraqi Freedom” and its purpose, explained through George Bush's own biography.

6.1.1 George W. Bush

The invasion commenced in March, 2003. The order took place from Bush's White House situation room, where all the members of the National Security Council had gathered.

“ I asked each man two questions; Do you have everything you need to win? And are you comfortable with the strategy? Each commander answered affirmatively. Tommy Spoke last. “Mr. President,” the commanding general said, “this force is ready,” I turned to Don Rumsfeld. “Mr. Secretary”, I said, “for the peace of the world and the benefit and freedom of the Iraqi people, I hereby give the order to execute Operation Iraqi freedom. May God Bless the troops” (Bush, W, George: Decision points: p. 223.) In his biography Bush further continues to defend this decision granted in the situation room. They weren't made with ease according to Bush. He stresses how he before the decision made every attempt, not going to war with Saddam Hussein, by rallying the international community in an effort at pressuring Saddam Hussein about coming clean regarding his weapons of mass destruction, and the serious consequences that would come by not doing so. (Bush:P. 223:2010). Further on, he argues that there were ways in which they tried to prevent the need of an invasion by reaching out to Arab nations asking them to take Saddam into exile. As a last option Bush had also made an ultimatum for Saddam and his son to leave the country within 48 hours to avoid war. This offer made by the Bush administration to Hussein was rejected. *“The only logical conclusion was that he had something to hide, something so important that he was ready to go to war for it”*. Bush mentions in his book, in a letter he wrote to his dad, after making his decision where he further approves and justifies his actions. *“I know I have taken the right action and pray that few will lose life. Iraq will be free, the world will be safer. The emotion of the moment has passed and now I wait word on the covert action taking place”*. (Bush: p.224:2010).

George W. Bush continues in his biography, about how removing Saddam Hussein from power, also came with a great responsibility for the future development of Iraq and its citizens. Here, he has a sense of obligation to install a democracy which would not only would have a positive impact on Iraq, but the entire region. He explains that there is an ideological struggle in the region where one side consists of people wanting to live in “dignity and peace”, and others having more insidious agendas consisting of groups of extremists with a goal of imposing more “radical views" with the use of violence. These extremists, according to Bush’s ontological views, had in mind exploiting the sense of “hopelessness” and “repression” to spread their views. Bush sees himself as an alternative, giving the citizens of Iraq “Freedom” and “Democracy”; a new path of ideology for Iraq. (Bush: p. 232:2010). The way Bush describes the situation in the region, and Iraq do not seem to take in consideration the

fragile relationship between the Sunni and the Shia. Nor does he seem to fully grasp the cultural differences between Iraq and the USA, and what the consequences of a similar rule as in the USA would have in Iraq.

Further on, Bush mentions how he had a hard time convincing certain world leaders as the Chancellor of Germany, Gerhard Schroeder, regarding his thoughts on Saddam Hussein. He had been in talks with Schroeder after his speech two days earlier at the State of Union address, where he had spoken about the threats from Iraq and other countries, such as Iran and North Korea. At this address he had called these countries ‘an axis of evil’: “*States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the world*”(Bush). He further clarifies, how he meant, that the axis of evil referred to the governments who pursued the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction. This, in turn, could end up in the hands of terrorists.

A clear pattern repeating itself when analysing different statements and rendering arguments made by Bush, shows how convinced he seemed that the Iraqi regime had evil intentions.

6.1.2 Paul Wolfowitz

There were figures in the shadows working on influencing the decisions made by Bush. One of these individuals is Paul Wolfowitz, who at the time had a role as the Bush administration’s Undersecretary of Defence for Policy (Draper: p. 7:2020:). Robert Draper, the author of “*To start a war how the Bush administration took America into Iraq* ” even claims to say that he was the architect behind the invasion of Iraq. Draper is, however, stressing that the key decisions of course lie in the hands of Bush. The reason why Draper mentions Wolfowitz in this kind of context, lies in how he, during the past decade of 2003, in the administration, crusaded for the overthrow of Saddam Hussein (Draper: p.3:2020). One of the reasons why Wolfowitz had become obsessed with the idea of a removal of Hussein, coincided with a theory that Hussein was behind the failed attack on the World Trade Centre in 1993, which he became aware of by a former Harvard professor, Laurie Mylroie. She had become convinced of this by her extensive research on the event that took place. This in turn, had heavily influenced Wolfowitz, as he was already unnerved by previous actions of Saddam's Regime in Iraq. Wolfowitz became however, further obsessed with Saddam, when he asked the CIA on their thoughts of Laurie Mylroie’s theory on Saddam Hussein's involvement in the failed terror attack in 1993, as they dismissed it, and blamed Al Qaeda for it. This made Wolfowitz convinced that the CIA were not taking Hussein as a serious threat. Dean James b. Steinberg, who served as a University Professor of Social Science on Syracuse University, recalls how he came into constant fights with Wolfowitz: “I’d get into huge fights with Paul, who was convinced Saddam was the cause of all, and I mean *all*, of the problems in the region” (Draper: p. 11: 2020). When it came to the justification process of war against Iraq, Wolfowitz said “*For bureaucratic reasons we settled on one issue, weapons of mass destruction,*

because it was the one reason we all could agree on. Wolfowitz in *Vanity Fair*, 2003. This seemed to just be one of many other reasons behind the decision to invade Iraq, according to Glenn Kessler at *Washington Post*. Before the invasion of Iraq 2003, Wolfowitz put forward propositions to the National Security Council in the White House. One of the suggestions made was to overthrow Saddam Hussein by training, funding and arming an Iraqi opposition. This didn't have much support from the rest of the council but Wolfowitz continued with his obsession of Saddam and kept on being a war hawk, putting forward and legitimising the threat of the Iraqi nation (Draper: p.15:2020). Another interesting remark from Wolfowitz happened on September the 15th, at Camp David, where The National Security Committee had gathered for a briefing on what actions could be taken after the attacks on 9/11. At the briefing Wolfowitz once again, reminded the participants of the idea of an invasion of Iraq:

Wolfowitz reminded the participants that while countries all across the world, including Iran and Libya, expressed sympathy to America for the nearly three thousand who had perished in the attacks, Saddam stood alone for his churlish response: "the United states reaps the thorns its rulers have planted in the world" And while bombing Afghanistan would largely be a futile exercise in pounding sand, Iraq offered a wealth of promising targets, an opportunity to send a potent message to adveraries around the world. (Draper: p.18:2020).

How this might come to conclude, lies in the normative logics mentioned before and how they might interpret Bush's and Wolfowitz rhetoric and whether they can answer this thesis research question: "Could Bush's war be justified through the use of normative theory and its logics?."

Therefore, arguments will be analysed through the four different logics previously mentioned in a structural manner presented underneath.

6.2.1 Bush's and Wolfowitz view and justification from a deontological perspective:

In Draper's literature there is a fact that Paul Wolfowitz was the architect behind the invasion of Saddam's regime in 2003 in the way he implemented certain thoughts on others in the administration, the literature clearly shows signs of this as shown before. From a deontological perspective, starting a war must always be wrong. The consequences of invading a country with weapons will from an empirical view, cause a loss of lives. But, there might - on some occasions - be exceptions, if, for example, the leader of the invaded country keeps the people hostage, and the invading army would come with the intention of saving the citizens. It all depends on the ontological perspective from each side of the conflict. Both Saddam and Bush can in different ways legitimate themselves as liberators defending the Iraqi people. A way of winning a war without losses can be achieved with superiority in means of military power by simply threatening a country until it kneels to the given demands. Before the invasion of Iraq, Bush explains how he tried to find several other solutions. These included giving

an ultimatum, as mentioned before, to Saddam to leave the country within a certain amount of hours. This action from Bush can be seen as a deontologic one, where he tried to use soft power in order to prevent bloodshed. But when the suggestion was rejected from Saddam, Bush was forced to abandon this doctrine. Can the fact that one country has mass destruction weapons be a reason to invade and kill people to prevent more deaths? It can never be justified from a deontological point of view to kill people to prevent a mass death. Therefore, it is safe to say that Bush's justification of war, through the grounds of a deontological perspective, are illegitimate. The justification used to liberate the Iraqi people and getting rid of the WMDs, will still result in the deaths of both Iraqi military personnel and civilians, which breaks one of the cores of the deontologism, even if the consequences of it eventually save more people.

6.2.2 Bush's and Wolfowitz Justification and its legitimacy through consequentialism

To start a war with a lie is acceptable from a consequentialist perspective. The judging part is if there will be an outcome that will serve the country or not. To lead the most powerful country in the world can force the leadership to make unpleasant choices. At first glance, some of them do not seem to be reasonable, since the consequences of the actions are mostly violent. The reasons are often geopolitical and the aim is to protect the country's position and those questions need to be hidden into deception. The arguments Bush used for the justification of war against Iraq can be seen as legitimate through consequentialism. The leading cause of this depends on how the U.S.A after the terror attacks needed to find the culprits and save their country from further attacks against their country. Therefore any means necessary are legitimate to protect the country's sovereignty. Even if it results in tens of thousands of civilian casualties inflicted at the enemy in question. One of the main points of justification were as previously mentioned Saddam Hussiens proclaimed WMDs, which if not destroyed before use, could lead to an exceptional amount of casualties. To prevent the accumulation of these weapons it can be justified to let a certain number of civilians die in order to prevent a much bigger loss of life in the future, as the consequences will be less fatal doing so. Bush also described how there was a duty to "help" the Iraqi people after their "liberation", to rebuild the country with a democracy. This further proves how he advocates for an invasion with a cause for the "greater good" for the Iraqi people. Even if there is to be a bloody invasion, the aftermath will show a more promised picture for the country which will blossom in the name of democracy. Therefore, all actions which will be made during the invasion are seen as justified, as they will lead to a greater cause in the end. Therefore the invasion can be seen as justified from the view of consequentialism. Wolfowitz argued in a similar manner for the grounds of invading Iraq. He was obsessed with the thought that Saddam Hussein was the main culprit behind everything bad that had happened to America related since the 1993 terror attacks to 2001 9/11. Therefore actions had to be taken by eradicating this threat no matter the consequences. It can even be argued that Wolfowitz liked the idea of showing the world these

consequences that were to be seen by taking military action. Sending a message to the surrounding enemies of the U.S. that they meant serious business. Therefore one can conclude that the consequences of invading Iraq would benefit the U.S. according to the view of Wolfowitz and the war can be seen as justified through the view of the consequentialist.

6.2.3 Bush's and Wolfowitz justification and legitimacy through the use of the logic of expediency

During this time the fear of terrorism increased because incidents that terrified nations and made governments to fight back. Logic of expediency can justify evil actions, if situations demand action. The terrorist had proven that they can reach the country that lays protected the coast of the sea only bordering friendly nations. People that before felt secure because of their country's location and its strongest military in the world was shaken by a terrifying experience. The US government had to find a quick solution for this removing any doubts of a incapacitated government unavailable to respond to the terror attacks. Therefore in these circumstances it can be justified through the logic of expediency to react and invade Iraq because of the situation in the USA. However there can be doubts whether Iraq was a legitimate target to attack after the terrorist attacks which were instigated by Al Qaeda. This concludes in how the events that took place on 9/11 2001 might not have bore the same amount of legitimacy of invading Iraq toppling Saddam Hussein as bombing Al Qaeda in Afghanistan. There is therefore a vague justification for war when it comes to the use of logic of expediency. As the actions against Iraq do not fully correlate to the events which took America to war after 9/11 2001 in one way of seeing it. Wolfowitz already began the justification process against Iraq after the bombing of the world trade center in 1993. Being in contact with the professor Laure Mylroie who had the theory that Saddam Hussein was behind these attacks made Wolfowitz, because of the circumstances, begin a justification campaign against Iraq seeing them as the main culprit behind the attacks. Making Iraq into a legitimate target, which could in a sense be justified through the logic of expediency.

6.2.4 Bush's and Wolfowitz justification seen through a contractualistic perspective

It can be reasoned that George Bush when he swore the oath in congress of becoming the president of the USA came with its responsibilities. The usual day for the average American was after the attacks on 9/11 2001 interrupted. Therefore there is a duty of the President to uphold the normalcy in the country. This can be augmented for that the president had to do something about the incursion of everyday American lives. The contract between the American state and its people had been broken by the endangerment of terrorism. To uphold the contract against his citizens he had to invade Iraq to regain stability and liability of the contract. Wolfowitz in this sense felt the same duty. As previously mentioned at Camp David where the national security council had gathered, Wolfowitz implicated the

importance of sending a message to not only the world but especially in this remark, the American people. That the government which had a contract with its citizens intended to make a harsh response, which could be shown in a greater picture with Iraq compared to Afghanistan. Therefore one can argue that the invasion through a contractualistic perspective is justified in the sense that the balance of the contract was violated after the terror attacks and had to be resettled.

7 Discussion, Conclusion & future research

This section's intention consists of having a discussion of the results presented in the analysis section. Also, there will be a discussion of if something could have been done differently and if the logic worked as they intended to do answering the research question of this work. Also there will be of interest to see what the logics couldn't answer.

The main aim of this thesis was to explain if the invasion of Iraq 2003, "Operation Iraqi Freedom, could be justified through the use of logic in normative methodology. There were several logics used to come to a conclusion. The logic used gave different results on how the war could have been justified or if it was justified at all, which this paper had a goal of achieving. Bringing up an example as the use of deontology, gave a result where the invasion of Iraq can be seen as illegitimate, as it proclaims that there are some rules which can not be broken, no matter the circumstances. In this instance, invading a country resulting in major collateral damage and civilian deaths can not be seen as justified, even though it is for a greater cause, protecting the United States from further terror attacks. Looking at other results coming from consequentialism, it seems to fit in well for the administration's actions. Consequentialism can achieve and justify lots of actions if the end goal of the action will result in something good. Therefore, Bush's actions, viewed in the result of the analysis, can be seen as justified. Having said that, one can say that even if there were many civilian deaths in Iraq, the proclaimed reasons for invading made those civilian deaths seen as acceptable from a consequentialist perspective. Though can one argue that, if there is legitimacy for an invasion which is built on a certain amount of lies? The logic became a useful tool in this case to study the way they could target the arguments through different angles and perspectives. The thought of why this is achievable, can be explained through philosophical aspects. Other logics could be more diffuse in whether they could justify the invasion or not. These include the logic of expediency, even though actions can be justified given the circumstances. There can be a discussion of whether there were the "right" actions. This corresponds to the vague intelligence provided to the administration, showing that Saddam Hussien was a legitimate target, while compared to the intelligence provided of the terrorist organisation Al Qaeda. That individuals like Wolfowitz then became "obsessed" with the idea that Saddam was the culprit, can be of concern, as this in fact may jeopardise the justification of war through the logic of expediency, as the claims of WMD only were a claim and not a fact given at the

time. The logic of contractualism showed however, like consequentialism, a clear understanding of the Bush administration's actions. The government had to react to the threat of terrorism in duty to its people no longer feeling safe in their country. The way they could achieve this was through the invasion of Iraq which they thought had the capability of attacking the US in future attacks with the help of WMDs. They also had the claims given by the intelligence community, that Saddam had links to Al Qaeda. These factors justified through contractualism an appropriate response of neutralising the threat coming from Iraq at the given moment.

Given these reasons, a question that should be asked might be, whether there are any disadvantages with the logics used for this thesis. One could argue that the logics only manages to answer a certain field of the area of analysis. That is however the entire point of this work; to be able to demarcate in order not to bite off more than one can chew.

A part of this thesis, which could have been included, would be to include a reference to a person in the administration - or outside of the administration, with an opposite opinion of the invasion. A dedicated section with an opposing view, would further broaden the aspects of the analysis, and give several perspectives of the invasion, which also would be of interest applying on the logics used.

To conclude, a 'problem' did appear, since the logic applied both on Bush and on Wolfowitz as they had the same results, since they both went by the same strategy and opinion, regarding the invasion of Iraq. Therefore, if there would have been more time for the thesis, an opposing opinion of the invasion would have been of interest to apply to further nuance this case study. In any case, the logic seems to have functioned the way they were intended for the thesis, and an answer for the research question of this work is hereby manifested, which is the essential part.

Further on, drawing a correlation with the section of former research, there are some aspects which can be of interest to discuss. The way a war is instigated requires several factors before coming to force. One of the most important; the justification process. The way the media deceived the public, even if it was not by purpose, as explained. The media contributed greatly to proclaim a picture of Bush and his administration, with key figures like Wolfowitz as sensible people making the right choices given at the time. This could be seen as something of normalcy, given when a country goes through hardships, as 9/11.

There is however great concern about how the media had a lack of critique against the government's actions. As explained in "Memory for fact, fiction and misinformation" the media used several headlines of information regarding the Saddam regime's procurement of weapons of mass destruction. Some of these claims were later on retracted by the media or proven to be false. Lewandowsky explained how this might have had an impact on the American public's support for the war. Even if

headlines in the media later on were corrected for putting out misinformation, it could already have been too late for the public to process. Hereby meaning, that many people were led to believe the false claims as correct. To conclude, one can say that even if Bush's actions can be justified through some of these logics, it would be much harder without the support of the media which managed to gather enough public support for an invasion.

Lastly, it's worth mentioning that the application of 'normative logics' has centred heavily on the American perspective of the invasion. It would have been compelling to do the same kind of case study with the perspective from the Iraqi government, to see how their handling of the situation could have been explained through theory.

7.1 Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to find out if Bush's justification of war could be seen as legitimate by using logic from normative theory. The end result has shown that the invasion of Iraq could be justified depending on which logic it correlates to. Of the four logics used in the thesis, three of them could completely or partly justify the invasion, by looking at a certain number of factors revolving around the data from the analysis section. The one logic which hardly can justify the invasion was the logic of deontologism. The logics of this case study seems to have fulfilled their original intention of the thesis in answering the research question. To conclude this work, one can argue that the invasion could be justified looking at most of the logics used for this case study. What one thinks of the invasion subjectively though, might have a differing result in mind.

7.2 Continued research

This work could have been widened in a more extensive research project. There would be of interest to study in depth more individuals working in The White House; their views, their arguments could be studied further, through normative logic. Another aspect could centre around analysing the arguments by other world leaders and how they augmented America's decisions on Iraq, adding an comparative study where individuals who were against the invasion could be put against Bush and his accomplices. This could bring lots of new perspectives into the subject.

8 References gathered from internet

Wong, Edward, “*Overview: The Iraq War*” The New York Times, (2008)

https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/ref/timestopics/topics_iraq.html (Gathered 22-07-13)

Kessler, Glenn, “*The Iraq War and WMDs: An intelligence failure or White House spin?* (2019)

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/03/22/iraq-war-wmds-an-intelligence-failure-or-white-house-spin/> Gathered 22-07-16

Lewandowsky, Stephan & Stritzke, Werner G.k & Oberauer, Klaus & Morales, Michael “*Memory for Fact, Fiction, and Misinformation*” (2005)

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00802.x?casa_token=ZNfacVvRndoAAAAA:nHkiTUUY2Pf0CXA88kOyUCbPcCzWUaM2sJKzIAUCyEeq2vLg04IRuirMrPiwfBZJfOn8q7IC1pJ (Gathered 2022-07-01)

Kull, Steven & Ramsay, Clay & Lewis, Evan “*Misperceptions, the Media, and the Iraq War*”

Academy of political science (2003)

https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/30035697.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aa2a00abb05a06dc76155f7f74aea65ee&ab_segments=&origin=&acceptTC=1 (Gathered 2022-07-04)

9 Literature list:

Bush, George, “*Decision points*”, Virgin books, (2010)

Badersten, Björn “*Normativ teori, att studera det önskvärda*”, 1:2 Upplaga, Studentlitteratur AB(2006)

Draper, Robert “*To start a war: How the Bush administration took America to Iraq*”, Penguin press (2020)

McLellan, Scott, “*What happened: Inside the bush White House and Washington’s culture of deception*, Public Affairs (2008)

Stone, Oliver & Kuznick, Peter “*The untold history of the United States*” Gallery books. (2012)