

Anglo-Saxon Axis in 2003: Blair's Doctrine and Bush Invasion of Iraq

Seyed Vahid Karimi*
Amir Hooshang Mirkooshesh**

Abstract

What is the relationship between the doctrine of Tony Blair and America's invasion of Iraq? This paper tries to answer this question. So, it looks at the American invasion of Iraq and the British response, and argues that Brain always prevails over brawn. United States was and still is a hard power. Britain plays a soft power role in international relations. Britain usually uses the American strength and resources for the benefit of Britain. When the British describe their relations with the United States as "special," they mean that they have the power to influence and direct US foreign policy. For an understanding of the international politics, we must concentrate on Anglo-Saxon "interdependency" through the "special relationship" which often exists between British Prime Ministers and US Presidents. Winston Churchill, British Prime Minister of the 1940s, Harold Macmillan in the 1960s, Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s and Tony Blair in the 2000s, all had special relationships with their US counterparts. While not always the case, the relationship between Tony Blair, British Prime Minister, and George Bush, American President, was beneficial to British interest and Blair's doctrine of International Community declared in 1999. It is imperative not only to understand international politics, but also to react properly to international politics. As it has been proven in the Iraq case, Tony Blair manipulated US foreign policy during the George Bush presidency.

Keywords: Blair's Doctrine, Bush, Iraq, Interdependency, Engagement

* Director for European Studies, Institute for Political and International Studies–IPIS
(svkarimi@gmail.com)

** Researcher, Center for Scientific Research & Middle East Strategic Studies
(Received: 12 July 2013 - Accepted: 7 October 2013)

Introduction

Are there any relevant link between European security problems and the Middle East? This is the subject of this essay. But what is important is the role Tony Blair played in manipulating US foreign policy for British interests as far as the European security arrangement is concerned. When Bush came to power in 2001, the Republican expressed their willingness to concentrate on Pacific and Asian countries. Such a view was welcomed by the French because they always favored European political independence from America. France also gained American support for their European Security Defense Policy (ESDP). However, British politicians remained ambivalent out of concern that the French could have an upper hand over Britain in the European security arrangement. The British knew if they could get America "engaged" in the Middle East, due to US "dependency" on British experience in the Middle East, America will favor British ambition in installing a National Missiles Defense system (NMD) in Europe. Britain and France clashed over the presence of America in Europe. Britain wanted America to be engaged in Europe, whereas the French were against it. By installing NMD in Europe, the European countries and France in particular, for at least several decades, would be under an American security umbrella. This is exactly what the British wanted. But NMD was too sophisticated and expensive, and the Europeans were against its installation. To bring NMD equipment to European countries, a good justification was needed, which a so called rouge state in the Middle East could provide. When the US is engaged in Europe and in the Middle East,



the British could easily implement their foreign policy in those regions through US (military) hard power.

Due to public opinion and pressure from the press, the Bush administration was compelled to form a committee in the Senate to report on the pre-war intelligence assessment of Iraq. The committee's assessment was limited to intelligence gathering and not the role of the politicians in deciding to go to war. On the basis of intelligence provided by the British Intelligence Services, President Bush accused Saddam Hussein of obtaining Uranium from Niger for nuclear weapons and claimed that Iraq could make weapons of mass destruction within 45 minutes. On that basis, and while ignoring international opposition, America and Britain invaded Iraq. Pressure for inquiry increased when it became known that the intelligence received by the White House from the British government was fake.

The Senate Intelligence Committee reported that US foreign policy was "manipulated" for the interest of others. It claims that "The (US) Intelligence Community relies too heavily on foreign government services and third party reporting, thereby increasing the potential for manipulation of U.S. policy by foreign interests" (Report on the US Intelligence..., 2004:34). A comparison of what Prime Minister Blair said before and after the Iraq invasion clearly indicates that Tony Blair's desire to invade Iraq and remove Saddam Hussein from Power was much greater than that of President Bush. Experts frequently assert that the UK supports US ambitions due to their alliance, but here it seems that the opposite is true. It was Blair who decided on war and then manipulated the US administration into implementing his Doctrine of International Community. On the basis of the above facts, a new theory titled "manipulation through interdependency and engagement" could be critical to understanding international politics since 1945. In this article, first, the theory is explained, and then Blair's doctrine and its relationship with President Bush and the Iraq war is described.



I- Conceptual Framework

There is no doubt that any political course or political regime has a theoretical background. Cognition is the essence of understanding the present international politics. Different political theories were presented for this purpose but none have satisfied those who create new theories. Amazingly, no theorist predicted the end of the Cold War. So how should we know which foreign policy to follow? Taking a new approach to shape a theory on the basis of the "British Prime Minister's political thinking" might help us better understand the future of international relations.

Kenneth Waltz says "There is no way from experience to the setting up of a theory"(Waltz, 1979:7). But Waltz also says: "if useful information were uncovered, the more difficult task of figuring out its theoretical meaning would remain"(Waltz: 3). He believes: "theory is a picture", and "theories are made by creativity." (Waltz: 8-9), He also claims that "theoretical notions can only be invented"(Waltz: 5). Therefore, Waltz states that "in modeling a theory, one looks for suggestive ways of depicting the theory"(Waltz:7). Therefore, I argue that from 1940 onward, due to the lack of experience in international relations, US Power and Resources has been originated or manipulated through interdependency and engagement.

Alan Isaak argues that political science has no theories and no theoretical concepts (Waltz: 38). Waltz too says that "if we could directly apprehend the world that interests us, we would have no need for theory." But he argues that "We cannot. One can reliably find this way among infinite materials only with the guidance of theory"(Waltz: 5). In developing a theory of international relations, as Kenneth Waltz says, "Some factors are more important than others and specifies relations among them ... in order to deal with it intellectually"(Waltz: 8).

Therefore, it's better to concentrate on three points. First, the year 1945 is the beginning of the "Post War Order" which we believe still continues. Secondly, as Waltz says "a theory is not the



occurrences seen and the associations recorded, but is instead the explanation of them"(Waltz: 9). We try to explain the special nature of the "Special Relationship" between eminent British Prime Ministers (Churchill, Macmillan, Thatcher and Blair) and US Presidents (Roosevelt, Kennedy, Regan and Bush). Thirdly, Waltz claimed that "a theory can be tested by experience, as Albert Einstein explains the observed. But there is no way from experience to the setting up a theory"(Waltz: 7) However we will derive a theory from experience because new information effects conceptual thinking.¹⁰ In doing so, we will "theorize the uncovered information on foreign policy experience of the post 1945 politics of international relations".

The United States has been a superpower since the 1900s and is the sole superpower at the beginning of this new millennium. How long that continues depends on a number of factors. The year 1945 could be considered the beginning of the study of modern international relations because new international organizations came into existence. In the 1940s, Winston Churchill, the then British Prime Minister, manipulated Franklin Roosevelt, the US President into formulating the "Post War Order". Churchill was successful according to newly uncovered information. Then again, in the 1960s, Harold Macmillan also manipulated John F. Kennedy into nuclear "interdependency", to organize European affairs as well as international relations. Macmillan too was successful according to new information which was uncovered after 3 decades. In the 1980s, Margaret Thatcher too, manipulated Ronald Regan to gain US engagement in international relations to formulate "Post German Reunification". Due to the above facts and experiences, one may conclude that in the 2000s, Tony Blair was "manipulating" George Bush to get US foreign policy engaged in international relations to formulate a "Post-Cold War" to create International Community (Blair, 1999a).

During the Second World War, in a meeting between US and British officials, a note was found in the dustbin. The note belonged



to the British delegation but was found by an American official. It was published after 3 decades as follow: "In Washington, Lord Halifax (British wartime Ambassador) Once whispered to Lord Keynes: It's true they (US) have the money bags but we (British) have all the Brains"(Gardner, 1985: 21). When Churchill was asked by Charles de Gaulle, the then French President, to form a new alliance with France for European cooperation, Churchill replied "In politics as in strategy, it is better to persuade the stronger than to pit yourself against him. The Americans have immense resources. They do not always use them to the best advantage. I am trying to enlighten them, without forgetting, of course, to benefit my country. I proceed by suggestion in order to influence matters in the right direction" (De Gaulle, 1964: 727). Macmillan also once said that "We are like the Greeks in the late Roman Empire. They ran it because they were so much cleverer than the Romans, but they never told the Romans this. That must be our relations to the Americans" (Woods & Jones, 1991:11-12). Thatcher as well stated that "We aren't worried about the abuse of American power. Our principal worry is that American troops will go home. We need to pursue policies that will persuade America to remain a European power" (Thatcher, 1992).

Blair also encourages America to act unilaterally and to "lead" and, shortly after the invasion of Iraq, told a member of Congress that if any American asks you - the political leader "why me? Why us? Why America?" tell him: "destiny put you in this place in history, in this moment in time and the task is yours to do"(Blair, 2003).

British Prime Ministers, from Winston Churchill, the architect of the "Post War Order", to Tony Blair, the architect of "Doctrine of International Community",⁽²⁾ maintained the same world order that was formed in 1945 and continued right through the end of the century and into new millennium. Of course different conceptual theories like communism and handful revolutionary governments, at different stages, unsuccessfully challenged the British concept of international relations. But British Prime Ministers through



interdependency and engagement successfully originated a new path of paradigm for US foreign policy in international relations.

If Winston Churchill manipulated US foreign policy for the sake of British interest in the Pre Cold War period, Tony Blair internationalized or theorized the British concept of international politics through US strength for the Post-Cold War era when he first articulated the "Doctrine of International Community" in 1999. On April 24, 1999, (over a year before the Bush Administration), Blair said that "We are witnessing the beginning of a new doctrine of international community. If anything Americans are too ready to see no need to get involved in affairs of the rest of the world. Now our actions are guided in defending the values we cherish. In the end, values and interests merge. The spread of our values makes us safer. The most pressing foreign policy problem we face is to identify the circumstances in which we should get involved in other people's conflicts. Non-interference has long been considered an important principle of international order. But the principle of non-interference must be qualified in important respects. If we wanted to right every wrong that we see in the modern world then we would do little else than intervene in the affairs of other countries. So we decide when and whether to intervene. I say to you (the American elites) never fall again for the doctrine of isolationism"(Blair, 2003). Later this concept was imposed upon US national strategy in 2002 and recently in France in 2006, and gradually it is becoming a strategic policy among other governments favoring "Western Values" in the international arena.

Where does the concept of "International Community" come from? E. H. Carr argues that "The English Speaking peoples are past masters in the art of concealing their selfish national interest in the guise of the general good" (Carr, 1946: 79). Barry Buzan also states that "The concept of International Community plays a key political function in generating legitimacy for those who act in its name"(Buzan & Gonzalez-Pelaez, 2005:33). Tony Blair used this



concept in 1999 as a yardstick to impose "English Speaking Values" on the international community. In fact, Blair's concept of International Community is "A concept of Minority's Values" in the name of International Community. Condoleezza Rice in 2000 used this phrase when she said "The national interest is replaced with the interest of the International Community"(Rice, 2000:74).

After the September 11th attacks of 2001, "Pre-emption" became the US National Strategy in 2002. This doctrine was in fact the same concept as Blair's Doctrine of International Community, and the events of September 11th justified it, as well as provided a golden opportunity for Blair who said "September 11th was for me a revelation"(Blair, 2004). Jacques Chirac, the French President too joined the UK and US interventionist strategic policy when he said that "We must be capable of using force when necessary" (Chirac, 2006). All three countries were following the same policy as to create a new paradigm in international politics, which in fact, originated from Tony Blair's concept on International Community. It is worth noting that the BBC reported that "Tony Blair is the original neo-con" and that "In foreign policy he (Blair) has always been ahead of Bush" (Rawlence, 2004).

It might be said that this theory is not broad enough in scope to be called an International Theory and is limited to the UK – US "Special Relationship". But we know that scholars from these two countries have monopoly over international theories. After the end of the Second World War in 1945, first British politicians and later US politicians invented bipolar politics. At the end of the Cold War Bush and later Chirac joined forces behind this new theory, which has its origins in Blair's interventionist concept, based on the values of a selected minority of English speaking countries and were wrongfully applied under the banner of "International Community".

II- Blair's Doctrine

The Berlin Wall fell on 9th November 1989. The Warsaw Pact was



diminished and the future of NATO⁹ was in disarray. Tony Blair who came to power on May 2nd, 1997, had several concerns regarding European as well as international politics.

His first concern was NATO's survival. He was in favor of keeping NATO for European cohesion. By the end of the Cold War, some mid-size countries wanted to play a greater role in the international arena and were in favor of the emergence of a multi-polar world. A new world order and changes in the composition of the Security Council of the United Nations were on the agenda for think tanks and among the elites. Non-Aligned states, Brazil, Germany, India, Japan, South Asians as well as the Islamic World wanted a stronger role in international relations. This was Tony Blair's second concern as he opposed such measures.

The collapse of the Soviet Union also provided an opportunity for French President Jacques Chirac to follow through on de Gaulle's wish to create a "European Independent Army" under the banner of the ESDP. This was the most important concern of Tony Blair. A French official explained the differences on policy by stating that "In Europe, Secretary Albright's recent speech proposing a "partnership in leadership" could not help but elicit a favorable reaction. The United States, however, must carefully avoid giving the impression – an impression too often rooted in reality – that is inverting the terms of that formulation to read "leadership in partnership"" (De l'Estang, 1999). France was eager to decrease American influence in Europe and lead Europe towards more independence. In the view of the United States and Great Britain, European forces should be able to act in situations where NATO, and the US itself, do not wish to commit troops, but its actions should not be "independent" of NATO, which is to say against American wishes (Smith, 2004). France however, believed that such forces should be able to act autonomously (Hay & Sicherman, 2000).

Long before the Bush administration came to power in the United States, Blair had been expressing his political ideas and



concerns about Europe and international politics through speeches and comments. On May 2nd 1997, the Labor Party won the general election in Britain and Tony Blair became the youngest ever Prime Minister. Within a month of him taking office in late May 1997, Blair, in a speech in Paris said "NATO has served my country well, it has served Europe well, and it remains the cornerstone of Europe's defense"(Blair, 1997). Blair's emphasis on the continuous role of NATO indicates that he favored American military commitment to European security. In 1998, Blair praised the British role in international politics as "pivotal"(Blair, 1998) and claimed that the "United States has been fundamental to British foreign policy." Blair then said that "America at its best is a powerful force for good in the world. I will ensure that the Americans are fully engaged. We remain absolutely together in our analysis of the continuing danger posed by Saddam Hussein and our determination not to allow him Weapon of Mass Destruction" (Blair, 1998).

Blair also expressed his concern about Europe and its security arrangement. In concluding a joint military accord at St. Malo with President Jacques Chirac of France in late 1998, he said "Europe is of vital importance to Britain, but is anxious about the direction Europe is taking""(Blair, 1998). By March 1999, at NATO's 50th anniversary, Blair said "50 years ago a British Labor government helped found the NATO Alliance which locked Europe and America safely together through all the dangerous years of the Cold War. Let us lay the foundations for dealing with the dangers lie before us in a spirit of partnership, cooperation, interdependence and commitment"(Blair, 1999a). In his report to the British Parliament about NATO, Blair said "We approved an updated Strategic Concept. Transatlantic link will of course remain the bedrock of the Alliance. I and President Chirac launched at our Summit last December in St. Malo, to develop a European defense capability for crisis management operations where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged. A stronger European capability will strengthen NATO and is fully compatible with our



commitment to NATO" (Blair, 1999b). Although Blair's intention was to participate in the European Army, he was critical of Europe's lack of reform. "The British, at their best, have two great characteristics, creativity and common sense", said Blair. He wanted Europe to be more open to reform and change. He had once said that "European ideal is best seen in terms of value rather than institutions" (Blair, 1999c). His first goal was peace within Europe and his second goal was meeting the new global challenges (Blair, 1999c).

On April 24th 1999, Blair delivered a speech in America which could be comparable to Winston Churchill's "Fulton" speech of March 1946. Like Churchill, who formulated the US post Second World War foreign policy, Blair formulated US foreign policy for the Post Cold War era. The addresses of British Prime Ministers before American elites can lead to interesting discourses. Churchill persuaded American President Franklin D. Roosevelt to enter the Second World War against Germany. Churchill used the phrase "Iron Curtain" and divided the world into two enemy blocs. This further indicates that British Prime Ministers, on different occasions, manipulated US foreign policy through military interdependency and engagement" in international politics.

On April 24th1999, in a speech to American politicians, Blair said "We are witnessing beginning of a new doctrine of international community." Blair indicated his concern about US isolationist tendencies by saying "If anything Americans are too ready to see no need to get involved in affairs of the rest of the world." He then tries to enlighten Americans by saying "In the end values and interests merge. The spread of our values makes us safer." His main argument in challenging international law is expressed when he said "The most pressing foreign policy problem we face is to identify the circumstances in which we should get actively involved in other people's conflicts. Non-interference has long been considered an important principle of international order. But the principle of non-interference must be qualified in important respects. If we wanted to



right every wrong that we see in modern world then we would do little else than intervene in the affairs of other countries." He continues by saying that "We decide when and whether to intervene." He also advises the Americans by emphasizing that "I say to you: never fall again for the doctrine of isolationism" (Blair, 1999d). The origins of Blair's Doctrine came from the war in the former Yugoslavia. Blair believed that: "it (was) so important to win the conflict to ensure that others do not make the same mistake in the future" (Blair, 1999d).

III- Bush's Republican Vision

Before the US election in 2000, Margaret Thatcher, the former British Prime Minister indicated that George Bush, the Republican, had to be elected for the US government to install NMD in Europe (Thatcher, 2000). NMD is the same as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) or the Star War Project in the 1980s, when American President Ronald Reagan proposed it. Some political experts believe that SDI brought about the Soviet Union's collapse. Following US administrations did not follow through on establishing SDI, but suddenly in 2000, it becomes one of the main issues in the US Presidential election. The verdict of the United States Supreme Court, which was favorable to the Republicans, paved the way for George Bush to be recognized as the winner of that election. In fact, Margaret Thatcher's hopes materialized. Interestingly, on the day of the decision by the Supreme Court, Margaret Thatcher was in Florida (Campbell, 2004).

By January of 2001, America had a new President in the White House. At first, George Bush and his team wanted to review US foreign policy (Bush, 2001). It is natural for any new administration to form a new foreign policy. But in the case of George Bush's foreign policy for America, it was nothing original or home-grown but rather the implementation of the British foreign policy for Europe and international politics. It was Tony Blair who was the first foreign leader to rush to a meeting with the new President in the White



House. Blair desperately worried about the isolationist tendency in some parts of the US government. He was also worried that the new administration was not prepared to pay attention to European affairs. Blair worried about the spread of WMD⁹ in the Middle East, the lack of enthusiasm among the Europeans, particularly the French, for the installation of a National Missiles Defense system, the future of the NATO and the French ambitions for European security and defense policy independent of any US influence.

On February 23rd 2001, 7 months before 9/11, Blair and Bush met for the first time in the White House. Through his comment after he met Tony Blair, one could conclude that George Bush, the inexperienced President, was strongly influenced by the British Prime Minister. After meeting Blair in Camp David In a joint press conference, Bush said "This is a chance for me to tell the Prime Minister how dedicated my administration will be to an alliance that has made a huge difference in the world; an alliance I firmly believe will make a difference in the years to come. We discussed the Prime Minister's vision of a strong NATO. We need to think differently about the post-Cold War era, that there are new threats that face people who love freedom. There is the threat of an accidental launch of a missile. The Prime Minister asked a lot of really good questions. And I'm now talking to the Pentagon to come up with a level of nuclear weaponry that will help us keep the peace. We spend a lot of time talking about our mutual interests in Iraq and the Persian Gulf. Prime Minister said something interesting, though. A chance in sanctions should not in any way, shape or form, embolden Saddam Hussein. He has got to understand that we are going to watch him carefully."

In regards to US engagement in Europe and the future of NATO, Bush said "Prime Minister assured me that the European defense would no way undermine NATO. I assured him United States will be actively engaged in Europe" (Bush & Blair, 2001a). For his part Blair said that "We discussed a whole range of issues. We've



got a lot of common history. On missile defense, for my part, that this is a debate that is important to have. And I think if you look at the weapons of mass destruction that people are trying to develop in nuclear proliferation that it's important that we look at every single way we possibly can of dealing with this threat." And on Saddam Hussein, Blair said "Don't be under any doubt at all our absolute determination to make sure the threat of Saddam Hussein is contained and that he is not able to develop weapons of mass destruction that he wishes to do" (Bush & Blair, 2001a).

In a joint Statement, Bush and Blair also outlined their strategy against the spread of Weapons of Mass Destruction. The joint Statement states that "We recognize the existence of a common threat stemming from the growing proliferation of WMD and increasingly sophisticated missiles for their delivery. We need to obstruct and deter these new threats with a strategy that encompasses both offensive and defensive systems" (Bush & Blair, 2001b). Such a statement could be regarded as the outlining of a joint preemptive strategy by Britain and the United States of America, which was insisted upon by Blair during their first meeting.

In his first meeting with President Bush, Blair was successful in obtaining US engagement in fighting WMD in the Middle East and US commitment to European security through its continuous presence in Europe as President Bush promised during the campaign. Naturally, when the inexperienced American President was engaged in the Middle East, due to American dependency on British experience, Britain could easily manipulate US policy in Europe as well.

IV- The Blair and September 11

Blair used the 9/11 attacks as an opportunity to implement his "doctrine of international community" through US military muscle. Blair expressed his full sympathy for the US administration and declared Britain's full support for America in confronting and



defeating those responsible.

On October 7th 2001, Britain and the US attacked Afghanistan. On the 8th of October, Blair in his report to justify the invasion of Afghanistan to the British Parliament said that "9/11 was not an attack to the West or the US alone. It was an attack on civilized values. I pay tribute to President Bush's statesmanship in having the patience to wait. This was for three reasons and on British advice" (Blair, 2001a).

On November 7th 2001, Blair once again went to Washington to meet President Bush. George Bush spoke of his admiration for Tony Blair by saying "I've got no better person I would like to talk to about our mutual concerns than Tony Blair. He brings a lot of wisdom and judgment, as we fight evil"(Blair, 2001b). Step by step, Tony Blair brings US foreign policy in line with British interests in international politics. In a speech to the European Research Institute, in describing his attempt to shape US foreign policy, Blair said that "The US will continue to play a vital role, and the present crisis has proven that our relationship with the American is as strong as ever. Indeed the UK has a powerful role to play as a bridge between USA and Europe. Britain's friendship with the United States is an asset for our European partners. We want to work with an internationalist USA"(Blair, 2001c).

When the US invaded Afghanistan, it was easy to get America invade Iraq. Step by step, Blair was directing US foreign policy according to his vision based on the doctrine of international community. On January 29th 2002, in his annual State of the Union Address, Bush declares Iraq to be part of an "axis of evil"(Bush, 2002f). Blair then used the occasion of meeting Dick Cheney, The Vice President of America in London, to emphasize that "Saddam Hussein has acquired weapons of mass destruction over a long period of time" (Blair & Cheney, 2002). A month later, Blair again went to Washington to meet President Bush. In a joint press conference Bush said "I appreciate his (Blair) advice. We have a common reading of



history. The thing I admire about this Prime Minister is he doesn't need a poll or a focus group to convince him the difference between right and wrong. And it's refreshing to see leaders speak with moral clarity when it comes to the defense of freedom" (Bush & Blair, 2002).

A day after his meeting with President Bush, Blair announces his second doctrinal of international politics for American elites. In his address at the George H. W. Bush Presidential Library, Blair said "The only purpose being in politics is to strive for the values and ideals we believe in: freedom, justice, what we European call solidarity but you might call respect for and help for others. But alongside the values we know we need a hard headed pragmatism – a realpolitik – required to give us any chance of translating those values into the practical world we live in. The same tension exists in the two views of international affairs. One is Utilitarian: each nation maximizes its own self-interest. The other is Utopian: we try to create a better world. Today I want to suggest that more than ever before those two views are merging. I advocate an enlightened self-interest that puts fighting for our values right at the heart of the politics necessary to protect our nations." He went on to advising the American elites by saying "Engagement in the world on the basis of these values, not isolationism from it is the hard-headed pragmatism for the 21st Century. Why? In part it is because the countries and people of the world today are more interdependent than ever."

Blair then referred to his earlier doctrine and said "When I spoke about this issue in Chicago in 1999 and called it a doctrine of international community, people hesitated over what appeared to be Panglossian idealism. Today, more than ever, "their" problems become "our" problems. Like it or not, weather you are a utilitarian or a Utopian, the world is interdependent. What erupted on the streets of New York on September 11 was not an attack on America alone. It was an attack on us all." Blair identifies interdependency as the best foreign policy path for the American administration and said



"The most obvious lesson is indeed our interdependence. A series of interlocking alliance with a common agenda on issues of security, trade and stability should replace old rivalries. We must be prepared to act where terrorism or Weapons of Mass Destruction threaten us. If necessary the action should be military and again, if necessary and justified, it should involve regime change. I have been involved as British Prime Minister in three conflicts involving regime change, Milosevic, Taliban and Sierra Leone. We should not shirk from confronting them. To allow WMD to be deployed by a state like Iraq without let or hindrance would be grossly to ignore the lessons of September 11 and we will not do it. Middle East requires continuous focus and engagement. Prevention is better than cure. In today's interdependent world, we need an integrated approach, a doctrine of international community as I put it before. For America, it has laid bare the reality. American power affects the world fundamentally. It is there. It is real. It is never irrelevant. It can affect the world for good or affect it for bad. Stand aside or engage, it never fails to affect. I want it engaged. Under President Bush, I am confident it will be and for good. When America is fighting for those values, then, we fight with her. Britain will be at America's side in doing it" (Blair, 2002a).

Interestingly, within less than a month, Condoleezza Rice, the then National Security Advisor to the White House, in a speech at John Hopkins University, repeats Blair's doctrine of international politics. Rice describes the US role on the international stage in a similar way to what had been proposed by Tony Blair. Blair wanted US foreign policy to be interdependent with British views and values and for the United States to be engaged in international politics. Rice said "As the world's most powerful nation, the United States has a special responsibility to help make the world more secure. Robust military power matters in international politics and in security. The best defense is a good offense. September 11 underscored was the need to deny terrorist and hostile states the opportunity to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Global terror demands a global



solution. As a professor, I recognize that power matter. Great powers matter because they can influence international stability for good or for ill. Great powers never have, and never will, just mind their own business within their borders. America today possesses as much power and influence as any nation or entity in the world. We will use our influence"(Rice, 2002).

It was Tony Blair who proposed regime change in Iraq. On the eve of the first 9/11 anniversary, Blair said "Let me tell you why I say Saddam Hussein is a threat that has to be dealt with"(Blair, 2002b). President Bush too immediately followed Blair in pushing for regime change in Iraq. According to US Constitution, it is necessary for the President to have Congressional approval to engage in war. Four days after the Blair initiative to wage war on Iraq, President Bush discusses growing danger posed by Saddam Hussein with the American people to galvanize support for Congressional approval for war. In pressuring Congress, President Bush said: "Congress must make it unmistakably clear that when it comes to confronting the growing danger posed by Iraq's efforts to develop or acquire weapon of mass destruction"(Bush, 2002a). Four days later, President Bush invited Congressional leaders to the White House President Bush said that "We talked about a resolution out of Congress and how it was important for us to work with Congress to pass a strong resolution. I want to thank the leadership for its commitment to get a resolution done before members go home for election break"(Bush, 2002b).

In a speech to the British Parliament, Blair said that "Today we published a 50 pages dossier detailing the history of Iraq's WMD. The policy of containment is not working. Iraq has chemical and biological weapons, that Saddam has continued to produce them, that he has existing and active military plans for the use of chemical and biological weapons, which could be activated within 45 minutes"(Blair, 2002c). Later, it became obvious that the allegation by Blair in the context of the "45 minutes" comment was false. Bush again expressed admiration for Blair by saying "Prime Minister Blair is



a very strong leader, and I admire his willingness to tell the truth and to lead. He has and continued to make the case, and so will I" (Bush, 2002c). Bush again increased pressure on Congress by stating that "Congress must now act to pass a resolution"(Bush, 2002c).

Within two days of Blair's "45 minutes" speech to the British Parliament about Iraq's weapon of mass destruction, President Bush announced that "According to the British government, the Iraqi regime could launch a biological or chemical attack in as little as 45 minutes after the order were given" (Bush, 2002d). He continues to mount pressure on Congress by saying that "I appreciate the sprite in which members of Congress are considering this vital issue"(Bush, 2002d). As it was mentioned, for US president to enter into war, it is necessary to obtain Congressional permission. Bush used every trick to deceive the Congress. In fact, it was Tony Blair who provided the fake material for President Bush to push the Congress into providing him with the authorization for the use of force in Iraq. Later on, it became obvious that the "45 minutes" accusation about Saddam Hussein's WMD capabilities was a lie by the British intelligent service to deceive the US Congress as well as manipulate US public opinion. The President had made up his mind to follow Blair but he had to justify it for the US Congress, and British intelligent service furnished it. To mobilize Congressmen, Bush said "I haven't made up my mind we're going to war with Iraq. I've made up my mind we need to disarm the man. He's a threat to Israel" (Bush, 2002e).

Ultimately on October 2nd 2002, in a joint resolution, Congress authorizes the use of military Force against Iraq (Joint Resolution..., 2002). It is worth noting that the same trick was used in the Second World War, when the US Congress was reluctant to enter the War in favor of the British. Winston Churchill cleverly convinced Roosevelt to enter the Second World War and he too needed Congressional approval. Roosevelt said "I may never declare war; I may make war. If I were to ask Congress to declare war, they might argue about it for three months" (Churchill, 1945: 527).



When Blair was assured of US Congressional approval for the war, he gradually started shaping British public opinion for war as well. In a speech to the Foreign Office Conference for the British Ambassadors, Blair said that "We should remain the closest ally of the US, as allies influence them to continue broadening their agenda. It is massively in our self-interest to remain close allies. The price of British influence is not that we have obediently to do what the US asks. The price of influence is that we do not leave the US to face the tricky issues alone. By tricky, I mean the one which people wish weren't there. But the US should confront. If the US acts alone, they are unilateralist; but if they want allies, people shuffle to the back. International terrorism is one such issue. WMD is another. In February 2001, at my first meeting with President Bush I said this was the key issue facing the world community. America should not be forced to take this issue on alone" (Blair, 2003a). Blair's speech clearly indicates his political ambition, as a close ally of America, to use US strength and military power to implement his doctrine of international community.

Before the invasion, Blair visits Bush in the White House once again. In a joint press conference, Bush welcomed Blair and said, "I appreciate his vision. I appreciate his willingness to lead. I appreciate his understanding that after September the 11th, 2001, the world changed; that we face a common enemy. I trust his judgment and I appreciate his wisdom." Blair however, had a problem. He had no justification to pursue regime change in Iraq, as the events of September 11th were unconnected terrorist attacks. But, to interpret both terrorism and the weapons of mass destruction as being connected, Blair for his part tried to fool US politicians as well as the public by saying "On what I think the two key issues that face our world today – which are issues of international terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. And I think both of those issues come together because they threaten the peace and the order and the stability of the world. We should realize those two threats are not



different, they're linked. And dealing with both of them is essential"(Bush, 2003).

V- Invasion of Iraq

On March 20th 2003, American and British forces invaded Iraq, removed Saddam and occupied the country. Tony Blair in his address to the Nation said, "On Tuesday night I gave order to British forces to take part in military action in Iraq" (Blair, 2002d).

Blair achieved his aims. To soothe tensions among US politicians who opposed the Bush administration's foreign policy, in an address to the US Congress, Blair advised Congress thusly, "There never has been a time the power of America was so necessary. The virus is terrorism. There is no more dangerous theory in international politics today than that we need to balance the power of America with other competitor powers, different poles around which nations gather. Such a theory made sense in 19th Century Europe. It was perforce the position in the Cold War. Today it is an anachronism to be discarded like traditional theories of security. It is dangerous because it is not rivalry but partnership we need. An alliance must start with America and Europe. Believe me if Europe and America are together, the others will work with us. But if we split, all the rest will play around"(Blair, 2003b). He went on to advise Congressmen that "America must listen as well as lead. But don't ever apologize for your values. That's a battle worth fighting." Blair even used spiritual comment to calm the bewilderment of American society regarding US political behavior in international relations by saying that "I know it's hard on America. And some saying to you the political leaders of this nation; why me? Why us? Why America? And the only answer is: because destiny put you in this place in history, in this moment in time and the task is yours to do. And our job, my nation that watched you grows. You're not going to be alone. We'll be with you"(Blair, 2003b).

No weapons of mass destruction were found in Iraq after the



British and American invasion. Both British and American governments came under intense criticism. In the United States, the Senate Committee on Intelligence began to scrutinize the issue. On July 7th 2004, the Senate Intelligence Committee published a 545 page document on the US intelligent community's faulty prewar intelligence.

In Britain, Blair was compelled to form a committee to scrutinize the intelligence service's assessment on Iraq. Blair asked Lord Butler, a close ally to British Royal family and establishment to head the committee. The British committee's report was published a week after the Senate Intelligence Committee report on 14th July 2004. Butler's report is complicated and more or less acquitted Blair of any wrong doing. But the Senate's report clearly indicates that the US intelligence services were manipulated by a third country. Although much of the report is elected and inaccessible, the report does state that "The Intelligence Community relies too heavily on foreign government services and third party reporting, thereby the potential for manipulation of US policy by foreign interests" (Report on the US Intelligence..., 2004, 34). It also states that "On January 28, 2003, the President noted in his State Union address that: The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa (Report on the US Intelligence..., 2004, 66)." This means that President Bush used British government information. The report then states that "The Iraq-Niger uranium deal was on false documents" (Report on the US Intelligence..., 2004, 71). Which again means that the President's information about the allegations against Iraq was false and was furnished by the British government. In this regard, Senator Ron Wyden, who was a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, in concluding the report stated that "In reality, the (US) Administration repeatedly and independently made the case for war not by relying on US intelligence, but by ignoring or directly contradicting the same." Senator Barbara A. Mikulski, also a member of the committee said



that "US intelligence agencies were wrong about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Errors were not limited to the CIA. They also occurred at the Department of Defense and State. Flawed intelligence was fuel for activating the policy of pre-emption" (Report on the US Intelligence..., 2004).

It was a disaster for the Bush Administration. The Senate Committee's investigative scope was limited to the assessment of the intelligence services and did not extend to the role that politicians played in war against Iraq. Although it was promised that another committee will assess the politicians' role in the Iraq war, in 2005 after the US presidential election, but it never came to fruition.

Richard Perle, a leading scholar at the influential think tank, the American Enterprise Institute, said that "Blair and the neo-conservatives have a lot in common." The BBC also, in a report asked "Is Blair the neo-conservative?"⁽⁶⁾ Apart from what the press or the thinkers have to say, in a speech in March 2004, Tony Blair expresses no doubt that his doctrine of international community was the basis behind President Bush's decision to invade Iraq in March 2003. To justify waging war on Iraq, Blair stated that "No decision I have ever made in politics has been as divisive as the decision to go to war to Iraq. It remains deeply divisive today. In a speech in Chicago in 1999, where I called for a doctrine of International Community, where in certain clear circumstances, we do intervene, even though we are not directly threatened. So, for me, before September 11th, I was already reaching for a different philosophy in international relations from a traditional one that has held sway since the treaty of Westphalia in 1648; namely that a country's internal affairs are for it and you don't interfere unless it threatens you, or breaches a treaty, or triggers an obligation of alliance. I did not consider Iraq fitted into this philosophy." He then said "However, I had started to become concerned about two other phenomena. The first was the increasing amount of Islamic extremism. The Second was the attempts by states to develop nuclear weapon programmers, CW⁽⁶⁾ and BM⁽⁷⁾ materials,



and long range missiles. All this was before September 11th. President Bush told me on September 9th 2001, that he had a meeting about Iraq in the White House when he discusses smart sanction, changes to the sanction regime. There was no talk of military action." Blair then continued by saying that "September 11th was for me a revelation. We had to confront the states with WMD" (Blair, 2004).

On October 23rd 2004, in an article in the Guardian newspaper, it was opined that "Tony Blair is the original neoconservative". It further reads: "In domestic and foreign policy, Blair has always been ahead of Bush" (Rawlence, 2004).

Conclusion

United States was and still is a hard power and Britain always prevails over brawn. Britain plays a soft power role in international relations. Britain usually uses American strength and resources for the benefit of Britain. When the British describe their relations with the United States as "special", it means they have the power to influence and direct US foreign policy. In order to understand international politics, we must study Anglo-Saxon "interdependency" through the "special relationship" which often exists between British Prime Ministers and US Presidents. Winston Churchill, the British Prime Minister of the 1940s, Harold Macmillan in the 1960s, Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s, and Tony Blair in 2000s, all had special relationships with their US counterparts. Though not always the case, in the case of Tony Blair with George Bush their relationship preceded in accordance with British interest and Blair's doctrine of international community declared in 1999. This must be considered not only to understand international politics, but also to react properly thereto. As it has been proven in the case of Iraq, Tony Blair, the then British Prime Minister, manipulated US foreign policy during the George Bush presidency.

Notes

1. Henry Kissinger says: during his term in office, he consulted British foreign office more than State Department. During Cuban Crises also, British ambassador's advice, which was present in the National Security Council-NSC meeting, was peaked by President Kennedy.
2. It is said that "doctrine of international community" belongs to professor Lawrence Freedman of King's College. Either Blair has borrowed from him or he is the theorizing brain for Blair's government.
3. North Atlantic Treaty Organization
4. Weapons of Mass Destruction
5. Panorama, BBC, 10.01.2004.
6. Chemical Weapons
7. Ballistic Missiles

References

- Blair, T. 1997, May 27. Speech by the Prime Minister Tony Blair at Paris, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 1998, December 15. Speech by the Prime Minister on Foreign Affairs, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 1999a, March 8. Prime Minister's Speech at the NATO Anniversary Conference, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 1999b, April 26. Prime Minister's Statement to Parliament on the NATO Summit in Washington, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 1999c, May 20. Prime Minister's Speech: The Challenge for Europe, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 1999d, April 24. Prime Minister's Speech: Doctrine of the International Community at the Economic Club, Chicago, *10 Downing Street*, Retrieved from <http://tna.europarchive.org/20030731055559/http://www.pm.gov.uk:80/output/Page1297.asp>.
- Blair, T. 2001a, October 10. Prime Minister's Statement to the House of Commons, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 2001b, December 7. Prime Minister Blair Says Coalition is Stronger, Remarks by President Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair of Great Britain in Press Availability, *The White House*.
- Blair T. 2001c, December 23. Britain's Role in Europe, in European Research Institute, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 2002a, April 7. Prime Minister's Speech at the George Bush Senior Presidential Library, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. (2002b, October 10). Prime Minister's speech to TUC conference in Blackpoll, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 2002c, October 24. Prime Minister's Iraq Statement to Parliament, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 2002d, March 20. Prime Minister's Address to the Nation, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T. 2003a, January 7. Prime Minister's Speech at the Foreign Office Conference, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair T. 2003b, July 18. Prime Minister's Speech to the US Congress, *10 Downing Street*, Retrieved from www.number10.gov.uk/output/page4220.asp.



- Blair T. 2004, March 5. Prime Minister Warns of Continuing Global Terror Threat, *10 Downing Street*.
- Blair, T and Cheney, D. 2002, March 11. Transcript of Doorstep Given by the Prime Minister Tony Blair and US Vice President Dick Cheney, London, *10 Downing Street*.
- Bush G.W. 2001, February 22. Press Conference by the President, *The White House*.
- Bush, G.W. 2002a, October 14. President Discussed Growing Danger Posed by Saddam Hussein's Regime, Radio Address by the President to the Nation, *The White House*.
- Bush, G.W. 2002b, October 18. President Discusses Iraq, Domestic Agenda with the Congressional Leaders, *The White House*.
- Bush, G.W. 2002c, October 24. President Urges Congress to Pass Iraq Resolution Promptly, *The White House*.
- Bush, G.W. 2002d, October 26. President Bush Discusses Iraq with Congressional Leaders, *The White House*.
- Bush, G.W. 2002e, November 1. President Stresses Need for Strong Iraq Resolution, *The White House*.
- Bush, G.W. 2002f, January 28. President's Union Address, *The white House*, Retrieved from <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/>.
- Bush, G.W. 2003. President Bush Meets with Prime Minister Blair, *The White House*.
- Bush, G.W and Blair, T. 2001a, February 23. Remarks by the President and Prime Minister Blair in Joint Press Conference, *The White House*.
- Bush, G.W and Blair, T. 2001b, February 23. Joint Statement by President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair, *The White House*.
- Bush, G.W and Blair, T. 2002, April 6. President Bush, Prime Minister Blair Hold Press Conference, *The White House*.
- Buzan , B and Gonzalez-Pelaez, A. 2005, January. International Community after Iraq, *International Affairs*, 81(1): 31-52.
- Campbell, D. 2004, November 29. Baroness Flies to Florida's Rescue, *The Guardian*.
- Carr E.H., 1946. *The Twenty Years Crisis*, 2nd ed., London: Macmillan.
- Chirac, J. 2006, January 19. Speech by Jacques Chirac, President of the Republic, During His Visit to the Strategic Forces Landvisiau – L'île Longue, French Armed Forces, Embassy of France.
- Churchill, W. 1945. *Second World War*, Cassell , III.
- De Gaulle, C. 1964. *The Complete War Memoirs of Charles de Gaulle*, New York: Simon & Schuster, I to III.
- De l'Estang, F. B. 1999, May 26. Cooperation and Conflicts in Transatlantic Relations: The French Point of View, Former French Ambassador to Washington, *French Embassy in Washington*.
- Gardner, R. N. 1985/6, Winter. Sterling-Dollar Diplomacy in Current Perspective, *International Affairs*, 62(1).
- Hay, W.A and Sicherman, H. 2001, February. Europe's Rapid Reaction Force: What, Why,



and How? *Watch on the West, A Newsletter of FPRI's Center for the Study of America and the West*, 2(2).

Joint Resolution to Authorize the Use of United States Armed Forces against Iraq. 2002, November 2. *The White House*.

Rawlence, B. 2004, October 23. Tony Blair is the Original Neo-con, *The Guardian*.

Report on the US Intelligence Community's Pre-War Intelligence Assessment on Iraq. 2004, July 7. *Senate Committee on Intelligence*, 108th Congress.

Rice, C. 2000, January/February. Promoting the National Interest, *Foreign Affairs*, 79(1).

Rice, C. 2002, April 29. Remarks by National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice on Terrorism and Foreign Policy, *The White House*.

Smith, J. 2004. Development of Response Force in NATO and the Evolving NATO-EU Relationship, in *NATO Parliamentary Assembly*, Committee Report.

Thatcher, M. 1992, May 15. Speech by Margaret Thatcher to the 'Global Panel', The Hague, in Robin Harris, ed., Margaret Thatcher, *The Collected Speeches*, Harper Collins Publisher, 517-518.

Thatcher, M. 2000, July 24. Clear and Present; The Imperative Missile Defense, *The Washington Times*.

Waltz, N.K. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Woods, R. B. & Jones, H. 1991. *Dawning of the Cold War: The US Quest for Order*, Georgia: University of Georgia Press.