

This paper aims to give a brief review of the different aspects that was evident before the USA invasion of Iraq. Even though the invasion is a fact today, still we miss logic and a reason to explain the act from the USA. The actual invasion in itself did not shed any light on the purpose, nor did the capture of Saddam Hussein. The articles that lay the ground for this paper tried to explain the situation according to the four major perspectives. These are “security”, “democracy” and finally “economy”. All in all, the matter of the invasion is a very complicated affair to grasp. The situation is a virtual greenhouse for conspiracy theories. I will in this paper try to outline the main arguments for each of the four theories and while doing this also add a personal reflection on the arguments. My intention is not to bring new ideas into this debate, nor is it to uncover new evidence or fire up conspiracy theories.

The first perspective is out of a security-concern. When breaking down the invasion in consideration to the instability of the region one must ask oneself what defines instability, and instability to whom. In this context it is presupposed without saying that stability refers to a climate of international dependence, using economy as the prime tool. The world as it is outlined today has a self-proclaimed sheriff with the main task of balancing the power that each nation has over the international order. This role has USA adopted without much complaint from the rest of the industrialized world. This was a natural outcome from the breakdown of the Soviet empire. However with the cold war and the battle between the two super-powers out of the way, once again the focus is turned towards many minor conflicts between states that for decades have been standing in the shadow of the cold war. This is without a doubt a realist way of defining the inner workings of the world system.

This perspective of the world is based on realist logic between states and has no or little acceptance of individual interests. Therefore one might say that a dangerous regime controlling a nation is less of a threat to the world system, than an individual ruler controlling a nation with little respect to the nations best interest. This is the case made in the first article that with little paraphrasing defines Saddam Hussein as an irrational and idiotic leader. An unstable region with an irrational element makes the whole region a

wildcard in international politics and therefore a risk. The bottom-line in Saddams behavior is not so much his treatment of his own people but his proven inability to make sound risk assessments, calculate odds and deal with diplomatic tenderness.

Dealings with nations are always backed up with thorough calculations of what the nations can sacrifice, has to offer and craves. This is where international politics, and indirectly stability in regions and the world as a whole, stems from. It is considered proven that Saddam does not take lightly on failure in his own regime and punishes bad news with harsh punishments. Therefore not necessarily is he irrational in his decision-making but it is also reasonable to assume that he in critical situations receives inaccurate information. In any case it is an actor that acts irrationally in a politically very tense region.

To further prove the statements the first article goes on pointing out Saddams lack of education and referring to several disastrous miscalculations in earlier attempts of war. The article goes on with statements that in court would have any defendant throwing herself out of the chair before the sentenced was finished shouting “your honor, that is hearsay”. The reason I point this out is that the article has a very important point but kicks open doors in when using rumors and gossip as facts in proving the statement. This behavior as a whole added together with a dislike towards American politics generates a dangerous enemy that does not understand or care about the dare consequences of supporting terrorist acts such as 9/11.

By opposing Saddams regime USA means to eliminate one kernel in terrorist networks and send a signal throughout the region that not working towards stability and politics compatible with USA and the world is considered a hostile action. The article makes the point of the weapons of mass destruction that not only does Saddam possess such tools. But also is he capable of using them at any time, in reference to earlier statements of Saddams mental health. The article refers to knowledge about a massive covert program to develop nuclear weapons. One might raise the question why USA hasn’t opposed to this program before. Since 1970 there has been many occasions where natural situations

has presented itself where USA would have been able to remove the ability or control the development. Meanwhile Iran has unquestionably progressed with their nuclear program much more aggressively.

Out of a security point-of-view it is also important to ask oneself the question of what really is the security perspective. Is another actor equipped with nuclear weapons mainly a political security-threat, or a state-security one? With the possession of nuclear weapons it does not really matter what mental state Saddam is in, he would still speak with a voice as loud as any other actor on the world arena, which would be a politically horrible situation for USA. It would also mean that Saddam would single-handedly control two-thirds of the worlds proven supplies of crude oil (on the other hand, according to the last seminar with Ann Towns, only 10% of the crude oil was located in Iraq).

This reasoning which makes Saddam Hussein the single important player but also by making him the Idi Amin of the middle-east is in itself according to me a security-threat. It is a dramatically simplistic view of multidimensional phenomena.

The second paper bares the same perspective, however a totally different aim. The focus on Saddam Hussein is dramatically less, not to mention Iraq as a nation. Instead the security-concerns lay north of Iraq, in Israel to be precise. The intricate relations between Israel and USA has for many years been a common “secret”. The diplomatic agreements that USA is pushing forward to create stability in Israel have always been a public affair. USA is trying to promote peace and a fair agreement in the issue of Palestinian settlements at the Gaza-strip. On the other side has several documents emerged that proves USA’s weapon-support and more controversial aid in the Israeli nuclear program. Not so much in providing them with technology, but in that letting a continuance in development progress.

It is common that in international politics each nation is primarily trying to achieve what is in the nations best interest. This means that the continuing support from USA to

Israel means that Israel is important to USA in many ways. But the actions of the Israeli government also prove that they have an agenda towards a greater goal. As earlier stated USA has proclaimed itself the hegemony of the world ever since the end of the cold war. What is interesting and important to point out here is the way they have progressed with this authoritarian pole position. It is obvious that they have made a point of being liberal, promoting open markets instead of controlled. They have made an example of being different from earlier rulers in history, interfering with power as little possible and instead declaring a form of middle-way between soft- and hard-power.

This position is a dangerous one since it also calls for challengers of the position in a larger scope than other methods. As the article describes it “The hegemony frequently sacrifices some of its immediate interests in order to promote the legitimacy and credibility of multilateral institutions”. This is important to bear in mind when reflecting on the following statement regarding security as main reason. Basically in the different stance that they have made when leaving most of the notable international society behind in their determination of invading Iraq.

To justify this action they have put forward arguments such as the violations of human rights, in which many other nations should be the main point of interest for USA if this were the soul-case. In a reference to what I stated above USA must have a profound reason to progress with the invasion. Equalizing the beaches of human rights is alone not sufficient. Another more realistic reason would be the feared arsenal of WMD's that Iraq is believed to possess. However much more evidence points to the fact that most of these weapons are damaged from earlier wars, or just not functioning and therefore not a threat to USA at all, hardly even to the neighboring countries. Arguments has been made why USA don't question Israel in this matter, or focus on Syria or Iran. Why is Saddam suddenly the kernel of instability and evil in the middle-eastern region?

The article makes its point that the reason to this is because Israel is the sent out guardian of the region, working in close strings to USA. By creating hegemony by proxy in the region USA would have a man in the middle position in the region that still lacks

the most of USA influence. Considering the argument that has been put forward for the invasion by USA regarding human rights and weapons, it is almost ironic that a close ally of USA is Israel who in this matter is a true black sheep in international politics. Myself has problems relating to this theory probably because this is new article containing the most new information for me. It also requires more knowledge about Israel than I have resulting in me not fully buying the proposed importance of Israel as a nation in the region, especially not in comparison to Saudi-Arabia, Syria and such.

The most common argument among people to explain the invasion is the fact that USA needs to control the oil reserves. In many ways surely the war will in the end bring a situation where USA has the control of the oil, however using the oil as sole purpose to describe the invasion is vague. An invasion where the prime target would be to occupy the oil inside another nations borders would in the international community be nothing but pure state-robbery. Even though the control of oil is critical in world politics and world economy, it is not so crucial a situation that USA can risk the implications of blunt state-robbery. The different arguments for the invasion has therefore in large been considered a smokescreen for the real purpose, however it falls short in reasoning on several issues.

The third article, posing oil as the main perspective for the invasion, has a bit of a twist in comparison to the ordinary arguments regarding oil. The article defines the different main arguments lifted and in detail runs through the terrorist suspicions, with reference to 9/11. The article makes it a fact that the connections between 9/11 and Saudi-Arabia are well established, in fact more established than that between Al-Qaida and Iraq. The article goes on by defining Saudi-Arabia as a main oil contributor to the USA and the world as a whole. The clear connection between Al-Qaida and Saudi-Arabia makes the terrorism that threatens USA state-financed and not with any kind of money, but the actual money from USA. Next to Saudi-Arabia's stronghold in oil reserves comes Iraq. With the clear terrorist-connection the articles mean that USA has the need to re-establish its dependence towards an actor from Saudi to any new. In this case not only does Iraq

stand in comparison in regard to actor as oil-provider, but also does Iraq provide the ability to take control of an uncomfortable dependency-situation.

Oil is without a doubt what makes our world go round. The control of the oil is therefore considered as the control of the world. However, the oil-reserves in both Saudi-Arabia and Iraq come at such high cost that the alternative sources around the world should acquire more focus than is the case. Also, perhaps the invasion of Iraq not at all is a way to cut loose the connections with Saudi-Arabia, but instead stabilizing the region and thereby level the pricing of oil. Perhaps the situation with Saddam really is affecting Saudi-Arabia more than USA and the invasion really is for the gain of Saudi-Arabia more than USA. Of course the occupation of the oil fields is the first course of action for the military troops, since not only does it help finance the costly invasion, but also in an attempt to avoid what took place in 1991 when all fields were put on fire. It is time and time again proven that a stable market is cheaper to maintain and more dependable as situation for industrial development than occupation and constant vigilance.

The last article is describing the situation out of a democracy-perspective. What it all comes down to in this article is the belief in “domino-effect” upon states. If one state is converted into a democracy, the rest is bound to follow. The same method was applied during the time of the cold war, without any significant proof that this actually worked. The theory is that democracy is a social change that improves many layers of the society, politically, culturally and economically. Since this is an improvement in all layers of society, except for the rulers, all states is bound to be welcoming to the changes, at least once the transformation is complete. On another note one can consider democracy as a set of tools for interacting state-state, and state-citizens. International politics depends on the fact that all actors work with the same set of methods and are dependable. As stated earlier in this paper, nations are constantly calculated in politics, what they can afford to loose, what they want to gain and so on. Without a common interface, these calculations are impossible to perform.

Therefore it is of outmost importance to the countries that are the rulers of the new economic world order, that the single most economically important region in the world will adopt these standards. A fun note worthy to point out in the article is the statement that the problem with democracy is that the people might vote wrong. The article in itself feels very “correct”, like reading a political statement by Richard Bach, though some important points makes it through. The paper makes a clear mark that by establishing a democratic Iraq the regions Muslim and non-democratic settings would be penetrated. This would in itself eliminate terrorism since democratic societies by default don’t nurture terror networks. After Iraq, Iran and Syria would come trembling down to the liberation of democracy and thereby the stable and strong Saudi-Arabia would be an island. This island would be more sensitive of diplomatic pressure and the control of oil would decrease.

It’s all a very smooth description of a best-case scenario, at least for the promoters. However what is left out of this plan is the fact that many democratic regimes throughout the world have problems with terror-networks. The base of the 9/11 hijackers has proven to be Germany and multiple countries in Europe have their own most active terror-networks. All in all, the document describes Iraq as the key to the Middle East, and the regime with Saddam to be instable. What should be considered when reading the article is that perhaps the author, and USA, has overestimated the role Iraq plays as a nation in the Middle East.

Finally, the reason USA invaded Iraq is a puzzling one. The international community did not, as expected, take lightly on the action. However, upon going through with the invasion USA managed to claim their position as hegemony not only in everybody’s mind, but using military brute force, declaring that it is a fact. Each article made a clear point on why the invasion should/could/would take place, and according to me the reason is in between. The different perspectives are closely intertwined. Economy, democracy and security all affect each other. At the end of the day, this is a continuing of a progress that started long ago with father Bush, and I believe it will take yet some time before we will be able to look back and say, “Oh, now I get it!”.