

**Andreea Crina Horea**  
PhD Student, Universitatea Babeș Bolyai, Cluj Napoca  
[andreeacrina.horea@yahoo.com](mailto:andreeacrina.horea@yahoo.com)

### **The Iraq Fall – Civilian power versus hard power: Germany vs. USA**

“Not since Rome has one nation loomed so large above others”, has Joseph Nye once said. *The Economist* wrote: “the US bestrides the globe like a colossus. It dominates business, commerce and communications, its economy is the world’s most successful, its military might second to none.”

Then again, Germany dared to confront the American colossus and said “NO”.

On 9/11 2001, Germany’s chancellor, Gerhard Schröder, promised the US unlimited solidarity in the fight against terrorism. After just one year, in 2002, a serious crisis erupted in the transatlantic and German-American relations: Germany not only refused to support the US’s invasion of Iraq, as part of the war against terror, but it also refused to support any other military action against Iraq.

Germany’s bitter opposition contrasted with the active role it had taken in the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan, when, for the first time in its post-war history, Germany sent a few hundred troops to participate in the fight.

The dispute between Germany and the US, and other European governments regarding the Iraqi invasion reached the unexpected, leading to a significant change in the international public opinion about the US.

The intervention in Iraq, in 2002-2007, is a subject that no one can easily approach and explain in a short analysis without thinking about the considerable controversy, as well as the implementation of the American led intervention and its consequences.

My goal here is a new, different one: to use two classical international relations theories, realism and liberalism and two classical concepts hard power and civilian power to create a framework for the analysis of this case, by focusing on the US (as all the key decisions were made in Washington) and Germany (as it is the European civilian power, struggling to create a common voice in Europe’s CFSP). This account focuses on the Iraq invasion in March 2003, with particular interest in Germany’s perception as Civilian Power due to its fierce opposition

and the reasons behind it and in the US's hard power image determined by its interests and objectives.

I also look at two important issues that have developed at that time and lead to the questions of my research: the American geopolitical device and the 2002 German elections. The German resistance largely came from domestic actors, the German government politicians and the opposition's members engaging in a fierce declarative debate promoting different perceptions and approaches of the situation, yet at some moment meeting a common view. However, the resistance included also a foreign policy culture strongly embedded in its past and collective memory.

The present paper deals with the analysis of the 2002-2007 Iraqi case, from the US's point of view, of its involvement, and influence in shaping the international opinion and Germany's behavior regarding the American motivations that led Iraq's actions. The Iraqi invasion represents a special case, a precedent for Iran and Afghanistan, worth being studied.

I want to follow and speak about the real reasons that determined the Iraqi invasion by the Americans, the lie behind the American, messianic propaganda, and the true economic interests behind the democratic reconstruction of Iraq. US's attitude determined by strategic interests and geographical position of its allies, hidden under a mixture of sympathy, neutrality or hostility towards Iraq and the Hussein regime.

The following research question will be the focus of this proposal: Why did the Iraq war become the catalyst to mark a break and reveal the main disagreements between the two major actors, traditional allies and friends, Germany and the US?

The dependent variable of the paper describes Germany as a guarantor of human rights and enforcer of international law, a main partner and reliable ally of US and as a Civilian Power that dared to confront this time US and not fight on the same side. The public declarations within the internal debate between the government's representatives and the opposition regarding Germany's position, the Bush administration's rhetoric and the reactions of the mass media and public opinion, as well as the historical background and the foreign policy culture act as indicators supporting this variable.

My research considers as independent variable the security interests of the two states, their strategic objectives in Iraq and it shall be explained through indicators like: official UN documents, resolutions and public documents of the American administration legitimizing the

invasion, official German statements regarding Iraqi area and a comparison of the interests they both have in this area.

The article develops two hypotheses. The first one argues that the greater the power and success of a state is the more it wants and is prone to act unilaterally, without any support or legitimization in order to achieve its interests and power.

The second hypothesis explains Germany's behavior, stating that the more brutal and bloody a state's history and past were, the larger the impact on collective memory and foreign policy strategy is.

My research paper will try to validate these two hypotheses through two apparently opposite international relations theories, liberalism and realism, proving that in fact they complement and complete each other providing a full picture of Germany's and US's behavior and a complete portrait of the Iraq invasion.

The research will not use a "key method", a pattern available for any situation, but rather combines concepts, ideas and instruments from different approaches, searching for an appropriate way of investigation.

I give special attention to political methods (unilateral, public and international, collective) used by both the US and Germany, as part of their strategy to pursue and secure their own interests and foreign policy guidelines.

However I will keep my analysis in the field of qualitative methods, paying significant attention yet not exclusive to both historical approach (identifying the important moments that led to the invasion and those most significant ones during the invasion and how the US played them, its role, as well as Germany's position as civilian power, its objectives and motivations) and to the analysis of documents and official testimonies, official documents, belonging to the United Nations, the resolutions adopted (1441/2002, 1511/2003), as well as speeches belonging to different authorities, legitimizing the invasion, (Iraq Resolution of 2002) or afterwards trying to find excuses for the mistakes done, and most important an analysis of the propaganda, carefully built, against Saddam Hussein and his regime.

During the cold war, US policy in Middle East focused on preventing a Soviet control of the region, maintaining the free flow of oil at good prices and securing Israel's survival. After the fall of the Soviet Union in December 1991, the other US objectives became easier to assert and

achieve. September 9, 2001 added a third element into the US policy equation: preventing the Middle East from turning into a base for the violent, anti-American islamists.

Therefore, to a certain degree, all these elements, combined, provided the Bush administration with the fundamental legitimization of the war against Iraq in 2003.

Furthermore, there will also be taken into account the US's security strategy and its principles, related to national security and the permanent state of war, and the new evidence found meant to prove the fake accusations invoked by the Bush Administration when starting the invasion. It will be interesting to follow the behavior of some of the international relations' main actors, their reaction and motivation.

The research will consist of two main chapters.

The first chapter *Hard power vs. Civilian power - Theoretical framework* deals with the theoretical framing of the two paradigms civilian power and hard power, their definition and tries a presentation of Germany and the US from the point of view of these features, justifying their recognition as Civilian Power and Hard Power. The second chapter *The Iraq War – between liberalism and realism* pursues an analysis of the war against Iraq considering the principles of the two theories, how do they apply and explain the interests and objectives shape the attitudes of the two actors towards the war. The two subchapters, *Germany's view of the Reasons for Iraq's invasion* and *Iraq – the interest of US and Germany?*, aim at revealing the facts and interests that shaped the behavior of the two countries not only regarding the war against Iraq, but also towards each other, underlining again the important role that past and collective memory, as well as success and power play in shaping the foreign policy strategy.

Hard power has been defined by Joseph Nye in terms of coercive force, as the ability to obtain the outcomes one wants. Civilian Power has been interpreted as prescribing new forms of international governance, whose purpose is civilianization of international community by limiting military force, in order to guarantee the right of law, prosperity and self-government. Civilian Power supports limiting the use of military force to reduce violence in order to build international institutions, promotes collective action to cope better with the non-military threats to security.

The Iraq crisis (2002-2007) has therefore become the catalyst that revealed the main disagreements between the two actors, with great importance for the evolution of the CFSP, the USA and Germany, disagreements based on historical experiences and different perceptions of

the security threats. Two different security strategic cultures have come to light, two cultures that are incompatible considering the large gap between military capabilities, areas of interest of foreign policy and its instruments (military vs. diplomatic)

To conclude, this dispute marked the beginning of two separated roads of two good old Allies, a shift that has not adversely affected the U.S., since, as said R.Kagan, “the US can shoulder the burden of maintaining global security without much help from Europe”, but it split Europe and slowed its way towards a common European voice in foreign policy and security issues.

Therefore I find such an analysis worth being studied, for, as Ernest Benn said “Politics is the art of looking for problems, to find out whether they exist or not, to incorrectly diagnose them and to wrongly apply the remedy.”

### **1. Hard power vs. Civilian power - Theoretical framework**

The Civilian Power paradigm and the Hard Power concept have, from the very first beginning, seized the attention of scholars. Even though two main scholars are entitled to claim their authority on these concepts, Hans Maull and Joseph S.Nye, the interest has remained high ever since on the academic agenda. A large number of papers, articles and different publications dedicated their attention to both concepts, analyzing their objectives, their means and methods, trying to define them as well as their influence in shaping the states' behavior.

This paper proposes an alternative picture of these concepts, obtained through an analysis of policy rationale and implementation in the case of the Iraq invasion starting from the two theories that created them: liberalism and realism.

Power is defined as the ability to do things and control others, or as Joseph Nye puts it “is the ability to get the outcomes you want and to affect the behavior of others to make this happen.”<sup>1</sup> Others have gone farther and said that in order to obtain the outcomes desired, they need to possess certain resources, such as a large population, territory, important natural

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph S.Nye, *Hard power, Soft Power and the war on Terrorism*, in ed. David Held and Matthias Koenig – Archibugi, *American Power in the 21st century*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2004, p. 117

resources, economic strength, military force and internal stability, defining power as possession of resources.<sup>2</sup>

The realist school linked power with the possession of such resources and defined hard power by the use of such resources to spur the behavior of other entities. As Michael Braeher said, the international political system is „made of an assembly of actors subjects to the internal constraints (the context) and to the external ones (environment) placed in a configuration of power (structure) and involved in regular networks of interaction (process).” So, the international system has been entirely shaped according and related to the state’s interests, interest that could be not only material, meaning space, resources, population, but also immaterial, pursuing power, honour, value, prestige, the international status of great power, even superpower.

Or the US proved to possess all these qualities as well as the necessary military force and the predilection for unilateralism and self-defense.

For 40 years of Cold War, the american geopolitical machine embodied two principles: strengthening the US’s absolute position within the non communist world and secondly, the prevention of any communist expansion in the world.

In the XXIst century, the US’s geopolitical objectives are:<sup>3</sup>

- Preserving the transatlantic relationship, with the european countries, mainly concerning the defense and security problems, relying on Berlin and London;
- Strengthening taking over the geopolitical acquis, meaning Latin American and the countries in the Carabean region, the US being ready to step in military speaking, without any UN support, in order to protect their own interests – Panama and Grenada;
- Preventing a recovery of the Russian power in its former influence areas: the Baltics, Ukraine, Caucasus and Central Asia;
- Preventing any economic and political regrouping in Europe and Asia, so that the EU or ASEAN cannot become a threat for the American economic hegemony;
- The opposition to China’s imperial call and preventing it from creating any own influence areas in Asia, once a reliable ally of the US, now China comes in contradiction with America’s interests;

---

<sup>2</sup> ibidem

<sup>3</sup> Chauprade Aymeric, Thual Francois, *Dictionar de geopolitica. State, concept, autori*, Bucuresti, Corint, 2003, p.319

- The control over the Middle East oil and its transport routes, having the traditional alliances with Saudi Arabia, Israel, Egypt, to oppose to the Iraqi and Iranian nationalism;
- Maintaining Iraq's unity in order to preserve the balance in the area, considering the fact that Iran is a much more threat for the oil companies than Iraq.

Therefore, defining US's fundamental interests, one global military superpower and a leader of the international security policy, has always had a characteristic, meaning defining them around the notions of Culture, American Creed (a set of ideas and universal principles, such as freedom, equality, democracy, constitutionalism).

In his study "The Erosion of the American national interests",<sup>4</sup> Huntington stated that: - the American interests combined the security issues with those of ethics, - its security policy is generally trying to maintain a balance between defense capabilities and commitments, but today, the Americans' need is no longer to find the strength to carry out defense, but to find the commitment to use American power, - the U.S. are a strong country, but its foreign policy is increasingly influenced by economic interests and lobbies ethnic groups, - the U.S. are a "soft" power, dealing with export of technology, food, ideas, culture and power and the import of "intelligence", capital and goods.

On the other hand, Brzezinski in the study "A strategy for Eurasia",<sup>5</sup> considers this region to be a global geopolitical axis, and one who will dominate this supercontinent will have decisive influence over two of the richest three regions worldwide. He believed that the U.S.'s status of major power will not be challenged for another generation to come and proposes for the US the following positions to adopt in the international relations: - involvement, along with Germany and France for the EU's and NATO's enlargement, this serving the American interests both short term and long term, - Russia's assimilation into a broader framework of European cooperation while supporting the independence of its new neighbors, - supporting China as an eastern anchor, it is considered that this country is a great regional power and its aspirations of global superpower are difficult to achieve, - on long-term, Eurasia's stability will be achieved

---

<sup>4</sup> Huntington, Samuel P, "*The erosion of American National Interest*", in Foreign Affairs, sept/oct 1997, p.29-49

<sup>5</sup> Brzezinski, Zbigniew, "*A geostrategy for Eurasia*", in Foreign Affairs, sept/oct 1997, p.50-64

through a trans-Eurasian security system, by expanding NATO, along with commitments to collective security with Russia, China and Japan.

Thus, the main feature of the contemporary international system, especially after September 11, 2001, is the lack of a big potential conflict between the powers. The contemporary system is unipolar, characterized by the existence of a superpower with global interests and political will, strategic capacity, but it already seems that a new system based on the principle of balance of powers emerges, through the rise of new states to the status of superpower: Russia, China, India, and Germany.

The American behavior is worthy of a Machiavellic hard power, respecting one of the basic principles of “The Prince”: “the principal foundations of all states...are good laws and good armies, and that a prince therefore must not have any other object nor any other thought, but war, its institutions and its discipline.”<sup>6</sup>

Means of hard power are both military and economic power, as both can be used either through inducements (carrots) or threats (sticks) to change other states’ behavior.

However there is another indirect way of achieving one’s objectives without the use of military force or any means of coercion: the civilian power.

Hans Maull depicted de civilian power also as an exercise of power as “Civilian Powers want to influence the course of history.”<sup>7</sup> Civilian Power emphasizes limiting the use of military force to contain violence in order to build international institutions and supports collective action to deal with non-military threats to security. It uses non-military instruments of foreign policy so that policy instruments are not distinct objectives and both promote collective security principles and democratic values.

Liberalism provides the grounds for the paradigm of civilian power, emphasizing on human rights, peacekeeping effects of democracy on foreign policy and the market economy, as well as on the positive aspects of international cooperation, opposing realist skepticism regarding the limits of cooperation, which realists considered superfluous, unnecessary and unlikely to survive in a hostile and threatening environment.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Stevens Cahn, *Classics of modern political theory: Machiavelli to Mill*, New York, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997, p.28

<sup>7</sup> Henning Tewes, *Germany, civilian power and the new Europe. Enlarging NATO and the EU*, Palgrave, Basingstoke, 2002, p.20

<sup>8</sup> Henning Tewes, *op.cit*, p. 21

Hans Maull's focus on human rights and international business law confirms liberal approach of state power. His concept is based on the notion of rights and highlights the necessity of accepting and pursuing universally recognized values: spreading democracy and protection of human rights.

A contradiction observed from the very beginning in motivating the divergence between the two powers and which lies in the two opposed theories. U.S. legitimizes their intervention in the name of spreading democracy whereas Germany motivated their fierce resistance in the name of human rights and democratic values.

The war in Iraq was a significant display of America's hard military power that removed a dangerous dictator, but it did not solve the problem of terrorism. Germany's reluctance was a dazzling proof of its civilian power policy, strongly embedded in the past and its collective memory, peaceful foreign policy and international cooperation, but it did not solve the problem of democracy and human rights in Iraq.

Henning Tewes argues in chapter 2, entitled "*Why is Germany a Civilian Power?*" of his work, *Germany, civilian power and the new Europe. Enlarging NATO and the EU*, Germany's categorization as Civilian Power based on the post-World War II history and the politics of peace and integration promoted by Konrad Adenauer. Thus, West German policy was built on 6 principles essential for its civilianization: stabilization of democracy in West Germany and promotion of multilateralism, a pillar of the civil power; Franco-German partnership; abandoning the policy of balance of power in favor of EEC or CFSP; promoting interstate cooperation in order to fulfill the interests of states; the principle of subsidiarity by yielding significant decision-making powers to the supranational community by nation states; considering integration as a process, while the latter principle consider integration also a progress.

Thus, Germany was ever since its early evidence a Civilian Power by promoting a multilateral foreign policy.

Civilian powers are engaged in defending democratic values they promote, using non-military instruments, but they have to secure their own defense, security, whose maintenance cannot be done without these instruments of foreign policy. This ambiguity and tension that lies within the civil power paradigm, the commitment to peace corresponds to non-military instruments of policy, while the commitment to democratic values establishes the regulations governing foreign policy.

According to the Civilian Power paradigm, Germany's foreign policy will oppose national power politics and will closely cooperate with its Western allies within the framework of Western multilateral institutions and the UN, as "never again, never alone and politics before force" will become the defining feature of Germany's foreign policy. And so it has been done: one can clearly see that the classical realpolitik culture based on national interest, rationality and power has been replaced by social norms and a security policy based on a set of rules designated to restrict the use of force to self-defense.<sup>9</sup> Germany accepted therefore the use of force as last resort, after everything else has failed, however military force is a necessary component of a successful diplomacy.<sup>10</sup> In other words, it accepted hard power as means of reinforcing the tools and methods employed by the civilian power policy principles.

Dieter Dettke described the essence of German opposition to the war in Iraq, not only as a case of aversion to the use of force, but also as an effort to balance the US and to put together a counterweight to US power in the UN Security Council.<sup>11</sup> Although Germany's reaction fit the Civilian Power paradigm, its behavior revealed a more traditional pattern of foreign policy behavior based on national sovereignty and national interest. There again, applying the classical realist theory to Germany's evolution, everybody had expected Germany to promote its own defensive capabilities and acquire nuclear weapons, fact that did not happen.

On the other hand, Germany's predilection for multilateralism and cooperation with the international institutions in order to respect international law and protect the democratic values, strongly rooted in the liberal approach, finds a support in Hans Morgenthau, who, under the auspices of classical realism gave great importance to the multilateral structures in the form of alliances which are "typically of temporary duration and most prevalent in time."<sup>12</sup> Morgenthau goes further and emphasizes the use of coercive force in enumerating political power: "In international politics in particular, armed strength as a threat or a potentiality is the most important material factor making for the politics power of a nation."<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Dieter Dettke, *Germany says No. The Iraq War and the future of German Foreign and Security Policy*, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington DC, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2009, p.15

<sup>10</sup> Idem, p.7

<sup>11</sup> ibidem

<sup>12</sup> Henning Tewes, *op.cit.*, p.24

<sup>13</sup> Morgenthau Hans J., *Politics among nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Alfred A.Knopf, New York, 1967

The liberal international theory highlighted the capacity of international institutions, in our case, the United Nations (UN), of domestic politics (German general elections, the American neo-conservative opposition or the American economic lobby groups) and economic interdependence to influence international security behavior.

Richard Ned Lebow enhances in his study “Classical realism” an analysis of the US lead intervention in Iraq to overthrow Saddam Hussein and his regime starting from the classical realist points of view: “the inability to formulate interests intelligently and coherently outside of a language of justice; hubris, how can it readily lead to tragic outcomes that are the very opposite of those intended; the choice of means and the generally negative consequences of choosing those at odds with the values of the community.”<sup>14</sup>

However, the war against Iraq and its outcomes confirmed Joseph Nye’s vision that a state’s success at achieving its goals rests not on the exclusive use of either hard or soft power, yet success depends upon a combination of both, deemed as smart power. And as we all have witnessed the Iraq War has not been a success.

## **2. The Iraq War – between liberalism and realism**

Taking into consideration the Kosovo and Afghanistan cases, when Germany supported both diplomatic measures and the use of force if necessary, its attitude towards the war in Iraq revealed a contradiction in its foreign policy between Civilian Power tradition and the realist heritage. In both former cases, it took military force to achieve legitimate political objectives.

What is different now, in the case of Iraq and what has changed in Germany’s behavior to lead to this fierce opposition and confrontation of the American colossus?

In both cases there have been massive violations of human rights, the lack of democracy, and the Balkan region seemed a rightful moral responsibility for a European Germany, responsibility rooted in its past, collective memory and geographical belonging.

Yet, in Iraq Germany had no political, economic or strategic interest, the American pre-emptive war rhetoric and the identification of the “axis of evil” were seen as a direct declaration of war, given the fact that the so called evidence against Iraq and Saddam Hussein were weak,

---

<sup>14</sup> Richard Ned Lebow, *Classical realism*, in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, Steve Smith, *International Relations Theories. Discipline and diversity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, p.54

and US's initiative was a display of unilateralism, violating the international law. At this point, Germany had other priorities, such as the reelection of chancellor Schröder and in this context, an anti-war discourse, promoting peace, respect for the democratic values and focus on the internal social problems would have guaranteed an electoral success.

As mentioned in the previous section, Richard Ned Lebow's realist analysis of the Iraq invasion placed the US and its action in the sphere of unilateralism in international relations and in the field of Greek tragedies at diplomatic level: after the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War and defining influence in terms of power, the US saw no other reason why their hegemony should be constrained by treaties, agreements or norms that affect its interests, whereas its contempt towards its traditional allies and towards the international community brought the Bush Administration to a hubris, translated in terms of success and power.<sup>15</sup>

“The States shall not give up their right to make war, as the UN do not offer the states the absolute guarantee that they will help the states under attack; the UN can only promise to examine the situation and to do their best in order to help and that is all.” (Phillippe Moreau Defarges) The war is a vital question of the state and a right for which all the world's states rather reserve the sovereign right of decision.

Yet, the 2003 Iraq invasion broke the International Law, having no approval from the UN Security Council, only the 2002 number 1441 Resolution tried a legitimization of the invasion: *“Recognizing the threat Iraq's non-compliance with Council resolutions and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles poses to international peace and security, Recalling that its resolution 678 (1990) authorized Member States to use all necessary means to uphold and implement its resolution 660 (1990) of 2 August 1990 and all relevant resolutions subsequent to resolution 660 (1990) and to restore international peace and security in the area...”*

---

<sup>15</sup> Richard Ned Lebow, Classical Realism, in Tim Dunne et alli, *op.cit*, p.66



Once considered a peripheral, second rank power, after 1980's, Iraq moved to the center of Middle East and often of the world, as a major force, a result of the inside pressures and soaring ambitions of the regime, together with mutual miscomprehensions among the Iraqi leaders, Arab neighbors and Western countries. Iraq went from being a virtual US ally to becoming the first Arab state to fight a war with the US, shaping this way one of the most interesting chapters in the history of the US policy towards the Middle East.

The Iraq War (or Occupation of Iraq, the Second Gulf War, and Operation Iraqi Freedom) is an ongoing conflict which began on March, 20<sup>th</sup>, 2003 with the US led invasion of

Iraq. The 2003 State of Union Address claimed that the US could not wait anymore so that the threat of the Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein to become imminent.

For the US, Iraq was an aggressive and a revanchist state, under the control of an ambitious and dangerous dictator.<sup>16</sup> The threats Iraq represents must be thought in terms of possible strategic intentions and its ability to win the war, as Iraq is a threat in term of conventional forces and its capacity to retain and rebuild WMD.

Iraq was seen as a major proliferator, its struggle to preserve its WMD and missile capabilities continues and the UN reports showed that the Iraq has the capability to deliver chemical and biological weapons and is conducting a covert effort to rebuild its capabilities and to expand them.

Moreover, in US's conception, Iraq was to be treated as a major military threat to the security of world's supply of oil exports and a real "terrorist nation" as long as it is under the control of Saddam Hussein, or any similar "centrist regime".<sup>17</sup>

The main justification for Iraq's invasion and occupation offered by the US former President, George W. Bush, former Prime Minister of the UK, Tony Blair, former Prime Minister of Spain, Jose Aznar and their domestic and foreign supporters was the allegation that Iraq possessed and was actively developing WMD capabilities, while leaders and diplomats from countries on the UN Security Council that opposed the war made statements that contested the view.

In January 2005, the Iraq Survey Group concluded that Iraq has ended its WMD programs in 1991 and had no WMD at the time of the invasion; in spite of the abandoned remnants of the pre 1991 production that were found, US Governments spokespeople confirmed that these were not weapons for which the US went to war, as Colin Powell later said. Moreover, some US officials claimed a connection between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda, although no evidence of any operational or collaborative relationship with Al Qaeda has been discovered. Other reasons for the invasion invoked by the US officials talked about other kinds of terrorism such as financial support for Palestinian suicide bombers, spreading democracy, Iraqi government human rights abuses, and the economic importance of Iraq's oil supply.

---

<sup>16</sup> Cordesman, Anthony H., *Iraq and the war of Sanctions. Conventional Threats and Weapons of Mass Destruction*, Westport, Connecticut, Praeger, London, 1992, p.2.

<sup>17</sup> *Idem*, p.163

The invasion and occupation began on 20 March 2003, when a multinational force led by the US and the UK and supported by some contingents from Australia and Poland invaded Iraq, invasion that led to the defeat and flight of Saddam Hussein. The US led coalition occupied Iraq and attempted to establish a new democratic government, although it failed to restore order in Iraq, leading to asymmetric warfare, with the Iraqi insurgency, civil war between many Sunni and Shia Iraqis and al Qaeda operations in Iraq.

To conclude, the Iraqi invasion remains an ongoing conflict that had and has as main features:

- Overthrow of the Baath party government and Saddam's execution;
- Occupation of Iraq;
- Humanitarian crisis with human rights abuses, civilian casualties and refugees;
- Iraq insurgency and outbreak of civil war;
- Widespread infrastructure damage;
- Privatization of Iraqi services;
- Election of a democratic government;
- Al Qaeda terror operations in Iraq.

The case of Iraq led to a major conflict between allies, on the one hand between the coalition of the willing led by the US and UK, and on the other hand France and Germany, leading a coalition against the American invasion, coalition that included also Russia. However, the US and UK decided to go on with their plans, without having UN's legitimization, and have invaded and conquered Iraq.

Although sanctions against the Hussein regime were in force, the Bush administration was not happy with it. Vice President Cheney, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, Sub-Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, and national security adviser Condoleezza Rice wanted Hussein's removal and did not try to hide their objective. Hussein's removal would allow U.S. to redraw the Middle East map and increasing its influence in the world, given that Iraqis would welcome them with open arms as their liberators. Another objective of this crusade against Iraq was to intimidate North Korea and getting the support of other countries in the fight against terrorism.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Richard Ned Lebow, Classical Realism, in Tim Dunne et alli, *op.cit*, p.67

Declaring his “commitment to the mission of the UN”, Bush tried to mask his real intentions under the name of mistakes or misinterpreted information, which at first came from “solid sources” and spoke about the real reasons for invading Iraq:

- ✚ National and world security, the peril that Saddam himself was a public risk, because of his WMD, and the fact that sooner or later Iraq would use or lend its weaponry to kill the innocent;
- ✚ Liberate Iraq from the tyranny of the “lawless men” who now hold power, and it was the Americans task and their allies to destroy the “apparatus of terror” and “build a prosperous and free Iraq”, “that could set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.”<sup>19</sup>

If the Marshall Plan transformed a hostile Germany and a kamikaze Japan in US’s allies, in less than a generation, the “Bush Plan” for exploiting the oil from the free Iraq shows how expensive this plan can be in the international relations.

The US chase for the Iraq War faced heavy criticism from popular and official sources both inside and outside the US: the war created tensions inside the American political class as a result of the perception of 1, 3 billions of Muslims regarding Iraq’s invasion as a declaration of war of the US against the Islamic world. The Muslims tend to see the US as a colonial power that, along with Israel have military forces in the most important sacred places of the Islamic religion: Saudi Arabia (Mecca), Iraq (Kerbala, Najaf).

The discovery of the tortures applied to the Iraqi prisoners in the Abu Ghraib prison and in other prisons altered the image of the occupying forces, questioning not only the goals but also the means of the US regarding this war. The disagreement becomes bigger and bigger and the rejection of the invaders by the locals is more obvious, supported by the publication, in the international communication media, of images showing terrible physical and psychological tortures, humiliating treatments applied by the American and the British military forces to the prisoners.

Both proponents and opponents of the invasion have criticized the prosecution of the war effort, accusing them of not having devoted enough troops to the mission, not adequately planning for post-invasion Iraq and for perpetrating widespread human rights abuses.

---

<sup>19</sup> *Idem*, p.36

Moreover, American journalists called the whole affair *Mr. Rumsfeld's War*, as he had designed, or redesigned the war plans by dramatically reducing the troop strength that would be available from the invasion, forcing a greater reliance on air power. This was Rumsfeld's vision of a "clean fast war", as well as a cheap war, using America's technological supremacy to overpower Iraqi resistance and minimize casualties.

The invasion and especially the bombing of Baghdad determined the last great explosion of antiwar protest all over the world: demonstrations, marches around American consulates, riots. The killing of so many innocents, so many children, and the horror of bombing dissipated "the anti-war protest as a mass movement after the first week of war."<sup>20</sup>

The US Propaganda depicted an evil Saddam Hussein, affirming that Hussein is Hitler and has strong connections to transnational terrorism and Al Qaeda.

For Germany none of these features worked, given the fact that the analogy Hussein-Hitler did not have any great impact among the German public opinion. Post Second World War Germany was built on the principle "never again Nazism, never again war". Even though Hussein remained one of the world's biggest tyrants, his comparison to Hitler meant that Hitler and Auschwitz have not been unique, evil events, but they can be anytime compared to any other crimes against humanity.

The German past and collective memory had been in a certain degree ignored, overlooked and their importance and impact publicly undermined.

The German mass-media joined their American peers and argued that the Bush rhetoric did not only make the Germans uncomfortable but also raised questions about the real interests behind the invasion and doubts among the states. The most relevant example is that of the Spiegel magazine, which published on the 17<sup>th</sup> February 2002, an article entitled "On a Mission from God: The Crusade of George W. Bush", questioning the rhetoric of the American government as an attempt to legitimize its unilateral actions.<sup>21</sup>

Diane Panke and Thomas Risse oppose, in their study *Liberalism*, this view realistic explaining the U.S. decision to trigger war against Iraq without international support and Germany's opposition to this war in terms of a liberal actor - centred approach.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> *Idem*, p.47

<sup>21</sup> Anika Leithner, *Shaping German Foreign Policy. History, Memory and National Interest*, First Forum Press, Boulder and London, 2009, p.89

<sup>22</sup> Diane Panke, Thomas Risse, *Liberalism*, in Tim Dunne et alli, *op.cit*, p.99

Thus, within the United States there was a strong coalition in favor of war, created since 2001, following the attacks of 9/11, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld being the first to have mentioned Iraq as a target, and Afterwards George Tenet, former head of U.S. Central Intelligence Agency played a major part in the decision-making process for the Iraq War. After 9/11, the U.S. has become a national security state, which increased the power of interests of businessmen with regards to the military industrial complex, and to obtain resources and access to Iraqi oil, thereby reducing U.S. dependence Arab oil. On the other hand, Germany was facing internally a strong opposition of the public opinion to such a war, and amid general elections, Germany's opposition escalated.<sup>23</sup>

Even though neither the CIA nor the NSA had any evidence of the Iraqi involvement in the 9/11 attacks or of the Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) possessed by Iraq, the US assumed the responsibility and implications of such a war: "We knew plenty of countries that were working on WMD programs and desperately trying to conceal that fact. But we had no previous experience with a country that did not possess such weapons but pretended that it did...Before the war we didn't understand that he (Saddam) was bluffing, and he didn't understand that we were not."<sup>24</sup>

The ideological vision of American Neo-conservatives combined the liberal agenda of messianism, moral duty for spreading democracy and protecting human rights and the responsibility for international security with the use of military power to enforce these liberal goals. Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz believed that the lack of democracy and authoritarianism were at the core of the problems that the U.S. had in the Middle East, accusing the Bush Sr. administration of not having done the job, to get rid of Saddam and his brutal regime in 1991. The events of 9/11 were the opportunity of action for the neo-conservative action, the terrorist attacks on WTC creating a type of uncertainty and insecurity needed for such arguments.

For Germany, however, aversion to war was deeply rooted in the national culture and collective identity of the country, so often German foreign policy being characterized as a civilian power. Although the use of force is not excluded, unilateralism is almost a national taboo.

---

<sup>23</sup> *ibidem*

<sup>24</sup> George Tenet, from *At the Center of the Storm: My Years at the CIA*, HarperColins Publishers, New York, 2007, in Dieter Dettke, *op.cit*, p.155

Germany's reaction in the case of Iraq was strongly shaped by its historical memory and national interests. Anika Leithner identified in her paper, *Shaping German Foreign Policy. History, Memory and National Interest*, German memories about the Second World War, general beliefs about the use of force as foreign policy tool and the notion of a German Sonderweg (special path) as main reasons for Germany's opposition to the Iraq War.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, Bush's rhetoric of the "axis of evil" and depicting Iraq and Saddam's regime in black and white scared many Germans, who actually raised within such a social and political system, but who learned that the world would be better viewed in shades of grey, disapproving the US's initiative.<sup>26</sup>

### **2.1. Germany's view of the Reasons for Iraq's invasion**

"The propaganda War" was rooted in the tragedy of September 2001, the destruction of the WTC twins in New York, "a symbol of American prosperity" being compared to a gruesome instance of the "propaganda of the deed".<sup>27</sup>

And the result led to the declaration of war on terror by President Bush, who won widespread public support inside and outside the US. Therefore, it appeared the need to destroy the Taliban government in Afghanistan, an ally of Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda and the installation of a new regime of security in the US. This feeling of fear, the permanent security alerts, the speculations about gas attacks or other biological warfare, and water poisonings, the concerns about new suicide bombings, the stories of terrorist imprisoned were meant to create and maintain a state of paranoia, a conditioning for the public to accept the idea of permanent warfare.

Bush strongly believed and wanted the entire world to see the American superpower bestriding the world. In 2002 he denounced an "axis of evil", composed of Iraq, Iran and North Korea, as each was developing WMD, being a threat for the US and the world's peace and security, and therefore US's strategy of a pre-emptive action was a justified, legal one, in order to forestall a threat. But, in fact, off the record, the time had come to deal with Saddam Hussein whose persistence so long after the victory of Gulf War I both irritated and frightened the Americans.

---

<sup>25</sup> Anika Leithner, *op.cit*, p.88

<sup>26</sup> *Idem*, p.89

<sup>27</sup> Rutherford, Paul, *Weapons of mass persuasion. Marketing the War against Iraq*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Buffalo, London, 2004, p.24

What the majority of Americans wanted was the approval, to have some back up and an UN sanction, they did not want to go alone. Powell, along with the former Prime Minister of the UK, Blair wanted to win the approval of the UN for a new war against Iraq, to ensure its disarmament, but the UN refused to accept their case, the doubtful evidence of Iraqi evil that Powell outlined in his speech in 2003. The UN was seen as a “global parliament with high morality authority, its sanction of any invasion would have given legitimacy to the pro-war cause.”

So, as Rutherford affirmed, “Washington’s propaganda was tailored to suit the public mood”.<sup>28</sup>

Iraq’s invasion was presented to the entire world and the public opinion through means of media as a “fair success of the Bush Administration”, as New York Times said, while Washington Post praised in fulsome terms the strategies used by the White House; the British press underlined this messianic successful mission talking about the “US’s great victory” and Times said that Washington didn’t have to give up much of its strategies, while announcing that Pentagon had already made a plan of war against Iraq. The threatening tone and the hidden, tragically, illegal objectives of this so called “mission against terrorism, for peace and world’s security” of the Bush regime was masterly shadowed by the former American Defense Ministry Donald Rumsfeld’s words: “No one gets up in the morning wishing to go to war. The military option is and extreme one, never the first one. War is dangerous and dreadful.” Or even better by the former President’s Bush words: “Presidency is tiring...the period we came across now is tiring. I think only about Iraq. A lot. Every day I see the list of victims, I receive reports – I am sunk in this war.”<sup>29</sup>

Washington managed to make forgotten in people’s mind its killing and dramas, destructions by revealing to the entire world the very true face of Saddam Hussein and the true tragedy of everyday life under his regime: every year the dictator killed thousands of Iraqi citizens and tortured other thousands in his prisons, practicing genocide against the population of different religion of that of the ruler.

Another legal and legitimized action of the US, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the UN, by the 1511 UN resolution from October 2003:

---

<sup>28</sup> *Idem*, p.33

<sup>29</sup> Draper, Robert, *Dead certain: The presidency of George W. Bush*, 2007

*“8. RESOLVES that the United Nations, acting through the Secretary-General, his Special Representative, and the United Nations Assistance Mission in Iraq, should strengthen its vital role in Iraq, including by providing humanitarian relief, promoting the economic reconstruction of and conditions for sustainable development in Iraq, and advancing efforts to restore and establish national and local institutions for representative government.”*

This so called necessity of annihilating the threat of international terrorism has given the U.S. the possibility to change the old tactics, as Washington could no longer rely on preventive and defensive measures: a direct strike against the international terrorist networks through military campaigns in the areas with the highest risk factor: Afghanistan and Iraq.

The task was to manage the public international opinion, to nurture feelings that would ensure the success of the government’s agenda.

The daily briefings became a powerful weapon of mass persuasion, Washington striving to send 2 somewhat contradictory messages:

- ✓ On the one hand, maintaining the fiction that Iraq was a real enemy and to sustain the threat represented by the chemical weapons and missiles held of Saddam Hussein, who could employ them against the coalition forces
- ✓ On the other hand, preserving the integrity of the war plan, the idea that the war continues according to the scenario, it was time for damage control, how to deal swiftly with bad news.

There are five main ideas that can be distinguished in the propagandistic speeches of the Bush administration and the Security Council, presidential speeches that justified Iraq’s invasion:

- ✓ The problem state (Iraq) produces weapons of mass destruction;
- ✓ The leader, S. Hussein, is a new Hitler and has links with terrorists;
- ✓ The policy of sanctions and restrictions failed;
- ✓ Time’s up;
- ✓ "We must strike before it's too late."<sup>30</sup>

Seemed now that no evidence was any longer necessary to justify the war, but Bush reaffirmed the master narrative of a righteous war, sustaining the need to disarm Iraq. He noted the failure of the UN inspectors, the failure of diplomacy, of US’s efforts to bring about a just settlement and preserve the peace.

---

<sup>30</sup> Rachman, Gideon, *Financial Times*

His main concern was now Hussein: "Today no nation can possibly say that Iraq has disarmed. And it will not disarm so long as Saddam Hussein holds power."

In October 2002, a law has been passed by the US Congress as Public Law no 107-243, authorizing what was soon to become the Iraq War. So, the Americans were acting legally under the approval of the UN and the entire American and international public opinion through the "Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq/Iraq Resolution of 2002", citing many factors to justify the use of military force:

- Iraq's noncompliance with the conditions of the 1991 cease fire, including interference with weapons inspectors,
- Iraq's alleged WMD and programs to develop such weapons, posed a "threat to the national security of the US and international peace and security in the Persian Gulf region",
- Iraq's "brutal repression of its civilian population",
- Iraq's capability and willingness to use WMD against other nations and its own people,
- Iraq's hostility towards the US as demonstrated by the 1993 assassination attempt of former president George H.W. Bush, and firing on coalition aircraft enforcing the no fly zones following the 1991 Gulf War;
- Members of Al Qaeda were known to be in Iraq;
- Iraq's "continuing to aid and harbor other international terrorist organizations", including anti US terrorist organizations;
- The authorization by the Constitution and the Congress for the President to fight anti US terrorism;
- Citing the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, the resolution reiterated that it should be the policy of the United States to remove the Saddam Hussein regime and promote a democratic replacement.

"It authorized the US to use military force to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council Resolutions regarding Iraq."<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq/ *Iraq Resolution of 2002*, apud [www.wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org)

Moreover, the principle of a pre-emptive war brought back the memory of Nazi aggression, or for Germany, which accepted the use of force only as last resort; such a strike could not be justified nor accepted as tool of foreign policy.<sup>32</sup>

## **2.2. Iraq – the interest of US and Germany?**

US's strategic objectives qualify it for a rough hard power. But what was it exactly behind all these pretexts and so called world peace preserving?

**“It's all about the oil”** (Ted Koppel, New York Times), nothing else but Iraq's most precious good: oil.

Iraq's importance to the world oil system is greater, in terms of proved oil reserves, Iraq's is 4<sup>th</sup>, with a production of 115,0 billion barrels, after Iran, with 132,5 billion barrels, and the first Saudi Arabia, 264,3 billion barrels, while the US have only 26 billion barrels, less than 2,5% of world proved resources.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, the significance of Iraq's threat in the crisis becomes more evident: in 1990, Iraq controlled both its own and Kuwait's reserves, and combined with the oil of the rich, but military weak United Arabian Emirates, Iraq was in position in 2000/2002 to dominate 55% of the world's proved reserves.

But in the context of the UN's sanctions after Gulf War, Iraq's economy had a great need for oil revenues and this situation gave some chance for external actors to influence Iraq's conduct and so Iraq will continue to have a pressing long term need for export revenue and this shall motivate Saddam or his successors to encourage higher world oil prices and give Iraq good reasons for seeking to intimidate its neighbors.

The oil dimension was linked to two other important aspects:

1. On one hand, Iraq, having already attacked four neighbor states (Iran, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Israel) and having bitter quarrels (Syria) could again find itself in a war;
2. If Iraq succeeded and regained regional power and influence, this may lead to an attempt to manipulate oil production in order to increase oil prices.

---

<sup>32</sup> Anika Leithenr, *op.cit*, p.90

<sup>33</sup> Baram, Amatzia, Rubin, Barry, *Iraq's Road to War*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1993, p. 89

Or, the Americans are the greatest “gasoline consumers” in the world: the American oil corporations, also those under the control of the Bush or Cheney families (Halliburton) need the oil and Iraq, the 4<sup>th</sup> country rich in oil was a too tempting target for this war not to happen.

The oil is what the immediate interests pursued by the White House and more and more Americans start to realize that this war is a war for oil. Saddam’s assault in Kuwait had the same reason.

But, on the other hand one of the first actions of the Iraqi “free government” was to give more than 65% of the oil export profits to the American and British companies.

Yet one can say that the Iraq war did not happen just because of the oil, if we consider a new great actor, **Israel** and its need for security.

Bush needed a democratic government to rule Iraq, a government that would be favorable to Israel, ally of the US. American aid to Israel goes beyond protecting Israel’s security needs within its internationally recognized borders, as the US assistance includes support for policies in militarily occupied territories that often violate well established legal and ethical standards of international behavior.

What is strange is the fact that 99% of US military assistance to Israel came only after Israel proved itself to be far stronger than any combination of Arab armies and after Israeli occupation forces became the rulers of a large Palestinian population.

So, the US’s support for the Israeli government is not motivated by objective security needs or a strong moral commitment to the country. But, its foreign policy is motivated to advance its strategic interests:

- Israel’s air force is predominant through the region;
- Israel has missiles capable of reaching as far as the former Soviet Union, it possess a nuclear arsenal of hundreds of weapons and it has cooperated with the US military industrial complex with research and development for new jet fighters and anti-missile defense systems;
- Israel has successfully prevented victories by radical nationalist movements in Lebanon and Jordan, as well as in Palestine;
- Israel has kept Syria, for many years an ally of the Soviet Union, in check;
- Israel’s frequent wars have provided battlefield testing for American arms, often against Soviet weapons;

- It has served as a conduit for US arms to regimes and movements too unpopular in the US for openly granting direct military assistance (apartheid South Africa, the Islamic Republic in Iran, the military junta in Guatemala, and the Nicaraguan Contras);
- Israel's intelligence service has assisted the US in intelligence gathering and covert operations.

Israel's military superiority is therefore ensured by the US as a result of the American desire to continue Israel's political dominance of the Palestinians and its military dominance in the region. The army industry, which contributes five times more money to congressional campaigns and lobbying efforts than AIPAC and other pro-Israel groups, has a great part in supporting massive arms shipments to Israel and other Middle Eastern allies of the US.

Many Americans identify with Israel's internal democracy, progressive social institutions, relatively high level of social equality, and its important role as a sanctuary for the oppressed minority group that spent long time in Diaspora.

While the US support for Israeli occupation policies is primarily based upon the country's support for US's security interests, there is also some other complicating the efforts by peace and human rights groups to change US policy.

We should also consider another hypothesis: although indirectly, the US want to control **China's and India's** progress, for, considering the economic growth the oil consume rose also and with US as "owner of the world oil", the Bush administration could place the bets and make the game. China seems to affirm itself as a counter power, counterweight to the American supremacy, a country with a great technological potential and economic progress, an important demographic power, that dares challenging Russia at the Siberian borders and the US on the world's market.

However, it is an important fight for the US, if we think at what Henry Kissinger<sup>34</sup> predicted, that the XXI<sup>st</sup> century is going to be the century of multipolarity, there will not be only one Superpower (the US), that shall keep its role, eve tough with lots of effort will still remain world's economic superpower for many years, but there are also great powers, aspiring at the status of Superpower: India, China, Europe, Russia, Asia.

---

<sup>34</sup> Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, All, Bucharest, 2004, p.20

It is a battle of the brilliant minds and good nerves, of lies and tricks, of winning the public opinion and nation's approval for a war that seemed justified for both parts (defense of peace and world's security, stability – for the US and defense of their national identity and state and sovereignty – for Iraq), an endless struggle with thousands of loses and no sure gain as well as no guaranteed winner.

“The war itself shall clarify who was right and who was wrong about the WMD. History and reality are on the point of interfering and we want to let them give their own verdict”, said the neo-conservatory magazine *The Weekly Standard*, right before Iraq's invasion.

As for Germany, it did not have such interests in Iraq. Although the American public discourse underlined the social and economic sources of terrorism, this military strike against Saddam Hussein was considered by Germany to be ineffective and a waste of resources. Why?

As Anika Leithner puts it, “Germany had other fish to fry”: national elections and Schroder's priority to be reelected and regain the public opinion's support as well as the European integration process and the advancement of a common European foreign and security policy.

Germany's position regarding the Iraq war led to a rough debate between the government's view and the opposition's arguments, ranging from the responsibility in Iraq, considered by the government as pillar of Germany's foreign policy whereas the opposition depicted today's responsibility as originated in its past and Germany's evolution as a reliable partner was based on a sense of trust “we must not violate”<sup>35</sup> to Germany's responsibility to uphold the democratic values, derived from its history and democratic commitment, to promote and maintain peace, while the opposition through Michael Glos (CDU) sustained that “it is this history that pushes Germany to intervene in Iraq as a people which is responsible for the Holocaust, because it was not able to stop a dictator in time.”<sup>36</sup> This opposition was translated by Angela Merkel (CDU) in terms of Germany's reliability as ally and trustworthy partner, image that due to this reluctance would be seriously jeopardized. The debate moved to Germany's responsibility towards its allies, bringing into question Germany's evolution as power by its integration into the western cooperation structures and European community and its gratitude to US, its main partner and friend. The government saw this responsibility as a necessity to “lead

---

<sup>35</sup> Anika Leithner, *op.cit*, p.98

<sup>36</sup> *Idem*, p.100

the discussions with our American partners, but in the form of a friendship of open words and not in blind submission”<sup>37</sup>, Gernot Erler arguing the need to promote Germany’s interests and its pattern as equal to US. The difference in rhetoric persisted. Whereas the government accused the US of violation of International law, argued that the 1441 Resolution did not legitimize the war and that the weapons inspections work alone, fearing that US’s initiative could lead to a precedent of unilateralism, the opposition pointed to Saddam Hussein as violating the international law, fiercely supported the Resolution as legitimizing the war and argued that the inspection alone does not function, requiring other means of coercive force.

Germany perceived this war on terror more as a problem of internal security, and not as a question of international security. This is why Germany found it very hard to imagine and explain the war against Iraq in the same manner as the US.

### **3. Conclusion**

To conclude, the misperceptions and divergences between Germany and the US in the case of Iraq seem obvious: President Bush and his administration never made a distinction between the war on terror and Iraq, for the US propaganda machine Iraq was part of the war on terror. On other hand, for chancellor Schröder, Iraq and the war on terror were two separate issues, as he constantly outlined in his speeches. For him, the war on terror was a legitimate reason to use military force declaring that “Germany has the responsibility in the fight against international terrorism, responsibility for the unconditional disarmament of Iraq”, but a peaceful disarmament could have also been reached.

America seems to be the representation of hard power whereas Germany is the embodiment of civilian power. The US possess all military capabilities, second to none, it struggles to maintain its worldwide presence and dominance, to assert its strategic interests and it taught itself to be its own support, to go to war alone and win. As Robert Kooper said, “the US’s most important relationships are expressed primarily in military terms: NATO in Europe or the Security Treaty for Japan.”

Germany on the other hand, has become the center of the European and international interest in terms of power and history, assuming as always the role of key to the European

---

<sup>37</sup> *Idem*, p.104

balance, either as unification reason, or as factor of fear and instability. History has taught Germany that every time it tried to take in its hands its own destiny without thinking at its neighbors, its fate was doomed to fail.

*This work was possible with the financial support of the Sectoral Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007-2013, co-financed by the European Social Fund, under the project number POSDRU/107/1.5/S/77946 with the title „Doctorate: an Attractive Research Career”.*

## References

### *Official Documents*

1. Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq/ *Iraq Resolution of 2002*, available at [www.wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org)
2. 1511 UN resolution from October 2003

### *Books and articles*

1. Baram, Amatzia, Rubin, Barry, *Iraq's Road to War*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1993,
2. Brzezinski, Zbigniew, "A geostrategy for Eurasia", in *Foreign Affairs*, sept/oct 1997,
3. Chauprade Aymeric, Thual Francois, *Dictionar de geopolitica. State, concept, autori*, Bucuresti, Corint, 2003,
4. Cordesman, Anthony H., *Iraq and the war of Sanctions. Conventional Threats and Weapons of Mass Destruction*, Westport, Connecticut, Praeger, London, 1992
5. Dettke, Dieter, *Germany says No. The Iraq War and the future of German Foreign and Security Policy*, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington DC, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2009,
6. Draper, Robert, *Dead certain: The presidency of George W. Bush*, 2007,
7. Huntington, Samuel P, "The erosion of American National Interest", in *Foreign Affairs*, sept/oct 1997, p.29-49
8. Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, All, Bucharest, 2004,
9. Leithner, Anika, *Shaping German Foreign Policy. History, Memory and National Interest*, First Forum Press, Boulder and London, 2009,
10. Nye, Joseph S. *Hard power, Soft Power and the war on Terrorism*, in ed. David Held and Matthias Koenig – Archibugi, *American Power in the 21st century*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2004,
11. Rutherford, Paul, *Weapons of mass persuasion. Marketing the War against Iraq*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Buffalo, London, 2004,

12. Stevens Cahn, *Classics of modern political theory: Machiavelli to Mill*, New York, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997,
13. Tewes, Henning, *Germany, civilian power and the new Europe. Enlarging NATO and the EU*, Palgrave, Basingstoke, 2002, p.20
14. Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, Steve Smith, *International Relations Theories. Discipline and diversity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, p.54