Evaluating the US Decision to Get Involved in the 2003 Iraq War Using a Bureaucratic Politics Model

Mohammad Mazi Fatur Rahman Chalimi

International Relation Major, Faculty of Social Science and Political Science, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya
10040221104@uinsby.ac.id

Arfiansyah Putra Pradana Hadi

International Relation Major, Faculty of Social Science and Political Science, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya
10020221036@uinsby.ac.id

Ahmad Farhan Dzaky Kafrawi

International Relation Major, Faculty of Social Science and Political Science, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya
10040221104@uinsby.ac.id

Abstract

This comprehensive policy brief delves into the intricate US decision to engage in the 2003 Iraq War, shedding light on the multifaceted aspects that influenced this pivotal moment in international relations. The Iraq War is renowned for its controversy and profound global repercussions, making it an essential subject of study. The evaluation framework utilized in this research is the Bureaucratic Politics Model, which scrutinizes the inner workings of the US government in foreign policy decisions. To understand the depth of this decision, the research encompasses an extensive analysis of the political, economic, military, and diplomatic landscape that surrounded the choice to invade Iraq. This investigation uncovers the inner dynamics of US foreign policy by highlighting the roles and diverse objectives of key decision-makers within the government, offering valuable insights into the complexity of the decision-making process. The findings

underscore the significance of internal factors in shaping foreign policy and emphasize the need for transparency within the decision-making process. Furthermore, it underscores the importance of prioritizing diplomacy as a tool for conflict resolution and the necessity of considering the long-term consequences of foreign policy decisions. In a world where international relations are ever-evolving, this research serves as a poignant reminder of the intricacies of foreign policy and its far-reaching implications.

Ringkasan kebijakan komprehensif ini menggali keputusan rumit AS untuk terlibat dalam Perang Irak 2003, menyoroti berbagai aspek yang mempengaruhi momen penting dalam hubungan internasional ini. Perang Irak terkenal dengan kontroversi dan dampak global yang mendalam, sehingga menjadikannya sebagai subjek studi yang penting. Kerangka evaluasi yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah Model Politik Birokrasi, yang meneliti cara kerja pemerintah AS dalam pengambilan keputusan kebijakan luar negeri. Untuk memahami kedalaman keputusan ini, penelitian ini mencakup analisis ekstensif terhadap lanskap politik, ekonomi, militer, dan diplomatik yang melingkupi pilihan untuk menginvasi Irak. Penelitian ini mengungkap dinamika internal kebijakan luar negeri AS dengan menyoroti peran dan beragam tujuan para pengambil keputusan utama di dalam pemerintahan, yang memberikan wawasan berharga tentang kompleksitas proses pengambilan keputusan. Temuan-temuan ini menggarisbawahi pentingnya faktor internal dalam membentuk kebijakan luar negeri dan menekankan perlunya transparansi dalam proses pengambilan keputusan. Selain itu, penelitian ini juga menggarisbawahi pentingnya memprioritaskan diplomasi sebagai alat untuk menyelesaikan konflik dan perlunya mempertimbangkan konsekuensi jangka panjang dari keputusan kebijakan luar negeri. Di dunia di mana hubungan internasional terus berkembang, penelitian ini berfungsi sebagai pengingat yang tajam akan seluk-beluk kebijakan luar negeri dan implikasinya yang luas.

Keywords: Iraq War, Bureaucratic Politics Model, decision-making, internal factors, and implications.

Introduction

The United States' (US) decision to engage in the 2003 Iraq War was one of the most controversial and significant events in the country's foreign policy history. The war had a profound impact on global politics, regional security and dynamics in the Middle East. It also sparked a prolonged debate about the motives, legality and consequences of the US military intervention in Iraq. This decision was made in the context of the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks and the alleged weapons of mass destruction possessed by Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. In this policy brief, we will conduct an in-depth evaluation of this decision using the Beureaucratic Politics Model framework to understand how internal factors within the US government influence foreign decision- making[1]. The 2003 Iraq War was one of the most controversial moments in the history of US foreign policy and global geopolitics. The US decision to invade Iraq and the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime in March 2003 triggered a series of events that had profound repercussions around the

world. To fully understand the implications of this decision, it is important to consider the political, economic, military and diplomatic context that accompanied it. At the beginning of the 21st century, the US was led by President George W. Bush, who had been elected in 2000. International terrorism became a major concern of the US government after the September 11, 2001 attacks, which shook the nation. The Bush administration responded strongly to the attacks and declared war on global terrorism. As part of this strategy, Saddam Hussein's regime was considered a threat to the national security of the US and its allies.

In addition to political and security factors, economic aspects also played an important role in the US decision. Iraq is one of the world's largest oil producers, and control of its oil resources has a significant economic impact. The US government also considered that removing Saddam Hussein's regime would open up economic opportunities in Iraq for US companies. Meanwhile at the military context, in preparation for the invasion, the US mobilized massive forces into the Middle East region. This military operation was carried out with the support of several allies, including the UK and Australia, in an attempt to form an international coalition. And for the diplomatic and intelligence context, the US government used intelligence information that they claimed showed that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction (WMD), such as chemical and biological weapons, as well as an ongoing nuclear program. These claims became the legal basis for US military intervention, but they were later proven false after the invasion. The 2003 Iraq War had far-reaching and complex impacts. It fueled tensions across the Middle East, caused unrest, ethnic and sectarian divisions, and generated an insurgency against US forces that resulted in heavy losses.[2] In addition, the US management of post-conquest Iraq has been a source of continuing controversy. Controversies over the legality of the war, false intelligence claims, and doubts about US motivations for the intervention also affected US diplomatic relations with many countries and redefined the role of the US in global politics. In this policy brief, we will delve deeper into the factors that influenced the US decision to engage in the 2003 Iraq War, as well as its consequences for US foreign policy and conditions in the Middle East. We will also provide relevant policy recommendations to address the issues that still evolve from these events.

In the realm of foreign policy and decision-making within the United States government, the Beureaucratic Politics Model offers invaluable insights into the intricate dynamics and interplay of key actors, their differing objectives, shifts in perception, and the subsequent negotiation and interaction that shape monumental choices. One such pivotal decision was the 2003 Iraq War, which serves as a compelling case study to elucidate

the model's application. As the paramount leader of the United States, President Bush held the ultimate authority over foreign decision-making, a responsibility that weighed heavily on his shoulders. And as a figure of significant influence, Vice President Cheney harbored a predisposition towards military action, especially in matters of national security. The State Department embodied diplomacy and the pursuit of stable international relations, wielding soft power in an arena often dominated by the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense, on the other hand, was vested in the utilization of American military might to address global threats, wielding hard power.

In the grand theater of American foreign policy, the stage was set for a riveting drama, where the key actors held distinct and often divergent objectives that played a pivotal role in shaping the nation's course. At the heart of this narrative lay the contrasting motivations of two formidable entities: the Department of State, led by the Secretary of State, and the Department of Defense, under the guidance of the Secretary of Defense.

1. Department of State (Secretary of State):

As the curtains rose on this diplomatic tableau, the Department of State, helmed by the Secretary of State, took its position at center stage. Their role was to represent the interests of diplomacy and the pursuit of stable international relations. They were the embodiment of the peacemaker, the diplomat, the advocate for peaceful resolutions to security issues. Their objectives were firmly rooted in the belief that dialogue, negotiation, and compromise were the bedrocks of international cooperation.[3] They saw diplomacy as the beacon to guide the nation through the turbulent waters of global politics. For the Secretary of State and the Department of State, the path to resolving security challenges lay in fostering diplomatic relations, engaging in high-stakes negotiations, and building bridges of understanding with other nations. Theirs was a preference for peaceful means of conflict resolution, a commitment to utilizing soft power to defuse tensions, and a dedication to finding common ground in an increasingly divided world.

2. Department of Defense (Secretary of Defense):

In stark contrast to the diplomatic overtures of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, under the steady hand of the Secretary of Defense, brought a different ethos to the stage. Their role was firmly entrenched in the use of military power to address threats and secure the nation's interests. They were the embodiment of the warrior, the strategist, the advocate for the use of force when necessary.[4] Their objectives were deeply rooted in the belief that a robust military posture and readiness were

essential components of national security. For the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Defense, the path to security lay in the unyielding commitment to protect the nation and its interests. They saw the world as a complex and sometimes perilous place, where military might serve as a deterrent to potential adversaries and a means of addressing imminent threats. Theirs was a preference for leveraging hard power when needed, an unwavering dedication to maintaining a strong and capable military, and a commitment to safeguarding the nation's sovereignty.

The interplay between these two departments and their respective leaders was a central plot point in the larger narrative of American foreign policy. Their differing objectives, one favoring diplomacy and the other advocating military action, set the stage for intense negotiations, complex decision-making, and conflicts of interest. The juxtaposition of these contrasting worldviews underscored the profound challenges that the United States faced when navigating the treacherous waters of international relations, and it would be the decisions made in this dynamic tension that would ultimately shape the nation's course on the global stage.

In the annals of American history, the year 2001 marked a seismic shift in the nation's collective psyche. The shocking and tragic events of September 11, 2001, were etched into the very core of the American consciousness, serving as an indelible watershed moment that fundamentally altered the perception of threats to US national security. The specter of terrorism, once a distant concern, abruptly took center stage, searing itself into the nation's fears, priorities, and policies. The devastating attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon not only claimed the lives of thousands but also triggered a tectonic shift in how the United States perceived and responded to global security challenges. Yet, the winds of change did not stop there. In the complex tapestry of international relations, another thread was being woven, one that revolved around the alleged presence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq under Saddam Hussein's regime. This revelation cast a long shadow over the world stage, drastically affecting the perception of Iraq as a potential security risk. The international community was gripped by a sense of unease, as doubts and suspicions loomed large. The prospect of a nation possessing such destructive capabilities shook the very foundations of diplomacy and regional stability. These revelations set the stage for a series of consequential decisions, with far-reaching implications for the United States and the world at large, as the nation grappled with a changing global landscape, forever altered by the events of September 11th and the specter of weapons of mass destruction.

In the lead-up to the Iraq War, the corridors of power in Washington, D.C., buzzed with an intensity matched by few other moments in American political history. It was a time of high stakes and even higher tensions, as a

complex web of negotiations and interactions wove its way through the government's highest echelons. At the heart of this intricate dance were President George W. Bush, a leader burdened with the ultimate responsibility for the nation's foreign policy decisions, and Vice President Dick Cheney, whose influence in matters of national security was palpable. These two formidable figures were not alone in this high-stakes drama. The State Department, led by the Secretary of State, represented the interests of diplomacy and the pursuit of stable international relations. On the opposing side of the spectrum was the Department of Defense, under the guidance of the Secretary of Defense, with a vested interest in the use of military power to address perceived threats. In this crucible of decision-making, compromise, disagreement, and persuasion became the order of the day. As President Bush navigated the complex terrain, he found himself caught between the contrasting objectives and beliefs of his top advisors. The State Department advocated for diplomacy as the preferred solution to the looming crisis, while the Defense Department leaned toward the application of military force. The intricate web of negotiations between these agencies and their respective leaders painted a vivid picture of a government grappling with a momentous decision.

Yet, in this labyrinth of diplomatic discourse and strategic debates, conflicts of interest naturally arose. Each key actor sought to exert their influence, fighting for their vision of the nation's role in the world. These conflicts mirrored the broader struggle for dominance between diplomacy and military action, reflecting the deep-seated convictions and departmental loyalties that had taken root in the highest levels of government. The fate of the nation hung in the balance as these actors sought to sway the final decision, their maneuvers echoing the profound complexities and challenges inherent in the foreign policy decisions of a superpower.

The decision to embark on the 2003 Iraq War stands as a profound and enduring chapter in the annals of global politics, leaving a lasting impact that reverberates to this day. It was a decision marked by a confluence of critical aspects that continue to shape international relations and foreign policy discourse.

1. Intelligence Failure:

At the epicenter of this momentous choice lay the intelligence failure, a glaring imperfection in the decision-making process that shook the foundations of trust in intelligence agencies and assessments.[5] The primary justification for military intervention in Iraq was the assertion of the alleged presence of weapons of mass destruction, a claim that, with the passage of time, was never substantiated. This failure to find concrete evidence gave rise to profound

doubts about the quality of intelligence and analysis that underpinned the decision. It was a sobering moment that underscored the critical need for rigorous scrutiny of sources and methods employed in intelligence assessments, for the consequences of this shortcoming would reverberate across the globe in the years to come.

2. Importance of Diplomacy

In the intricate tapestry of decision-making leading up to the Iraq War, the Beureaucratic Politics Model revealed an interesting paradox. The State Department, responsible for the nation's diplomatic relations, fervently advocated for diplomacy as the primary solution to the brewing crisis.[6] Theirs was a plea for dialogue, negotiation, and peaceful means of resolving conflicts. However, the ultimate choice veered in a different direction, as military action took precedence. This decision raised eyebrows not only domestically but also on the international stage, drawing skepticism and distrust from the global community. It exacerbated tensions in the already volatile Middle East, casting a shadow over the United States' image as a proponent of peaceful solutions. It was a stark reminder of the complex and multifaceted nature of foreign decision-making and its far-reaching implications for international relations.

3. Complex Consequences

The Iraq War, in the wake of its fervent and controversial inception, left behind a legacy of intricate and far-reaching consequences. Its protracted conflicts and the ever-shifting power dynamics within the region continue to serve as a stark reminder of the imperative to meticulously evaluate the long-term repercussions of foreign decisions. The war's enduring impact has shaped not only Iraq but also the broader Middle East, contributing to a complex geopolitical landscape with implications for peace and security. It stands as a cautionary tale, underscoring the need for careful consideration and comprehensive analysis in the formulation of foreign policy, lest history repeats itself with unforeseen and enduring ramifications. In retrospect, the decision to engage in the 2003 Iraq War reveals the intricate interplay of intelligence, diplomacy, and the consequences of foreign policy choices.[7] It remains a subject of study, debate, and reflection, a testament to the weighty responsibilities borne by leaders and the far-reaching consequences of their decisions in the complex arena of international relations.

In the quest to comprehensively analyze and understand the monumental foreign policy decision that led to the 2003 Iraq War, the Beureaucratic Politics Model offers a critical lens through which we can scrutinize the intricate interplay of internal factors within the United States government. This decision, etched into the annals of history, serves as a poignant reminder of how deeply conflicts of interest, shifts in perception,

and the complexities of foreign decision-making can impact the trajectory of nations on the world stage. Foremost among the revelations this decision brings to the fore is the paramount influence of internal factors. The different objectives and priorities held by key actors within the government created a dynamic tension, a tug-of-war that had profound consequences. The Department of State, guided by its inclination toward diplomacy, stood in stark contrast to the Department of Defense, which was resolute in its support for military action. It was this internal discord that encapsulated the very essence of the Bureaucratic Politics Model, a reflection of the intricate dance that took place within the corridors of power.[8]

Moreover, the 2003 Iraq War underscores the fragility of intelligence assessment and analysis. The failure to substantiate claims of weapons of mass destruction shook the foundations of trust in the intelligence community and raised questions about the quality of information used to make momentous decisions. This demands an imperative recommendation to enhance transparency in the foreign decision-making process, a call for rigorous scrutiny of sources and methods employed in intelligence assessments. This imperative not only safeguards against future intelligence failures but also upholds the fundamental principle of informed and accountable governance. Furthermore, the enduring implications of the Iraq War speak to the significance of prioritizing diplomacy in the resolution of international conflicts. The model reveals that while diplomacy was advocated by the State Department, the selection of military action carried with it significant consequences, both in terms of international skepticism and the exacerbation of tensions in the Middle East.[9] Thus, a key recommendation arises – to prioritize diplomacy as the foremost solution and consider military action as a last resort. The cost of conflict, as demonstrated by the Iraq War's protracted aftermath, is a stark reminder of the value of peaceful means of dispute resolution and the need to consider the long-term consequences of military intervention.

Lastly, the lessons of this momentous decision should be etched into the very fabric of American foreign policy. The imperative to learn from experience is a guiding principle in the formulation of future foreign policy. A careful analysis of the past, grounded in robust intelligence, and fortified by effective communication with the international community, is essential in guiding sound, informed decisions on the world stage. The 2003 Iraq War stands as a vital lesson, reminding us of the weighty responsibilities borne by leaders, the complexities of the international arena, and the enduring impact of choices made in the name of national security.

In conclusion, the decision to engage in the 2003 Iraq War, when viewed through the prism of the Beureaucratic Politics Model, unveils the intricate dynamics of government decision-making, the influence of internal factors, and the consequences of those choices. It beckons

us to draw lessons and chart a more informed path forward, not only as a nation but as responsible global citizens. It urges us to uphold transparency, prioritize diplomacy, and learn from the past, as we navigate the ever-evolving landscape of international relations.

Endnotes

[1] Lieberfeld, Daniel. 2005. Theories of Conflict and The Iraq War. International Journal of Peace Studies, Volume 10, Number 2.
https://www3.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol10_2/wLieberfeld10n2IJPS.pdf

[2] Walt, S. M. 2005. The relationship between theory and policy in international relations. Annual Review of Political Science. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104904

[3] Allison, T. Graham. 1971. The Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. Massachusetts: Little, Brown.

[4] U.S. Government Manual. 2004. Department of Defense. Office of the Secretary, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1155. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GOVMAN-2004-06-01/pdf/GOVMAN-2004-06-01-Pg152.pdf

[5] Levy, Jack S. & Katherine Barbieri. (1999). Sleeping with the Enemy: The Impact of War on Trade. Journal of Peace Research 36 (4): 463–479. https://www.prio.org/publications/1810

[6] Janis, I. L., & Mann, L. (1977). Decision Making: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice, and Commitment. The Free Press.

[7] Halper, S., & Clarke, J. (2004). America Alone: The Neo-Conservatives and the Global Order. Cambridge University Press.

[8] Renshon, S. A. (2008). The 50% American: Immigration and National Identity in an Age of Terror. Georgetown University Press

[9] Feaver, P. D., & Kohn, R. H. (2001). Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security. MIT Press.