Compassionate Conservatism VS Bush Doctrine

CONSERVATISME COMPATISSANT VS DOCTRINE BUSH

Fakhreddin Soltani[1]

Jayum A. Jawan[2]

Abstract: George W. Bush compared his administration plan for Pre-September the 11th with Post-September the 11th and declared that the first one was designed for internal issues such as helping parents, developing good character in American children, and strengthening a spirit of citizenship and service in the United States; but the second era changed the ways that was planed for past. Defeating evildoers and bringing them to justice shaped the way United States has to pass. In contrast to pre-September the 11th which had been called conditions of peace; the new condition after September the 11th was recognised as war condition and was declared as necessary war that is necessity of United States' future security and freedom of American children (Bush, 11 October 2001). This article is to study perspective of George W. Bush and his administration on security strategies of the United States in pre-September the 11th (Compassionate Conservatism) and post-September the 11th era (Bush Doctrine).
Key words: Compassionate Conservatism; September the 11th; Bush Doctrine; Preventive War; United States; Security.

Resumé: George W. Bush a comparé ses plans d'administration avant et après le 11 Septembre et a déclaré que le premier avait été conçu pour des questions internes telles que l'aide aux parents, le développement de moralité chez les enfants américains, le renforcement de l'esprit de citoyenneté et de service aux États-Unis; mais la seconde période a changé la façon conçue pour le passé. L'idée de battre les malfaiteurs et les amener en justice a façonné la manière dont les États-Unis ont à passer. Contrairement au pré-11 Septembre, qui avait été appelé l'état de paix; l'état neuf après le 11 Septembre a été reconnu en tant que l'état de guerre et la guerre a été reconnue nécessaire pour la sécurité des États-Unis et la liberté des enfants américains. (Bush, le 11 Octobre 2001). Cet article étudie les perspectives de George W. Bush et son administration sur les stratégies de sécurité des États-Unis dans les périodes avant le 11 Septembre (conservatisme compatissant) et après le 11 septembre (doctrine Bush).
Mots-clés: conservatisme compatissant; le 11 Septembre; Doctrine Bush, guerre préventive; États-Unis; sécurité

---

[1] PH.D Candidate, Politics and Government, Department of Government and Civilization Studies, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. Email: fakhreddinsoltani@yahoo.com
[2] PH.D. Department of Government and Civilization Studies, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia , 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. Email: jayum@putra.upm.edu.my

1. INTRODUCTION

For about half a century, war against communism and Soviet Union was basis of United States foreign policy and security strategies. United States' presidents described the Soviet Union and Communism by the phrases such as atheistic, fanatical, satanic and menacing totalitarian state (Edwards, 2008). End of the Cold War inevitably influenced foreign policy and security issues of the United States. United States found itself victorious in the long war against Soviet Union and the as the sole super-power in post-Cold War era. In following, the first Bush declared "New World Order" (Haley, Apr 2004) as the ordering condition of the new era.

But end of the Cold War made a problem for United States; lack of adversary. Communism and Soviet Union had shaped United States foreign policy for defining its security and threats against security; but in new era after Cold War it could not be functional way for purpose of United States to shape its objectives of security and foreign policy (Edwards, 2008). So, United States' presidents attempted to create new concepts for defining their foreign policy and threats against security. In regard to that, collapse of Communism created vacuum of threat and power for United States; it was the beginning of United States strategy to prevent any "potential competitors" against its leadership that was goal of liberal grand strategy for providing security in United States (Ikenberry, Sep 1, 2002).

The threat of communism was substituted by threat of rogue states. So, small scale military actions, humanitarian interventions, and peace keeping in favour of world order increased. Expansion of NATO and its transformation from military alliance to political one was an instrument for accomplishing of operations for new missions (Betts, 2004). Four missions designed in the United States for achieving the purpose of leadership including(Donnelly, Kagan, & Schmitt, 2000):

First, homeland security was first and essential priority of United States in future. But post Cold War era brought new challenges that nuclear deterrence of Cold War era was not enough for responding them although it would remain vital element of homeland security. So, United States must prevent proliferation of ballistic missiles and WMD because these weapons have been the sole instrument that make weak states able to threat United States homeland security and its allies.

Second, operating in different regions in the same time was another goal of United States in post-Cold War era. In other word, United States must be able to win any large-scale wars and respond any unanticipated contingencies in different regions.

Third, preserving of current peace was critical for goals of the United States. Balkan, Southeast Asia, and East Asia were the regions of tension for United States in the future. So, United States had to be ready for missions to preserve the peace in those regions.

Fourth, accomplish "revolution in military affairs" was vital for United States in the new era which was based on using advance technology in military systems. Conventional systems of military systems are not capable of military operations in future conflicts; so, United States should make itself ready for future by using advance technology in military system (Donnelly et al., 2000).

United States shaped its new missions on the basis of Cold War environment and concepts in foreign policy. Post-Cold War presidents tried to introduce their policies based on necessities of new era; so, they emphasized on mentioned missions above but insisted more on homeland security and domestic problems that United States faced. Clinton and George W. Bush in first eight months of his presidency followed the same policies in new era. Clinton said that United States can be strong in international sphere if it be able to create a strong country in the United States (Clinton, July 16, 1992).

Therefore, collapse of the soviet Union and end of the Cold War were beginning of the new age in foreign policy and security strategies for United States. United States described this period by four main factors:

1. The rise of unipolar system in which United States is the sole hegemony out of the Cold War.

2. The rise of anti-western and especially anti-US Islamist groups and their willing to use terrorism as a tool in order to produce insecurity in the west.

3. Justified intervention policy toward other countries especially weak ones.

4. Legitimate preventive war for producing security especially against terrorism.

Preventive war and terrorism are the factors that were emphasized especially after the events of September the 11th (Jackson & Towle, 2006). These factors shaped security concerns of the United States in foreign affairs.

George W. Bush focused on criticizing Clinton foreign policy toward foreign policy during presidential campaign; but in fact, he did not change policies of Clinton deeply. He followed Clinton's policies in foreign and domestic affairs before September the 11th. Goal of Bush's administration was to lead the world and ask for cooperation of the partners (Gordon & Shapiro, 2004). Leading and cooperation of partners shaped policy of compassionate conservatism in Bush's administration before terrorist attacks of September the 11th.

2. COMPASSIONATE CONSERVATISM

There is no deep difference between the concepts in speeches of George W. Bush and Bill Clinton as ex-president of the United States. George W. Bush referred to threats to United States' national security including health and retirement security. The faith in victory of the freedom and democracy in the Cold War resulted in compassionate conservatism in Bush's administration. Compassionate conservatism is the policy of preventing inequalities in civil rights. On the basis of compassionate conservatism; there are segregation and slavery in the society which cause behavioural problems like crime. So, poverty and social justice are the main subjects of attention for compassionate conservatism (Teles, Fall 2009).

Education standards, social security, Medicare and taxes were focus of Bush's speeches. These issues were directly related to problem of poverty as roots of social problems. He called himself as "compassionate conservative" because his priority was domestic problems especially poor people in American society. Laura Bush emphasized on her husband's commitment to reducing of inequality and promoting of education standards in the United States (Teles, Fall 2009). Bush mentioned to unacceptable conditions of schools in the United States and the inequalities between American people especially young people and asserted that "We will reform social security and Medicare, sparing our children from struggles we have the power to prevent. And we will reduce taxes, to recover the momentum of our country and the rewards the effort and enterprise of working Americas… Many in our country do not know the pain of poverty, but we can listen to those who do" (Bush, 20 January 2001).

These statements shaped George W. Bush administration's promises for citizens of United States especially low income ones in the beginning of his presidency in the United States. The focus of compassionate conservatism was "health", and "retirement security" that were supposed as elements of the national security. He emphasized on three objectives of his administration; to strengthen Medicare that was based on values of availability of financial grounds and prescription drugs for every one who needs them, to transform housing rental program to help stability and dignity of low income families, and to treat women more equally (Bush, 3 August 2000).

In the United States, public views suppose commitment of government to Medicare as its responsibility about its people and its commitment to values of fairness (Jennings, Feb 2002). The noted objectives referred to expansion of government during presidency of George W. Bush. He increased federal domestic spending twice the rate it was during presidency of Bill Clinton. Expansion of Medicare to encompass prescription drugs was the biggest expansion during past thirty years (Davies, 2008).

To strengthen Social Security that was based on end of politics of fear which involves tax relief or in other word reducing of tax rates, list of taxes into sound, responsible investment, retirement guarantees, workers security, promoting of education standards. George W. Bush promised to improve social security in the United States by risky promises such as preparing conditions for especially younger workers to be able to save part of their own money for themselves (Gibson, Sep 2003).

Other objective of compassionate conservatism was focused on better equipment, training and payment to armed forces. Reduce nuclear weapons and nuclear tension and deploying of missile defences. It would

help U.S military to deal with every challenge to American values and friends. Improvement of military sector was based on two main elements; development of military forces and idea of Revolution in Military Affairs that referred to using of information technology and technologically advanced fighting force (Major, Jan 2009). Therefore, focus of compassionate conservatism was on social problems in the United States; in foreign policy, compassionate conservatism had two main elements including leadership and engagement strategy.

2.1 Leadership

There is an idea in the United States arguing that countries can defend themselves the best when they lead others; but the leading should be based on common grounds. For example, Truman and Eisenhower understood that strong military is necessity of defending Europe and United States against Soviet Union but defending Europe is possible only under condition in which allies wish to follow United States. The common ground for persuading allies to follow leadership of the United States was based on prosperous economy, commitment of United States to human dignity, struggle against prejudice even in the United States; and if the United States tends to lead in the future again, it has to follow same principles by respecting international law, human rights and civil liberties (Richardson, Jan/Feb 2008).

George W. Bush began his presidency with criticizing Clinton administration because of losing "great purpose" of the United States. Leadership was the "great purpose" that he called as "lost purpose" of the United States during Clinton presidency. He asserted that losing of great purpose caused "steady erosion of American power and an unsteady exercise of American influence" (Bush, 3 August 2000). He emphasized on military weaknesses and said that United States military is not ready to play on the basis of new era necessities and then described the general condition of United States military by the words "Not ready for duty". With this premises he talked about "moment of leadership" and "time for new beginning" (Bush, 3 August 2000).

In following idea of American leadership; his administration emphasized on policies that were based on the supposition that the Cold War era had been ended by victory of the United States and democracy. So, policies of the United States were adapting of United States' alliances in order to better cooperation for shaping Post-Cold War era; helping other states especially Russia as former adversary of the United States to reorient their policies; encouraging democratization, open markets, free trade, and sustainable development in deferent regions; and preventing conflicts especially ethnic ones that were supposed as the most destabilizing factors in regional conflicts ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000).

The policies of the George W. Bush during his first year of presidency indicate to the feeling of security about external enemy. The mentioned objectives were emphasized in National Security Strategy for a Global Age as "fundamentals of strategy" ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000). The fundamentals of strategy can be categorized into three elements:

- Enhancing security at home and abroad.

- Promoting prosperity.

- Promoting democracy and human rights based on American values

The mentioned principles in compassionate Conservatism and National Security Strategy for a Global Age have their roots in Hamiltonism that is one of three main schools of foreign policy in history of the United States including Hamiltonism, Jacksonism[3] and Wilsonism[4]. Hamiltonism emphasizes more on

---

[3] On the basis of Jacksonism, international institutions and laws are supposed as constraining elements for autonomy of the United States. Jacksonism is skeptical about super-national bodies and rejects the authority of such institutions about security of the United States. In other word jacksonism insist on self-help and believes that United States can just trust on itself. So, based on Jacksonism the best way of providing world security is to rely on unipolar system of international politics. For more information see (Mead, 2002).

[4] Wilsonism has its roots in the belief that spreading democracy around the world will lead to more stable and secure world for United States. Spreading of democracy around the world will increase security of the United States because it makes the governmental system of the United States an example for other countries to follow. In contrast to Jacksonism;

American values than American interests in other countries. Expanding of American values throughout the world and balance of power are the main goals of Hamiltonism in foreign policy. The approach that Hamiltonism offers is to present a successful pattern of American values to other countries in a way that they adapt it willingly. In other words, American values are the ideals that can save other countries; but the condition of being the ideal for other parts of the world is to be strong domestically for being able to globalize American values (Kissinger, 2001).

Therefore, security at home and abroad can be achieved just by domestically strong country. George W. Bush asserted, "While many of our citizens prosper, others doubt the promise, even the justice of our own country. … We do not accept this, and we will not allow it. … and this is my solemn pledge: I will work to build a single nation of justice and opportunity" (Bush, 20 January 2001). So, in compassionate conservatism, security and prosperity at home will finally lead to security and prosperity at abroad.

Promoting democracy and human rights based on American values was third and last concern of compassionate conservatism that focused on military issues and the threats to values and friends of the United States. Categorizing the objectives of promoting democracy and necessity of using force for it was third concern because of the supposition that democracy as the victorious ideal of Cold War will spontaneously extend itself throughout the world. George W. Bush described the condition of Cold War era for values of democracy and freedom as perilous condition for them. During Cold War, United States relied on military strength for securing democracy and freedom in the world. But the condition in post-Cold War era was deeply different. The supposition of victory of democracy and freedom was dominant belief in this period. He described Cold War era as hostile rivalry between United States and Soviet Union in which United States had the responsibility of supporting freedom and democracy against communism. He descried Cold War era as challenging one and asserted that "…America's faith in freedom and democracy was a rock in a raging sea" (Bush, 20 January 2001).

He separated new era from the Cold War era and asserted that "Now it [America's faith in freedom and democracy] is a seed upon the wind, taking roots in many nations" (Bush, 20 January 2001). "Civility" and "chaos" are two concepts that were distinguishing nature of new era and Cold War era. "Trust" is character of civility and "cynicism" is character of chaos (Bush, 20 January 2001). Cynicism refers to security dilemma that dominated during Cold War on behaviour of the grate powers. They could not trust each other because trustiness could put their survival in danger. In contrast, civility is character of new era and refers to optimism of George W. Bush on new conditions after the end of the Cold War. The trustiness to other countries is not risky for survival of the United States any more; because American values have won the war and going to take roots in many nations.

On the basis of his statements, there was no need to be worry about the security of the United States against other countries in post-Cold War era. His belief in victory of freedom and democracy around the world and likening conditions for freedom and democracy to "seed upon the wind" refers to the idea that democracy and freedom would expand throughout the world spontaneously with no need to militarily support of the United States. The core objectives of the fundamental elements and compassionate conservatism were to provide common defence, promoting of general welfare, and securing American liberty and prosperity. The mentioned elements had been called as "essence of compassionate conservatism" (Bush, 13 December 2000) which Bush emphasized on them as his "foundation of administration" (Bush, 20 January 2001). Noted objectives were based on supposition that United States had won the Cold War and is a country with no overriding enemy abroad and as country that possesses prosperity.

2.2 Engagement Strategy

Strategy of engagement emphasized on necessity of United States' strong leadership in international community. In other words, United States must use all its power and influence for shaping international security environment. Leadership of the United States was required for providing peace and stability in different regions of the world in order to secure its vital interests and values. For achieving the mentioned

---

Wilsonism trust on international law for stabilizing world order and promoting security. For more information see (LaFeber, 1994).

goal, United States preferred to operate in concert with other countries and if necessary act unilaterally. United States emphasized on operating in concert because there was a supposition that nature of post-Cold War challenges needs cooperative and multinational approaches (Cohen, May 1997).

United States emphasized that destroying of Soviet Union brought significance changes in the global security environment. In this new environment strategy of the United States is to prevent conflicts by promoting democracy and peaceful resolutions for conflicts. The purpose of the United States in post-Cold War era was to shape new environment through policies of deterrence and engagement and make itself ready for uncertain future (Brake, 21 Jun 2001). Uncertain future is result of asymmetrical threats; asymmetrical threats are ranging from Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) including nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons to information warfare and terrorism (Cohen, May 1997). So, United States chose strategy of internationalism that have been called engagement strategy for dealing with asymmetrical threats ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000) which had to be followed by American administration to achieve the noted fundamentals of the strategy.

George W. Bush described post-Cold War situation as "present peace" (Bush, 20 January 2001) that has to be extended and be secured by "American internationalism". American internationalism of post-Cold War era refers to the strategy of "engagement" ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000) that was following status qua policy (Marshall, Nov/Dec 2003) based on spreading of American values. Main goals of engagement strategy were promoting American values, promoting peace and creating strong military to preserve peace (Bush, 20 January 2001). So, preserving peace based on American values was the core of engagement strategy. On the basis of engagement strategy, American values can preserve peace and make better world in the future. Present peace is core concept for describing post-Cold War period in which United States had no serious enemy to challenge its superiority and was supposed as period of peace and prosperity for American values. So, according to engagement strategy; the present peace was best condition for interests of the United States and sole responsibility or best choice for the United States in this period is to promote peace based on American values because it would make United States able to fulfil its interest in cheapest way without need to use extensive military force.

Concepts that are used in engagement strategy referred to the George W. Bush's security strategy based on internationalism for new era. But the nature of engagement strategy is different from the nature of internationalism during Cold War era. In Cold War era the emphasis of internationalism strategy was to provide security for democracy and Western Europe against communism and Soviet Union. In other words, conflict was character of Cold War era and strategy of internationalism. The character of internationalism that was insisted in engagement strategy was based on lack of any serious conflict in the world; and peace was character of new internationalism in post-Cold War era. So, the tools of providing security in Cold War internationalism were different from the internationalism of engagement strategy. For securing present peace America had to cooperate with its allies for promoting free market, free trade and freedom from oppression. Therefore, the focus of internationalism of engagement was on low politics not high politics. The concepts that were used had their roots in liberalism not realism. Strong military to keep the peace indicated to promoting peace and supporting of free trade and market throughout the world in contrast with Cold War era in which military forces were necessary to provide security for surviving against external enemy like communism.

Engagement strategy had main elements including "adapting alliances; encouraging the reorientation of other states including former adversaries; encouraging democratization, open markets, free trade, and sustainable development; preventing conflict; countering potential regional aggressors; confronting new threats; and steering international peace and stability operations" ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000). These Elements would support three main objectives of engagement strategy which had called three "strategic concepts". These three strategic concepts were principal elements of the United States security ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000). The Concepts were "Shaping the International Environment, Responding to Threats and Crises, and Preparing for an Uncertain Future" ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000).

Shaping the International Security Environment

Shaping the International Environment was "primary element of strategy of engagement" with the purpose of helping to form a new international system that is necessary to promote peace, stability, and prosperity. This element focused on strengthening the relation with friend alliances and reorientation of other states including former adversaries. Shaping the international security environment indicates that threats of the Cold War era had not vanished completely in the post-Cold War era; so, United States has to maintain security arrangements of the Cold War and simultaneously "strengthen the post-Cold War international system by encouraging "democratization, open markets, free trade, and sustainable development" ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000) because on the basis of grand liberal strategy democracies do not go to war with each other easily and are more likely to resolve the conflicts by peaceful means.

Democracy, open market, free trade, and sustainable development will facilitate political freedom and will result in interstate and regional stability. Democratization has its roots in the idea that democracies are more peaceful in nature. The idea that democracies are more peaceful goes back to the Immanuel Kant work of "Perpetual Peace" in eighteenth century (Wittkopf, Kegley, & Scott, 2002). It was basis of democratic peace theory that argue democracies do not go to war with each other and tend to solve tensions and conflict in peaceful way. It became a security approach in United States and many presidents followed it and argued that the best way for warranty of American security is extending of democracy to other parts of the world.

For achieving the mentioned goals, engagement strategy mentioned to variety of means that the United States would use including diplomacy and militaristic activities. The United States, on the basis of engagement strategy, would provide foreign assistance to promote global stability. In this way, arms control and non-proliferation initiatives were most important for security of the United States. So, Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I (START I, entry into force in 1994)[5]; NPT that made Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine non-nuclear states; and Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty II (START II, signed in 1997) which could limit the United States and Russia strategic nuclear weapons to 3000 and 3500; and the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty which was supposed to promote strategic stability ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000) were the tools that were used in for achieving the goals.

Limiting spread of nuclear weapons was another strategy for shaping international security environment which followed by Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). CTBT provided opportunity of monitoring other countries which tend to do nuclear tests. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)[6] as safeguard system can help the United States in this way. NATO will be the centre for leading the mentioned attempts. All the noted acts had done for preparing international system for extending of democracy and fulfilling of democratization policy ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000).

Responding To Threats and Crises

"Porous borders, rapid change in technology, greater information flow, and the potential destructive power within the reach of small states, groups, and individuals" were introduced as threats and crises that must be dealt by the United States. Engagement strategy calls them strategic challenges of the United States' interests and values. Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), conventional arms, information/cyber security, different kinds of smugglings, and international terrorism were asserted as threats and crises in engagement strategy which the United States has to confront during the "peacetime" ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000) in post Cold War era. So, "prevention" is the most important part of confronting the mentioned threats and crises that includes preventing fragmentation of states, assisting failing states, and preventing ethnic and religious conflicts; because they will lead to turmoil within several regions of the world. Security strategy of the United States in 2000 had

---

[5] START I and START II were bilateral agreements between United States and Soviet Union in order to reduce their strategic offensive arms. For more information see START I treaty and START II treaty and (Kegly & Wittkopph, 1998)

[6] International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is an international organization that was established on 1957 with goal of securing use of nuclear energy as weapon. For more information see (Olson, 2005).

focused especially on ethnic conflicts because they were supposed to be great challenges to American values and security and destabilizing factors in different regions.

The first way of responding to threats and crises in national strategy of the United States was to deter adversary. Deterrence was commitment of the United States to involve in a war against aggressor nations, terrorist groups, or criminal organizations. For following deterrence, the United States has to promote its superiority in space related scientific issues and in information technology. Asymmetrical threats had been mentioned as important challenges against homeland security. Asymmetrical threats were introduced as potential adversaries that tend to harm vulnerable civilian targets in the United States. So, combating terrorism as an asymmetrical threat had been supposed as necessity of United States' security ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000). The ways of combating were categorized into three kinds including "law enforcement and intelligence efforts; vigorous diplomacy; economic sanctions; and if terrorists continue to target American citizens, military force" ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000). So, we can see that using of military force was the last tool of engagement strategy for dealing with threats and crises.

Preparing For an Uncertain Future

Engagement strategy had outlined guiding principles to deal with new threats to security of the United States. Engagement strategy argued that the United States' goals and the policies of achieving the goals must reflect principle of "protecting our [United States] national interests". National interests have been categorized into three kinds including vital, important, and humanitarian ones ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000).

Vital interests are those that directly influence survival of the United States and if the vital interests be at risk, use of force by the United States would be decisive. Among these vital interests, engagement strategy had mentioned to "protection against WMD proliferation; economic well being; and protection of energy, banking, finance, telecommunications, transportation, water systems, vital human services and government services". Engagement strategy emphasized that United States military forces would be present abroad; and would engage in non-proliferation programs such as START agreements for stabilizing security environment. On this basis, it had been asserted that engagement strategy would enhance American ability to address "asymmetrical threats" such as terrorism by preventing terrorist groups to achieve WMD.

Important interests in engagement strategy were American national "well being" or "that of the world" in which people live. For protecting important interests, using of military force would be "selective and limited", reflecting the importance of the interests at stake. Among these important interests, engagement strategy mentioned to "developments in regions where America holds a significant economic or political stake; global environmental impact; economic turmoil or crises; and destabilizing humanitarian movement". For protecting these interests, the United States would try the best but not using the military force.

International organizations were at focus of attention in security strategy of the United States in 2000 in order to protect important interests. Engagement strategy declared that strong international economic organizations are necessity of stable world economic system. Broadening community of free-markets, democracies, and stronger institutions and international non-governmental movements committed to human rights and democratization ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000) were supposed as the United States goals. So, Involvement of the United States in international economic organizations like Group of Eight (G-8)[7], World Trade Organization (WTO)[8], and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)[9] in the framework of engagement strategy are helpful for stable international economic system. Engagement strategy emphasized that the United States has to

---

[7] G8 is a forum that includes eight governments of France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, United States, Canada and Russia that was established in 1975 in order to get agreements on issues including social economic and political ones. For more information see (Kirton & Stefanova, 2004).
[8] WTO is an international organization that was established in 1995. Its goal is to regulate and facilitate trade among member states. For more information see (Gallagher, 2005).
[9] OECD is an international organization of developed countries that established in 1948 under the name of Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) in order to reconstruct Europe after World War II. In 1961 it accepted new members and changed its name to OECD. For more information see (Long, 2000).

strengthen financial coordination, promote an open trading system, provide security for energy, and promote sustainable development for achieving economic goals of the United States.

Engagement strategy emphasized that open trading system is essential for domestic economic growth in the United States. Open trading system declines unemployment, rise standards of living, and cause economic growth in the United States by expanding trade with other nations. So, it had been mentioned to some initiatives of the United States for preparing the conditions for open trading system such as North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) which facilitated trading relationship with Mexico and Canada, the Uruguay round of the General Tariffs and Trade which created the WTO, and successes in advancing economic relationships with China ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000). Oil import security and sustainable development in different regions of the world is critical for economic goals of engagement strategy. The goal of the engagement strategy is to find other sources for providing oil in order to decrease dependency of West on Middle East for future rising energy demands, and to help the countries that globalization lefts behind. For doing so, sustainable development, and regional stability are the first step.

Humanitarian interests were introduced as long-term interests of the United States. Long-term interests are those that using of military force is not best tool but under certain conditions. Among these humanitarian interests, engagement strategy mentioned to "natural and man-made disasters; violation against human rights; supporting emerging democracies; rule of law and civilian control of the military; promoting sustainable development and environmental protection; or facilitating humanitarian demining" ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000).

Engagement strategy emphasized that American policies for achieving its national interests have been guided by American values which are part of humanitarian interests. So, advancing American democratic values including political and economic freedom, respect for human rights, and the rule of law are the guiding principles of American foreign policy for protecting national interests and security of the United States. Engagement strategy underlined that promoting democracy helps the United States to avoid isolationist policy. So, the United States strengthens democratic norms in all countries because its "security depends upon the protection and expansion of democracy worldwide, without which repression, corruption and instability could engulf a number of countries and threaten the stability of entire regions" ("A National Security Strategy for a Global Age ", December 2000).

3. SEPTEMBER THE 11TH: GEORGE W. BUSH DOCTRINE

George W. Bush used the word "beginning" (Bush, 29 January 2002) to describe new era and asserted that "history took a different turn by events of September the 11th" (Bush, 23 September 2003) because the nature of the enemy and the threats that United States faced in September the 11th were unique and therefore different from all periods in history of the United States. The new enemy was not a country like Soviet Union and there was no one to negotiate or get into war with. He tried to solve problem of defining new enemy by making relations between the terrorist and countries. So, he stated that "We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbour them" (Bush, 20 September 2001). It was the first time that the United States described terrorists by relating them directly to the countries not because it knew the enemy or terrorists but because it did not know them and was the beginning of Bush doctrine.

Bush compared September the 11th to December 7 in 1941 but he also emphasized on uniqueness' of the September the 11th. He asserted that enemies of freedom committed act of war against United States in September the 11th and killed Americans. He followed that "Americans have known wars -- but for the past 136 years, they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941. Americans have known the casualties of war -- but not at the centre of a great city on a peaceful morning. Americans have known surprise attacks -- but never before on thousands of civilians. All of this was brought upon us in a single day -- and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack" (Bush, 20 September 2001).

Bush doctrine was based on existence of new threats against security of the United States that rogue states and terrorists caused. Some of the states were called rogue states because United States condemned them that they do not respect international law and are looking to achieve WMD and some are the states that sponsor terrorists. Non-state threats are terrorist networks, international criminal organizations, illegal armed forces and individuals that have the means and will threaten international security. United States insist that these adversaries do not have the power of fighting United States in direct war; so, they seek asymmetric capabilities against United States (National Military Strategy "National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow," 2004).

United States declared that the task has been changed ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America," September 2002); and emphasized that enemies of past eras needed great armies to threaten Americans but new enemies are not countries but individuals and groups that their goal is to bring chaos. They are terrorists who try to use modern technologies against the United States. Rise of non-states terrorists' networks is the characteristics that were used to define the threats of the new era after September the 11th ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Feb 6, 2006). The new enemies can not be limited to geographical borders. Appearance of different enemies equipped with new modern technologies and weapons have changed the relationship between United States Geography and its security ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Feb 6, 2006).

Threats were categorised into four groups including "traditional, irregular, catastrophic and disruptive". Traditional threats are presented by military forces of states; irregular threats are unconventional methods that are employed by non-state actors and states against stronger opponents; catastrophic threats are clandestine terrorist or rogue states actions against United States and its interests by WMD; and disruptive threats are result of using technological capabilities against United States by competitors that developing them ("National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow," 2004). Based on characteristics of the threats, the traditional and disruptive threats were at the centre of the attention during the Cold War. Irregular and catastrophic threats are the ones that United States concerned most in post September 11th era and are mentioned many times in security strategies and presidential speeches.

The main question was about nature of the threats. Islamic radicalism was the answer that was given to the mentioned question. Islamic radicalism was the first challenge that there was problem in defining it and finding moderate alternative for it especially in Arab and Muslims world (Huckabee, Jan/Feb 2008). Religious fundamentalism was the concept that was used in different ways to introduce the threats against American values. George W. Bush introduced September the 11th as the war in which the enemy tends for "imposing radical beliefs on people everywhere" (Bush, 20 September 2001). He declared that it is the war that began in United States soil and not by a specific country but by Islamic extremism or radical network of terrorists. He asserted that the war is not against Islam or Muslims but against "religious extreminists" who caused terrorist attacks. This war is not among armies but armies, civilians including women and children (Bush, 7 October 2001).

Democratizing of Islamic countries, as rogue states which are harbouring terrorists, was at the centre of Bush' policy for dealing with new threats. He asserted that "democracy will take time, but it is worth every effort" (Bush, 1 May 2003). Therefore, Bush's administration had long-term policy for democratization and will try to promote democracy even at the expense of high costs because on the basis of his sentences free countries do not act against security of the United States. High costs refer to readiness for remaining and intervening for long time in the countries that have to be democratized because amateur democracies were supposed as threatening as non-democratic countries. For example, some thinkers such as Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder believe that rapid democratizing of Iraq could be harmful for Iraq because it can polarize antagonistic groups and emerging democracies are prone to violence. So, democracy can solve these problems, but if it comes at the right time (Biddle, Mar/Apr 2006) and if it be supported for enough time.

He puts every person, organization, or government that supports terrorists as guilty of terrorists and enemy of democracy. He mentioned to Franklin Roosevelt's four freedoms in the Truman Doctrine and in Ronald Reagan's challenge to evil empire (Bush, 1 May 2003) which are freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom of want and freedom from fear everywhere in the world (Roosevelt, January 6, 1941) as indicators of United States policy. On the basis of the noted freedoms, United States give the right

of intervening in different regions for supporting human rights because any region that democracy and freedom take place will be peaceful and safe for the world and for values, interests and security of the United States; as Franklin Roosevelt said in his speech "freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere" (Roosevelt, January 6, 1941). So, any one who is enemy of the democracy; is enemy of the peace and stability and enemy of the United States in following. Bush asserted:

"Our aim is democratic peace… The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world… now it is the urgent requirement of our nation's security… so it is policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world… the concrete effort of free nations to promote democracy is a prelude to our enemies defeat" (Bush, 20 January, 2005).

3.1 Security Approach of the United States

Enemy of the United States has not been limited to any single political regime, person, religion, or ideology but was defined under the name of "terrorism premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against innocents" ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America," September 2002). United States introduced war against terrorism as different one from conventional wars in the history. The war against terrorism has no specific fronts and period of time because the new enemy is not fighting with traditional conventional military forces. "Intimidation, propaganda and indiscriminate violence" are used for dominating Muslim world by government of radical theocratic tyranny ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Feb 6, 2006).

In order to emphasize on different nature of the terrorism as threat to United States in new era, Bush mentioned to purpose of terrorists that is not "merely to end the lives, but to disrupt and end a way of life" (Bush, 20 September 2001). He declared that "Vast oceans" do not protect American security but "vigorous action abroad and increase vigilance at home" will protect (Bush, 29 January 2002). Inability of Vast oceans was the metaphor in order to show invalidity of approaches such as isolationism. In other word, Protecting of American security can not be done just by focusing on internal issues of the United States and Americans have to provide their security out of their boarders; it is why he, in the following, called American leadership in the world in favour of American values as "opportunity during time of war… that will bring lasting peace" (Bush, 29 January 2002).

Therefore, commitment of the United States will help to make world not just safer but better for human kind; and the first step for achieving this goal is to win the war on terrorism. Victory against terrorism finally will result in preserving of the peace ("National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow," 2004). Based on noted arguments, for becoming hegemony, United States needed two tools. The first one is to be the strongest country among other ones; and the second one is to find justification of intervening in different regions which was provided by democratic peace theory. Justifications such as democratization, liberty and freedom provided the basis for the second element of hegemonic stability theory for United States.

United States declared that terrorist attacks demonstrated that geographic boarders are not sufficient barrier against challenges of new age. Defeating of terrorist networks require supporting of national and partner nations efforts in order to deny state sponsorship to terrorists. So, for threats of new era United States tried to undertake an approach that enhances security in the United States while extending defensive capabilities beyond borders of the United States. The mentioned approach had three elements including protecting of the United States against external threats; preventing of conflict, surprise attack and prevail against adversaries ("National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow," 2004). Achieving of elements of mentioned approach was based on integrated overseas presence of the United States that would make United States able to re-act any adversary more swiftly than in the past and support promoting of democracy. United States declared that military presence of the United States is part of active global strategy to support security and stability ("National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow," 2004).

So, presence of the United States in other parts of the world that were supposed as potential threat to security of the United States became the basis of United States doctrine during presidency of Bush. On the basis of mentioned doctrine, presence of the United States was the main element of preventing the threat

before the United States being threatened. This doctrine was supported by the doctrine of "The Responsibility to Protect" in UN. The doctrine of "The Responsibility to Protect" was proposed by UN which insisted that UN member States have the responsibility to protect lives, liberty, and human rights of their citizens. And if members of international community realizes that some members are not able to carry their own responsibility; then the other members have the right of intervening ("The Responsibility To Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty," December 2001).

3.2. Preventive and Pre-emptive Action

It is emphasized that United States has to stand against enemies offensively and they would not distinguish between the terrorists and the countries that support them; and that the United States has to confront threats before they reach American shores (Bush, 11 September, 2006). These statements show the commitment to preventive and pre-emptive attack theory in which one actor or state has to attack another one before it get the power of attacking the first one.

Prevention and pre-emption did not just refer militaristic action. The first way is soft power that emphasized on responsibility of the United States to promote American values such as democracy and freedom and the mentioned values would finally lead into peace and stability throughout the world and in following security of the United States. The idea of United States' responsibility for promoting peace and democracy throughout the world has its roots in Wilsonian tradition (Zyla, 2007) in United States foreign policy that got the opportunity of flourishing by beginning of unipolar word after the Cold War.

Bush, on the basis of the idea that believes the outlaw and terrorists with nuclear weapons are able to threaten security and even survival of the United States, followed three No's including no loose nukes, no nascent nukes, and no new nuclear states which were the core of his doctrine (Allison, Jan/Feb 2004). Briefly, George W. Bush's Doctrine to win the war against terrorists had two objectives:

- To destroy terrorists and their facilities and

- To prevent other regimes to seek chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons (Bush, 11 October 2001).

United States declared four goals for viable peace and security of the United States. First, United States has to have active presence in the world for assuring its allies and friends about its commitment to their security. Second, United States must prevent future military competitions in order to complicate military programs of potential adversaries in the future. Third, was to deter enemies of United States interests by increasing United States ability to respond any aggression immediately. Fourth, was about actions of the United States if deterrence failed. In other words, United States has to be able to defeat enemies including regimes of the adversary state, non-state or even occupy foreign territory ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Sep 30, 2001).

The mentioned goals of the United States were based on the concept of "shifting to a capabilities-based approach" that reflects inability of the United States to predict what kind of actors will pose threats against security and vital interests of the United States. But United States can anticipate the capabilities that can make other states or non-states actors able to threat it ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Sep 30, 2001). On the basis of this anticipation, United States deters aggression and coercion in critical regions in advance. For achieving mentioned goal, United States designed following approaches for achieving the goals:

- Defeat global terrorism and prevent attacks against the United States and its friends.

- Prevent enemies from threatening the United States, its allies, and friends, with WMD.

- Support democracies, free markets and free trade.

- Persuade other great powers for cooperation ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America," September 2002).

United States insisted that terrorist networks are seeking for WMD and if they get it, they use it with no hesitation ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Feb 6, 2006). There are five general priorities in war against terrorism ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America," September 2002).

- To disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations by "direct and continuous action". The focus of this priority is to limit terrorists or their sponsors to reach WMD.

- To defend the United States before the enemy could attack it. This priority indicates to preventive and pre-emptive attack policy of the United States.

- To compel states to accept their responsibilities.

- To wage war of ideas against terrorism by illegitimating terrorist ideologies, supporting moderate and modern Muslim governments.

- To facilitate free flow of information and ideas.

Some strategic principles were designed to approach mentioned priorities. These principles are: building institutions that can help managing local crises and helping those who are ready to do their part. For following these principles, the United States is committed to solve Palestine and Israel crisis democratically. India and Pakistan should resolve their disputes; United States would help Indonesia to achieve democracy; helps Mexico, Brazil, Canada, Chile, and Colombia in the Western Hemisphere to promote democracy; strengthen African states for being able to deny fostering of terrorism in their territories ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America," September 2002).

The new challenge was supposed greater than Soviet Union and communism because there are expanding number of hostile regimes and terrorists that are looking for WMD without hesitation for using them ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Feb 6, 2006). The principal goal of the United States is to prevent these regimes and terrorist groups from acquiring WMD. Rapid reacting to these threats needs short process of decision making. Necessity of rapid decision making increased authority of President of United States in emergencies. The word "emergency" referred to terrorist attacks with undetermined definition which help president to act more freely on the basis of "interest of and benefit of the United States" and " Classified Information" ("U.S.A Patriot Act," 24 October, 2001a). So, enacting of trade sanctions against the terrorists, those who support terrorism and those who trying to achieve WMD was facilitated in the United States ("U.S.A Patriot Act," 24 October, 2001b).

By the increase in authority of President after September the 11th; he became able determine any country as friend of the United States and help it financially; in other word, if the President determines that a particular country has committed to any actions against terrorism in order to contribute to efforts of the United States, he can instruct to international financial institutes to support any loan or fiscal funds for such country ("U.S.A Patriot Act," 24 October, 2001c). George W. Bush administration established "Counterterrorism Fund" which was available without fiscal year to restore any facilities that has been attacked by terrorists ("U.S.A Patriot Act," 24 October, 2001d). On the basis of Sec. 101 of Title I, Counter-terrorism Fund helps to counter, investigate, or prosecute without limitation. The Patriot Act provided fiscal support for the United States to detain individuals in foreign countries which have violated the laws of the United States by terrorist attacks.

Following goals are presented for facing emerging enemy ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America," September 2002):

- Proactive counter-proliferation efforts: The United States will try fight threats before they rise and get ready for prevail in any conflicts with WMD-armed enemies.

- Non-proliferation efforts: it is to prevent rogue states to achieve any facilities necessary for WMD.

The mentioned goals can be achieved if United States strengthen existing alliances based on common threats and interests ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Feb 6, 2006). So, United States will help friend countries to develop their means to protect their own security and in result this process will lead to promoting of collective security ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Feb 6, 2006). Deterrence based on retaliation was understood an effective defence against adversary. But deterrence based on sole retaliation is not effective against rogue states and terrorists because they are not rational actors. They are "more willing to take risks, gambling with the lives of their people, and the wealth of their nations". So, the first way to deal with terrorists and rogue states was called "pre-emptive action" against "imminent threat" ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America," September 2002). Preventive attack to capabilities and objectives of adversaries became the United States first goal if pre-emptive action failed.

The United States had to prevent future terrorist attack because it could be more sever than the September 11, 2001 if terrorists acquire WMD.

Expanding of democracy, free markets and free trade were introduced as part of pre-emptive actions which could keep the world safe from terror. So, United States declared that it would support democracies, free markets and free trade throughout the world. Europe and Japan as allies of the United States must have strong economic growth because it is supposed vital for security of the United States. Stability and security of free markets and trade is vital for global economic growth ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America," September 2002). Liberty, peace, stability, and prosperity in the Africa, and expanding of democracy, peace, and stability in the Middle East are strategic goals of the United States which will be achieved by vanishing of tyranny and fundamental ideas.

4. CONCLUSION

Both strategies of compassionate conservatism and engagement strategy were based on the liberal approach of post-Cold War ear that noted above. George W. Bush introduced himself as compassionate conservative in first year of his presidency until September the 11th. Concerns of compassionate conservatism's were social problems including Medicare, education standards, social security, taxes and poverty in the United States especially for low income Americans. He emphasized that United States has won the external war and it is time for making United States strong internally. He believed that dealing with social problems in the United States is necessity of providing security in the future. In other words, Compassionate conservatism was based on supposition that the United States and American values were winner of the Cold War and there was no serious enemy for them out of the boarders and United States will lead the world if it becomes strong internally.

In foreign affairs George W. Bush emphasized on leadership of the United States based on engagement strategy. He described the post-Cold War era as the period of peace in which United States can promote democracy by its leadership because American values such as freedom and democracy have won the war and will expand throughout the world spontaneously without need for coercion by United States. For leadership, as United States' great purpose, George W. Bush administration outlined engagement strategy which in nature was an American internationalism but based on persuasive strategy not on coercive one. On the basis of engagement strategy, present post-Cold War peace was the best condition for spreading American values around the world. In this condition, United States should strengthen relations with friend and persuade other countries to reorient their policies. So, since beginning of presidency of George W. Bush to September the 11th 2001, core attention of engagement Strategy was based on policy of status qua.

But terrorist attacks to United States in September the 11th 2001 changed the priorities of foreign policy and in following security perspective of George W Bush on interpretation and defining of threat, enemy and security. Terrorist attacks shaped new policy of George W. Bush' administration that accelerated the change in engagement strategy of the United States from persuasive strategy of democratic peace to offensive strategy of democratic peace based on preventive war in George W. Bush doctrine. In other word, September the 11th was turning point in United States' policy toward security of the United States after the Cold War.

The terrorist attacks changed priorities of the George W. Bush administration from internal social issues to security issues out of the United States against external threats. In the day of attacks, he mentioned to the threats against survival of the United States by declaring that "American freedom and way of life is attacked with terrorists operations" (Bush, 11 September 2001). Freedom and American way of life were the values that he had supposed them as victorious values out of the Cold War in compassionate conservatism; but events of September the 11th were called a war against freedom and way of American life itself ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Sep 30, 2001).

George W. Bush's doctrine, Preventive action, combined the notion of democratic peace with aggressive strategy of preventive war in post-September the 11th era. The combination of democratic peace and preventive war justified the strategy of total regime change in other countries from dictatorship to democracy and was the point that differentiated policy of the United States in post-September the 11th from

past (Haley, 2004). Therefore, pre-September the 11th strategy of status qua was replaced by strategy of the regime change in foreign policy of the United States.

REFRENCES

Allison, G. (Jan/Feb 2004). How to Stop Nuclear Terror. *Foreign Affairs, 83(1).*

Betts, R. K. (2004). *U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY: LENSES AND LANDMARKS.* Retrieved 25/11, 2009, from http://www.princeton.edu/~ppns/papers/betts.pdf

Biddle, S. (Mar/Apr 2006). Seeing Baghdad, Thinking Saigon. *Foreign Affairs* Retrieved 2, 85, from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=996893051&sid=21&Fmt=3&clientId=36652&RQT=309&V Name=PQD

Brake, J. D. (21 Jun 2001). *Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR): Background, Process, and Issues.* Retrieved 1/11, 2009, from http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/crs/RS20771.pdf

Bush, G. W. (1 May 2003). *George W. Bush' Address Announcing End Of Major Combat Operations In Iraq.* Retrieved 27, 3, 2009, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bushiraq4.html

Bush, G. W. (3 August 2000). *President George W. Bush's Accepts Republican Party Nomination.* Retrieved 23/8, 2009, from http://www.australianpolitics.com/news/2000/00-08-03a.shtml

Bush, G. W. (7 October 2001). *President George W Bush's Address ToThe Nation.* Retrieved 25, 3, 2009, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bush911d.html

Bush, G. W. (11 October 2001). *President George W. Bush's Press Confrence.* Retrieved 6, 2, 2009, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bush911e.html

Bush, G. W. (11 September 2001). *President George W. Bush's Address To The Nation.* Retrieved 7, 2, 2009, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bush911a.html

Bush, G. W. (11 September, 2006). *President George W. Bush's Address on the Fifth Anniversary of 9/11.* Retrieved 8, 2, 2009, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/bush9112006.html

Bush, G. W. (13 December 2000). *George W. Bush's Victory Speech.* Retrieved 23/3, 2009, from http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/gwbush2000victoryspeech.htm

Bush, G. W. (20 January 2001). *President George W. Bush's Inaugural Address.* Retrieved 25, 3, 2009, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/bushinaug.html

Bush, G. W. (20 January, 2005). *President George W. Bush's Second Inaugural Address.* Retrieved 24, 2, 2009, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/bushinaug2.html

Bush, G. W. (20 September 2001). *President George W. Bush's Address to Congress And The Nation On Terrorism.* Retrieved 20, 3, 2009, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bush911c.html

Bush, G. W. (23 September 2003). *George W. Bush' address To The United Nations.* Retrieved 23, 3, 2009, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bushiraq6.html

Bush, G. W. (29 January 2002). *President George W. Bush's State Of The Union Address. 13, 3,* from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/bushstun2002.html

Clinton, B. (July 16, 1992). *Acceptance Speech to the Democratic National Convention.* from http://www.4president.org/speeches/billclinton1992acceptance.htm

Cohen, W. S. (May 1997). *Report of the Quadrennial Deffense Review.* from http://www.dod.mil/pubs/qdr/msg.html

Davies, G. (2008). Towards Big-government Conservatism: Conservatives and Federal Aid to Education in the 1970s. *Journal of Contemporary History, 43(4)*, 635.

Donnelly, T., Kagan, D., & Schmitt, G. (2000). *Rebilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century.* Retrieved 25/11, 2009, from http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/archivos_pdf/RebuildingAmericaDefenses.pdf

Edwards, J. A. (2008). Defining the Enemy for the Post-Cold War World: Bill Clinton's Foreign Policy Discourse in Somalia and Haiti. *International Journal of Communication, 2, 18.*

Gallagher, P. (2005). *The First Ten Years of the WTO 1995-2005.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gibson, E. (Sep 2003). Tales of Two Cities: The Administrative Facade of Social Security. *Administration & Society, 35, 30.*

Gordon, P. H., & Shapiro, J. (2004). *Allies At War: America, Europe, And The Crisis Over Iraq.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Haley, P. E. (2004). A Defensive Grand Strategy for the United States. *Armed Forces and Society, 30, 21.*

Haley, P. E. (Apr 2004). A Defensive Grand Strategy for the United States. *Armed Forces & Society, 30, 20.*

Huckabee, M. D. (Jan/Feb 2008). America's Priorities in the War on Terror; Islamists, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan. *Foreign Affairs, 87(1)*, 11.

Ikenberry, G. J. (Sep 1, 2002). America's Imperial Ambition. *Foreign Affairs, 81(5),* 44.

Jackson, R. J., & Towle, P. (2006). *Temptations of Power The United States in Global Politics after 9/11.* New York, N.Y: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jennings, C. P. (Feb 2002). Medicare, Past, Present, and Future: A Policy Perspective. *Policy, Politics, & Nursing Practice, 3, 9.*

Kegley, C. W., & Wittkopf, E. R. (1998). *World politics: Trend And Transformation* (9 ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kirton, J. J., & Stefanova, R. N. (2004). Introduction: The G8's Role in Global Conflict Prevention. In J. J. Kirton & R. N. Stefanova (Eds.), *The G8, The United Nations, and Conflict Prevention.* Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Kissinger, H. (2001). *Does America Need a Foreign Policy?. Toward a Diplomacy for The 21st Century.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

LaFeber, W. (1994). *The American age: United States foreign policy at home and abroad since 1750.* New York: Norton.

Long, B. L. (2000). *Environmental Issues and the OECD 1950-2000: An Historical Perspective.* Paris: OECD.

Major, A. (Jan 2009). Which Revolution in Military Affairs?: Political Discourse and the Defense Industrial Base. *Armed Forces & Society, 35, 29.*

Marshall, J. M. (Nov/Dec 2003). Remaking the World: Bush and the Neoconservatives. *Foreign Affairs, 82(6).*

Mead, W. R. (2002). *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed The World.* New York, NY: Routledge.

National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow. (2004).Retrieved1,11,2009,fromhttp://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/d20050318 nms.pdf

A National Security Strategy for a Global Age (December 2000). Retrieved 27, 9, 2009, from http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/national/nss-0012.pdf

The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America. (September 2002). Retrieved 28, 9, 2009, from http://www.ndu.edu/library/epubs/nss09-2002.pdf

Olson, S. P. (2005). The International Atomic Energy Agency. New York, NY: Rosen Publishing Group.

Quadrennial Defense Review Report. (Feb 6, 2006). Retrieved 10,11, 2009, from http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/qdr-2006-report.pdf

Quadrennial Defense Review Report. (Sep 30, 2001). from http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/pdfs/qdr2001.pdf

The Responsibility To Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. (December 2001). from http://www.iciss.ca/pdf/Commission-Report.pdf

Richardson, B. (Jan/Feb 2008). A New Realism; A Realistic and Principled Foreign Policy. *Foreign Affairs, 87(1).*

Roosevelt, F. D. (January 6, 1941). *Franklin D. Roosevelt's Address to Congress: The "Four Freedoms".* Retrieved 9,12, 2009, from http://www.wwnorton.com/college/history/ralph/workbook/ralprs36b.htm

Teles, S. M. (Fall 2009). The Eternal Return of Compassionate Conservatism. *National Affairs(1), 20.*

U.S.A Patriot Act, Senate Of The United States Title I, Sec. 106 (24 October, 2001a).

U.S.A Patriot Act, Senate Of The United States Title II, Sec. 221 (24 October, 2001b).

U.S.A Patriot Act, Senate Of The United States Title III, Sec. 360 (24 October, 2001c).

U.S.A Patriot Act, Sanate Of The United States Title I, Sec. 101 (24 October, 2001d).

Wittkopf, E. R., Kegley, C. W., & Scott, J. M. (2002). *American Foreign Policy* (6 ed.). Ohio: Wadsworth Publishing.

Zyla, B. (2007). *Multilateralism à la Carte? The Bush II Administration and US Foreign Policy.* Retrieved 6, 7, 2009, from http://opus.kobv.de/ubp/volltexte/2007/1343/pdf/54_fb_zyla.pdf