

Preemption, Prevention, Prevarication

William W. Keller
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
and Gordon R. Mitchell, Department of
Communications, University of Pittsburgh
2006-23

About the Matthew B. Ridgway Center

The Matthew B. Ridgway Center for International Security Studies at the University of Pittsburgh is dedicated to producing original and impartial analysis that informs policymakers who must confront diverse challenges to international and human security. Center programs address a range of security concerns – from the spread of terrorism and technologies of mass destruction to genocide, failed states, and the abuse of human rights in repressive regimes.

The Ridgway Center is affiliated with the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs (GSPIA) and the University Center for International Studies (UCIS), both at the University of Pittsburgh.

This working paper is one of several outcomes of the Ridgway Working Group on Preemptive and Preventive Military Intervention, chaired by Gordon R. Mitchell.

Section 603 of the 1986 Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act requires each U.S. president to submit an annual report to Congress outlining the nation's strategic security objectives. This is usually a low-key affair that passes quietly under political radar. An exception was President George W. Bush's September 2002 submission of "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America" (NSS 2002). That strategy document drew special notice, partly because it laid out the Bush administration's strategic thinking on the pressing issue of how to deal with the threat of mass casualty terrorism after 11 September 2001. NSS 2002 also raised eyebrows by declaring that the emergent danger posed by the "crossroads of radicalism and technology" presents "a compelling case for taking anticipatory actions to defend ourselves, *even if uncertainty remains* as to the time and place of the enemy's attack."¹

Sympathetic commentators lauded NSS 2002 shortly after its publication, arguing that "acting preemptively"² was a shrewd way for the U.S. to seize the strategic high ground in the "war on terror."³ On the other hand, skeptics cautioned that by asserting a prerogative to hit first against terrorists and states that harbor them, the Bush administration risked unraveling the fabric of international law governing the use of force.⁴ In explaining their new strategy, Bush officials emphasized a reminder: "Preemption is not a new concept."⁵ Indeed, Article 51 of the UN Charter implicitly recognizes a right to "anticipatory self-defense," one that has been invoked previously by nations facing imminent security threats.⁶

Was the Bush administration's commitment to first-strike defense a rash gambit of historic proportions? Or was it simply a re-articulation of one military option long understood to be implicit in national security strategy? Key ambiguities in the text of NSS 2002 made it difficult to tell. It is one thing to use force in self-defense against an enemy that constitutes an imminent danger—Israel's 1967 preemptive strike against Egyptian forces massing in the Sinai desert is a textbook example.⁷ It is another matter to strike a potential enemy who is suspected of plotting an attack at some unspecified time and place—consider Israel's 1981 bombardment of Iraq's nuclear facility at Osiraq. The latter case is more accurately described as preventive—not preemptive—use of military force.⁸ Yet as Lt. Col. Arnel Enriquez observes, "the distinction between preemption and prevention is blurred in the NSS."⁹ By using the terms "preemptive" and "preventive" almost interchangeably, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld further clouded this distinction.¹⁰ A follow-on strategy paper released by the White House two months after NSS 2002 did little to clear up precise conditions under which the U.S. would strike first with "preemptive measures" against adversaries suspected of developing nuclear, biological, or chemical arms.¹¹

Details regarding the White House's new use-of-force doctrine emerged when the Bush administration pulled NSS 2002 off the shelf and put it to use. In a bracing series of speeches and

public appearances during 2002 and 2003, Bush officials castigated Saddam Hussein's regime as posing exactly the sort of threat that makes first use of military force prudent. As buildup to invasion against Iraq proceeded, it became apparent that the US-led campaign would be a preventive, not preemptive war. Public arguments advanced to justify Operation Iraqi Freedom revealed that the Bush administration's idea of "acting preemptively" went beyond Article 51 "anticipatory self-defense," drifting into the area of preventive warfare to counter "gathering," not imminent threats.¹²

Outright declaration of the preventive attack option in an official U.S. strategy document challenged established rules of international conduct and raised a host of vexing policy concerns regarding alliance cohesion, intelligence capabilities, and resource tradeoffs. Today, some continue to see assertion of this prerogative as a reckless break from established security doctrine.¹³ Others downplay the novelty of this turn in American security strategy, arguing that NSS 2002's version of preventive military action is a timely adaptation of the long-accepted principle of preemptive self-defense.¹⁴

Hitting First engages this debate by analyzing preventive attack strategies from a multidisciplinary perspective that blends insight from political science, rhetoric and philosophy with practical knowledge drawn from work in institutional policy settings. This opening chapter frames the study by considering NSS 2002's basic dynamics in more detail, outlining the book's common terms of reference, and previewing contents of the ensuing chapters.

A STRATEGY FOR "THE BOYS IN LUBBOCK"

In the fall of 2002, one year after al-Qaida's devastating suicide airline attacks, the blueprint for a new U.S. security strategy was taking shape. While President Bush used broad strokes to outline the nascent strategy in a series of speeches to American military academies, then-National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice worked on a document that would express the basic concepts in finer detail. She tapped State Department official Richard Haass to write the first draft, then brought in University of Virginia professor Philip Zelikow and deputy Stephen Hadley to help with revisions.¹⁵ The result was NSS 2002, a bold and ambitious 29-page document that announced the White House's intention to "defeat global terrorism" by strengthening alliances, "igniting" economic growth, spreading democracy, and most notably, "acting preemptively" to hit enemies first, before they could mount attacks on the US.¹⁶

Ten days after release of NSS 2002, Rice gave a speech that the White House billed as a discussion of the "President's National Security Strategy." In her introductory comments, it became apparent that she viewed the venue for the address —New York— as symbolically

important on multiple levels. First, Rice linked her decision to “venture beyond Washington” for the speech with President Bush’s preference that NSS 2002 should contain “plain English, not academic jargon.” Regarding the strategy document, Rice quoted Bush as saying, “The boys in Lubbock ought to be able to read it.”¹⁷ Second, the New York audience provided an opportunity for the administration to frame NSS 2002 as a direct response to the September 11 attacks: “And after 9/11, there is no longer any doubt that today America faces an existential threat to our security . . . President Bush's new National Security Strategy offers a bold vision for protecting our Nation that captures today's new realities and new opportunities,” said Rice.¹⁸

As a rhetorical strategy for domestic mobilization, Rice’s framing device proved enormously successful. The simple formula 9/11 = NSS 2002 became a ubiquitous theme in public deliberation.¹⁹ It was a compelling notion that played well with “the boys in Lubbock,” and also seemed to explain how Bush could transmogrify so dramatically from an advocate of “humble” U.S. foreign policy on the 2000 campaign trail to a determined interventionist in the Oval Office two years later.²⁰ However, even as this popular narrative illuminated, it also obscured. In the words of Andrew Bacevich, “The grievous losses suffered in the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon had seemingly rendered all that had gone before irrelevant.”²¹ By fixing 11 September 2001 as the temporal starting point for discussions about U.S. security strategy, Rice’s framing device cultivated mass amnesia about the crucial fact that the lion’s share of strategic concepts in NSS 2002 had been pilot-tested long before al-Qaida attacked the U.S. homeland.

In this vein, consider that NSS 2002’s bureaucratic lineage can be traced to earlier planning documents, such as a 1992 Pentagon Defense Planning Guidance draft,²² a 1996 strategy paper prepared for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu,²³ a 1998 letter to President Bill Clinton,²⁴ and a U.S. think-tank report published in 2000.²⁵ Each of these boardroom blueprints endorsed first-strike force as a key element of defense strategy and suggested Iraq as prime target for preventive war.²⁶ However, authors of these reports, such as John Bolton, Stephen Cambone, Lewis Libby, Richard Perle, Donald Rumsfeld, Abram Shulsky, Paul Wolfowitz, David Wurmser and Dov Zakheim, encountered resistance when, as private citizens, they attempted to translate their ideas into policy during the Clinton administration. The 2000 Project for a New American Century (PNAC) report, *Rebuilding America’s Defenses*, contains a striking metaphor that likens military planners’ lack of interest in the PNAC “hit first” strategy during the 1990s to a complacent ring fighter gone soft:

[Some believe] the United States can enjoy a respite from the demands of international leadership . . . Like a boxer between championship bouts, America

can afford to relax and live the good life, certain that there would be enough time to shape up for the next big challenge. . . . But as we have seen over the past decade, there has been no shortage of powers around the world who have taken the collapse of the Soviet empire as an opportunity to expand their own influence and challenge the American-led security order.²⁷

After Bush's 2000 election victory ushered them into the corridors of power, Bolton, Cambone, Libby, Perle, Rumsfeld, Shulsky, Wolfowitz, Wurmser and Zakheim took a big step toward realizing their goals, but obstacles remained. Their sweeping vision of American "dominance" through military "transformation" and "regime change" was blocked by recalcitrant quarters of the entrenched Washington bureaucracy. Yet in their 2000 planning document, the PNAC authors presciently foresaw one scenario that could break the logjam: "Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event — like a new Pearl Harbor."²⁸ The fact that the 9/11 attacks provided just this sort of "Pearl Harbor" jolt to the system has fueled the speculation of conspiracy theorists. For example, Claremont University theology professor David Lee Griffin cites the PNAC "new Pearl Harbor" reference as one piece of evidence supporting the theory that Bush administration officials conspired to enable the 9/11 attacks.²⁹ As *Publisher's Weekly* notes in a review of Griffin's book, "Even many Bush opponents will find these charges ridiculous."³⁰ Yet it is far more difficult to dismiss findings from the *National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States* (9/11 Commission) that PNAC-affiliated Bush administration officials such as Rumsfeld seized almost immediately on the 9/11 attacks as triggers for preventive war against Iraq. According to notes taken by Rumsfeld's deputy Cambone, when smoke was still billowing out of the Pentagon at 2:40 p.m. on 11 September 2001, the Defense Secretary hunkered down in the operations center and "[Rumsfeld's] instinct was to hit Saddam Hussein at the same time—not only bin Ladin."³¹ Other Bush officials soon followed suit; Bob Woodward reports that days later at Camp David, Wolfowitz "seized the opportunity" of 9/11 to press his longstanding case for attacking Iraq.³²

Hitting First explores this episode as an instance of what Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones call "policy entrepreneurship," the practice of alert actors responding to windows of opportunity by asserting agency in the policy process.³³ As Chris Mackenzie notes, the policy entrepreneur is "skilled in the art of argument and persuasion, and is able to manipulate how problems and policy issues are defined, so as to mould new 'policy images' and exploit the many 'policy venues' present . . ."³⁴ Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz' first round of policy entrepreneurship did not succeed — on 15 September 2001, Bush rebuffed their calls to invade Iraq in the

immediate aftermath of 9/11.³⁵ Yet soon afterward, they regrouped with other former PNAC members to mount a much broader and more co-ordinated campaign that culminated in NSS 2002 and Operation Iraqi Freedom.³⁶ This campaign institutionalized key tenets of the 1992 Defense Planning Guidance draft, the 1996 “Clean Break” report, the 1998 PNAC letter to Clinton, and the 2000 PNAC report. It also built public support for preventive war in Iraq through a variety of strategies involving intelligence manipulation, foreign diplomacy, and media influence.

THEORETICAL APPROACH

This volume analyzes the role of preventive military force in U.S. security strategy in a narrow sense, exploring the Bush administration’s official codification of a preventive first-strike prerogative, and expansively, looking at how NSS 2002 relates to the broader historical record. Several discourse-oriented chapters focus on the fact that much of the Bush administration’s definition and legitimation of its preventive warfare strategy was accomplished in official speeches and public statements by cabinet members.³⁷ While NSS 2002 provided a sketch of the Bush first-strike policy, details that transformed it into a working doctrine came in key public addresses, such as President Bush’s West Point graduation speech, Vice President Richard Cheney’s address at the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Secretary of State Colin Powell’s presentation to the United Nations.³⁸ Analysis of these addresses helps to explain how the White House successfully sold its new military approach to key audiences.

The considerable time lag separating announcement of the proposal to invade Iraq and commencement of Operation Iraqi Freedom opened unprecedented space for U.S. officials and sympathetic advocates to proffer public arguments justifying a specific first-strike venture prior to its execution. In a democratic society, declaratory policy expressing an official commitment to use preventive military force raises burdens of public justification for decisions to implement such policy in given instances. The significance of this process surpasses domestic political considerations, since as Mohammed Ayoob notes, “Normative justifications, when resorted to repeatedly, lead to the emergence and consolidation of a range of international expectations that, in turn, begin to change the normative framework within which states operate.”³⁹ Some chapters in *Hitting First* take this insight as a point of departure to evaluate the history of preventive military force, its moral status, and its strategic appropriateness, especially in light of alternative security strategies that emphasize non-military means of prevention. Here, study of the wider policy arena builds context necessary to assess NSS 2002’s dynamics and future prospects.

The parameters of a shared theoretical approach weaving the contributors’ research together emerged during the course of two workshops convened to organize paper drafts around

common terms of reference. This task proved somewhat challenging, given that much of the nomenclature relating to the Bush administration's embrace of preventive military strategy is itself ambiguous. As workshop discussions proceeded, it became apparent that the very imprecise character of some of the central concepts offered an important window into understanding public debate over NSS 2002, where advocates tend to stretch the meaning of elastic terms and where semantic confusion often fuels controversy. The authors of *Hitting First* adapted to this phenomenon by carefully delineating three of these malleable and contested concepts—one acronym, one distinction, and one spectrum.

“WMD”

The official origin of the phrase “weapons of mass destruction” can be traced to a 1948 resolution passed by the United Nations Commission for Conventional Armaments.⁴⁰ However, the phrase (and its acronym “WMD”) did not become a fixture of Cold War public dialogue until U.S. officials deployed it to dramatize the horror of chemical weapons usage during the Iran-Iraq War. Then came the 11 September 2001 attacks, after which Bush administration officials chose “WMD” as a favored catch-phrase. So many followed suit that the American Dialect Society voted “WMD” its “Word of the Year” for 2002.⁴¹ According to a study by Susan Moeller of the University of Maryland's Center for International and Security Studies, “Most journalists accepted the Bush administration's formulation of the ‘War on Terror’ as a campaign against WMD.”⁴²

The ubiquity of “WMD” as a term of reference has a significant effect in framing public discussion of NSS 2002, since the acronym enables advocates of preventive war to argue that first-strike force is a necessary response to a syndrome of disparate threats neatly bundled together under the umbrella of “weapons of mass destruction.” As Moeller observes, media reportage tended to reinforce this notion during the run-up to the 2003 Iraq War: “Most media outlets represented WMD as a monolithic menace, failing to adequately distinguish between weapons programs and actual weapons or to address the real differences among chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological weapons.”⁴³ This semantic leveling obscures the fact that each class of weapons falling under the “WMD” umbrella varies significantly with regard to potential lethality and destructive power; the feasibility of protection and defenses; and potential missions.⁴⁴ When dimensions of threat are blurred in this fashion, inaccuracies are easy to introduce. For example, the rhetorical flexibility afforded by the omnibus category “weapons of mass destruction” enabled Bush administration officials to support claims of an Iraqi “WMD” threat (replete with ominous “mushroom cloud” imagery) by pointing to evidence of possible

Iraqi chemical weapons development. Obviously, chemical weapons lack the capacity for nuclear destruction, yet as Wolfgang Panofsky points out, “Linking these three classes of weapons in a single WMD category elevates the status of both biological and chemical weapons.”⁴⁵

In a study that predates the Bush administration’s “WMD”-based justifications for war against Iraq, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace analyst Gert Harigel argues that the term weapons of mass destruction is “misleading, politically dangerous, and cannot be justified on grounds of military efficiency.”⁴⁶ Moeller’s more recent study concludes that fresh disclosures detailing misuse of threat intelligence in the Iraq case “have dramatically demonstrated the need for greater public understanding of the role that WMD plays in the formulation of and rhetorical justifications for U.S. security policy.”⁴⁷

The chapters in *Hitting First* are crafted to address this need, with authors focusing critical attention on how “WMD”’s conflation of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weaponry frames understanding of NSS 2002 and steers public deliberation on the topic of preventive military force. This approach highlights, for example, how the relationship between chemical, biological and nuclear threat categories plays out at the seam connecting the Intelligence Community to policy-makers, as well as how the monolithic “WMD” construct works rhetorically to persuade public audiences of the necessity to launch first-strike attacks. To avoid reproducing confusion created by the phrase “weapons of mass destruction,” authors of this volume follow Greg Thielmann’s lead, adopting the standard practice he used at the State Department’s Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR). At INR, Thielmann directed analysts to eschew the acronym “WMD” when writing reports, and instead either name the specific class of weapons being referenced (e.g. chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons), or in a pinch, to use the more accurate phrase “unconventional weaponry.”

PREEMPTIVE VS. PREVENTIVE USE OF FORCE

The distinction between preemptive and preventive use of military force is codified in an official Pentagon document⁴⁸ and recognized as a key tenet of international law.⁴⁹ However, as we noted previously in this chapter, some proponents of NSS 2002 prevaricate by using the terms preventive and preemptive interchangeably.⁵⁰ The resulting fog of semantic confusion facilitates a mix-and-match rhetorical strategy that defends preventive military force by linking it to the more legitimate aspects of preemptive action. As Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. observes, this tactic has proved quite effective: “Given the disrepute attached to the idea of ‘preventive’ war, the Bush administration prefers to talk about ‘preemptive’ war, and too many have followed its example.”⁵¹

Unfortunately, as Henry Laver argues, eliding this important distinction not only clouds understanding of the real nature of NSS 2002; it also poses tangible security risks:

Potential allies may perceive such imprecision as an American inability to recognize the subtleties and nuances of diplomacy, resulting in decreased international confidence and hindering the prospect of a united front against terrorism. Indiscriminately swapping terms can also mislead potential enemies, convincing them to accelerate development of deterrent capabilities, namely weapons of mass destruction (WMD), to counter a perceived threat from the United States when none may in fact exist.⁵²

In making the preemptive/preventive distinction a common reference point of analysis, authors of *Hitting First* sort out this tangle of nomenclature, revisiting historical episodes and scholarly commentaries that elucidate and rehabilitate the distinction. Conversely, scrutiny of the recent texts and practices that erode the distinction helps show how the Bush White House successfully invoked the parlance of self-defense to legitimize a manifestly offensive military strategy. For example, rhetorical analysis reveals how transmogrification of the term “imminence” enabled Bush officials to execute this persuasive maneuver in official speeches prior to the 2003 Iraq War. Looking ahead, authors analyze the possible fallout that permanent erasure of the preemptive-preventive distinction might have for the U.S. intelligence community, American military readiness, and the morality of U.S. foreign policy.

THE SPECTRUM OF FORCE

Less than two months after release of NSS 2002, a U.S. MQ-1B Predator Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) flew into Yemen, where it tracked a Sport Utility Vehicle (SUV) being driven by suspected al-Qaida terrorists. About an hour later, a U.S. soldier guiding the UAV, in a command center some 350 miles away in Djibouti, launched an AGM-114 Hellfire air-attack missile that destroyed the SUV and its passengers. Military analyst Bill Yenne calls this episode a “small but important turning point in military history,” because it was the first time the U.S. used a UAV to carry out an offensive strike mission.⁵³ This application of first-strike force, though less controversial than the 2003 Iraq War, raises a host of questions regarding “low-intensity military confrontations.” As Seyom Brown notes, we are “entering a vast unknown” where the maturation of such technology creates capabilities to use preventive force in unique ways that challenge established principles of sovereignty and political accountability.⁵⁴ Since these low-intensity attacks raise different issues than full-scale military interventions with regime change missions,

any assessment of preventive military strategy must come to grips with the spectrum of force that can be applied in striking first.

Authors of *Hitting First* engage this issue by adopting preventive military strategy's spectrum of force as a common reference point of analysis. One windfall of this approach is a comprehensive history of all recorded 18 preventive attacks against nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons targets, with the attacks sorted at various points along the spectrum, ranging from low-intensity missile strikes to high-intensity regime-change interventions. The analytical flexibility afforded by a commitment to consider different kinds of first-strike force also brings the topic of humanitarian military intervention and peacekeeping under the purview of inquiry. The resulting comparisons between traditionally "low-intensive" peacekeeping missions and "high-intensity" preventive attacks yield surprising insights. Finally, the spectrum-of-force approach colors prospective assessments of the intelligence and military capacity to implement first-strike strategies, since obviously, "low-intensity" warfare tends not only to be less destructive, but also less resource-intensive, than its more elaborate counterparts on the higher end of the use of force spectrum.

The remainder of this chapter previews the book's content, which comes in four sections. Section one fills out the historical backdrop framing the debate over NSS 2002. The second section examines public discourse advanced to justify the theory and practice of preventive warfare. The logistical constraints complicating the implementation of NSS 2002 are considered in section three, while section four assesses the future of first-strike force in U.S. security strategy, in light of the analyses offered in these pages.

A WIDE ANGLE LENS:

PREVENTIVE MILITARY STRATEGY IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Public memory of military conflicts is often colored vividly by iconic images that capture telling moments. The photograph of Marines valiantly raising the American flag over Iwo Jima became a symbol of U.S. commitment and fighting spirit during World War II, just as the image of naked, nine-year-old Phan Thi Kim Phuc fleeing a napalm attack dramatized the agony of war in Vietnam. On 9 April 2003, an event unfolded in Baghdad's Firdos Square that seemed flush with history-making potential — a statue of ousted Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein was pulled off its moorings, then smashed to pieces by what appeared to be a jubilant crowd of liberated Iraqis.

Since Firdos Square is adjacent to the Palestine Hotel, which housed many journalists covering the 2003 Iraq War, visual images of Hussein's toppling statue quickly circled the globe.

American reporters punctuated “the war’s most symbolic piece of video”⁵⁵ with breathless commentary. Mark Phillips of CBS News described the scene from Baghdad: “This crowd has been growing. . . . It’s a scene to remember. It’s not just remarkable. It’s not just extraordinary. It is historic.”⁵⁶ The episode was thick with drama; “Every detail of the toppling dripped with upbeat, telegenic symbolism.”⁵⁷ News anchors stoked excitement back in U.S. television studios. On the *Today* show, Katie Couric announced, “I think it’s safe to say we may be witnessing the lasting symbol of Operation Iraqi Freedom right now.”⁵⁸ Couric’s partner Tom Brokaw framed the unfolding events in Cold War terms: “It is so reminiscent to me of watching the Berlin Wall coming down.”⁵⁹

In a matter of hours, “the images from Firdos Square already had been condensed into easily rerun 10-second bursts: the statue falls, the crowd cheers.”⁶⁰ In the news cycle that followed, many echoed Brokaw’s Cold War framing of the image. On Fox News, correspondent Ceci Connolly said, “It was reminiscent, I think, of the fall of the Berlin Wall. And just sort of that pure emotional expression, not choreographed, not stage-managed, the way so many things these days seem to be. Really breathtaking.”⁶¹ Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld struck a similar chord at a news conference later in the day, saying that after watching Hussein’s statue tumble, “one cannot help but think of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Iron Curtain.”⁶²

The most evocative initial images from Firdos Square were close-in shots of excited people crowding around the statue, pulling on a rope attached to the neck of Saddam Hussein’s likeness (see Figure 1). This tight vantage point seemed to validate the triumphal news narrative that described the statue takedown as a spontaneous outburst of jubilation by scores of liberated Iraqis: “The networks knew we’d be transfixed by the amazing video: This is the sort of flash from the front that plays in Peoria. The rich imagery seemed to speak volumes about the overthrow of the evil dictator.”⁶³

Less widely circulated photographs told a different story. These images, shot from a wider angle, showed Firdos Square from a more panoramic perspective (see Figure 2). From this vantage point, it became apparent that the crowd was much smaller than suggested by the tighter shots, and that Hussein’s statue was actually being pulled down by an American M88 recovery vehicle. In fact, Firdos Square itself turned out to be ringed by several U.S. military tanks, causing some to wonder “whether the toppling of the statue of Saddam was as spontaneous as it was made to appear.”⁶⁴

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

More doubts were raised when an internal Army study disclosed that the U.S. 305th Psychological Operations Company played a significant role in the event.⁶⁵ When this psychological warfare unit arrived at Firdos Square on 9 April 2003, it “started to do some PSYOP broadcasts about bringing about a free Iraq.”⁶⁶ Soon thereafter, a Colonel with the 4th Marine Regiment “saw the Saddam statue as a target of opportunity and decided that the statue must come down.”⁶⁷ Assessing things with the benefit of hindsight afforded by this broader picture, communication scholar Christopher Simpson notes, “This particular event was more of what you might call a propaganda event. It was a publicity, a photo-op if you will.”⁶⁸

Part one of *Hitting First* draws back the analytical lens to cast NSS 2002 in broad historical perspective. Just as a panoramic view elucidates key parts of the 9 April 2003 scene in Firdos Square, a long view of history provides salient background for understanding the strategic, tactical, and political dimensions of preventive military force. In one respect, this approach lends perspective by clarifying NSS 2002’s origins. Bush administration strategists did not fashion a post-9/11 military doctrine from whole cloth. Rather, their ideas built on strategies and techniques honed in the Cold War struggle against the Soviet Union, as well as initiatives by several UN General Secretaries to recalibrate the relationship between national sovereignty and the use of force during the 1990s. Analysis of this historical arc sheds light on how the ideas in NSS 2002 evolved, and provides useful reference points that fill out the contextual backdrop framing understanding of the Bush administration’s emergent use-of-force doctrine. For example,

consider that in 1984, secret authorization for U.S. first-strike attacks on guerrilla forces came from classified National Security Decision Directive (NSDD) 138, entitled, “Preemptive Strikes Against Suspected Terrorists.”

The still-classified portions of this directive authorized the establishment of secret FBI and CIA paramilitary squads and use of existing Pentagon military units—such as the Green Berets and Navy SEALs—for conducting what amounted to guerrilla warfare against guerrillas. It authorized sabotage, killing (though not “assassination,”) preemptive and retaliatory raids, deception, and a significantly expanded intelligence collection program aimed at suspected radicals and people regarded as sympathizers.⁶⁹

As NSDD 138 demonstrates, Secretary Rumsfeld’s comparison of a tumbling statue in Baghdad to a crumbling wall in Berlin is not the only dimension of Operation Iraqi Freedom with deep Cold War roots. Since preventive use-of-force strategies have been proposed and implemented before, a close look at these historical correlates is warranted. Chapter two, “Preventive Attacks against Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Weapons Programs: The Track Record,” is a companion piece to Dan Reiter’s 1995 *International Security* article on the oft-misunderstood history of preemptive warfare.⁷⁰ Reiter uses a similar approach here to assess the track record of success for the 18 preventive attacks that have been launched against nuclear, biological and chemical weapons programs from 1942–2003. Reiter categorizes these attacks into discrete clusters, including allied strikes on the German and Japanese unconventional weapons programs in World War II, Israeli and Iranian attacks on the Iraqi nuclear program from 1979–1981, Iraq’s Scud attacks on Israel’s nuclear program (during Operation Desert Storm) and Iran’s nuclear and chemical facilities (during the Iran-Iraq War), U.S. and coalition force cruise missile strikes on al-Qaida nuclear, biological and chemical weapons facilities in Afghanistan and Sudan, and finally the numerous U.S. and coalition strikes versus Iraq’s nuclear, biological and chemical assets from 1991-2003.⁷¹

Every “track record” assessment contains normative assumptions, and Reiter makes his transparent by engaging openly the question of how one decides whether or not a given preventive attack “succeeds.” The resulting discussion yields valuable insight regarding the selection of criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of preventive attacks on nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs. For example, Reiter finds that one key dimension of assessment criteria involves the time horizon for evaluation. A “snapshot” approach that focuses on the immediate aftermath of a preventive attack (e.g. the dome of Iraq’s Osiraq nuclear facility was blown up by a 1981 Israeli raid) may heighten perception of short-term success, yet obscure the

fact that over the longer term, nations often restore weapons facilities damaged in limited preventive attacks that do not achieve regime change. Reiter develops this point in an extended analysis of Israel's strike on the Osiraq reactor. A preview of Reiter's argument appears in his March 2005 letter to the editor, published in *The Atlantic Monthly*. James Fallows' response underscores the salience of Reiter's historical research in the contemporary policy debate regarding the wisdom of using preventive first-strikes to attack Iran's nuclear infrastructure.⁷²

In Chapter three, Simon Reich's wide angle lens for framing understanding of NSS 2002 focuses attention on the erosion of national sovereignty as an operational cornerstone of the international system. Multilateral peacekeeping missions have long relied on preventive military force to achieve humanitarian objectives. Reich shows how relatively recent changes in the operational attributes and broader mandates of peacekeeping missions have steadily diluted the principle of sovereignty.

Reich's analysis traces doctrinal shifts that have unfolded over the past two decades, amidst humanitarian crises in Somalia, Rwanda and Macedonia. Traditional peacekeeping doctrines protected sovereignty by stipulating that peacekeeping forces required consent from affected states before intervening. The rise of the "peace enforcement" paradigm, championed by a series of UN secretary generals, including Kofi Annan, narrowed this stipulation by making sovereignty conditional. Under peace enforcement, which gained adherents in the mid-1990s, states that violate universally accepted principles of behavior—international norms—give up their right to sovereignty and become subject to the application of preventive military force without consent.

The surprising upshot of Reich's analysis is that Annan inadvertently did important spadework that laid a foundation for NSS 2002's frontal assault on the principle of national sovereignty. It is the case that the doctrines of coercive humanitarian intervention and preventive military intervention are supported by different groups (primarily the UN versus the Bush administration), advocate different methods (multilateralism versus unilateralism or a limited coalition), and have different objectives (the relief from ethnic conflict, genocide or famine versus addressing a clear and present danger of unconventional weaponry or terrorism). However, Reich argues that they share an important root in that they challenge the shibboleth of sovereignty in the new millennium.

In Chapter four, Gordon Mitchell and Robert Newman study other historical precursors to NSS 2002, such as NSC-68, the 1950 planning document known as the "blueprint for Cold War defense."⁷³ Others have noted how NSC-68's endorsement of 'any measures' necessary to fight the Cold War bears a similarity to NSS 2002's assertion of a first-strike prerogative.⁷⁴ In

“By ‘Any Measures’ Necessary: NSC-68 and Cold War Roots of the 2002 National Security Strategy,” Mitchell and Newman build on this scholarship by reconstructing the political strategies and argumentative maneuvers deployed by Paul Nitze and the Committee on the Present Danger to ram NSC-68 through a skeptical national security bureaucracy and translate its ringing alarmism into plans for U.S. preventive warfare against the Soviet Union. Their findings reveal argument patterns that readers may find familiar today, such as deductive logic schemes that convert absence of evidence into positive proof, reliance on defector testimony as a preferred form of intelligence data, and synthesis of disparate data points into monolithic threat constructs.

Another prominent theme of this analysis is that historically, preventive warfare and public deception go hand-in-hand. As one illustration, Mitchell and Newman point to Operation Northwoods, a 1962 plan by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to trick the U.S. public into supporting a military first-strike on Cuba. This plan called for the U.S. government to create pretexts for preventive war, by staging bizarre events such as rigged airline hijackings and “remember the Maine” incidents at sea, which would then be blamed on Fidel Castro.⁷⁵ General Lyman Lemnitzer, mastermind of this deception gambit, went on to join Nitze and Paul Wolfowitz in the influential 1975-1976 “Team B” experiment in competitive intelligence analysis. Mitchell and Newman show how Wolfowitz and others in the George W. Bush White House replicated this “B-Teaming” strategy 16 years later to “fix” the “intelligence and facts” around the policy of regime change in Iraq.⁷⁶

ADLAI STEPHENSON MOMENTS:

PUBLIC DISCOURSE JUSTIFYING USE OF PREVENTIVE MILITARY FORCE

One factor likely to complicate American military planning in a world of first-strike warfare is the likelihood that ad hoc coalitions will have to be assembled each time a major operation is contemplated. Allied consent not only enables U.S. military forces to use foreign bases and gain access to airspace; it also works as political glue holding together often fragile political coalitions assembled to back particular military missions.⁷⁷ This challenge calls on American officials to rally potential coalition partners to the cause by proffering sufficiently persuasive evidence of a threat. But such evidence is not always easy to obtain, and interested states and other political entities can interpret it very differently.

A textbook example of successful persuasion took place in 1962, when American ambassador Adlai Stevenson shocked the world by presenting to the UN Security Council dramatic aerial photographs of Soviet nuclear missiles being unloaded in Cuba. Such evidence gave instant legitimacy to the Kennedy administration’s naval blockade in the Cuban missile

crisis, and led commentators to coin the phrase “Adlai Stevenson moment” to describe episodes where U.S. officials present “incontrovertible” evidence justifying use of force in international crisis situations.⁷⁸

Secretary Powell felt the historical weight of Stevenson’s smashing presentation some 40 years later, as he prepared his own pivotal UN address on Iraq in early 2003. “The greatest challenge was knowing that it was going to be an Adlai Stevenson moment,” Powell told an interviewer; “And every reporter was getting their score sheet out.”⁷⁹ Powell’s address scored quick political points for the White House and provided a much-needed short-term boost in public support for Operation Iraqi Freedom. But over time, key elements of his case disintegrated—the probative value of satellite photography showing alleged Iraqi chemical weapons activity was discounted;⁸⁰ a British dossier on Iraq’s terror links proved to be drawn from a plagiarized graduate student paper;⁸¹ Iraq’s aluminum tube imports were judged by IAEA scientists not to have nuclear enrichment applications;⁸² and the single source for documentation of Iraq’s alleged mobile biological weapons facilities was discredited as a “serial fabricator.”⁸³ Perhaps this episode calls for coinage of a new locution—the “Colin Powell moment”—to describe instances where high-stakes justifications of U.S. military force appear initially persuasive, but then erode under subsequent scrutiny.

In the aftermath of Operation Iraqi Freedom, considerable energy has been spent dissecting the massive intelligence failure that led to Secretary Powell’s UN debacle. But another mystery has received comparatively little attention—if Powell’s evidence was so poor, why did a raft of opinion leaders find his arguments persuasive, and why did public support for the Iraq War surge following his speech?⁸⁴ In the second section’s opening chapter, “Strategic Doctrine, Public Debate and the Terror War,” Tom Goodnight gains purchase on these questions by analyzing how Bush administration officials lowered the rhetorical bar for Powell’s speech by articulating details of NSS 2002 in ways that set lax proof standards for justifying use of first-strike force.

Goodnight’s analysis focuses on how Bush administration officials shift the meaning of a pivotal term—imminence—in public speeches clarifying the dynamics of their new first-strike posture. In American jurisprudence, the origin point of standards for determining the legitimacy of anticipatory self-defense can be traced to a 1842 legal case involving border skirmishes with Canada, where Daniel Webster set forth criteria stipulating conditions under which a threat could be sufficiently “imminent” so as to justify preemptive warfare. Whereas Webster’s criteria for assessing a threat’s imminence emphasize factors such as the immediacy and unavoidability of impending enemy attack, speeches by Bush, Rumsfeld and Cheney lay out a subtly different formulation of imminence. Goodnight shows how this reformulated concept of imminence

structured public debate on Operation Iraqi Freedom. This analysis not only helps explain the persuasiveness of Powell's UN address; it also lays bare some of the key working dynamics of NSS 2002. According to Goodnight, the White House's revised imminence standard reverses the burden of proof in public argument by insisting that unless a foreign enemy proves that they *do not* possess unconventional weapons programs, they can be assumed to pose an imminent threat. Stephen Hartnett and Laura Stengrim classify this maneuver as an argumentative fallacy known as the *argumentum ad ignorantiam*—"the rhetorical trick of manufacturing certainty out of uncertainty."⁸⁵

When Goodnight relates these findings to the distinction between preemptive and preventive warfare, he highlights some thorny dilemmas facing officials who must juggle conflicting political and operational concerns in justifying use of first-strike force. As an enemy threat becomes more immediate, evidence justifying a preemptive attack grows more convincing and the political case for use of force becomes easier to make. But if would-be pre-empters wait too long for threat evidence to mature, they forfeit the element of surprise and give enemies an opportunity to harden their arsenals, lessening the chances that a preemptive first strike will succeed. Here a Hobson's choice between political disrepute and operational failure bedevils first-strike planning. This dilemma takes on a slightly different form for officials contemplating use of preventive military force. In this problematic, the opportunity to neutralize an enemy's nascent arsenal, before it has fully matured, maximizes prospects for operational success. But this in turn introduces political complications, since it may only be possible to justify preventive first-strike missions by wringing maximum proof from speculative data pointing to an enemy's early efforts to develop nuclear, biological or chemical weapons. Building on this insight, Goodnight notes how NSS 2002 contains an inbuilt impetus to exaggerate threat evidence.

While numerous official investigations have concluded that the American case for preventive war against Iraq was based on exaggerated threat evidence,⁸⁶ so far the Bush administration has largely escaped political accountability for these errors by blaming the Intelligence Community (IC). Rodger Payne's chapter, "Deliberate Before Striking First?," revisits the Iraq War timeline and notices something startling—administration officials were exaggerating threat evidence on Iraq *before* the IC completed its National Intelligence Estimate in October 2002. This is especially remarkable in light of the fact that key Bush administration officials were saying that Saddam Hussein was "in check" and "living on borrowed time" as late as February 2001. Noting that the "we were given bad intelligence" excuse does not account for the White House's exaggeration of threat evidence from February 2001 to October 2002, Payne searches for other explanations and discovers evidence of a systematic effort by Bush

administration officials to manipulate public debate. With this effort, Payne picks up where the Senate Select Intelligence Committee stalled. That committee originally planned to follow up on its July 2004 report of the IC's role in the Iraq prewar intelligence failure with a phase two investigation that would focus on the White House's role in the fiasco. Yet, astonishingly, in March 2005 committee chairperson Pat Roberts (R-KS) dropped this second stage of his investigation.⁸⁷ Payne amplifies evidence published in the annex of the committee's phase one report to detail how the White House's "communicative misdeeds" distorted public debate and may have pressured the IC to produce its flawed National Intelligence Estimate in October 2002.

Payne frames the significance of this strategic deception campaign by examining how it sharply contradicts portions of NSS 2002 that insist on the importance of public deliberation and debate as safeguards that limit preventive war options. Clearly, U.S. officials were concerned that other nations might cynically adopt NSS 2002's logic and use it as a "pretext for aggression." Payne shows how these concerns led the White House to attach "deliberative caveats" to its assertion of a first-strike prerogative. Drafters of NSS 2002 apparently hoped that abuse of the preventive warfare option by other nations could be curtailed by stipulating a requirement that first-strike force ought to be justified in public spheres of deliberation prior to executing attacks. What are the consequences of the White House violating its own self-imposed deliberative requirement? This question drives the concluding portion of Payne's analysis, where he suggests that one negative security outcome may be a "Chicken Little effect," where world skepticism sown by U.S. strategic deception complicates efforts to persuade audiences of the need to act swiftly when real threats appear on the horizon.⁸⁸

In "On Justifying the First Blow," philosopher Tom Rockmore closes out section two by adding a moral dimension to the discussion of whether and how first-strike force can be justified. Echoing Goodnight, Rockmore uses the preemption-prevention distinction as a point of departure for his analysis. After rehearsing how the distinction plays out in official, scholarly, and common sense terms, Rockmore considers the moral status of first-strike attacks by comparing how preemptive and preventive uses of military force square with various just war theories. Rockmore's conclusion circles back to Thrasymachus, the character in Plato's dialogues who simplifies moral dilemmas into a tidy axiom: "Might makes right."

FROM BOARDROOM TO BATTLEFIELD:

CHALLENGES OF IMPLEMENTING PREVENTIVE WAR STRATEGY

While numerous official studies offered in-depth assessments of the logistical challenges presented by the prospect of forcible regime change in Iraq, Bush administration officials'

confidence that U.S. forces would be “greeted as liberators”⁸⁹ led them to ignore such advice and publicly deride those who questioned the “cakewalk” formula.⁹⁰ As senior White House officials noted around the time that the decision to go to war was being finalized in July 2002, “there was little discussion in Washington of the aftermath after military action.”⁹¹

After sustaining thousands of U.S. military fatalities and hundreds of billions of dollars later, it is apparent that preventive warfare’s translation from boardroom to battlefield tends to be more difficult than official planners of Operation Iraqi Freedom foresaw. Section three of *Hitting First* studies this practical issue by analyzing how logistical challenges complicate efforts to pursue first-strike military strategy on three levels: intelligence, military capability, and allied diplomacy. In successive chapters, Greg Thielmann, Peter Dombrowski and Jacques Hymans assess how material constraints in each of these areas are likely to color future attempts to protect U.S. security through application of preventive military force.

Thielmann begins his chapter, “Intelligence in Preventive Military Strategy,” by explaining how the institutional routines of U.S. intelligence tradecraft have evolved in ways that predispose analysts to view the world through a glass darkly. A series of traumatic surprises, ranging from Pearl Harbor to 9/11, have heaped pressure on the IC to provide more accurate warning of looming dangers. Thielmann notes that this pressure, when combined with the tendencies of hostile states to camouflage their real military capabilities, and the predilection of U.S. politicians to stretch intelligence data, generates systemic inertia to produce inflated threat assessments. He shows how all three of these factors coalesced in the Iraq case to cause a major intelligence failure. The jettisoning of caveats and official dissents from intelligence reports, conflation of chemical and nuclear threat categories, as well as Saddam Hussein’s own “double game of deception,” worked to paint an ominous picture of the Iraqi regime that diverged dramatically from reality.

Thielmann’s experience as an intelligence insider positions him well to highlight the variegated nature of the IC and show how consensus intelligence assessments, such as the 2002 National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq, are woven together in a give-and-take process that brings together the U.S. government’s major intelligence agencies for negotiation, and sometimes debate. To illustrate, he points to intelligence community discussions regarding Iraq’s alleged development of weaponized UAVs. In 2002, the main U.S. intelligence entities battled over the question of whether Iraq was developing threatening UAV capability. CIA analysts argued that Saddam Hussein had embarked on a developmental program to use UAVs for delivery of deadly biological agents. However, Air Force intelligence, later joined by the Defense Intelligence Agency and Army intelligence, disagreed with this assessment, arguing that since Iraqi UAVs

were intended primarily for reconnaissance and not attack missions, CIA's ominous analysis should be discounted.

Eventually, public audiences heard only about the CIA's alarming descriptions of Iraq's UAV program. As an explanation for why the substance of the internal IC disagreement was expurgated from declassified versions of the 2002 NIE, Thielmann points to the intense political pressure put on the IC by NSS 2002 to produce actionable intelligence justifying a preventive first-strike against Iraq. In a sobering passage, Thielmann speculates that, "a more faithful rendering to the public on the dearth of hard evidence concerning the existence of delivery vehicles for the 'WMD' agents of concern would almost certainly have affected public willingness to wage war."

Looking ahead, Thielmann anticipates that the endemic factors driving threat inflation will persist in the future. This poses serious problems for implementation of NSS 2002, since preventive war strategy depends on the IC to produce "near certain" assessments of incipient threats. The natural response of the IC to these demands, reasons Thielmann, is to further tilt intelligence analysis in a direction that prioritizes warning over prediction, ironically reinforcing the underlying dynamics that produced intelligence failure prior to Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Can this spiraling dynamic be overcome? The stakes are high, especially since reliable intelligence is essential for effective functioning of a wide array of security instruments that have little to do with preventive warfare, such as tracking and containing the spread of fissile materials and enforcement of international nonproliferation regimes. This is why rejection of the preventive war doctrine rates high on Thielmann's list of formulas for positive change. There has already been some hopeful movement toward implementation of other recommendations on his list, such as separating the positions of CIA Chief and Director of Central Intelligence.⁹² Whether this move translates into meaningful intelligence reform may depend in large part on how new Director of National Intelligence addresses the remaining vital areas of change that Thielmann isolates in his conclusion.

Thielmann's analysis raises grave doubts about American capability to muster the necessary intelligence resources required to implement successfully NSS 2002. In the section's second chapter, Dombrowski asks whether the Pentagon possess the requisite military capabilities to pursue preventive military force over time. His study begins with a general assessment of the types of military hardware and personnel necessary to execute preventive strike missions. Dombrowski then identifies Syria and Iran as the most likely targets of future U.S. first-strike attacks. His treatment of hypothetical U.S. campaigns against Syria and Iran focuses on three

parameters: geography; military balance and effectiveness; and intensity of resistance to foreign military intervention.

Does the U.S. military have what it takes to prevail against these potential adversaries? Dombrowski is not sanguine on this point, partly because of the fact that U.S. military capabilities seem mismatched to respond to the unique set of contingencies presented by these hypothetical war scenarios. For example, recent investment in high-technology weaponry (such as *Predator* and *Global Hawk*) maximizes U.S. long-range strike capability. But this hardware has only limited utility versus Iran, a nation that as Dan Reiter explains in an earlier chapter, has learned a lesson from Osiraq, dispersing and burying nuclear facilities to reduce substantially their vulnerability to standoff attack. On the other hand, if the U.S. decides to pursue full-scale regime change via the preventive war option, Dombrowski predicts that its overwhelming conventional firepower would probably produce a quick force-on-force victory over the much smaller Iranian army. The problem is that consolidation of this victory would likely entail substantial post-conflict nation building, something the U.S. military is not particularly well equipped or eager to do.

In a conclusion that dovetails with some of Reiter's key findings, Dombrowski notes that the distinction between limited preventive strikes and regime-changing preventive military intervention is crucial for determining the workability and credibility of first-strike strategy. Should U.S. military spending priorities continue to shape a fighting force with capabilities that do not respond well to the resource demands presented by first-strike missions, Dombrowski contends that U.S. military credibility will decline and American security will be compromised. He ends by exploring possible remedies, including adding more "boots on the ground," integrating civilian capabilities into military planning, and cooperating more with allies.

Interlocking themes enable the Thielmann and Dombrowski chapters to be read as companion pieces. For example, Dombrowski notes that it may be difficult to pursue allied cooperation effectively if Washington continues to alienate security partners by distorting public debate with manipulated intelligence data. Likewise, Thielmann argues that the structural impetus for IC threat inflation will be very difficult to correct if policy-makers continue to push the envelope on NSS 2002's maxim that "our best defense is a good offense."⁹³

As the Bush administration learned prior to Operation Iraq Freedom, the diplomatic challenge of persuading international audiences to accept U.S. justifications for application of preventive military force can be onerous, particularly when powerful allies mount diplomatic counter-offensives designed to frustrate U.S. rhetorical efforts. Jacques Hymans' chapter, "A Sheep in Wolf's Clothing?" examines the French counter-diplomacy campaign conducted during

the run-up to the 2003 Iraq War. The pointed intransigence displayed by France in opposition to U.S. arguments for Operation Iraqi Freedom caused some commentators to wonder whether the arrival of NSS 2002 opened a permanent rift in US-France relations. If correct, such assessments point to a rocky road ahead for U.S. diplomats seeking to broaden international support for future first-strike ventures. Hymans discounts the inevitability of this scenario, using a careful analysis of the influences driving French prewar policy to elucidate factors that cast its diplomatic decision-making in a much more complex light. His approach enables one to see French opposition to Operation Iraqi Freedom less as an instance of principled rejection of U.S. “hyperpower,” and more as an approach shaped by specific contingencies, such as unique trends in the German electoral cycle and the French experience in Algeria. Allied reactions to U.S. proposals for application of first-strike force diplomatically constrain U.S. policy options. As a case study of the nascent phenomenon of preventive warfare diplomacy, Hymans’ chapter elucidates some of these constraints and suggests how they might be overcome. These insights, which highlight the contingent nature of French foreign policy, may provide succor to those who worry that Washington’s diplomatic relationship with France is a lost cause.

OUTLOOK: THE FUTURE OF FIRST STRIKE STRATEGY

The 2004 U.S. presidential election campaign provided an occasion for the nation’s voters to take stock of the Bush administration’s first-strike force strategy. As William Hartung notes in Chapter eleven, the trajectory of campaign discussion largely skirted the question of whether NSS 2002 offers a sound framework for U.S. security in the future. However, Democrats did offer some preliminary sketches of a competing approach to post-9/11 security, and Hartung uses these as points of departure for discussion of his own “policy of preventive diplomacy” that serves as an alternative to NSS 2002. The Hartung approach stipulates that military force should remain a strategy option, but that it should be used as a last resort. Force is included as part of a “layered defense,” where non-military measures of prevention based on diplomacy, treaties, rigorous inspections, intelligence, law enforcement, and economic leverage take precedence. Hartung draws from reports published by prominent study groups and task forces to show how a redoubled commitment to “prevention, not intervention” offers a more promising U.S. security strategy. Finally, Hartung explores how it might be possible to leverage political arguments for such a preventive diplomacy approach. This links the contents of his chapter back into the volume’s earlier analyses of rhetorical strategies deployed by the Bush administration to privilege first-strike force at the expense of non-military tools of prevention.

In the volume's concluding chapter, "Preventive Force: Untangling the Discourse," we consider whether Operation Iraqi Freedom may be a dead end for the White House's preventive war ambitions, or perhaps just an unexpected detour. Condoleezza Rice's statement that we "would never want to do another Iraq,"⁹⁴ coupled with her rejuvenated approach to diplomacy as Secretary of State, seem to indicate that the pendulum of U.S. foreign policy has swung back into a more moderate equilibrium. On the other hand, the operationalization of high-tech "global strike" plans by the Pentagon, along with a recycled round of bellicose rhetoric directed toward "axis of evil" states such as Iran, point to the prospect that the Bush administration may be planning an encore to Operation Iraqi Freedom. If the Bush administration does attempt to give first-strike force a second chance after the strategy's checkered debut in 2003 invasion of Iraq, a key determinant of policy success will likely be the degree to which the White House and its public interlocutors remedy factors that contributed to mistakes in 2002-2003. During the run-up to Operation Iraqi Freedom, a breakdown in the marketplace of ideas resulted in widespread political support for a preventive war that was legitimated politically as an exercise in self-defense but turned out to be an instance of raw aggression against a phantom enemy. Can this error be avoided in the future? We close the book by considering this question, drawing on analyses in earlier chapters, studies of public opinion, and rhetorical theory, to suggest preliminary answers.

¹ United States, White House Office of Homeland Security, "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America," September 2002, <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>>, emphasis added.

² U.S. White House, "National Security Strategy."

³ Notable examples of early positive reactions to NSS 2002 include Joshua Muravchik, "The Bush Manifesto," *Commentary* (December 2002): 23-30; John Lewis Gaddis, "A Grand Strategy of Transformation," *Foreign Policy* (November/October 2002): 50-56; Norman Podhoretz, "In Praise of the Bush Doctrine," *Commentary* (September 2002): 19-28; and Richard H. Schultz and Andreas Vogt, "It's War! Fighting Post-11 September Global Terrorism through a Doctrine of Preemption," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 15 (Spring 2003): 1-30.

⁴ For early criticism of NSS 2002 along these lines, see G. John Ikenberry, "America's Imperial Ambition," *Foreign Affairs* 81 (September/October 2002): 44-60; Robert S. Litwak, "The New Calculus of Pre-emption," *Survival* 44 (Winter 2002): 53-79; Jeffrey Record, "The Bush Doctrine and War with Iraq," *33 Parameters* (Spring 2003): 4-21; and John Steinbruner, "Confusing Ends and Means: The Doctrine of Coercive Pre-emption," *Arms Control Today* 15 (January/February 2003): 3-6.

⁵ Condoleezza Rice, "A Balance of Power that Favors Freedom," *U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda* (December 2002), <<http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itps/1202/ijpe/ijpe1202.pdf>>.

⁶ See United Nations charter, <<http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/chapter7.htm>>.

⁷ See Robert E. Harkavy, "Preemption and Two-front Conventional Warfare," *Jerusalem Papers on Peace Problems* No. 23 (1977): 9.

⁸ This distinction is codified in the U.S. Department of Defense's *Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, which defines a preemptive attack as one "initiated on the basis of incontrovertible evidence that an enemy attack is imminent" (415). A preventive war, on the other hand, is "initiated in the

belief that military conflict, while not imminent, is inevitable, and that to delay would involve greater risk” (419). See United States, Department of Defense, *Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, Joint Publication I-02, April 2001, <http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf>.

⁹ Arnel B. Enriquez, “The U.S. National Security Strategy of 2002—A New Use-of-Force Doctrine?” *Air & Space Power Journal* (Fall 2004): 36; see also Melvyn P. Leffler, letter to the editor, *Foreign Policy* (January/February 2005): 11.

¹⁰ See Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld, “Prepared Testimony of U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees Regarding Iraq,” 18-19 September 2002, <<http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2002/s20020918-secdef.html>>.

¹¹ United States, White House Office of Homeland Security, “National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction,” December 2002, <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/12/WMDStrategy.pdf>>.

¹² Later, Bush administration Press Secretary Scott McClellan would explicitly eschew “imminent threat” terminology in lieu of characterization of Iraq as a “gathering” danger. See Scott McClellan, “Press Briefing by Scott McClellan,” 27 January 2004, <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/01/20040127-6.html>>.

¹³ William Arkin, “Not Just a Last Resort? A Global Strike Plan, With a Nuclear Option,” *Washington Post*, 15 May 2005; Andrew J. Bacevich, *The New American Militarism: How Americans are Seduced by War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Daniel Benjamin and Steven Simon, *The Next Attack: The Failure of the War on Terror and a Strategy for Getting it Right* (New York: Henry Holt, 2005); Renato Cruz de Castro, “U.S. War on Terror in East Asia: The Perils of Preemptive Defense in Waging a War of the Third Kind,” *Asian Affairs* 31 (Winter 2005): 212-232; Arnold A. Offner, “Rogue President, Rogue Nation: Bush and U.S. National Security,” *Diplomatic History* 29 (June 2005): 433-435; Jeffrey Record, *Dark Victory: America’s Second War Against Iraq* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 2004); and Roger Speed and Michael May, “Dangerous Doctrine,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 61 (March/April 2005): 38-50.

¹⁴ John Lewis Gaddis, “After Containment,” *The New Republic*, 25 April 2005; Newt Gingrich, *Winning the Future* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2004); Stephen P. Hayes, “Sticking to His Guns,” *The Weekly Standard*, 14 February 2005; Walter Russell Mead, *Power, Terror, Peace and War: America’s Grand Strategy in a World at Risk* (New York: Knopf, 2004); Richard Miniter, *Shadow War: The Untold Story of How Bush is Winning the War on Terror* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2004); Robert J. Pauly, Jr. and Tom Lansford, *Strategic Preemption: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Second Iraq War* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); and Rowan Scarborough, *Rumsfeld’s War: The Untold Story of America’s Anti-Terrorist Commander* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2004).

¹⁵ George Packer, *The Assassins’ Gate: America in Iraq* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2005), 63; and James Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans: The History of Bush’s War Cabinet* (New York: Viking, 2004), 317.

¹⁶ U.S. White House, “National Security Strategy.”

¹⁷ National Public Radio’s informal sample of local public opinion revealed that NSS 2002’s “plain English” resonated with residents of Lubbock, Texas: “In George W. Bush’s blunt threats to Saddam Hussein to disarm or prepare for war, west Texans believe they recognize a streak of themselves.” The White House could take heart in this finding, since “[t]he president has long used the conservative city on the high Plains of west Texas as his political weather vane” (Jacki Lyden and John Burnett, “Support of the Bush Doctrine on Iraq by the People of the west Texas city of Lubbock,” *All Things Considered*, National Public Radio broadcast, 24 October 2002, Lexis-Nexis news transcript database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>).

¹⁸ Condoleezza Rice, “Dr. Condoleezza Rice Discusses President’s National Security Strategy,” 1 October 2002, <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021001-6.html>>.

¹⁹ For early examples of popular commentaries featuring the 9/11 = NSS 2002 formula, see Bob Deans, “Sept. 11 Jolted Bush’s Stance on Security,” *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 22 September 2002, 1F, Lexis-Nexis general news database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>; Roy Eccleston, “Bush’s Rule of Fear for a Peaceful World,” *The Australian*, 30 September 2002, 14, Lexis-Nexis general news database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>; and Muravcik, “The Bush Manifesto.”

²⁰ George W. Bush, "The Second Gore-Bush Presidential Debate," 11 October 2000, <<http://www.debates.org/pages/trans2000b.html>>.

²¹ Bacevich, *New American Militarism*, 217. For additional commentary unpacking the rhetorical advantages afforded to Bush administration officials by their choice of 9/11 as the temporal starting point for discussions of terrorism policy, see Winkler, *In the Name of Terrorism*, 167-168.

²² "Excerpts From Pentagon's Plan: 'Prevent the Re-Emergence of a New Rival,'" *New York Times*, 8 March 1992. Useful context explaining the circumstances around which this document was leaked to the *Los Angeles Times* is provided in Patrick E. Tyler, "U.S. Strategy Plan Calls for Insuring No Rivals Develop," *New York Times*, 8 March 1992.

²³ Richard Perle, Douglas Feith and David Wurmser, "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm," Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies Paper, 8 July 1996, <http://www.aaiusa.org/news/must_read_feith.htm>.

²⁴ Elliott Abrams, et al., Letter to Honorable William J. Clinton, 26 January 1998, <<http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqlintonletter.htm>>.

²⁵ Thomas Donnelly, et al., "Rebuilding Americas Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century," Project for the New American Century Report, September 2000, <<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pddbchf>>.

²⁶ For commentary placing these documents in an evolutionary trajectory culminating in NSS 2002, see Chris J. Dolan, "Foreign Policy on the Offensive," in Betty Glad and Chris J. Dolan, ed., *Striking First: The Preventive War Doctrine and the Reshaping of U.S. Foreign Policy* (London: Palgrave, 2004), 3-22; Stefan Halper and Jonathan Clarke, *America Alone: The Neo-Conservatives and the Global Order* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 106-108; Chalmers Johnson, *Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy and the End of the Republic* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004), 234-38; James Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans: The History of Bush's War Cabinet* (New York: Penguin Books), 209-15, 238, 245; and Packer, *Assassins' Gate*, 30-32.

²⁷ Donnelly, et al., 2.

²⁸ Donnelly, et al., 51.

²⁹ David Ray Griffin, *The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11* (Northampton, Mass.: Interlink Press, 2004).

³⁰ "The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11," unsigned book review, *Publisher's Weekly* (31 March 2004).

³¹ *Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004), 335-6; and Bob Woodward, *Plan of Attack* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004), 25; more generally, see Richard Clarke, *Against All Enemies* (New York: Free Press, 2004), 264-65.

³² Bob Woodward, *Bush at War* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002), 81.

³³ Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones, *Agendas and Instability in American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 3-6; see also Carol Weissert, "Policy Entrepreneurs, Policy Opportunists, and Legislative Effectiveness," *American Politics Quarterly* 19 (1991): 262-74.

³⁴ Chris Mackenzie, "Policy Entrepreneurship in Australia: A Conceptual Review and Application," *Australian Journal of Political Science* 39 (July 2004): 368.

³⁵ Woodward, *Bush at War*, 84-85.

³⁶ See Simon and Benjamin, *The Next Attack*, 145-146.

³⁷ This analytical approach fits with a broader body of scholarship that treats public discourse as a central object of study. Examples from political science that draw on public sphere theory to explain international relations include Neta C. Crawford, *Argument and Change in World Politics: Ethics, Decolonization, and Humanitarian Intervention* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Jurgen Haacke, "Theory and Praxis in International Relations: Habermas, Self-Reflection and Rational Argumentation," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 25 (1996): 255-89; Marc Lynch, *State Interests and Public Spheres* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Rodger A. Payne and Nayef H. Samhat, *Democratizing Global Politics; Discourse Norms, International Regimes and Political*

Community (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004) and Thomas Risse, "'Let's Argue!' Communicative Action in World Politics," *International Organization* 54 (2000): 1-39.

In the field of communication, notable studies of U.S. foreign policy that elucidate dynamics of international security by analyzing rhetorical texts include Denise M. Bostdorff, *The Presidency and the Rhetoric of Foreign Crisis* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994); Ronald H. Carpenter, *Rhetoric in Martial Deliberations and Decision Making* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2004); Cori Elizabeth Dauber, *Cold War Analytical Structures and the Post Post-War World* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1993); Stephen A. Hartnett and Laura A. Stengrim, *Globalization and Empire: The U.S. Invasion of Iraq, Free Markets, and the Twilight of Democracy* (Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 2006); J. Michael Hogan, *The Nuclear Freeze Campaign* (East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press, 1994); Robert L. Ivie, *Democracy and America's War on Terror* (Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 2005); Gordon R. Mitchell, *Strategic Deception: Rhetoric, Science and Politics in Missile Defense Advocacy* (East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press, 2000); Robert P. Newman, *Owen Lattimore and the 'Loss' of China* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1992); and Carol K. Winkler, *In the Name of Terrorism: Presidents on Political Violence in the Post-world War II Era* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006).

An illuminating collaborative effort that bridges political science and communication is *Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*, ed. Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman (East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press, 1994). Francis Beer's *Meanings of War and Peace* (College Station, TX: Texas A & M University Press, 2001) and *Collateral Language: A User's Guide to America's New War*, ed. John Collins and Ross Glover (New York: New York University Press, 2002) feature similar collaborative work. For a review essay discussing recent multidisciplinary work in this area, see Gordon R. Mitchell, "Public Argument-Driven Security Studies," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 39 (Summer 2004): 57-71.

³⁸ See George W. Bush, "President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point," 1 June 2002, <<http://222.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/print/20020601-3.html>>; Richard Cheney, "Vice President Speaks at VFW 1034d National Convention," 26 August 2002, <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/08/print/20020826.html>>; and Colin Powell, "Remarks to the United Nations Security Council," 5 February 2003, <<http://www.state.gov/secretary/former/powell/remarks/2003/17300.htm>>.

³⁹ Mohammed Ayoob, "The War Against Iraq: Normative and Strategic Implications," *Middle East Policy* (Summer 2003). See also Martha Finnemore, "Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention," in *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, ed. Peter J. Katzenstein (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996): 159.

⁴⁰ For a concise history of the phrase, see Jacques E.C. Hymans, "Roots of the Washington Threat Consensus," in *Striking First*, 37-39.

⁴¹ American Dialect Society, "2002 Words of the Year," <http://www.americandialect.org/index.php/amerdial/2002_words_of_the_y/>.

⁴² Susan D. Moeller, "Media Coverage of Weapons of Mass Destruction," Center for International and Security Studies Report (March 2004), <http://www.cisssm.umd.edu/documents/WMDstudy_full.pdf>.

⁴³ Moeller, "Media Coverage."

⁴⁴ See Wolfgang Panofsky, "Dismantling the Concept Of 'Weapons of Mass Destruction,'" *Arms Control Today* (April 1998), <http://www.armscontrol.org/act/1998_04/wkhp98.asp>.

⁴⁵ Panofsky, "Dismantling the Concept."

⁴⁶ Gert G. Harigel, "Chemical and Biological Weapons: Use in Warfare, Impact on Society and Environment," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Report (2001), <<http://www.ceip.org/files/Publications/Harigelreport.asp>>.

⁴⁷ Moeller, "Media Coverage."

⁴⁸ U.S. DOD, *Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*.

⁴⁹ Anthony Clark Arend, "International Law and the Preemptive Use of Military Force," *Washington Quarterly* 26 (Spring 2003): 89-103.

⁵⁰ Here we use ‘prevaricate’ in the narrow sense of the word: to “be deliberately ambiguous or unclear in order to mislead or withhold information” (WordNet database, <<http://wordnet.princeton.edu>>).

⁵¹ Arthur M. Schlesinger, *War and the American Presidency* (New York: Norton, 2004), 23.

⁵² Henry S. Laver, “Preemption and the Evolution of America’s Strategic Defense,” *Parameters* 35 (Summer 2005): 114; see also Francois Heisbourg, “A Work in Progress: The Bush Doctrine and its Consequences,” *Washington Quarterly* 26 (Spring 2003): 75-88.

⁵³ Bill Yenne, *Attack of the Drones: A History of Unmanned Aerial Combat* (St. Paul, Minn.: Zenith Press, 2004), 8-9; see also John B. Alexander, *Winning the War: Advanced Weapons, Strategies and Concepts for the post-9/11 World* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2003), 49.

⁵⁴ Seyom Brown, *Illusion of Control: Force and Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 2003), 149.

⁵⁵ Paul Friedman, “The Real-Time War; TV: A Missed Opportunity,” *Columbia Journalism Review* (May/June 2003).

⁵⁶ Mark Phillips, “The Early Show,” CBS News Transcripts, 9 April 2003, Lexis-Nexis news transcripts database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>.

⁵⁷ Matthew Gilbert and Suzanne C. Ryan, “Snap Judgments: Did Iconic Images from Baghdad Reveal More About the Media than Iraq?” *Boston Globe*, 10 April 2003.

⁵⁸ Katie Couric, “Today,” CBS News Transcripts, 9 April 2003, Lexis-Nexis news transcripts database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>.

⁵⁹ Tom Brokaw, “Today,” CBS News Transcripts, 9 April 2003, Lexis-Nexis news transcripts database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>.

⁶⁰ Robert Bianco, “Taking Down a Statue of Saddam is Symbolic but has Power All its Own,” *USA Today*, 10 April 2003, D1.

⁶¹ Ceci Connolly, “Fox Special Report with Brit Hume,” 9 April 2003, Transcript #040905cb.254, Lexis-Nexis news transcripts database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>.

⁶² Donald Rumsfeld and Richard Myers, “Defense Department Operational Briefing,” 9 April 2003, Lexis-Nexis news transcripts database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>.

⁶³ Joanne Ostrow, “Lasting Images: Tumbling statue immediately burns into memory,” *Denver Post*, 10 April 2003.

⁶⁴ Sheldon Rampton and John Stauber, *Weapons of Mass Deception: The Uses of Propaganda in Bush’s War on Iraq* (New York: Center for Media and Democracy, 2003), 4.

⁶⁵ Gregory Fontenot, E.J. Degen and David Tohn, *On Point: The United States Army in Operation Iraqi Freedom* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 2005), advance online copy available at <<http://onpoint.leavenworth.army.mil/>>.

⁶⁶ Brian Plesic, Interview with Lieutenant Colonel Dennis Cahill, 31 May 2003, in Fontenot, Degen and Tohn, *On Point*.

⁶⁷ Plesic, Interview with Cahill.

⁶⁸ Christopher Simpson, quoted in Andrea McCarren, “Toppling of Saddam’s Statue Staged?” WJLA-TV I-Team Report, 22 July 2004, <<http://www.wjla.com/news/stories/0704/161032.html>>.

⁶⁹ Christopher Simpson, *National Security Directives of the Reagan & Bush Administrations* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1995), 366. For a one-page declassified “extract” of NSDD 138, see Simpson, *National Security*, 405. Discussion regarding implementation of the directive can be found in Charles Hill, Memorandum to Robert C. McFarlane, 19 June 1984, Folder “[Terrorism] [8404913],” Box 90761, files of D. Fortier, Ronald Reagan Library, Simi Valley, CA; and “Public Report of the Vice President’s Task Force on Combatting Terrorism,” February 1986, Folder “[Terrorism] [OA/ID 14923],” Press Office, Bush Vice Presidential Records, George Bush Presidential Library, College Station, TX. This archival research is presented and discussed in Winkler, *In the Name of Terrorism*, 93-95.

⁷⁰ Dan Reiter, “Exploding the Powder Keg Myth: Preemptive Wars Almost Never Happen,” *International Security* 20 (Fall 1995): 5-34.

⁷¹ The government of Denmark draws extensively from Reiter’s survey to inform its recent study of preventive military force. See Danish Institute for International Studies, *New Threats and the Use of*

Force (Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies, 2005), 40-45, <<http://www.diis.dk/sw12399.asp>>.

⁷² Dan Reiter, Letter to the editor, *Atlantic Monthly* (March 2005): 26-27; James Fallows, Reply to letters, *Atlantic Monthly* (March 2005): 27-28. See also James Fallows, "Will Iran Be Next?" *Atlantic Monthly* (December 2004): 99-110; and Dan Reiter, "The Osirak Myth and the Track Record of Preventive Military Attacks," Ridgway Center Policy Brief 04-2 (October 2004).

⁷³ Herman S. Wolk, "The Blueprint for Cold War Defense," *Air Force* 83 (2000), <<http://www.afa.org/magazine/march2000/0300coldwar.asp>>.

⁷⁴ See Jean-Yves Haine and Gustav Lindström, "An Analysis of The National Security Strategy of the United States of America," Institute for Security Studies Analysis (January 2003), <<http://www.iss-eu.org/new/analysis/analy034.html>>; Melvyn P. Leffler, "9/11 and American Foreign Policy," *Diplomatic History* 29 (June 2005): 411-413; and John Shaw, "Bush National Security Strategy Drawing Both Praise and Criticism," *Washington Diplomat* (November 2002), <http://washingtondiplomat.com/02-11/c1_02_11.html>.

⁷⁵ L.L. Lemnitzer, "Justification for U.S. Military Intervention in Cuba (TS)," Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, 13 March 1962, U.S. National Security Archive, <<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20010430/northwoods.pdf>>; see also James Bamford, *Body of Secrets* (New York, Doubleday, 2001), 81-89.

⁷⁶ "The Secret Downing Street Memo," *Sunday Times (Britain)*, 1 May 2005, <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-1593607,00.html>>, emphasis added. According to National Security Archive Senior Fellow John Prados, the Dearlove memo makes clear, "with stunning clarity," that "that the goal of overthrowing Saddam Hussein was set at least a year in advance," and that "President Bush's repeated assertions that no decision had been made about attacking Iraq were plainly false." John Prados, "Iraq: When was the Die Cast?" 3 May 2005, <http://www.tompaine.com/articles/iraq_when_was_the_die_cast.php>.

⁷⁷ As John Steinbruner explains, "since the U.S. military operates within a network of foreign basing rights and access agreements that require consent from host governments, it would be difficult to organize a preemptive attack that did not enjoy general approval." Steinbruner, "Confusing Ends and Means."

⁷⁸ See Gregory R. Treverton, "Intelligence: The Achilles Heel of the Bush Doctrine," *Arms Control Today* (July/August 2003).

⁷⁹ Colin Powell, quoted in Bill Sammon, *Misunderestimated: The President Battles Terrorism, John Kerry, and the Bush Haters* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004): 145-46.

⁸⁰ Hans Blix, "Report by the Chief Inspector for Biological and Chemical Arms," *New York Times*, 14 February 2003.

⁸¹ Sarah Lyall, "Britain Admits That Much of Its Report on Iraq Came From Magazines," *New York Times*, 8 February 2003.

⁸² David Albright, "The CIA's Aluminum Tubes' Assessment: Is the Nuclear Case Going Down the Tubes?" Institute for Science and International Security paper, 10 March 2003, <http://www.isis-online.org/publications/iraq/al_tubes.html>.

⁸³ See United States, Senate Select Intelligence Committee, *Report on the U.S. Intelligence Community's Prewar Assessments on Iraq*, July 2004, 245-250, <<http://intelligence.senate.gov/iraqreport2.pdf>>, and Bob Drogin, "The Conflict in Iraq: Spy Work in Iraq Riddled with Failures," *Los Angeles Times*, 17 June 2004, A1. For point-by-point analysis detailing the numerous claims in Secretary Powell's speech that stretched available intelligence data, see John Prados, *Hoodwinked: The Documents that Reveal How Bush Sold Us a War* (London: New Press, 2004), 207-236; and Charles J. Hanley, "Point by Point, a Look Back at a 'Thick' File," Associated Press Wire, 9 August 2003, Lexis-Nexis news wire database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>.

⁸⁴ A *Newsweek* poll showed that Powell's address boosted overall public support for the war by 10%. Notably, the poll also found that "60 per cent of Americans now say they would support military action, even if the inspectors do not find any evidence for weapons of mass destruction, as long as the Bush administration says U.S. intelligence indicates that the banned weapons are there" (David Rennie, "Powell

Boosts Support in U.S., *Daily Telegraph (London)*, 10 February 2003, Lexis-Nexis general news database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>. On the positive reaction to Powell's address by opinion leaders, see Moeller, "Media Coverage"; and Prados, *Hoodwinked*, 258.

⁸⁵ Stephen J. Hartnett and Laura A. Stengrim, "'The Whole Operation of Deception': Reconstructing President Bush's Rhetoric of Weapons of Mass Destruction," *Cultural Studies—Critical Methodologies* 4 (2004): 168.

⁸⁶ See Charles Duelfer, *Comprehensive Report of the Special Advisor to the DCI on Iraq's WMD*, 30 September 2004, <http://www.cia.gov/cia/reports/iraq_wmd_2004/>; United States, Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction, *Report to the President*, March 2005, <<http://www.wmd.gov/report/>>; and U.S. Senate Select Intelligence Committee, *Prewar Assessments*.

⁸⁷ See Katherine Shrader, "Senate Iraq Intelligence Probe Nears End," Associated Press Wire, 10 March 2005, Lexis-Nexis news wire database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.com>>.

⁸⁸ Elsewhere in this volume, Tom Goodnight quotes Antony J. Blinken's reference to the "Chicken Little effect." See Antony J. Blinken, "From Preemption to Engagement," *Survival* 45 (Winter 2003): 28.

⁸⁹ Richard Cheney, quoted in "Vice President Dick Cheney Discusses a Possible War with Iraq," *Meet the Press*, 16 March 2003, NBC News Transcripts, Lexis-Nexis news wire database, <<http://www.lexis-nexis.org>>.

⁹⁰ The "cakewalk" reference comes from Bush administration advisor Kenneth Adelman's op-ed, "Cakewalk in Iraq," *Washington Post*, 13 February 2002, A27. For an exhaustive summary of the Bush administration's efforts to eschew pre-war planning and punish those who disagreed with its rosy regime change scenarios, see James Fallows, "Blind into Baghdad," *Atlantic Monthly* (January/February 2004). The most dramatic example of this tendency involved Pentagon reaction to congressional testimony by Army Chief of Staff Gen. Erik Shinseki, who suggested in February 2003 that "several hundred thousand troops" might be needed for Operation Iraqi Freedom. In response to this claim, senior Bush officials rebuked Shinseki and categorically dismissed his estimates out of hand. See Michael E. O'Hanlon, "Iraq without a Plan," *Policy Review* (December 2004/January 2005): 33-45; and Larry Diamond, "What Went Wrong in Iraq," *Foreign Affairs* 83 (September/October 2004): 34-57.

⁹¹ "Secret Downing Street Memo."

⁹² This bifurcation was mandated in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. See *Congressional Record*, 7 December 2004, H10930-H10993.

⁹³ U.S. White House, "National Security Strategy."

⁹⁴ Condoleezza Rice, quoted in Steven R. Weisman, "Preemption: Idea With a Lineage Whose Time Has Come," *New York Times*, 23 March 2003.