In James P. Pfiffner and Mark Phythian, eds. *Intelligence and National Security Policymaking on Iraq: British and American Perspectives* (UK: Manchester University Press, 2008), pp. 1-16.

Chapter One
Introduction: Policy-Making and Intelligence on Iraq

James P. Pfiffner & Mark Phythian

It is already clear that the 2003 Iraq war represents a seminal event in the history of the 21st century, the consequences of which will continue to influence the nature of international politics for years to come. In a US context, the war and its aftermath are set to become at least as significant to 21st century history as the Vietnam war, with which it has come to be regularly compared, was to that of the 20th.[1] Alongside the consequences of the war, the highly controversial decision to go to war in Iraq will be studied and debated well into the future.

This book is designed to help frame, facilitate and inform these debates. The decision to go to war in Iraq offers an excellent case study through which we can analyse the nature of national security decision-making, the foreign policy roles of the President and Prime Minister, the roles of Congress and Parliament, the role and limits of intelligence, the management of public opinion, and the ethics of humanitarian military intervention. The case is unusual for such a contemporary event in that much official documentation is publicly available, allowing students to gain a nuanced understanding of both the process of going to war in Iraq and the making and implementation of national security policy in the US and UK.

Parallels between President Bush and Prime Minister Blair

At the outset it is useful to highlight a number of the most striking parallels and connections between the Bush Administration in the US and the Blair government in the UK in making and sustaining the case for war in Iraq during 2002-03. Both leaders committed themselves to the probability of war with Iraq early in 2002, and each remained firmly committed despite broad international skepticism about the need for war. Blair's commitment to regime change was a direct response to post-11 September 2001 (9/11) developments in the Bush Administration's approach to the problem of Iraq. In both countries the decision to go to war drew on – or, at least, was taken in the context of – separate yet intersecting debates. In the US this context was provided by neo-conservative intellectuals in or around the Bush Administration, while in the UK the debate concerned the possibilities and limits of humanitarian military intervention.

The changing nature of executive leadership in the US and UK provides a further useful point of comparison. A marked trend in British politics over recent decades has been an increasing presidentialization of government. This has resulted in greater political control being centered in the prime minister himself and his personal entourage. This parallels a trend in the US over the past fifty years of centralized control of executive branch policy-making in the White House office as opposed to the rest of the departments and agencies of the government.

Part of this trend in the US involved the marginalization of cabinet secretaries, even though they are appointed by the president because of their political loyalty and policy agreement with him. Younger and more politically attuned White House staffers came to dominate policy-making and wield the most power in presidential administrations. In the UK, the Cabinet had traditionally formed a collective deliberative body in which the prime minister was first among equals, and where policy emerged after informed consultation and debate, based on discussion of detailed position papers specially prepared for it. However, as various former members have attested, under Blair the Cabinet was shunted to the sidelines in policy-making in general, and national security policy in particular. It is not the case that Iraq rarely featured on the Cabinet agenda, rather that Cabinet was merely informed of developments and not involved as a policy-making body. Debate was not encouraged. For example, former Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, by this time demoted to the post of Leader of the House, recalled in his diaries a Cabinet meeting of 28th February 2002 at which Home Secretary David Blunkett, one of the most senior members of the Cabinet, and Cook asked for a Cabinet debate on Iraq. This was held the following week, when Cook recorded in his diaries: "A momentous event. A real discussion at Cabinet…For the first time I can recall in five years, Tony was out on a limb."[2] However, rather than seek to sum up the balance of a discussion that, on the basis of Cook's account, opposed the prime ministerial line on Iraq, Blair concluded the meeting by simply reiterating the rationale underpinning the existing approach. Moreover, leaks to newspapers over the next few days from sources close to the Prime Minister had the effect of undermining Cook's position and served as a disincentive for other Cabinet colleagues to continue their dissent.[3]

As Chapter Five outlines, key decisions relating to Iraq were taken outside of Cabinet by a small group of (unelected) advisers operating within what amounted to a Prime Minister's Department in Downing Street, often in ad hoc meetings at which no minutes were taken. In the US, President Bush relied very heavily on Vice President Dick Cheney, National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld for advice on war. Secretary of State Colin Powell was sidelined by the White House staff and seen as not being a loyal team member, despite his being the only person at high levels in the Bush administration to have combat experience, in addition to his career in the military.

Experience and scholarship have agreed that an orderly policy process for decision making, particularly about war, can help a leader get the most informed advice possible.[4] Experience has shown that it is important for leaders to listen to advice from several different, often conflicting, directions in order to be best informed when making crucial

decisions. However, the Bush administration was different from most other recent administrations in its lack of a formal policy development process. In addition to the lack of orderly process, President Bush did not deliberate with his top advisors in any one meeting in which the pros and cons of going to war with Iraq were deliberated. His decision-making was seriatim and disjointed; his initial inclination to go to war went forward in a cascading fashion, without formal deliberations about whether going to war was a wise thing to do.[5] As former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency George Tenet wrote in his memoirs: "There was never a serious debate that I know of within the administration about the imminence of the Iraqi threat", nor even "a significant discussion" about options for continuing to contain Iraq.[6] In the UK case, as well as bypassing Cabinet as a consultative body, the small group of advisers around Blair operated independently of Foreign Office advice. A former diplomat who worked on Iraq, Carne Ross, has spoken of a, "subtle and creeping politicisation of the diplomatic service, whereby in order to get promoted one has to show oneself as being sympathetic to, and identifying with, the views of Ministers - in particular the Prime Minister…Decision-making powers have become increasingly concentrated in No 10 rather than the Foreign Office, and the Foreign Office has become subsidiary to No 10."[7]

All of this means that in the cases of both Bush and Blair it is very difficult to identify the precise point at which they became committed to regime change in Iraq. For President Bush, the point seems to be somewhere around the time of the 2002 State of the Union address, for Prime Minister Blair shortly thereafter. By March, memoranda to and from Downing Street staffers were referring to Blair's commitment to regime change, although his Cabinet remained unaware of this. Senior Cabinet members were aware by the summer of 2002, although those Cabinet members thought most likely to be resistant were kept in the dark well into the final months of 2002. Both men knew what they wanted, and their top aides worked to make this happen. Skeptics were shunted aside.

There were also clear parallels in the way in which intelligence was used to sell the case for war. As chapters twelve and thirteen argue, in the US intelligence was used selectively to support the president's decision to go to war, and the intelligence was in some ways politicized. The Bush administration selectively leaked information to the press, which faithfully reported it with little skeptical analysis.[8] Intelligence findings were "cherry picked" to present to the public the most alarming allegations about Iraqi capabilities and intentions in order to support the drive to war. Systematically misleading implications were drawn by the top levels of the Bush administration about a purported link between Saddam and al Qaeda, and about Saddam's supposed nuclear capacity. Even after claims of either an Iraqi link to the events of 9/11 or more general Saddam-al Qaeda co-operation were conclusively rejected by official enquiries on both sides of the Atlantic, senior figures in the Bush and Blair administrations continued to refer or allude to them. They wanted to legitimize a war for which there was declining public support, despite their best efforts to manage public opinion. In both cases the Iraq war will dominate their historical legacies.

Similarly intelligence in the UK was presented to the public in a misleading way so as to generate support for Prime Minister Blair's decision to support the Bush Administration's

strategy of regime change. Intelligence was selectively leaked or "sexed up" in order to provide support for Blair's and Bush's charges about Saddam. The high water mark of this approach came with the publication in September 2002 of a dossier incorporating what turned out to be faulty intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programmes. This was prepared for publication by Downing Street and presented a suitably alarming portrayal of Iraqi capabilities and intent. Within eighteen months the intelligence underpinning all of the most alarming claims had been withdrawn by the foreign intelligence service, MI6, because it was unreliable.

After the war, several official investigations were conducted in both countries to determine why there had been such an enormous intelligence failure. In the US, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI), controlled by the Republicans, investigated and concluded that the intelligence process had failed and no inappropriate pressure had been placed on the intelligence community by the Bush administration. Subsequently, an independent commission, the Robb-Silberman Commission, was appointed by President Bush to examine the intelligence process leading up to the war. As with the SSCI report, the Commission found that the intelligence agencies had failed and that the Bush administration was innocent of any policy or analytic failures. Upon close reading, however, both reports provided considerable evidence that much of the intelligence failure was due to the way in which the intelligence was used by policy makers, rather than to failures at the professional levels of the organizations comprising the intelligence community.

By July 2004 four separate UK investigations had considered the use of intelligence before the Iraq war. The first, by the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee can be considered no more than a partial investigation because of the government's refusal to co-operate. A judicial inquiry conducted by Lord Hutton which considered the accuracy of claims contained in the September 2002 dossier, exonerated the government of any bad faith, although it subsequently transpired that it had not been informed of all relevant developments. The third inquiry, by the Intelligence and Security Committee - a quasi-parliamentary committee answerable to the Prime Minister and designed to provide a limited degree of oversight of the intelligence and security agencies – similarly absolved the government of bad faith, albeit in at times rather qualified language, although it emerged that it too had not had access to the full intelligence picture in carrying out its inquiry. Finally, the Butler Inquiry was the most critical of the four, although it too exonerated any individual of responsibility for the failures it identified. In both countries, these inquiries suggested the inability of the politicians who undertook them to rise clearly above party political considerations where significant criticism of their party leader could have electoral consequences, or even bring about a change of government. With the exception of the Hutton inquiry in the UK, by their very nature all of these reports were the product of negotiation and compromise between committee or inquiry members.

The formal conclusions of these inquiries provided decision-makers in the US and UK with an alibi for a course of action that proved disastrous for many Iraqis, leading to the deaths of between 60-70,000 by May 2007. The war also proved highly costly for the US

and UK in financial and human terms, created an environment in which terrorism – both inside Iraq and more widely – flourished, and acted as a spur to suicide bombings in London. President John F. Kennedy had reflected in the wake of the 1961 Bay of Pigs debacle that victory has a hundred fathers, but defeat is an orphan. In the case of Iraq, decision-makers sought to share the blame liberally, in particular by pinning it on the intelligence communities. Hence, in the US, the publication of George Tenet's memoirs was met by a White House spokesman's assurance that: "The president made the decision to remove Saddam Hussein for a number of reasons, mainly the National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq and Saddam Hussein's own actions, and only after a thorough and lengthy assessment of all available information as well as Congressional authorization."[9] Similarly, in the UK, the blame was heaped on the intelligence community, as when Prime Minister Blair told the 2004 Labour Party Conference, "the problem is, I can apologise for the information that turned out to be wrong, but I can't, sincerely at least, apologise for removing Saddam."[10] Trade and Industry Secretary Patricia Hewitt, a member of a Cabinet denied a full role in the decision-making process that led to war, repeated this formula, telling a television audience: "All of us who were involved in making an incredibly difficult decision are very sorry and do apologise for the fact that that information was wrong."[11] Similarly, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Falconer, told the *Today* radio programme that Blair, "has made it absolutely clear that he is sorry about the sorts of issue – the information issue, the 45-minute issue – he is very sorry about that…We know the intelligence on which it was based is flawed and we are sorry about that."[12]

A further point of comparison concerns the roles of the respective legislatures, Congress and Parliament, in the war decision. Although President Bush maintained that he did not need the approval of Congress in order for him to attack Iraq, he knew that it would be useful politically if he did ask for their support. Many constitutional scholars, however, believed that he was required to go to Congress for authorization to go to war, because the Constitution vests the power to declare war in Congress.[13] In August 2002 the Bush administration argued that the 1991 resolution authorizing President George H.W. Bush to initiate the Gulf War extended to his son's initiating war with Iraq in 2002 or 2003. Although the president subsequently agreed to consult with members of Congress before going to war, he did not concede that he needed their approval or a formal declaration of war.

Bush was very skillful in the use of his political power in persuading Congress to grant him authority to take the country to war. The administration's public campaign heated up with Vice President Cheney's speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention on August 26, 2002 [See excerpts in Appendix A]. Cheney's strong speech argued that Saddam Hussein had chemical and biological weapons and was reconstituting his nuclear weapons capacity. Next, the administration leaked the purported evidence for Saddam's nuclear activity, claiming that a large shipment of aluminum tubes bound for Iraq was intended to be used as nuclear centrifuges.

On 11th September 2002, the first anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, President Bush gave a nation-wide speech warning of the danger posed by Iraq. The next day in his address to

the United Nations President Bush framed the issue as one of credibility for the UN and the need for its many resolutions to be enforced. Citing "flagrant violations" by Saddam Hussein, Bush declared that "we have been more than patient. . . .The conduct of the Iraqi regime is a threat to the authority of the United Nations and a threat to peace." Arguing that the UN could not afford to become "irrelevant," he urged the passage of a tough resolution that would threaten Saddam with military action if he did not give up his weapons of mass destruction. "We cannot stand by and do nothing while dangers gather. We must stand up for our security and for the permanent rights and the hopes of mankind."[14]

On 1st October, the National Intelligence Estimate concerning Iraq (see Chapter 4 for a critique) was given to Congress, and it contained alarming assertions about Iraq's WMD capacity. A White Paper containing the most disturbing claims of the NIE but none of the cautioning language or dissents, was released to the public. In anticipation of the upcoming congressional vote on a resolution authorizing war with Iraq, the President made a speech to the nation from Cincinnati on 7th October 2002 in which he explained the need for the authorization to take military action. He outlined the capacity and intentions of Saddam Hussein in dire tones, and made his strongest case for war with Iraq (see excerpts in Appendix A). The president made the case that America was vulnerable to terrorist attack and that a hostile regime in Iraq might be willing to share its CBN [chemical, biological, nuclear] technology with terrorists. Thus the US had to act preemptively to prevent this from happening.

Not everyone agreed that the threat from Saddam was as immediate as the president argued. In a letter to SSCI chair Senator Bob Graham (D-Fl), CIA Director Tenet said that, in the judgment of the CIA, the probability of Saddam initiating an attack on the United States "in the foreseeable future, given the conditions we understand now, the likelihood I think would be low." But if faced with a "use or lose" situation, Saddam would likely use his weapons. "Baghdad for now appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks with conventional or C.B.W. [chemical and biological weapons] against the United States. . . . Should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he probably would become much less constrained in adopting terrorist actions."[15]

Critics of the administration's war plans argued that a US attack would likely precipitate the use of the chemical and biological weapons that the US feared. They also felt that the negative consequences of a US invasion of Iraq would outweigh the benefits of stopping Saddam's efforts to obtain nuclear weapons and that Saddam could be contained. But President Bush's arguments were sufficient to persuade a majority of Congress to vote for an authorizing resolution.

The Democrats were in a difficult political situation. Many of them were skeptical of granting the president authority to take the country to war with Iraq, but they knew that he was persuasive with a narrow majority of the American public in arguing that war was necessary. In addition, congressional elections were coming up in the next month in which all of the House of Representatives was up for election and one third of the Senate.

The Democrats did not want to run for reelection with their Republican opponents calling them 'soft' on Saddam and terrorism. Although some of the Democrats were truly convinced that war was necessary, others voted for the authorization for war because they wanted to defuse the war issue and campaign on domestic issues, in which the Democrats considered themselves to have an advantage.

Although there was a debate in Congress and statements by those supporting and opposing the resolution, there was never much doubt about the outcome, and the debate lacked the drama of the deliberation in 1991 over the Gulf War resolution. A number of Democrats voted for the resolution from fear that a negative vote could be used against them in the upcoming elections. The Democratic leadership, Majority Leader of the Senate Tom Daschle and House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt, voted for the measure. The resolution passed in the House by 296 to 133, with 6 Republicans and 126 Democrats (and one independent) voting against it. In the Senate the resolution passed 77 to 23, with 21 Democrats, one Republican, and one Independent voting against it. The president had managed to persuade former critics of war with Iraq, Senators Hagel, Lugar, and Kerry and Representative Richard Army to vote for the resolution.

The final resolution, which was passed by the House on October 10 and by the Senate on 11th October, was very similar to the draft resolution proposed by the White House. After detailing Iraq's refusal to comply with UN resolutions on weapons inspections and noting that members of al Qaeda were in Iraq, the resolution stated: "The president is authorized to use the armed forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate, in order to: (1) defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and (2) enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."[16]

Although it faces significant practical difficulties in making it felt, the US Congress enjoys far greater formal power over the decision to commit troops to war than does the UK Parliament. In the UK, the power to declare war is exercised by the Prime Minister under the terms of the Royal Prerogative – an arrangement dating back to the 1689 Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights transferred many powers to Parliament, but the war power remained with the Crown. Because the power was handed down from monarch to Prime Minister, and because the Prime Minister wields this power on behalf of the Crown, there is no formal role for Parliament.

However, Labour Party backbenchers have been voicing anxieties about the implications of this position since at least the time of the 1982 Falklands war. At this time the only way in which they could register their opposition to imminent war was through the unsatisfactory procedural device of a vote on an adjournment motion, rather than a vote on a substantive motion.[17] Calls for Parliament to play a more substantive role grew in subsequent years, most notably in relation to the war over Kosovo. In the case of Iraq, Robin Cook, as Leader of the House, played a key role in persuading the government to grant Parliament a vote on the war, in which he was supported by Foreign Secretary Jack Straw. In part, Cook's argument was based on the fact that the US Congress was to vote on the war, so why not the UK Parliament? At this time – the latter part of 2002 – the

government's strategy was still to secure a specific UN Security Council resolution to legitimize the coming war, and substantive motions for parliamentary debate could be framed around support for the UN in enforcing Iraqi compliance with its resolutions. On this basis, a debate on a motion affirming the government's support for UN Security Council resolution 1441 on 25th November 2002 ended with 85, mainly Labour, Members of Parliament (MPs), approximately an eighth of all MPs, voting against the government.

The government's commitment to seeking a legitimizing vote in Parliament involved a manageable risk if the hoped-for UN Security Council resolution was forthcoming, but once it became clear it was not, MPs would be voting on whether to take Britain to war without a UN mandate. For a party within which support for the UN was a core principle of foreign policy, and which had played a role in the creation of the UN during the 1945 Attlee government, this was bound to prove highly divisive.[18] Hence, Labour MPs had to be convinced of the Iraqi threat, and here the flawed intelligence and exaggerations in threat presentation played a significant role in winning Parliament's support for the war. Still, in the final debate of 18th March 2003, where Parliament voted to commit British forces to war without UN authorization, 139 Labour MPs voted for an amendment to the motion stating that the case for war had still to be established – the largest rebellion by government backbenchers in 150 years.[19] If Blair had lost the vote he may well have had no choice but to do what his supporters told wavering Labour MPs he would do if he lost – that is, resign. Hence, although the flawed intelligence that underpinned the government's case for war may have had little significance in terms of the government's war decision, it was much more important in terms of the vital parliamentary vote and the future of Blair's prime ministership.

Nevertheless, the vote of 18th March 2003 set a precedent that it will prove difficult to move away from, establishing for Parliament a formal role in approving the deployment of British forces in war situations. Moreover, the government's manipulation of the case for war may well result in greater parliamentary skepticism in the future, and a determination not to get fooled again. However, as the history of the US Congress in relation to matters of war suggests, legislatures are poorly equipped to challenge the exercise of executive power in this area.

The Structure of the Book

The book is divided into five sections. The first examines the intellectual frameworks within which the case for war in Iraq was developed in the US and UK. In Chapter Two, John Dumbrell analyses the neo-conservative roots of the decision to go to war. He traces the evolution of neo-conservative thinking on foreign and security policy issues, highlighting the complexity of, and potential contradictions within, neo-conservative thought. By the 1990s the neo-cons had an influential base in the Project for a New American Century that called for military action to overthrow Saddam Hussein's regime. Signatories to this programme – including Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, and John Bolton – would go on to secure important positions in the Bush Administration, from which, post-9/11, they could make the case for the necessity of military action. However, the extent to which neo-conservatives 'captured' the Bush Administration is still keenly

debated, and Dumbrell cautions that, while they undoubtedly played an important role, their significance to the decision to go to war in Iraq can be overstated.

In the UK the Blair government presented the case for war in Iraq as being in part a continuation of the humanitarian military interventionism it had increasingly pursued since coming into office. In particular, in 1999 the Blair government had committed British forces to a war over Kosovo without UN approval, but within the framework of NATO. In Chapter Three, Jim Whitman analyses the humanitarian intervention rationale that was developed in the context of the Kosovo campaign, Blair's presentation of it, and the case of Iraq. The question of whether Iraq represents a genuine case of humanitarian intervention remains highly controversial.[20] Whitman focuses on the essentially post-facto nature of this justification, emphasizes the damage the Iraq war has inflicted on the non-interventionist norm, considers the impact of the war on the authority of the UN, and the implications for future international order. In doing so, this chapter engages in important debates about the ethics, merits, risks and legality of humanitarian military intervention and, by extension, of the legality of the Iraq war itself.

The second part of the book looks at the parallel processes through which the Bush administration and Blair government constructed their cases for war, analyzing similarities and divergences in approach. Both faced considerable opposition which they sought to overcome, in part, by the public use of secret intelligence. In Chapter Four James Pfiffner analyzes the arguments for war with Iraq put forward by President Bush and his top aides. He concludes that top administration members did not lie outright, but that they did systematically mislead the country about Saddam's nuclear capacity and the "link" between Saddam and al Qaeda. Pfiffner says that the intelligence on chemical and biological weapons in Iraq was outdated and exaggerated, but that most allied intelligence agencies agreed that Saddam had them, so the Bush administration cannot be faulted for agreeing with most other nations.

In Chapter Five, Mark Phythian analyses the background to the Blair government's decision to go to war, focusing on the chronology underpinning the decision as revealed by official inquiries and leaked documents, and discussing the relationship between intelligence and policy-making in this case. He also considers the extent to which the increased presidentialization of British politics created the space in which the war decision was taken, and the failure of the Cabinet to adequately challenge the Prime Minister as he developed his pro-war case. The US and UK were not the only countries where the case for war proved controversial. In Australia, the government of John Howard strongly supported the Bush-Blair approach, and similarly engaged in a campaign to secure public support for its own military involvement. As Rodney Tiffen shows in Chapter Six, Australia enjoyed both the political luxuries and liabilities of being a junior ally. It did not have to take on the central responsibility for the conduct and outcome of the conflict. Nor did it have to make a military commitment on the same scale, or suffer as many casualties. Moreover, there was political benefit to be gained from proclaiming conformity with the country's two most traditionally important allies. On the other hand, it was captive to decisions made in Washington and London, which it was almost powerless to affect. It also relied on its two senior allies for most of its

intelligence on the Middle East, and its policy-making was therefore to some extent dependent on the quality of information it was being supplied with. This chapter analyses this relationship over Iraq and the issues raised by Australia's reliance on the US and UK for intelligence.

In Chapter Seven public opinion expert John Mueller examines how the Bush administration tried to manage public opinion in support of its war policies. Although a small majority of Americans had favored going to war with Iraq since 2000, (support stayed within 5 points of 55%, except for short spikes right after 9/11 and after Colin Powell's speech to the UN), the administration was not able to improve those numbers as war approached. Once the war was underway and casualties increased with the rise of the insurgency, public support began to erode, and after several years solid majorities of the American public thought the war had been a mistake.

One of the most significant aspects of the war in Iraq was the scale of the intelligence failure leading up to it. The nature of intelligence failure is a keenly debated topic within the field of intelligence studies, but never before have students of intelligence had available to them so much primary documentation from so recent and significant a case from which they can analyze the issue. Parts Three and Four provide a range of analyses that consider the loci of the intelligence failure over Iraq, the lessons for the intelligence communities, and the degree to which the decision to go to war in Iraq represented a policy rather than, or as well as, an intelligence failure. Richard Kerr, a former Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, along with several colleagues, conducted a post-mortem analysis on the intelligence process before the war in Iraq. In the unclassified analysis in Chapter Eight, they conclude that the judgments of the intelligence community were "seriously flawed, misleading, and even wrong." Part of the reason for this was that the intelligence relied upon by the agencies was collected prior to 1998 and was not updated with more recent evidence. Ironically, they conclude that where the intelligence community was correct (about the absence of a link between Saddam and al Qaeda), the Bush administration applied pressure for changes. But where the intelligence community was wrong (about WMD), no pressure was applied because the intelligence supported the policy preferences of the administration.

In Chapter Nine intelligence scholar Robert Jervis takes a longer range and more detached view of the intelligence process in the US. Jervis argues that policy-makers in all administrations say that they want better intelligence, but in fact they do not. Policy makers get frustrated with good intelligence analysis because it is often couched in careful terms and seldom presents clear and simple answers. He concludes that the usual response to intelligence failures is to reform the process, just as the US reorganized its intelligence community, but that these efforts are often futile because the fundamental problem is embodied in the different purposes of policy makers and intelligence professionals.

Intelligence scholar and former congressional intelligence staff member Loch Johnson in Chapter Ten looks at how Congress dealt with intelligence before the war. His analysis centers around why Congress, which is supposed to oversee the executive branch and

hold it accountable for accomplishing the goals set out in legislation, failed to realize the faulty nature of the intelligence that the administration relied upon in taking the country to war. Johnson argues that lawmakers have varied and different approaches to the oversight of the intelligence community, and that while some take an appropriately skeptical but supportive stance toward the intelligence community, most others do not have the motivation to put their limited energy and time into intelligence oversight. Thus Congress as a whole failed to do its job with respect to the use of intelligence before the Iraq war.

In Chapter Eleven, Mark Phythian complements the analyses of US pre-war intelligence failures contained in parts three and four by analysing what post-war inquiries have revealed about the nature of the failure in the UK case. The focus of the chapter is twofold – firstly, to consider the extent of and reasons for the UK intelligence failure over Iraq and, secondly, to assess the effectiveness of the different forms of inquiry into aspects of pre-war intelligence in explaining how the UK came to go to war on what Robin Cook famously termed a "false prospectus".

In Chapter Twelve James Pfiffner looks at the decision-making process of the Bush administration in the year before the war in Iraq. He argues that the process was minimal and that it was non-deliberative, sequential, and informal. He links the poor use of intelligence before the war to the faulty policy development process. President Bush failed to heed the advice of career professionals in the agencies of the government and relied instead on those close aides who agreed with him about Iraq. Thus the US went to war based on faulty intelligence and unprepared for the lengthy occupation after the initial combat phase was concluded.

Paul Pillar spent his career in the CIA and was the top intelligence official in the intelligence community responsible for the Near East and South Asia from 2000 to 2005. He was thus a major participant in the intelligence process from the career professional side during the time leading up to the Iraq war. That is why his criticisms of the Bush administration in Chapter Thirteen are so credible and important. Pillar charges the Bush administration with ignoring professional intelligence when it did not support its policy views, misusing intelligence in its attempt to build support for the war, and politicizing the intelligence process during the run-up to the war.

The volume concludes with part five, which provides excerpts from a number of speeches and documents which are key to understanding the nature of national security decision-making and intelligence failure in this case and which are referred to in the preceding chapters.

---

[1] See, for example, John Dumbrell & David Ryan (eds.), *Vietnam in Iraq: Tactics, Lessons, Legacies and Ghosts* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2007).

[2] Robin Cook, *The Point of Departure* (London, Simon & Schuster, 2003), p.115.

[3] Ibid, pp.120-1.

[4] See for example, John Burke and Fred Greenstein, *How Presidents Test Reality: Decisions on Vietnam, 1954 and 1965* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1991). Alexander George, 'The Case for Multiple Advocacy in Making Foreign Policy', *American Political Science Review.* Vol. 66 No. 3, 1972; and *Presidential Decisionmaking in Foreign Policy* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1980).

[5] See also, James P. Pfiffner, 'The First MBA President: George W. Bush as Public Administrator', *Public Administration Review*, Jan/Feb. 2007, pp.6-20.

[6] Scott Shane & Mark Mazzetti, 'Ex-CIA Chief, in Book, Assails Cheney on Iraq', *New York Times*, 27 Apr. 2007.

[7] Carne Ross: Minutes of Evidence, Foreign Affairs Committee, 8 Nov. 2006, http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmfaff/167/6110805.htm He went on to say that; "policy making in the run-up to the Iraq war was extremely poor, in that available alternatives to war were not properly considered, the presentation to the public of the intelligence on weapons of mass destruction was manipulated, and proper legal advice from the Foreign Office on the legality of the war was ignored." Ibid.

[8] On this, see Chaim Kaufmann, 'Threat Inflation and the Failure of the Marketplace of Ideas: The Selling of the Iraq War', *International Security*, Vol.29 No.1 Summer 2004, pp.5-48.

[9] Shane & Mazzetti, 'Ex-CIA Chief, in Book, Assails Cheney on Iraq'.

[10] Tony Blair's Speech to the Labour Party Conference, 28 Sep. 2004. at http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/36

[11] BBC News, 'Ministers 'Sorry' For Iraq Error', 8 Oct. 2004., at http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/37

[12] *Today*, Radio 4, 13 Oct. 2004. Cited in *The Independent*, 14 Oct. 2004.

[13] See for example, Louis Fisher, *Presidential War Power* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1995); Harold Hongju Koh, *The National Security Constitution: Sharing Power After the Iran-Contra Affair* (New Haven, CT:Yale University Press, 1990).

[14] President's Remarks to the Nation, Ellis Island, New York, 11th Sep. 2002, White House website.

[15] CIA Letter to Senate on Baghdad's Intentions, October 7, 2002. Reprinted on GlobalSecurity.org at: http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/news/iraq/2002/iraq-021007-cia01.htm.

[16] Public Law 107-243-16 October, 2002, Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002. Available at: http://www.cspan.org/resources/pdf/hjres114.pdf.

[17] See, Robin Cook, *The Point of Departure*, pp.189-90 for a description of this device.

[18] On this foreign policy tradition, see Mark Phythian, *The Labour Party, War and International Relations, 1945-2006* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2007).

[19] Philip Cowley, *The Rebels: How Blair Mislaid His Majority* (London, Politico's, 2005), p.123.

[20] For example, Human Rights Watch's Kenneth Roth has argued that the invasion of Iraq failed to meet the test of a humanitarian intervention. Kenneth Roth, 'War in Iraq: Not a Humanitarian Intervention', 2004, http://hrw.org/wr2k4/3.htm. That it was is argued in Thomas Cushman (ed.), *A Matter of Principle: Humanitarian Arguments for*

War in Iraq (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2005).