The motives of the Bush administration to subvert the International Criminal Court were not limited solely to fears for personal security, nor are efforts to thwart the Court exclusive to this administration or political party. Motives to halt this direction in international accountability are underscored by basic tenets of political philosophy sounding in “American exceptionalism” common to both U.S. political parties. Under George W. Bush, this “exceptionalism” was advanced in a particularly caustic form by adherents of neoconservativism, a term pejoratively used to describe a political philosophy arguably brought to apogee during the Bush administration with the assistance and ministrations of several think tanks, including the American Enterprise Institute, the Cato Institute, the Heritage Foundation and the now defunct Project for a New American Century. Though typically classified as an extreme offshoot of conservative political philosophy, neoconservativism subscribes to massive increases in military spending, and in greatly expanding the American sphere of influence politically, economically and strategically. It calls for substantial cuts to social programs including social security and public assistance, privatization of public schools and other traditional government services as well as greatly curtailing government scrutiny of business with deregulation, union busting, lowering corporate taxes and encouraging the expansion of radical free market economics.

1 See American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) at http://www.aei.org/about/.
4 The Project for the New American Century has closed operations and the prior email address no longer functions but its last known address was 1150 17th Street NW, Suite 510 Washington, DC 20036 and last known email project@newamericancentury.org and website www.newamericancentury.org. More recently, it was announced that a new neo-conservative foreign policy group named the Foreign Policy Initiative (FPI) was created. It includes William Kristol, Robert Kagan and Dan Senor and has pushed for a U.S. “surge” in Afghanistan. Daniel Luban and Jim Lobe, Neo-Con Ideologues Launch New Foreign Policy Group, INTER PRESS SERVICE NEWS AGENCY, March 27, 2009, http://www.ipsnews.net/print.asp?idnews=46272 (last visited March 27, 2009).
Central to neoconservative philosophy are measures directed at maintaining U.S. military and economic supremacy abroad in order, some allege, to support U.S. consumption at unsustainable levels. This calls for a continuation of historic neocolonial and nationalistic models through resort to realpolitik and the maintenance of the so-called military industrial complex. Under a radical neoconservative interpretation, American exceptionalism has come to justify an international double standard where the U.S. holds a superior position among states and will not be bound by international law unless it serves the American interests. Such ideology fundamentally clashes with the transparency and oversight functions of the International Criminal Court, to say nothing of the principles of fundamental fairness. Other international criminal tribunals, in which the U.S. has played a role, represent a U.S. concession to the vitality of popular international human rights movements and help provide for U.S. “bragging rights” – but none of those courts concerned significant U.S. interests. Thus, the U.S. has had little to lose in supporting them.

The Bush administration’s hostility to the notion of an international criminal court was paramount and its efforts to strangle economic competition were obvious. Use of military and strategic techniques in the furtherance of economic goals included a

---


6 Author Andrew J. Bacevich discusses the lack of sustainability and the U.S. appetite for more. In a book chapter entitled “The Crisis of Profligacy,” Bacevich allows that, “[t]he ethic of self-gratification threatens the well-being of the United States. It does so not because Americans have lost touch with some mythical Puritan habits of hard work and self-abnegation, but because it saddles us with costly commitments abroad that we are increasingly ill-equipped to sustain while confronting us with dangers to which we have no ready response. As the prerequisites to the American way of life have grown, they have outstripped the means available to satisfy them. Americans of an earlier generation worried about bomber and missile gaps, both of which turned out to be fictitious. The present-day gap between requirements and the means available to satisfy those requirements is neither contrived nor imaginary. It is real and growing. This gap defines the crisis of American profligacy.” Andrew J. Bacevich, *The Limits Of Power, The End Of American Exceptionalism* 17 (2008).
