

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
AMAR THELIDJI UNIVERSITY OF LAGHOUAT
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH



The U.S Foreign Policy in the Middle East post 9/11
Case study: Iraq war 2003

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for a Master Degree in Language, Literature and
Civilization**

Submitted by:

ACHOUR ABDEKADER

HILOUFA MOHAMED NADIR

Supervised by:

Mr. NEBEG RAOUF

2018/2019

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A special and heartfelt note of gratitude must go to my supervisor
Mr. Nebeg Raouf for his valuable guidance, precious advice,
and constructive criticism.

I wish to thank my family for their constant support and encouragement.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the members of the jury for
their unrelenting assistance and notably for the time they devoted to
me all through this year of research.

I am equally thankful to my colleagues at the level of Civilization &
Literature class.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all people who in a way
or another backed me up.

DEDICATION

Abdel Kader:

To the memory of my father

Possibly no words could accurately convey my profound gratitude and heartfelt thankfulness for my dear family, Remain unmatched in their incomparable sacrifices, deepest love, boundless patience, and chiefly greatest encouragement.

Mohammed Nadir:

I would like to dedicate this work to all our beloved ones who have shared us our hard times: to our parents, brothers, and sisters.

Abstract

The foreign policy of the United States is the policy by which the United States deals with foreign countries. The U.S. is still considered as the only superpower in the world. The main objective of the U.S. foreign policy is to create a secure and democratic world for all the American people and international community. This study undertakes to examine the United States foreign policy in the Middle East after the incident of September 11, 2001 and what are the main reasons that led to the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Many politicians, scholars and journalists argue that there is a clear discrepancy between claimed U.S. ideals and its actions; that human rights, justice and self-determination are victims of national interests and that restoring things to what's right is all that matters U.S. foreign policy. This research seeks to investigate whether U.S. foreign policy towards the Middle East after 9/11 including the invasion of Iraq was a reaction to that incident. The thesis is based on two assumptions; the U.S. professes high standards and acts in double standards, and the U.S pretends to export its values but basically seeks to extend its rule more broadly in order to preserve the privileges gained after the collapse of the USSR. In an attempt to uncover the underlying causes of the U.S. foreign policy, we took Iraq war as case study. This work uses the present study to compare the agenda of American democracy with its real interests. In addition, this work uses a historical research approach to provide a comprehensive analysis. One of the main findings of this research is that the claims made by the Bush administration to wage wars on Afghanistan and Iraq proved to be illusory. The US military and foreign policies are causing chaos. . Eventually, the thesis looks into the severe violations on the right of Iraqis and aims at clarifying and uncover the oil cartels' greed, consequently, reaching the real ends behind the war on Iraq. The only way for America to reduce the negative image and restore the world's confidence in it and to respect its foreign policy again is to get rid of egoism and its self-serving attitude, and to stand on the same distance between all parties - Muslims and Jews - stop the use of power and believe in a world shared with others so as not to be dominated.

Résumé

La politique des affaires étrangères des États-Unis est une politique avec laquelle l'États-Unis s'occupe des affaires des pays étrangers. L'États-Unis considérée comme le seul super pouvoir dans le monde. L'objectif principal de cette politique est de créer un monde sécurisé et démocratique pour le peuple américain et la communauté internationale. Cette étude entreprend d'examiner cette politique dans le Moyen-Orient après l'incidence de 11 septembre 2001, et les principales raisons qui ont abouti à l'invasion de l'Irak en 2003. Plusieurs politiciens, savants et journalistes argumentent que il existe une véritable contradiction entre les idées des États-Unis et ses actions. Les droits de l'homme, la justice et l'autodétermination sont les victimes de l'intérêt national et restaurer les choses à un état de quoi qui est juste est considéré pour la politique étrangère des États-Unis. Cette recherche prend d'investir est-ce que la politique des affaires étrangères des États-Unis dans moyen Orient après 11 septembre en incluant l'invasion d'Irak en 2003 était une réaction de cette incidence ? La thèse est basée sur deux suppositions : les États-Unis professe des normes élevées et agit avec double standards, et l'Etats-Unis prétend d'exporter ses valeurs mais à la base elle cherche d'étendre ses règles largement pour garder et préserver les privilèges gagnés après le collapsus de USSR, Pour essayer de révéler les causes principales des la politique étrangère des États-Unis on a pris la guerre de l'Irak comme cas d'étude Ce travail utilise les études présentes pour comparer les agendas de la démocratie américaine et ses intérêts réels On plus on a utilisé dans ce travail l'approche de recherche historique pour donner des analyses compréhensives L'UN de principaux résultats de ce recherche est : les arguments de gouvernement de Bush pour financer la guerre d'Irak et la guerre d'Afghanistan sont prouvés qu'ils étaient irréels. La politique étrangère des États-Unis et son armé causent de chaos Éventuellement, cette thèse prend en considération les violations sévères de peuple iraquien et vise d'éclairer et révéler le glouton des cartels pétroliers. En conséquence chercher les fins réels derrière la guerre d'Irak , et le seul moyen pour l'États-Unis pour réduire l'image négative et restaurer la confiance mondiale , et le respect pour sa politique étrangère est de se débarrasser de son égoïsme et la recherche que ses intérêts attitude. Et rester a distance égale entre les différents partie -les musulmans et les juifs- , l'arrêt d'utilisation de pouvoir et croire en monde partagé avec les autres et comme ne pas être dominé.

ملخص

السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة هي السياسة التي تتعامل بها الولايات المتحدة مع الدول الأجنبية. بما أن الولايات المتحدة تعتبر القوة العظمى الوحيدة في العالم. وبالتالي، فإن الهدف الرئيسي للسياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة هو خلق عالم آمن وديمقراطي لجميع الشعب الأمريكي والمجتمع الدولي. تتعهد هذه الدراسة بدراسة السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة في الشرق الأوسط بعد حادثة 11 سبتمبر 2001 والكشف عن الأسباب الرئيسية التي أدت إلى غزو العراق عام 2003. يجادل العديد من السياسيين والعلماء والصحفيين بوجود تباين واضح بين المثل الأمريكية المزعومة وأفعالها؛ أن حقوق الإنسان والعدالة وتقرير المصير هم ضحايا للمصالح الوطنية وأن استعادة الأمور إلى ما هو صحيح هو كل ما يهم السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة. يسعى هذا البحث إلى معرفة ما إذا كانت السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة تجاه الشرق الأوسط بعد 11 سبتمبر بما في ذلك غزو العراق كانت بمثابة رد فعل على هذا الحادث. تستند الرسالة إلى افتراضين؛ تجدر الإشارة إلى أن الولايات المتحدة تتعهد بمعايير عالية وتتصرف بمقاييس مزدوجة، وتظهر الولايات المتحدة بتصدير قيمها ولكنها تسعى أساساً إلى تمديد حكمها على نطاق أوسع من أجل الحفاظ على الامتيازات المكتسبة بعد انهيار الاتحاد السوفيتي. وفي محاولة للكشف عن الأسباب الأساسية للسياسة الخارجية الأمريكية، أخذنا حرب العراق كدراسة حالة. يستخدم هذا العمل الدراسة الحالية لمقارنة أجندة الديمقراطية الأمريكية بمصالحها الحقيقية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يستخدم هذا العمل منهج البحث التاريخي لتقديم تحليل شامل. أحد النتائج الرئيسية لهذا البحث هو أن ادعاءات إدارة بوش بشأن حروب على أفغانستان والعراق أثبتت أنها وهمية. وإن سياسات الولايات المتحدة العسكرية والخارجية تسبب الفوضى. في النهاية، تنتظر الأطروحة إلى الانتهاكات الجسيمة لحقوق العراقيين وتهدف إلى توضيح وكشف جشع عصابات النفط، وبالتالي الوصول إلى الغايات الحقيقية وراء الحرب على العراق. إن الطريقة الوحيدة لأمريكا لتقليص الصورة السلبية واستعادة ثقة العالم بها واحترام سياستها الخارجية مرة أخرى هي التخلص من الأنانية وموقفها المتمثل في خدمة الذات، والوقوف على نفس المسافة بين جميع الأطراف -المسلمين ويهود-توقف عن استخدام القوة وتؤمن بعالم مشترك مع الآخرين حتى لا يتم السيطرة عليهم .

ABM: Anti –Ballistic Missile

ACDA: Arm Control and Disarmament Agency

AEI: American Enterprise Institute

CEO: Chief Executive Officer

CTEG: Counter- Terrorism Evaluation Group

EIA: Energy Information Administration

INC: Iraqi National Congress

IPI: International Petroleum Institute

ISI: Inter-Service Intelligence

KBR: Kellogg Brown and Roots

MPA: Master Business Administration

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NSC: National Security Council

NSS: National Security Strategy

OPEC: Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries

OSP: Office of Special Plans

PNAC: Project for the New American Century

SALT: Strategic Arms Limitations Talks

U.S.: United States

UN: United Nation

UNMOVIC: United Nations Monitoring Verification and Inspection

UNSCOM: United Nation Special Commission

USLAW: United States Labor Against the War

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction

WWII: Second World War

CIA: Central Intelligence Agency

FBI: Federal Bureau of Investigation

NSA: National Security Agency

USSR: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

TABLE OF CONTENT

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	I
DEDICATION.....	II
ABSTRACT.....	III
RESUME.....	IV
ملخص	V
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	VI
GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	02

CHAPTRE ONE: THE DIMENSIONS OF THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

1- Introduction	06
2- US foreign policy	06
2.1-Historical background	07
3- The U.S. Foreign Policy in the Middle East	10
4- The U.S. interest in the Middle East.....	13
4.1- The economic interest	14
4.2- The political interest	15
5- The US conflicts with the major powers in the area	16
6-The Repercussion of September 11 attacks on the US Policy	17
6.1- The United States reaction to the incident	18
6.1.1- The Social Reaction	19
6.1.2- The Political Reaction	19
7-Conclusion.....	20

**CHAPTER TWO: SEPTEMBER 11, 2001: A TURNING
POINT IN THE U.S FOREIGN POLICY**

1- Introduction	22
2- The American foreign affairs after 9/11	22
3- The United States Global war on terror	23
4- The United states patriot act 2001.....	26
4.1- Definition of United States Patriot Act....	27
4.2- Principles of the United States Patriot Act	28
5- The project of New American Century.....	30
5.1- Definition of PNAC.....	30
5.2- PNAC aims and goals.....	31
6- The role of PNAC on the U.S foreign policy post 9/11.....	32
6.1- The U.S world dominance.....	33
6.2- The military strategies.....	35
6.3- PNAC role in the invasion of Iraq.....	36
7- End of PNAC.....	38
8- Conclusion.....	42

CHAPTER THREE: THE INFLUENCE OF 9/11 EVENTS ON IRAQ

1- Introduction.....	44
2- Major leading forces behind the invasion of Iraq.....	44
2.1- Economic Embargo.....	45
2.2- Political Embargo.....	47
3- Iraq Invasion (2003).....	49
4- The consequences of the US policy in Iraq.....	50
5- Post Invasion phase.....	53
6-The achieved success and the unexpected casualties.....	54
7-The division of the country on ethnic basis.....	56
8-Conclusion.....	57
GENERAL CONCLUSION.....	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	62

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Foreign policy is a broad term, covering many different figures of policy and action. A state's foreign policy consists of the strategies it uses to protect its international and domestic interests and determines the way it interacts with other nations with a primary purpose that aims to defend the nation's national interests which can be in nonviolent or violent ways. The subject of the American foreign policy towards the Middle East is of paramount importance in the academic studies, considering the United States as the dominant state in various interactions and transformations of international politics. The Americans see that their values of democracy and human rights are applicable to the whole world and they have a mission to transmit them. Yet of course The Foreign Policy of the United States, like other nations, has always resulted from a mixture of self-interests and the attempt to common ideas. As in other lands, The Middle East encountered different American policies through history which increased more after WWII and reached its highest after the September 11th events which had been more troubling and confusing to the people and governments of the region.

Problematic of research:

Much of this work tends to focus on the U.S. foreign policy towards the Middle East that has been accused of being a source of terrorism following the September 11th, 2001 attacks, which led to an immediate change in the US foreign policy decision maker's administration as a reaction to the incident.

Thus, we ask the following questions: What were the dimensions of the American foreign policy in the Middle East? Is it true that the American interference in the Middle East was for the sake of justice, peace and world safety? How did the 9/11 attacks change the American foreign policy towards the Middle East? Did the Iraq war reveal the real intentions of the United States in the Middle East?

Methodology of research:

The present thesis is divided into three chapters, in addition to a general introduction and general conclusion. The first chapter aims at investigating the backgrounds of the main dimensions of the US foreign policy, it highlights the most important periods of the American foreign policy through history. After that we launched a brief extraction to the most important political and economic interests of the United States in the Middle East before displaying the conflicts between the major powers towards the Middle East and its importance geographically and strategically. After the tragic incident of 9/11 there has been a huge impact on the world, and specifically on the US soils which led us to clarify how the social and political reaction was to the incident.

The social and political reactions were only the beginning as there have been several changes in the U.S. Foreign Policy especially in the Middle East considering it as the source of the threat. And according to that we used the Second chapter to try to reveal the new strategies of the United States government after 9/11 focusing mainly on the Project of the New American Century and the United State Patriot Act aims and goals and their role in the change occurred to the US foreign policy as they were directly linked to the war on Iraq in 2003.

Finally, we devoted chapter three to our case of study which is the Iraq war of 2003. It clarifies the real causes for the Iraq war, describes the pre-war scene and the power of the American propaganda. The chapter intends to explain the U.S. military failure against the Iraqi resistance. Concluding by condemning the scandal committed by the greedy oil corporations in Iraq and their relentless seek to the goods of the raped nation.

Indeed, a large number of scholars have written and rewritten papers and books on this issue. Hypotheses and assertions have been made on the question of the Iraq war; however, in this work we are trying to introduce a coherent analysis to the hidden facts about the American agenda behind the war. Trying to clarify the erosion of the American democracy abroad by manifesting the duality, ideals and ideology that the U.S.A may use

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

again to launch another "economic" war against Iran, the second state in the Axis of Evil, a Muslim Middle-East country and oil wealthy nation.

CHAPTER ONE

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE US

FOREIGN POLICY

1- Introduction:

In this chapter and as a start, we introduce a meaningful clear definition about the foreign policy in general before we assign our speaking to the US foreign policy in particular and then try to cover the most important periods of the American foreign policy through history. Furthermore, we will take an overview about the U.S foreign policy in the Middle East and its interest economically and politically. In addition, we will highlight the U.S conflicts with the major powers in the Area and eventually we will display the motives of the post 9/11 attacks on the U.S. foreign policy including the United States social and political reaction toward the incident.

2- The U.S foreign policy:

2.1- Definition of the U.S foreign policy:

Foreign policy is a broad term; its concerns include defense and National Security, trade and commerce, global stability and conflicts, values and rules that govern relation between states. Its instruments are equally varied: economics diplomacy and action each offer a wide range of means of pursuing foreign policy goals.¹

A state's foreign policy consists of the strategies it uses to protect its international and domestic interests and determines the way it interacts with the other foreign countries, in order to achieve its objectives and adapt to the variables of this environment. Thus, we can say that the concept of foreign policy is an open plan or strategy that governs the state's work with the outside world, with its sovereignty, material and military capabilities. It is not limited to countries only, but to multinational companies, regional organizations and international organizations to have their own foreign policy that may be compatible or different with their respective countries.

¹ Philip McKeever, and Robert J. Davies. Politics USA. 2nd Ed (England: Pearson, 2006) 357, 358.

It is very difficult to define the foreign policy concept of a country such as the United States of America, given that the general framework of US foreign policy is the extent of its influence and effectiveness as well as its place on the international scene. In order to arrive at a comprehensive conception of US foreign policy, we need to take a look on the history of the U.S. foreign policy given that the political and social changes that accompanied the emergence of the United States before we begin to display the most important behaviors of the US foreign policy.

2.1- Historical background

Historically, the foreign policy that accompanied the United States of America during the first 150 years of its emergence was mainly based on isolationism and non-interventionism. George Washington's farewell address is often cited as laying the foundation for a tradition of American non-interventionism:

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.²

² This passage comes from the United States President George Washington's "Farewell Address" given on September 19, 1796

This comes with the arrival of President George Washington to power, benefiting from the support of the US leaders who called for the need to build a strong state capable of protecting its independence and the prevention of external threats, believing that this can only be through the construction of social, cultural and economic oriented inward and prevent contact and intervene in the foreign problems.

The first established foreign policy of the United States was of neutrality or non-involvement. Having just defeated the English and gaining our independence, the US faced the challenging task of creating a new nation. In an effort to guard ourselves from involvement in the wider conflicts of the European and focus on domestic affairs, a course of neutrality was followed. The roots of this initial policy can be seen as early as the presidency of George Washington.³

That explains the reluctance of the United States on the political association with European countries, which were experiencing conflicts and problems between them at that time fearing of the transmission of their effects to the American interior.

When the WWI came, the United States of America considered it as an European war in which it has no business or interest with it. This policy ensured for the United States the advantage to deal with all parties, especially in economic terms, which constituted a stable American base alongside with internal stability in return for the fragility of the European economic base. And that what encouraged US politicians to be more open to the outside world.

³ Joshua De Lorenzo, Introduction to the American Foreign policy (New York: State High School Regents Exam Prep Centre, 2000).

Since they were aware that the American economy was more depended on overseas markets, they decided to adopt an “open door” policy regarding to the international trade. This action would permit American business to enter to markets and raw materials simultaneously as other nations.⁴

Therefore, it is safe to say that the American foreign policy began to get into internationalist period starting economically then politically. President Wilson proposed in 1916 the American mediation to resolve the European disputes, which led to the entry of the United States to the war in 1917 alongside with the countries of reconciliation. This change in the US foreign policy considered as a major cause to the defeat of the Axis countries and the emergence of the American role in the foreign affairs scene. As a result, the United States emerged intelligently from its isolation that lasted from its independence until the end of the WWI, achieving a political victory through its role in ending the war and economically by minimizing the negative effects of the post-war economic crisis.

In the same way as the United States dealt with WWI, it tried to distance itself from intervening directly in the WWII and did not take any military action against any party despite it was well prepared for war, until the incident of " Pearl Harper ", that led the United States to enter the war alongside with Britain and the allied countries.

As it was the case after the end of the WWI, the United States came out of an important international and economic position that made it qualified to expand its foreign policy and give up isolationism, at the same time the USSR emerged as a base of global socialism against the American capitalism. The emergence of the United States and the Soviet Union as the only powerful states competing to lead the world led

⁴ Philip McKeever, and Robert J. Davies. Politics USA. 2nd Ed (England: Pearson, 2006) 325.

to the emergence of the so-called Cold War, which lasted until the collapse of the Soviet Union in the 1990s. Which opened the way for the United States to achieve some of the plans in its foreign policy agendas, such as the Strategy of Containment and seeking to dominate the world.

3- The U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East

The US foreign policy in the Middle East is a complicated combination of American idealism, uses of power and strategic interests. The USA has always presented itself as a manifest destiny to the world to help people decide their fates. However, this is done with isolation in order to gain political and economic interests. And ironically and regardless to its own ideals, it may use power to protect its interests in order to seek empowering its strategy in any targeted area.

The first ties of the US foreign policy with the Middle East is back to the 1860s. Nonetheless, the broad objective of the American interests in the 19th century was rather the Middle East. Missionaries started to focus on creating educational institutions in Lebanon, Syria and Palestine. They founded the Syrian Protestant College in 1866, which is now the American University in Beirut. In Turkey, they established the Robert College in 1863. These institutions educated members of the elite who would have a major impact on the region. However, the USA did not deeply intervene in the Middle East because it did not want to compete with the British and the French interests there.⁵

The first contact of the Americans with the Middle East were mainly cultural. In his book "Epic Encounters: culture, media and U.S. interests in the Middle East. Since 1945, Melani McAlister says that the Americans encountered the Middle East through its history as a sacred space and on T.V shows; as a part of the struggle over oil, but also in debates over ancient history and in discussions of religion. This shows how the

⁵ Mohamed El Mansour, The US-Middle East Connection: Interests, Attitudes and Images. <<<http://www.teachmideast.org/essays/28-history/110-the-us-middle-east-connectioninterests-attitudes-and-images>, 2004. >>

presence of oil and the claim to religious origins highlighted Americans' vision towards the Middle East. Which means that the Middle East and its people became more valuable with the political and cultural context of the United States by means to the formation of the modern states.

After World War 1, the United States became an observant to the USSR behavior towards the Middle East. Its strategic interests were in progress in the region especially when they managed that the old colonial powers including France and Britain would not be in position to contain the Soviet ambitions to control the Middle East; in the 1930's, the world learned more about the value of oil as a main long-term source of energy. Consequently, American companies began to compete in exploiting overseas oil resources.⁶

*“The postwar period was marked by the gradual rise of American power in the region due to the increasing importance of oil, the establishment of the state of Israel, and the determination to counter Soviet influence. This strategy is known as the Truman Doctrine”.*⁷ For the Arab, Palestine has an emotional concern as a sacred land; The creation of State of Israel on the that land and the support deal of the Americans in that was so harmful to the whole Arab people; Since then, the loss of Palestine has haunted the entire Middle Eastern people's conscience.

Henceforth the security and survival of Israel became one of the pillars of US policy in the Middle East, not only because the Jewish state fitted very well in their Cold War politics, but also because for many Americans, Israel represented part of their culture and a Western presence in an alien and threatening region.⁸

⁶ Amin. Seikal, Islam and the West: Conflict or Cooperation? (Palgrave: NY, 2003).

⁷ Mohamed El Mansour, The US-Middle East Connection: Interests, Attitudes and Images. <<<http://www.teachmideast.org/essays/28-history/110-the-us-middle-east-connectioninterests-attitudes-and-images>, 2004. >>

⁸ Ibid.

The Arab Israeli War of 1967 resulted the Israeli occupation of more Arab lands. and even when the United Nations Organization called for the withdrawal of Israel from the Arab occupied territories, U.S prevented its strategic ally from any sanctions of U.N and it has continued till now the settlement in the Palestinian lands in the West Bank and Gaza Strip; In 1973, The Arab Israeli War led to an Oil Embargo; The Arab deducted that the use of oil as against the American support to Israel would have a great impact on the united states relations with the region.

The Iranian Revolution of 1979 brought more into debate the so-called "Political Islam". The Americans considered it as a threat to their allies and interests in the Middle East. In other words, the American Realpolitik reveals in such as crisis. The U.S was supporting the theocratic regimes those belong to its vital space. However, when a state opposes its policies, it becomes an obsession. By holding 52 hostages for more than a year, the Americans seemed unfamiliarly powerless. Since that crisis, the Americans have acquired a negative image of Islam. The loss of Shah of Iran resulted in real damage to U.S presence and interests in the Middle East.⁹

The chronic instability in the Middle East has made the US policy in dealing with region problems more difficult. and it became much worst when of the critics of the first President Bush, say he sidelined American ideals in favor of oil when he liberated Kuwait from Iraq in 1991. However, in the 1990's the U.S had been taken a lot of prestige when it succeeded in supervising the Oslo accords in its attempts to resolve the ongoing Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Yet, the United State would continue to protect Israel from any questioning towards the international law under the flag of fighting terrorism.

By the 21st century, the relation between the U.S and Middle East entered a new era highlighted by accusing the region as a source of terrorism after the 9/11 attacks .under G.Bush administration, there was a rise to the Neoconservative theories that wanted to reshape the region according to their extremist views to bargain more benefits and impose more hegemony.

⁹ ibid.

4- The US interest in the Middle East

Let our position be absolutely clear: an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.¹⁰

The way that the United States has defined its interests in the Middle East since the end of the Cold War, has evolved in dramatic ways. Which led to a several changes in the perceptions of U.S. national interests contributed to dramatic shifts in strategic priorities. Whereas the United States once sought to preserve regional stability above all, it came to see an imperative in transforming the region by toppling dictators and promoting democratic change. My work on these issues will result in a book on changing U.S. interests in the Middle East and suggest that the United States needs to define its interests with greater precision, while finding a way to narrow the gap between its ideals and actions in the region.¹¹

The interest of the United States of America in the Middle East is divided into two main points considering the region as a target to all major powers that seeks to control the world economically and politically. Regardless of what is given on the US agendas, the United States has repeated a stable set of interests in the Middle East that have guided U.S. policy in the region. That has initially predicated on the region's energy resources by the end of the WWI which it considered as an economic interest, before

¹⁰ President Carter, in his "State of the Union" address, January 1980

¹¹ Robert, M. Danin, Defining US interests in the Middle East (<https://www.cfr.org/project/defining-us-interests-middle-east>).

that interest later diversified into keeping Soviet influence out of the region during the Cold War, which was obviously political.

4.1- The U.S. economic interest in the Middle East

As Routledge cited in: *Addicted to oil: America's Relentless Drive for Energy Security*. “*Oil is the lifeblood of the American economy*”¹². In addition to the oil reserves of the region of the Middle East and its economic effects on the major powers, including the United States of America. Back to the late 18th century. In the aftermath of the American Revolution, the northern colonies witnessed an era of manufacturing. The increasing number of plants and manufactories in addition to the proliferation of different means of transportation consequently caused a growing of vehicles' number. The result has been the rise of the modern United State as the biggest consumer of oil; hence, oil became the most wanted energy for the American economy.

Routledge also stated, “*The Middle East has the greatest oilfields in the world*”.¹³ In addition to the Ghawar in Saudi Arabia, the Greater Burgan in Kuwait and Kirkuk in northern Iraq are ranked as the largest oilfields in the world.

The only goal of the United States is to maintain its hegemony in the region and to achieve that end; the United States is ready to employ all elements of national power, including the use of military force. Since the beginning of the oil age, the demand on this energy is growing for the sake of providing a more industrialized societies then a modern life of luxury. Capitalism which means a continuous growth in economy otherwise it would be recession, depression or more terrible, economic crisis, is the leading credo in the occident and more precisely in the United States. Capitalism obliged Big Oil to keep seeking for more sources to guarantee the flow of black gold to their tankers that sail the oceans.¹⁴

¹² Ian, Routledge, *Addicted to oil: America's Relentless Drive for Energy Security* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2005)

¹³ *ibid*

¹⁴ Abdulhay Yahia. Zalloum, *Oil Crusades: America through Arab Eyes* (London: Pluto Press, 2007) 8.

4.2- The U.S. Political interest in the Middle East

Although the Americans and Russians fought as allies in World War II, their friendship was short-lived. After the end of the war, the United States and the Soviet Union emerged as great powers with different ideologies in a race to dominate the world politically and economically. ; The Middle East was one of the most important areas of political conflict for these two forces because of its strategic location American foreign policy makers viewed that they had to stop the spread of communism out of the Russian lands. This considered as the main reason for the U.S political interest in the Middle East.

Israel is another central US interest. America has seen Israel as the hidden agent that is capable of implementing its plans and facilitating its tasks in the region in exchange for protection and support, which includes Israel's support for a mix of arms sales, intelligence cooperation, security and diplomatic support. Furthermore, the presence of the United States has often been linked to the desire to promote peace between Israel and the Palestinians.

The non-proliferation of nuclear weapons was another major interest of the United States in the Middle East. The aim of this policy is to prevent any hostile state from obtaining enough power to threaten American interests with regard to oil security or Israel's security.

5- The US conflict with the major powers in The Area of the Middle East

The Middle East has remained an arena of strategic competition during the 19th and 20th centuries between major powers in the world due to many reasons which the energy sources isn't the most important one. In that case the existence of interests directly means the existence of rivalry between the forces concerned, and In the mid-20th century, the Western European powers' influence in the Middle East started to decline, this withdraw of the European powers left the space for the United States which became the dominant Western power in the region; The Soviet Union, on the other hand, emerged as the only direct competitor to threaten US dominance in the region.

As President Eisenhower¹⁵ declared, "*the Middle East is the most valuable estate in the world*". And in consistent with the previous quotation the Middle East is of great importance to the United States, as every American president has expressed since Franklin Roosevelt to Richard Nixon in the 1970s, with the strongest words about the vitality of American interests in the region and in the Arab world in particular. The US conflict against the USSR post WWII that lasted for four decades of Cold War and until the collapse of the Soviet Union was characterized by the US containment strategy in the area in order to stop the flow on communism, hence, protecting their interests in the region whether politically or economically. In response, Soviet Union also formalized a policy of alliances beyond its borders. And emerge as the patron of Egypt, taking advantages of the Suez crisis in 1956 and later on enhancing its influence in the Middle East.

Politically, and in order encircle the Soviet influence and work to reduce it in the region. The United States has worked to promote a peaceful settlement of regional conflicts in attempt to highlight the American role in it, especially in the Arab-Israeli conflict, which targeted ensuring Israel's security and trying to keep the Soviet Union

¹⁵ The 34th president of the United States from 1953 to 1961

from participating in the Middle East settlement process. On the economic front, Middle East oil was the key word for the United States, ensuring that it continues to flow to it and to its allies and to prevent it from falling into the hands of the Soviets.

6- The repercussions of the September 11 attacks on US policy

The 11th September 2001 attacks marked as a major turning point in the history of the United States, both in terms of domestic and foreign policy, and the international relations that are particularly linking the West to the Arab and Islamic world.

The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts. I've directed the full resources of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and to bring them to justice, we will make no distinction between the terrorists and those who harbor them.¹⁶

Those rhetoric words paved the way for George W. Bush to rise as a wartime leader, who exerts no effort to chase the terrorists everywhere.

Except for the loss of life, the towers and the four planes hijacked by the terrorists, there were no direct and negative economic effects on the United States. The effects did not go beyond other losses, including the closing of the US stock market for some days, and impacts on airlines and tourism for one or two years.

¹⁶ The President of the United States George W. Bush speech after the 9/11 attacks. September.2001

One of the important effects of the September 11, 2001, attacks led to the imbalance of power in the world, as no country ever dominated the world, especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union. With the defense budget continually rising, the United States has tightened its economic, technical and cultural clout on the world's nations. The United States has maintained its position as a superpower through nuclear weapons and its proliferation according to its defense strategy.

Before the September 11 incident, solving political crises depended on international or diplomatic agencies. However, after the events, the military aspects were based on a new principle of "preventive war" which was based on sudden strikes without waiting for proven evidence of the hostility of the target party. US Secretary of Defense Ronald Rumsfeld¹⁷ said at an important NATO meeting in Brussels in 2002 that *"NATO cannot wait for the evidence to move against terrorist groups or countries possessing chemical, biological or nuclear weapons"*. This statement paved the way to the invasion of Iraq in 2003 and a pre-emptive strike according to the new concept of the US military strategy.

6.1- The United States' reaction to the 9/11 events

The world's governments have condemned the attacks on a large scale. Immediately following the attacks, the Bush administration announced the war on terror, with the stated goals of bringing Osama Bin Laden and al-Qaeda to justice. Immediately following the attacks, the Bush administration announced the war on terror, with the stated goals of bringing Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda to justice as it was the main suspect responsible for the attacks. *"The Bush administration quickly blamed al-Qaeda for the 9/11 attacks"*¹⁸. And with the help of its allies, it started several military operation in Afghanistan in order to bring down Taliban, take their revenge and to relief the world from the danger of terrorists.

¹⁷ Former U.S. Congressman and the Secretary of Defense from 1975 to 1977 and again from 2001 to 2006

¹⁸ Eric. Foner. Give Me Liberty: 3rd Edition (Harvard university :2006)

- The United States' reaction to the Incident is divided into 2 main reactions

6.1.1- Social reaction

Shortly after the Twin Towers fell on September 11, 2001, the nation began to mourn, and around the country some Americans displayed their grief as anger and frustration, and they looked for someone to blame for the attacks; while others started to demonstrate their patriotism donate blood and commemorate the victims. Sports teams postponed games, and Celebrities organized concerts and performances with the American flag pinned on to their lapels or written on their t-shirts to pay tributes to the dead and to share their grief with others. *"A sense of unity. We all feel differently about what to do in response, but everybody seems to agree that we've got to be together no matter what happens. So you get a little bit of hope in togetherness."* one young man in Union Square told a reporter from the New York Times.¹⁹

6.1.2- Political reaction

Political leaders urged calm and promised aid. President George Bush was able to win authorization to act in the nation's defense. In a speech on September 20, he asked citizens to be *"calm and resolute, even in the face of a continuing threat"* and promised that *"the United States would triumph over terrorism"*. the political reaction was described as the "Global War on Terror"¹ which is a military campaign against terrorism around the world led by the US and supported by NATO; following that and supported by FBI, CIA, NSA the United states Patriot Act was launched as a reaction against domestic terrorist attacks in order to straighten military forces and reunite the American nation, it was signed by president G. Bush in October 26th, 2001.

¹⁹ History.com editors. **Reaction to 9/11**. A&E Television Networks, August 13, 2010. <https://www.history.com/topics/21st-century/reaction-to-9-11>

7- Conclusion

As a result, we can say that the factors that led to the success of the American foreign policy are very clear; this is just because the U.S. foreign policy is based on the American internal and external interests. Beginning with neutral isolationism and continuing with Globalism or internationalism, the American foreign policy is always built up to the American needs and interests. But we see in the next chapter, how the American foreign policy would become after the 9/11 events.

CHAPTER TWO

**SEPTEMBER 11, 2001: A TURNING
POINT IN THE U.S. FOREIGN
POLICY**

1- Introduction:

The 9/11 campaigns and the consequential incidents are estimated as denoting critical moment in the American foreign policy and world politics. Leon Fuerth, national security adviser to vice President Al Gore, said that the 9/11 events can be regarded as a "demarcation point as stark as B.C and A.D in U.S foreign policy."²⁰ " Furthermore, Secretary of State Colin Powell highlighted the importance of the attacks, and said that after 9/11, "Not only is the cold war over, the post-cold war period is also over ."²¹ A variety of policymakers and scholars have discussed and debated the broader importance of the 9/11. A common theme in essays and articles is that American foreign policy and international politics changed dramatically in the aftermath of the attacks, result in a different political environment. Many scholars claim that the attacks on the World Trade Center had significantly altered U.S foreign policy.

2- The American foreign affairs after 9/11:

After the 9/11 incident, the events that followed are regarded as a noticeable turning point in the American Foreign Policy and world politics that changed dramatically result in a different political environment. The U.S foreign policy began to shift to terror. It is said that President Bush changed the command of the American foreign policy by making terror its main focal point. One more outstanding speech besides Bush's "9/11 Address to The Nation" which is his "Address to joint Session of Congress" delivered on September 20th, 2001. George W. Bush addressed the congress and the national television audience to launch the phrase "War on terror"²², which was used by Bush for the first time. Actually, this speech articulates in depths what steps the U.S intends to take against the following attacks. At the outset of this speech, Bush again reminds everybody that America had proved its strength in the last nine days and now, it is "fully awakened to danger" and

²⁰ Robert S.Litwak, The Imperial Republic after 9/11(The Wilson Quarterly 2002) 76

²¹ ibid

²² **War on Terror:** Also known as war on terrorism, a term used to describe the American-led global counterterrorism campaign launched in response to the terrorist attacks of 9/11 ("Britannica").

called to “defend freedom.” Bush points out that the enemy of America is neither the Muslim community nor their Arab friends showing his respect to Islam, but the real enemy is a radical network of terrorists, and those governments that support terrorism. The term was originally used with a particular focus on countries associated with al-Qaeda²³. It is important to note that after 2001, hate crimes against Muslims significantly increased despite Bush's remarks on them. The president then asked other nations to join him in the war warning them to choose a side. In his formal speech to congress, Bush declares the war on terror “*A Timeline of the U.S.-Led War on Terror*”.

3- The United States Global War on Terror:

In the weeks that followed the September 11 attacks, the United States vow to punish the criminals who had brought destruction to American territory and developed a comprehensive plan to dismantle terrorist networks at home and abroad. To justify the immediate measures that were taken to fight terrorism, President George W. Bush said: “*We’re a nation at war*”. Five years later, on the anniversary of the attacks, he repeated: “*We’re engaged in a global war against an enemy that threatens all civilized nations. And today the civilized world stands together to defend our freedom; we stand together to defeat the terrorists; and we are working to secure the peace for generations to come*”²⁴. Consequently, in this global war on terrorism, America stands again as a beacon for fundamental human values and as a fortress of freedom.²⁵

The phrase "War on Terror" has been used to specifically refer to the ongoing military campaign led by the U.S., U.K. and their allies against organizations and regimes identified by them as terrorist, and usually exclude other independent counter-terrorist operations and campaigns such as those by Russia and India. The conflict has also been referred to by names other than the War on Terror.²⁶

²³ **Al-Qaeda:** Arabic term means “the Base”, which is a broad-based militant Islamist Organization founded by Osama Bin Laden in the late 1980s. (“Britannica”).

²⁴ President George W. Bush on the fifth anniversary of the attacks September 11, 2006

²⁵ Philip McKeever, and Robert J. Davies. *Politics USA. 2nd Ed* (England: Pearson, 2006) 214

²⁶ Karen j. Greenberg. *Rogue Justice : The Making of the Security State* (Broadway Books, an Imprint of the Crown Publishing Group, 2017)

Conventional responses to the attacks came quickly, because Congress passed a joint resolution (107-40)²⁷ to authorize the President to use all means, including military, to fight terrorism. On the executive side, in order to ensure domestic safety, George W. Bush established an Office of homeland security at the White House in early October 2001, led by former Pennsylvania governor Tom Ridge. The agenda was to develop a new comprehensive strategy to strengthen protection against terroristic threats or attacks in the United States. The Office made recommendations and measures in order to increase the safety of the American citizens.²⁸

A proposition of the president on July 2002 consists on a national strategy for Homeland Security and asked Congress to establish a new and single Department of Homeland Security, whose primary objectives were to prevent new terrorist attacks on the American soil and to reduce the vulnerability of the nation to terrorism. This department was later created by a congressional act on November 25th, 2002, with an initial budget of \$20 billion. The Department worked to find proper tactics for detecting, preparing for preventing, protecting against, responding to, and recovering from terrorist threats or attacks within the United States”, as its mission statement indicated.²⁹

Deputies were also active on Capitol Hill. The President signed a bill that had gone through both assemblies at full speed, which became the USA Patriot Act exactly on October 26, 2001. Fighting terrorism domestically required expanded powers on the part of law enforcement agencies. Therefore, stricter security standards were imposed on airlines and at borders. Immigrants, suspected of terrorism, could be detained and even deported. Monitoring of financial transactions and communications, even private ones, was increased at the expense of civil liberties. Among the potential tactics used by the terrorists were biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons, more generally identified as “weapons of mass destruction”.³⁰

²⁷ “USA PATRIOT Act”(U.S. H.R. 3162, Public Law 107-56)

²⁸ Philip McKeever, and Robert J. Davies. Politics USA. 2nd Ed (England: Pearson, 2006) 214

²⁹ *ibid*

³⁰ *Ibid*

George W. Bush had notified that there would be “a campaign against terrorist activity, a worldwide campaign”³¹ and distanced out the governments which supported or sheltered terrorist groups. Operations Enduring Freedom, which began on October 7, 2001, was part of this global response, spearheaded by the United States, with the United Nations’ blessing. First, Afghanistan, with its fundamentalist Taliban³² regime, was targeted as a shelter for terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda. Heavy bombardments sought to destroy training camps and help capture Al-Qaeda leaders. The operation also involved American troops in the Philippines, to fight against the Islamist separatist group led by Abu Sayaf, who were suspected of organizing the Bali car bombing of October 12, 2002, and in the Horn of Africa to conduct counterterrorist controls. By the end of 2001, the Taliban had been ousted from power in Kabul, but Osama Bin Laden has assumed hideout could not be located. Three years later, on October 9, 2004, Afghans elected their first post-Taliban President Hamid Karzai.³³

As soon as the Afghanistan campaign had apparently succeeded, the Bush Administration now turned to another nation notoriously supported or sheltered terrorists, which is Iraq. President Bush, in his State of the Union address of January 2003, designated Saddam Hussein as a dangerous dictator who eventually needs to be removed. Arguments ranged from the Iraqi regime’s ties with terrorist networks to its possession of “weapons of mass destruction”, i.e., chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. International suspicions were fueled by Saddam Hussein’s reluctant compliance with the United Nations’ resolution 687. Consequently, Bush warned the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein in his January 2003 address by telling him: *“If Saddam Hussein does not fully disarm... For the safety of our people and for the peace of the world, we will lead a coalition to disarm him”*. The beginning of the disarmament of Saddam Hussein was on March 20, 2003 with the help of a scanty coalition of military allies.³⁴

³¹ George W. Bush National Strategy speech for Homeland Security (the white house July 16, 2002)

³² Taliban Students”, also spelled Taleban, which is ultraconservative political and religious faction that emerged in Afghanistan in the mid-1990s following the withdrawal of Soviet troops, the collapse of Afghanistan’s communist regime, and the subsequent breakdown in civil order. (“Britannica”))

³³ Philip McKeever, and Robert J. Davies. Politics USA. 2nd Ed (England: Pearson, 2006) 214

³⁴ Ibid (215)

The war in Iraq, which was originally labeled “Operation Iraqi Freedom”, sought officially to remove Saddam Hussein and preventively destroy all of Iraq’s deadly arsenal. On May 1, 2003, On board USS Abraham Lincoln in the Gulf, President Bush announced the end of major combat in Iraq and optimistically declared that, in the battle of Iraq, the United States and its allies had prevailed. Finally, Saddam Hussein was captured on December 13, 2003, and after a long hectic trial was found guilty of crimes against humanity and hanged on December 30, 2006. Meanwhile, keeping civil peace in Iraq proved a formidable challenge for America and its allies.³⁵

The global war on terror of the President Bush realized many victories against terroristic groups or Al -Qaeda, such as the hanging of Saddam Hussein and the killing of Osama Bin Laden. This war, however, had not finished yet since the terroristic groups are still continuing their killing missions in many countries in the world.

4- The United States Patriot Act:

The Patriot Act is considered to be a constitutional law occurred right away after the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States America. Giving law enforcement agencies extensive powers to interrogate charge and deliver terrorists to justice. It also managed to lead to merger penalties for committing and supporting terrorist crimes. In reaction, Congress irresistibly passed the U.S Patriot Act. This Act is way more than a hypothetical governmental debate in Washington. It is a crucial element of the United States' attempt to summon the War on Terror in touchable, perceptible manners. The House of Representatives has chosen to repowers the provisions of the Patriot Act that are leading to concrete consequences in the war.³⁶

³⁵ Ibid

³⁶ James Chen in his review about the [USA Patriot Act](#) updated in 2019

4.1- Definition of the USPA:

The 2001 patriot act came as a reaction to the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and was introduced in Congress on October 23, 2001, it passed the House on October 24, and it passed on the Senate on October 25 by wide margins, and it was directly signed into law by President Bush the very next day. The sense of urgency and the need for immediate security transpires in the lack of debate that accompanied the votes and the lack of significant criticism against the curtailment of civil liberties which the Act commanded.³⁷

Anne Harrison stated that this Act offers federal officials greater authority in tracking and intercepting communications, both for purposes of law enforcement and foreign intelligence gathering. Therefore, this Act also gives the Secretary of the Treasury regulatory power to face corruption in US financial institutions for foreign money-laundering purposes. It works more actively to close the US borders to foreign terrorists, and detain and remove those within the American borders; it also establishes new crimes, new penalties and new procedural techniques against domestic and international terrorists.³⁸

The Act was an arbitrate version of the Anti-Terrorism Act of 2001 (ATA), a broad congressional entity designed to consolidate the nation's resistance against terrorism. The ATA contained several provisions vastly expanding the authority of law enforcement and intelligence agencies to monitor private communications and access personal information. The final legislation included a few beneficial additions from the Administration's initial proposal: most notably, a so-called sunset provision, which provides that several sections of the act automatically expire after a certain period of time, unless they are explicitly renewed by Congress, on some of the electronic surveillance provisions, and an amendment providing judicial oversight of law enforcement's use of the FBI's Carnivore system.³⁹

³⁷ Robert S.Litwak, The Imperial Republic after 9/11(The Wilson Quarterly 2002) 213

³⁸ Anne Harrison. Behind the USA Patriot Act (November 5,2001)

³⁹ ibid

Nevertheless, the US Patriot Act keeps accoutrement considerably augmenting government investigative authority, notably with consideration to the Internet. That accouterment invoke matters that are complex and associate fundamental constitutional protections of individual freedom, containing the applicable procedures for interception of information transmitted over the Internet and other rapidly evolving technologies.

4.2- Principles of the USPA:

The aim mentioned of the law was to combat terrorism at home and abroad while domestic security was to be guaranteed through:

- Increased surveillance procedures.
- Easing intelligence gathering on terrorism over the United States territory.
- Improving border protection and controlling immigration
- Monitoring financial transactions, especially international money laundering activities.

The mentioned provisions insinuated a severe campaign of the private sphere by such agencies such as the FBI, whose powers of investigation were widely extended. Searches of homes and businesses could now be secretly conducted, suspected immigrants could be detained indefinitely, telephones could be wiretapped and emails inspected. New controlling procedures were established, among which machine-readable passports and elaborate searches at points of entry into US territory.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ *ibid*

Ann Harrison mentioned some other principles as follows:

- The enhancement of domestic security against terrorism.
- The enhancement of surveillance procedures.
- The abatement of money-laundering and terrorism financing.
- The protection of the northern border.
- The removal of obstacles to the investigation of terrorism.
- The provision of aid and assistance to victims of terrorism, public safety officers, and their families.
- Increased information sharing between federal, local, and state governments.
- The strengthening of criminal laws against terrorism.
- The improvement of intelligence capabilities.

Despite the USA Patriot Act's goal is to address the security requirements of the United States in the wake of the terrorist attacks of the September 11th, the act makes special provision for the preservation of the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans, including Arab Americans, Muslim Americans, the Americans from South Asia, and states that every effort must be taken to preserve their safety as well as it touched only the Arab and Muslim worlds besides the Arab Americans and the Muslim Americans. The USA Patriot Act also denounces discrimination against Arab and Muslim Americans and demands acts of violence against those individuals to be punished to the full extent of the law.⁴¹

⁴¹ James Chen in his review about the USA Patriot Act updated in 2019

5- The Project of New American Century:

5.1- Definition of PNAC:

The Project for the New American Century or the PNAC was a neo-conservative think tank found in 1997. It had strong ties to the American Enterprise Institute. It was cofounded as a non-profit educational organization by the neoconservatives William Kristol and Robert Kagan. The main aim or goal of the PNAC was to promote the American global leadership. Therefore, the fundamental view of the PNAC was that American leadership is both good for America and good for the world and support for a Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity. The PNAC exerted influence on high –level, U.S government officials in the administration of President George W. Bush and affected the Bush Administration's development of military and foreign policies, especially involving national security and the war in Iraq.⁴²

The Venture for the New American Century scrutinize neoconservative Washington, D.C. foreign policy think tank which is formed out of maven foreign policy stalwarts who had been in the government for a very long time. The PNAC would desert its aims in 2006. It made a difference instigate back for the evacuation of Iraqi president Saddam Hussein starting in 1998, citing Iraq's noncooperation with UN weapons assessments.

The PNAC got to be advance encouraged in its criticalness and talk to suppress the geopolitical risk postured by Hussein after the 9/11 terror assaults. The George W. Bush Administration's only reaction is in foiling Hussein, the PNAC contended, included a military activity. The deal was basically established in 1997 by William Kristol, who was chairman at NCP at the time, and the president of the same organization, Gary Schmitt. Other think tanks as well were established by this organization, the most prominent was Council on Crime in America. PNAC are not given credit in Stefancic and Delgado's book

⁴² "Definition of PNAC". www.ProjectfortheNewAmericanCentury.com. Retrieved on May 30, 2007. 15:32.

no Mercy which states how conservatives' think tanks are funded, but they depict a few other Conservative and Neo-Conservative⁴³ think.⁴⁴

AEI is financially supported by the Randolph Foundation, but too by the John M. Olin Establishment and the Earhart Establishment. Concurring to this site, PNAC got more than 120,000 dollars from the John M. Olin, the Earhart, the Hickory and the William H. Donner Establishments between 2000 and 2003. The John M. Olin Establishment, moreover, gave away cash to NCP. In 1997 to begin a deal called The PNAC, which appears the tie between these establishments, NCP and PNAC. These numbers are taken from the foundations' IRS make up to 990, which are freely accessible for three years, and are presently accumulated in one put. Most of these donors were from corporate America and stressed over the US economy losing in competition overseas and they feared that "the Liberal intelligentsia" were putting the capitalistic system under risk too.⁴⁵

5.2- PNAC Aims and Goals:

The essential cause for establishing PNAC was that many Neo-Conservatives, including its founder William Kristol, considered that American Conservatives required an arrangement for foreign policy in the new world situation. Therefore, PNAC's agenda was to create this arrangement, which then has been shaped into documents like the Rebuilding America's Defenses document. It is difficult to define the strategy that PNAC wants to use to achieve these goals. The people behind PNAC primarily state what their goals are, but not how to influence those with the power to work for these goals. PNAC has written several letters to leaders around the world, but mainly to American presidents, where PNAC asks them to consider their solutions to international conflicts. In addition to this PNAC's members have written several articles and reports that sum up their view on international politics. The main difference between PNAC and the other Neo-Conservative think tanks is that PNAC mainly focuses on defense and foreign policy, while the others

⁴³ **Neo-Conservative:** neo-con. Someone whose politics are conservative or right wing, who believes strongly in the free market and thinks that their country should use its military power to become involved with or to control problems in other countries ("Cambridge Electronic Dictionary").

⁴⁴ *ibid*

⁴⁵ *ibid*

also produce policies on domestic and economic issues. PNAC's narrow focus makes it easier to extract the Neo-Conservative view on foreign policy which also makes it easier to compare with, for example, the Bush Administration's foreign policy.

6- The Role of PNAC on the U.S Foreign Policy Post 9/11:

Many considered that PNAC played a key role in shaping the foreign policy of the Bush Administration especially in growing support for the Iraq War. Mainly seeking to preserve and extend America's position of global leadership by maintaining the preeminence of U.S. military forces. «Rebuilding America's Defenses suggested establishing four core missions for US military forces: the defense of the "American homeland," the fighting and winning of "multiple, simultaneous major theatre wars," the performance of "'constabulary' duties associated with shaping the security environment" in key regions, and the transformation of US forces "to exploit the 'revolution in military affairs.'" Its specific recommendations included the maintenance of US nuclear superiority, an increase of the active personnel strength of the military from 1.4 to 1.6 million people, the redeployment of US forces to Southeast Europe and Asia, and the "selective" modernization of US forces. The report advocated the cancellation of "roadblock" programs such as the Joint Strike Fighter, under which she argued it would absorb "exorbitant" amounts of Pentagon funding while providing limited gains, but favored the development of "global missile defenses," and the control of "space and cyberspace," including the creation of a new military service with the mission of "space control." To help achieve these aims, Rebuilding America's Defenses advocated a gradual increase in military and defense spending "to a minimum level of 3.5 to 3.8 percent of gross domestic product, adding \$15 billion to \$20 billion to total defense spending annually."⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Thomas Donnelly. Rebuilding America's Defenses (a report of the Project of the New American Century: September 2000)

6.1- The U.S World Dominance:

Throughout history, world domination was estimated in terms of a nation flourishing its force to the point that all other nations are implemental to it. This may be attained through settling hegemony, an indirect form of government and of imperial dominance in which the leader state rules geopolitically subordinate states by means of its ambiguous force by the threat of force, rather than by direct military force .

However, domination can also be achieved by direct military force. In the 4th century BC, Alexander the Great notably expressed a desire to conquer the world, and a legend persists that after he completed his military conquest of the known ancient world, he "wept because he had no more worlds to conquer," although he was unaware of China farther to the east and had no way to know about civilizations in the Americas. However, with the full size and scope of the world known, it has been said that "world domination is an impossible goal," and specifically that "no single nation however big and powerful can dominate a world" of well over a hundred interdependent nations and billions of people. A contradictory vision was designated by Hans Morgenthau. He strained that the mechanical development of weapons, transportation, and communication makes "the conquest of the world technically possible, and they make it technically possible to keep the world in that conquered state". Its lack was the reason why great ancient empires, though vast, failed to complete universal conquest of their world and perpetuate the conquest. Now, however, this is possible. Technology undoes both geographic and climatic barriers.

Few counselors of ideologies (Anarchism, Communism, Fascism, Nazism, and Capitalism) actively pursue the aim of establishing a form of government consistent with their political beliefs, or assert that the world is moving "naturally" towards the adoption of a particular form of government (or self), authoritarian or anti-authoritarian. These proposals are not concerned with a particular nation achieving world domination, but with all nations conforming to a particular social or economic model. A goal of world domination can be to establish a world government, a single common political authority for all of humanity. The period of the Cold War, in particular, is considered to be a period of

intense ideological polarization; given the existence of two rival blocs the capitalist West and the communist East that each expressed the hope of seeing the triumph of their ideology over that of the enemy. The ultimate end of such a triumph would be that one ideology or the other would become the sole governing ideology in the world.

Certain adherents may also seek the conversion in some religions, *peaceful or forced* of as many people as possible to their own religion, without restrictions of national or ethnic origin. This type of spiritual domination is usually seen as distinct from the temporal dominion, although there have been instances of efforts begun as holy wars devolving into the pursuit of wealth, resources, and territory. Some Christian groups teach that a false religion, led by false prophets who achieve world domination by inducing nearly universal worship of a false deity, is a prerequisite to end times described in the Book of Revelation.

Speakers have incriminated nations or ideological groups that tried to attain world domination, even where those entities have denied that this was their goal. For example, J. G. Ballard quoted Aldous Huxley as having said of the United States entering the First World War, *"I dread the inevitable acceleration of American world domination which will be the result of it all...Europe will no longer be Europe"* (Huxley 86). More recently, Geert Wilders argued in 2012 that *"Islam is an ideology aiming for world domination rather than a religion,"* and in 2008 characterized the 2008 Israel-Gaza conflict as a proxy action by Islam against the West, contending that *"[t]he end of Israel would not mean the end of our problems with Islam, but only... the start of the final battle for world domination"*

6.2- The Military Strategies:

The new US doctrine of Military Supremacy which PNAC and the NSS 2002 document revealed as the origin or source provided justification for the US to undertake unilateral and pre-emptive strikes in the name of counter-proliferation and created new rules of international engagement without the consent of other nations⁴⁷. And one of the reasons of Iraq invasion was to expedite the military transformation and putting into practice the doctrines of unilateral and pre-emptive strikes

PNAC indicate that the US, though not widely recognized after the demise of USSR, constituted a global power heavily reliant on its military to control a world perceived as unruly and increasingly unwilling to accept US domination even long before the 9/11 attack⁴⁸. Barely a year after the 9/11 attack President Bush responded by laying a National Security Strategy (NSS). The NSS document described as a re-write of the one that was rejected by his father after the 1991 Gulf War became junior Bush's policy which justified the use of unilateral, pre-emptive force to change the world in the interests and image of the American super power. War on terrorism was deliberately added to justify the policy.⁴⁹

Generally, the foreign policy of President George Bush's administration exhibited a marked unilateralism and militarism in which the US military power has been used to advance US interests and geo-political hegemony worldwide. With the demise of USSR there had been a shift from the Cold War doctrine of containment and deterrence to new military policies of pre-emptive and unilateral strike because there is no power block to challenge the US and the UK.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Douglas Kellner, Pre-emptive strikes and the war on Iraq: A critique of Bush administration unilateralism and militarism.(*New Political Science* 2004) 87.

⁴⁸ Roger, Burbach, R & J, Tarbell. Imperial overstretch: George W. Bush and the hubris of the empire(Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing Ltd.2004)

⁴⁹ Jim Harding, After Iraq: War, imperialism and democracy(Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing Ltd.2004)

⁵⁰ Douglas Kellner, Pre-emptive strikes and the war on Iraq: A critique of Bush administration unilateralism and militarism.(*New Political Science* 2004) 87.

6.3- PNAC Role in the Invasion of Iraq:

Iraq's occupation was explained to the American nation by a modern propaganda campaign that mirrors a think tank's vision for a new foreign policy. One goal of its article is to set a theoretical argument forth for analyzing sophisticated propaganda as a feature of mass mediated discourse crafted by think tank's and highly organized claim makers. We suggest that the stream system of policy and critique is now institutionalized and restored as War Programming. Which connects criticism within a narrative sequence, containing critics and reflections concerning journalistic flaws.⁵¹

The scope of the actions is so huge that it precludes and preempts its critique. Next objective is to show how the rationale for the invasion was developed as a "public conspiracy" over a decade by the members of the Project of The New American Century (PNAC). Another aim was to describe and clarify why the PNAC's plan for Iraq and an imperialist foreign policy received very little news media coverage. Qualitative content analysis of news materials suggests that the source of news and media shared a logic and perspective about "timely and entertaining news." The PNAC program was not advertised by the major news media since it fell outside the focus of the Bush administration's propaganda campaign to demonize Iraq and its leader Saddam Hussein, who was held to be responsible for attacks on the United States. The implications of such a well-organized propaganda campaign for future news coverage of war are debated.⁵²

⁵¹David Altheide, and Jennifer N. Grimes, (War Programming: The Propaganda Project and the Iraq War.) *The Sociological Quarterly*, vol. 46, no. 4, 2005. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/4121509.

⁵² *ibid*

In 1997, Project for New American Century (PNAC) became a consolidation layout plan of US's global leadership influence with strong elements of militarism. The goal of PNAC was to promote American global leadership which required the following needs as outlined by the architects of the project namely to:

- Increase defense spending and modernize armed forces for the future if global responsibilities are to be carried out.
- Strengthen ties with democratic allies and to challenge regimes hostile to America's interests and values.
- Promote the cause of political and economic freedom abroad.

The aims of PNAC were to maintain global US pre-eminence, precluding the rise of a great power rival like China and shaping the international security order in line with American principles and interests. The PNAC document further projected a long range vision urging the US domination of strategic places such as the Gulf Region as far into the future as possible.⁵³

In effect President George Bush's administration showed a considerable skill in pursuing its imperial agenda under the guise of a global war on terror⁵⁴. The invasion of Iraq, according to Chomsky: was meant to be a global projection of US power not only on Iraq but also over the entire Middle East and even the rest of the World .⁵⁵

⁵³ Douglas Kellner, Pre-emptive strikes and the war on Iraq: A critique of Bush administration unilateralism and militarism.(*New Political Science* 2004) 87.

⁵⁴ Jim Harding, After Iraq: War, imperialism and democracy(Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing Ltd.2004)

⁵⁵ Noam Chomsky. Is Imperialism stupid? (In Khaleej Times.2004) Accessed 08/09/2010

7- End of PNAC:

There was no doubt that Washington was died since the absence of any authorized advertisement and neglecting the calls received by his telephone number. Eventually, a closed source from the group announced that the end of PNAC is near. As a matter of fact, the young group with his 27 characters among them the Vice President Dick Cheney and Pentagon chief Donald Rumsfeld take no step toward a good future since winter 2005, when they published their last “statements” that was a kind of supplication to augment the amount of the American battalion and navy to encounter the increasing requisition or need of the Pax Americana⁵⁶ it had done it’s better to elevate.

The Iraq invasion paved the way for the three part coalition .Consequently, some nationalists such as the religious Right’s Cheney, Christian Zionists and Israel-centered neo-conservatives started shattering in a short time. An attack on Rumsfeld leaded by the three, Weekly Standard editor William Kristol, PNAC director Gary Schmitt, and Carnegie Endowment for International Peace analyst Robert Kagan because they failed to spread the troops to mollify their homeland and to build a solid nation just like what happened in Germany and Japan after the World War II.⁵⁷

The breaking of the first policy and at the same time deepening the dilemma in Iraq, have led to the weakness of the hawks, obliging neo- conservatives of the group to stretch out to “liberal interventionists”, the two of them triggered a series of combined statements glorifying the values of nation building and a great battalion, or repealing for a harder U.S attitude toward Russia and China.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Pax Americana : American peace used for the period of relative tranquility from circa 1945 to the present day in regions to which U.S. power has extended (Merriam-Webster).

⁵⁷ Noam Chomsky. Is Imperialism stupid? (In Khaleej Times.2004) Accessed 08/09/2010

⁵⁸ ibid

During the President Bill Clinton's critics, the article was directed more against a Republican Congress which, in their view, had grown increasingly isolationist, particularly after the precipitous U.S. withdrawal from Somalia in 1994 and strong Republican opposition to intervention in the Balkans against Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic.⁵⁹

The two co-founded PNAC, whose charter was signed by leading neo-conservatives, including Cheney's future chief of staff, I. Lewis Libby; Rumsfeld's future deputy, Paul Wolfowitz; Bush's future top Middle East aide, Elliott Abrams; his future ambassador to Afghanistan and Iraq, Zalmay Khalilzad; Rumsfeld's future top international security official; the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) fellow Peter Rodman and neo-cons promoter Richard Perle, and Gov. Jeb Bush from Florida; similarly as Cheney and Rumsfeld themselves.

Some reports published by PNAC like "Rebuilding America's Defenses" and "Present Dangers", also some specifics concerning the characters, the two of them printed to impress the policy discussion throughout the presidential campaign that were based mostly to an excellent amount on unknown "Defense Planning Guidance" (DPG) paper created beneath Cheney once he was as secretary of defense underneath the American President George H.W. Bush in 1992⁶⁰

The document called for the "benevolent domination by one power" (the U.S.) created by Undersecretary of Defense Wolfowitz, Libby, Khalilzad, and the current deputy national security adviser, J.D. Crouch and other specialists in the domain was meant to interchange "collective internationalism", and at the same time for Washington to confirm that supremacy or hegemony notably in Australia, so as to stop the emergence by competition if needed, of any doable regional or world rival.

⁵⁹ *ibid*

⁶⁰ *Ibid*

It is currently PNAC's time to keep up and reproduce these concepts through its documents, its regular 'letters and statements' authorized by rightists and a gradual flow of ideas and essays that played the role of a bigger neo-conservative "echo chamber" that enclosed 'Kristol's Weekly Standard Fox News, the Washington Times, and the editorial pages of the Wall Street Journal', to border discussion in 'official Washington' and the thought media. From this point, PNAC was not just a "letter-head organization" that played the role of a mechanism for elaborating agreements on matters amid distinctive political powers in its condition, 'Republican hawks'-after propelling them to public ,and later 'as a think tank'.⁶¹

Thus, the truth that several of its half-a-dozen staff members – most recently, PNAC director Schmitt – have taken posts at the much-larger AEI located just five floors above PNAC's department aid demonstrate the incestuous constitution of the greater network. Yet, in 1998 PNAC first called for Washington to chase "regime change" in the East exactly in Iraq by armed forces tools in confluence with Ahmed chalabi's Iraqi National Congress who played a great role in the 'run-up to the 2003 invasion' upon Saddam Hussein later on.

Nevertheless, its most remarkable letter was transported to Bush Sep. 20, 2001, simply nine days once the 9/11 attacks. Additionally to line for the expulsion of the Taliban and starting war against al Qaeda, the letter involved 'waging a broader' and a lot of formidable "war on terrorism" that might embody setting apart the Palestinian Authority below Yassir statesman, absorbing Hizbullah⁶², menacing Syria and Islamic Republic of Iran and, most significantly, exclusion Hussein in spite of his affinity to the aggressions or al-Qaeda

⁶¹ ibid

⁶² Hezbollah - or the Party of God - is a powerful political and military organisation in Lebanon made up mainly of Shia Muslims. It emerged with financial backing from Iran in the early 1980s and began a struggle to drive Israeli troops from Lebanon(<http://news.bbc.co.uk>).

It may be that the Iraqi government provided assistance in some form to the recent attack on the United States,” it said. “But even if evidence does not link Iraq directly to the attack, any strategy aiming at the eradication of terrorism and its sponsors must include a determined effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power. Failure to undertake such an effort will constitute an early and perhaps decisive surrender in the war on international terrorism.⁶³

Thirty eight members of the predominantly neo-conservative Washington echo chamber signed the letter, many of whom especially Kristol, Kagan, Defense Policy Board members Perle, Woolsey, Eliot Cohen, Centre for Security Policy president Frank Gaffney, former Education Secretary William Bennett, syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer, and Foundation for the Defense of Democracies director Clifford May -would emerge, along with Woolsey, as the most ubiquitous champions of war with Iraq outside the administration

Seven months later, PNAC published a second letter authorized by a lot of similar individuals encouraging Bush to improve preparations ‘for war with’ Al- Iraq, break up all of ‘ties to the Palestinian Authority’ beneath Arafat and provides full aid to Ariel Sharon Israeli Prime Minister attempts to squeeze the Palestinian revolt: *“Israel’s fight against terrorism is our fight. Israel’s victory is an important part of our victory,”* the letter noted. *“For reasons both moral and strategic, we need to stand with Israel in its fight against terrorism.”* Bush complied two months later.

The world ended, and after September 11, the “new Pearl Harbor” envisioned in Rebuilding America’s Defenses, PNAC’s blueprint for world domination the world was born again in the fires of “Shock & Awe.” From top to bottom, the White House was staffed with PNAC ideologues who envisioned total war in the Middle East, regime change from Beirut to Cairo to Karachi to Riyadh. Beside Cheney and Rumsfeld were Lewis Libby, Paul Wolfowitz, Eliot Abrams, Richard Perle and a dramatically mustachioed rogue named John Bolton.

⁶³ Noam Chomsky. Is Imperialism stupid? (In Khaleej Times.2004) Accessed 08/09/2010

8- Conclusion

As a conclusion, after our focus on the main American foreign plans and strategies in the aftermath of the 9/11, we say that the American foreign strategies and visions towards the world did not change in case of the aims especially the leadership of the world. So, the American foreign plans and strategies changed only in the time, the space, and the manner.

CHAPTER THREE
THE INFLUENCE OF 9/11 EVENTS
ON IRAQ

1-Introduction

In this chapter we analyse and investigate the real reasons behind the American war on Iraq, based on the U.S. claims, their hidden intentions and their greed to find their benefits at the level of economy which is a major step toward controlling the global oil market in order to stay on its tracks against the economic giants including Russia and China.

The events of 9/11 took the world to another dimension, some serious changes occurred that day on so many levels. The whole world came to agree on how terrifying and crucial are those terrorists, the whole world felt threatened as if he is the next victim, the Twin Towers of the world trade in Manhattan, New York and the Pentagon in Washington D.C. which was an execution of 2996 victims by hijacked jets from American airports on September 11th, 2001. Therefore the American response was aggressive, as a response to the event. The U.S. government came up with one of the most extremist security strategies that helped Bush to declare war on Iraq.

2-Major leading forces behind the invasion of Iraq

After the First Gulf War there was a UN mandate; this mandate was called the UN Security Council Resolution 687⁶⁴. This mandate said that all Iraq long range missiles, nuclear, biological and chemical weapons were destroyed.

Outside of the UN Mandate after the First Gulf War the British and Americans (supported by France until 1998) conducted their own no fly zones in the north and south of Iraq. Something the Iraq regime was not happy about, as they said it went against their right to sovereignty.

⁶⁴ United Nations Security Council Resolution (1991) reaffirmed Iraq's liability under international law for any direct loss or damage resulting from Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

In 1998 the U.S. agreed on a political act called the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 where they called for a change in government in Iraq. This act saw the CIA spending around eight million Dollars a year funding the overtly seen movement to remove Saddam from power; many more millions were spent in covert operations.

When George W. Bush (Jr.) came to power in 2001 the chances of war in Iraq grew rapidly. Bush accused Iraq of starting to develop weapons of mass destruction and to ensure UN weapons inspectors were allowed full access to Iraq weapons, something they had not fully had. Iraq countered this by saying there were no weapons of mass destruction and that they were not allowing UN weapons inspectors as the 1999 checks included U.S. intelligence agents. Through late 2002 into 2003 Iraq reluctantly allowed weapons inspectors back in the country and were seen to be making progress, but this did not stop the United States pushing issues further. During the same time period the British Prime Minister Tony Blair was backing President Bush whole heartedly.

2.1- Economic embargo

Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 led the United Nations Security Council to authorize economic sanctions against Iraq, followed soon after by the freezing of Iraq's financial assets in Western Countries. These actions suspended all trade and financial relations between Iraq and a good part of the world. Today, these sanctions have not only curtailed the rate of growth of the Iraqi economy with serious economic and financial consequences, but also have had social and psychological consequences as well. According to the Iraqi government the embargo has cost Iraq an estimated 18 US billion between August 1990-January 1991.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ Amer, Al-Roubaie and Wajeeh Elali, THE FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ (Arab Studies Quarterly, vol. 17, no. 3, 1995)53–68.

Another study calculated that it cost the Country the equivalent of 21.6 US billion per annum in lost income. There has been a tremendous loss in export earnings, depreciation in the unofficial exchange rate of the Iraqi dinar, a substantial decrease in national income and a dramatic increase in the price of goods and services. The annual inflation rate is now estimated at 2.000 percent. This has produced a depressed economy and a lower standard of living not only for this generation but perhaps for many generations to come. Dreze⁶⁶ and Gazdar wrote:

War and prolonged sanctions have caused such comprehensive damage to Iraq's economy that it is now impossible to maintain these sanctions in their present form without perpetuating and perhaps even accentuating. The state of acute poverty in which a large part of the population is now plunged, the debate about sanctions cannot ignore this simple truth.⁶⁷

From a different perspective the invasion of Iraq is a desperate move by the U.S. rulers in order to safeguard their power, pushed by the need to rescue their economic crisis through using their military means and strategies. The Americans won't stop with Iraq, but will insist upon recolonizing the Middle East one way or another. Behind the invasion of Iraq exposes the idea that war will bring democracy to the Middle East.

⁶⁶ Jean Drèze is a Belgian-born Indian development economist and honorary professor at Delhi school of economic

⁶⁷ Jean Drèze, and Haris Gazdar. Hunger and Poverty in Iraq, 1991(World Development, vol. 20, no. 7, 1992)

2.2- Political:

Behind the invasion of Iraq lays some political forces to achieve certain goals seeking to control a larger share of the world's resources, the U.S. government planned to play one of the major roles in restricting, advising and controlling other governments, either by using their policies, economic strategies or their military means. After being one of the major powers in the world for centuries, the incident of 9/11 has shook America by striking their safety and economy.

Until today there is a divisive debate to know Bush's administrations motives, the U.S. provided many explanations, facts and reasons behind their actions and claims. We must know that the leading factors to the invasion of Iraq in order to comprehend the multidimensional factors, which provided the needed support to Bush's administration to declare war on terrorism and invade Iraq; therefore we need to go back and investigate pre 9/11 U.S. policy.

Official and publically provided reasons for the military action which gives only one side of the story to support the invasion, one must check the unofficial reasons and goals to grasp the other side of the story.

The invasion of Iraq is the most debatable questionable foreign policy decision. Historians are divided over interpretations and explanations of the war, the American claim that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction (WMD)⁶⁸ came to be proven wrong and those claims were not based on any facts or strong evidence. So does their actual causes and motives. During the war Bush's administration deception and trickery has been exposed, even before it became obvious to ex-weapons inspectors and Iraq specialists that Saddam had no (WMD) capability and clearly not one able of threatening the U.S.

⁶⁸ weapons of mass destruction is a nuclear, radiological, chemical, biological, or any other weapon that can kill and bring significant harm to a large number of humans or cause great damage to human-made structures

Robert Jervis already had examined and distrusted that such claims are raised, because there was no such thing as a nuclear armed Iraq could ever be a threat to the U.S; that it could not be contained, there for this claim should be off the list in order to prevent the war; be concluded that made deterrence turn up inadequate for U.S goals war the overweening eagerness of the Bush administration to predominate and demolish any regime it dispraise

One of the explicit materialist explanations for the war is oil, even if the American government denied the fact that oil is one of the main reasons behind the war. The response to those accusations is that America sits world's second large oil reserve, on top of the world's second largest oil reserve, on the other hand North Korea should be targeted by American because of its nuclear capabilities were strong but did not own oil; famously Wolfowitz⁶⁹ attributed the difference to the fact that Iraq was 'swimming in oil. According to Michael Klare, a prominent analyst of oil politics:

No doubt many factors are involved some strategic, some political, and some economic. But it is hard to believe that US leaders would contemplate such an extreme act without very powerful motives and the pursuit of oil has long constituted the most commanding motive for US military action in the Persian Gulf region.

⁶⁹ Paul Dundes Wolfowitz, U.S. government official, who, as deputy secretary of defense (2001–05) in the administration of Pres. [George W. Bush](#), was a leading architect of the [Iraq War](#). From 2005 to 2007 he was president of the [World Bank](#). Britanica

From a different perspective the invasion of Iraq is a desperate move by the U.S. rulers in order to safeguard their power, pushed by the need to rescue their economic crisis through using their military means and strategies. The Americans won't stop with Iraq, but will insist upon recolonizing the Middle East one way or another behind the invasion of Iraq exposes the idea that war will bring democracy to the Middle East.

3-Iraq Invasion (2003)

The 2003 invasion of Iraq was the first stage of the Iraq war. The invasion phase started on 19 March 2003 and lasted a month, including 21 days of vital combat operations, in which a combined army force of troops from the U.S., the U.K., Poland and Australia invaded Iraq together. the first stage of the war ended on 1 May 2003 when U.S. President G.W. Bush declared the "End of major combat operations", after which the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) was established as the first of several successive transitional governments leading up to the first Iraqi parliamentary election in January 2005. U.S. military forces later remained in Iraq until the departure in 2011.

The U.S.-led coalition sent their troops into Iraq during the initial invasion phase which lasted from 19 March until the May first 2003. Australian, British and polish troops were also sent among 36 other countries were involved in its aftermath in preparation for the invasion.

4- Consequences of the U.S. policy in Iraq

The Arab Gulf countries supported him against Iran and made him a symbol of courage. His reputed and fame as a hero increased in these countries with each Iraqi citizen killed in his conflicts. Many Iraqis didn't participate in those wars, and a lot of them had been executed, and their families had to pay for the bullets, which being used to kill their sons. Many asserted that the real reason for the war was the America's desire to have control of oil in Iraq, the United States announced in 2003 that its stockpile of its oil will be carried out after ten years, as stated in the media. And others assumed the reason was the Israel's dream to expand its area to include Iraq.

The United States declared to the world that the reason is to find the Mass destruction weapons, and to eliminate Saddam's regime, which has become a threat to the world. After long years of courtship between the Arab Gulf states and Saddam with all that unwavering support for each other, Suddenly they have become enemies. Friend of yesterday has become the enemy of the day.⁷⁰

The U.S Air Forces launched from the bases in the Arab Gulf countries and started the attack campaign in mars 2003, the first rockets batches hit Baghdad wildly to topple Saddam's regime. The sound of explosions spread in Baghdad and the other provinces in Iraq.

⁷⁰ Ayoub Atheer , in his research: Iraq befor and after 2003 (Uppsala University)

The horror of war made people lose patience and lose the feel of safe. Large numbers of people in Baghdad left to the east of Iraq and many others to the different provinces and some went out of Iraq, and some remain in Baghdad to witness the war and take their first class seats and watch the sky turning to a big screen displays a real war movie. Missiles, planes, bombs and explosions in everywhere.

All this and people were wandering the streets and even worse still, when kids go out in each attack campaign to watch the anti-aircraft missiles haunting the coalition forces aircraft, while bombing. Actually, they were afraid and just wanted to see by themselves that the danger has passed them.

As we were following through the media and meeting networking sites, days in Iraq become long and full of fear and anticipation, blended joy feelings of imminent demise for the regime with fear of death, The Americans became a source of fear and death rather than a symbol of devotion.

The suicidal explosions were responsible for killing a large amount of the civilians comparing with the soldiers. It looks like that the scene has not changed. Many people died during the last two decades due to different reasons but the number of casualties stayed the same, but this time it was happening daily in front of the media, and viewable by everyone, not a secret as it was in Saddam's time nor a conspiracy like it was during the Embargo.

Finally, the war officially ended. The American won the war as the people wished. The troops of US spread and controlled the streets of Baghdad and destroyed together with people the statues of Saddam in Baghdad. People loved the US troops as they saved them from the tyrant. The joy of the dictatorial regime demise didn't last. The terrorist attacks targeted US Army in the streets and harvested civilian souls too. The beautiful freedom has another meaning and weird ways to be applied, in that environment. Giving democracy to people in that way was like giving nuclear weapon to the cave man. What followed after the end of that war was worse than the war itself.

Iraq, lost its stability during the global economic weakness mainly caused by the war. By the end of the war, the number of displaced people outside the country was about 4 million. Of whom an average of about 100 people dead daily, one-third of the population lives in poverty, and the humanitarian emergency in Iraq has reached a crisis level that compares some of the world's most urgent disasters.

Since the 2003 invasion, economically, the United States has designed policies to open the country to foreign investors, dissolve various factories and state-owned enterprises; the (IMF) has imposed a range of economic reforms, including fuel, food and health. This led to the destruction of the Iraqi economy to 60 per cent. After the war and the occupation of Iraq, the coalition did not succeed in protecting the Iraqi's cultural heritage which was stolen by art thieves. The National Library and National Museum, along with many other important cultural institutions, were severely damaged and looted in the early days of the occupation, destroying Iraqi cultural heritage.⁷¹

⁷¹ Operation Corporate Freedom: The IMF and World Bank in Iraq by Basav Sen , Hope Chu 5 april 2006

5- Post invasion phase

The Operation Iraq Freedom was successful and quick, exactly as it had been planned by the US government. In no longer than three weeks Baghdad fell down in the hands the willing coalition troops, who celebrated victory side by side with the anti-Saddam Iraqis as they were destroying the dictator's statue at El-Ferdous Yard. In May 2003, aboard the military aircraft carrier Abraham Lincoln, the United States President G. Bush made a speech declaring that "*Mission accomplished*". Then, claiming that it is time to start achieving the political goals of the occupation.

Many analysts thought that post invasion phase will be as they expected and the end of the war would be soon. Yet, the resistance started, paradoxically, when several revolutionary militias from Kurds, Ba'athists, and el-Qaeda jihadists started a wave of attacks on the US forces taking advantages from knowing the land and using jungles, deserts, caves, mountains, and even hidden among civilians in the cities especially in El-Fallujah which was the solid stronghold for the Mujahedeen. As the journalist of Al Jazeera Ahmed Mansour⁷² described in his book that he published under the title *Battle of El- Fallujah . . . and America's Defeat in Iraq*. Mansur considered that the city rose as the Iraqi resistance symbol.

Since capitalism has become a leading economic doctrine in the United States. The greed of American cartels has reached high levels of savagery; after the invasion of Iraq they got the opportunity to make business during war and winning more and more revenues as it was the main objective of these companies. And the wars waged by the Pentagon have in fact been sources of huge results in corporate coffers. Christian Miller, an American reporter and writer witnessed the process of the Iraq reconstruction that followed the official end of the military operations. Miller documented his field experience with the corporations' working units in his book *Blood Money: Wasted Billions, Lost Lives, And Corporate Greed in Iraq* published in 2010.

⁷² Ahmed Mansour, the celebrated reporter and anchor for the Al-Jazeera network, the only reporter to remain in Fallujah during the US siege of the city. He is also the author of eighteen books.

The book criticizes the numerous acts of fraudulence committed by the corporations. According to Miller, Americans were struggling in Iraq for money; trying to earn as they could since the Iraq money was without any owner. Rebuilding Iraq was a mere excuse to pave the way for the capitalist greedy oil corporations to facilitate the long-term process of controlling the producing oilfields and oil reserves.

6- The achieved success and the unexpected casualties

The Professor of Political Science at Duke University Christopher Gelpi in association with Peter D. Feaver, and Jason Reifler stated at the start of their book: Success Matters: Casualty Sensitivity and the War in Iraq, That

Since the Vietnam War, U.S. policymakers have worried that the American public will support military operations only if the human costs of the war, as measured in combat casualties, are minimal. Although the public is rightly averse to suffering casualties, the level of popular sensitivity to U.S. military casualties depends critically on the context in which those losses occur. The public's tolerance for the human costs of war is primarily shaped by the intersection of two crucial factors: beliefs about the rightness or wrongness of the war, and beliefs about the war's likely success. The impact of each belief depends upon the other. Ultimately, however, beliefs about the likelihood of success matter most in determining the public's willingness to

tolerate U.S. military deaths in combat.⁷³

A reanalysis of publicly available polls and a detailed analysis of a series of polls designed by the authors to tap into public attitudes on casualties resulted that success at war would absorb the anger of people toward casualties.

The US military media has taken the lead in minimizing the real losses of war for American public opinion leaders. Because of the intensity of its influence on the political decision-making and the financing of wars, which is usually born by the US taxpayer, in addition to the impact on the morale of soldiers in the field In Iraq; as soon as the Iraqi resistance emerged and its operations escalated, the US administration tried to underestimate the resistance and to overshadow its losses for the fear of public opinion reaction and also in order to frustrate the morale of the enemy.

Despite the success achieved at the Iraq war, The US losses in Iraq were not limited to human and material losses, but also to the unseen loss of the US military morale, the deterioration of the credibility of its democracy and the deterioration of its prestige at the international level.

⁷³ Jason Reifler; Christopher Gelpi,; and , Peter Feaver ,Success Matters: Casualty Sensitivity and the War in Iraq.(Political Science Faculty Publications, 2006).

7- The division of the country on ethnic basis

Iraq is shaped by a number of religious, cultural, and ethnic forces. A precise statistical breakdown of the population is extremely difficult due to inaccuracies in census data coupled with official manipulations. At least 97 percent of the population adheres to some form of Islam. Before the invasion the ascent by the majority Shiite Arabs to ruling status. Fervently opposed to the Shiite-led government are armed factions of Sunni Arabs who chafe at the overturning of the old order. British colonialists installed Sunni Arabs as proxy rulers in the early 20th century, and Sunni families and tribes managed to hold onto power after Iraq was granted independence and even as the country's Shiite population steadily increased. Saddam Hussein was a Sunni strongman from the north who crushed anyone opposed to him, but reserved some of his most vicious punishments for the Shiite Arabs and Kurds, two groups in Iraq that have long sought a significant measure of power or independence. (Wong)⁷⁴

Wong also stated in his report to the New York times that Some of the first steps the American Occupation Authority took in 2003 are blamed by critics for igniting the Sunni-led insurgency: disbanding the Iraqi Army and purging members of the former ruling Baath Party from government and public life. Yet, the conflict between the Sunni Arabs and the Shiites is at its heart a deeply existential one. To put the majority Shiites in power, the Americans held a series of elections in 2005. Iraqis largely voted along ethnic and sectarian lines, further reinforcing the rifts in Iraqi society that had widened under Mr Hussein. Moreover, to the disappointment of the Bush administration, the parties that the Iraqis voted for were overwhelmingly conservative and religious. (ibid)

A Shiite coalitionn cobbled together by Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani, the most powerful Shiite cleric in Iraq, won the most votes in both sets of parliamentary elections in 2005 and consequently took control of the government. This further inflamed the Sunni Arab insurgency as well as bringing new worries to the American government.

⁷⁴ Wong on Feb. 15, 2008 to the New York Times

Much of the Middle East destabilizing was affected by The Iraq war. A lot of scholars and politicians of the region agreed that the biggest winner of the Iraq war is Iran, which is ruled by Shiite Persians and has close ties to Iraq's Shiite leaders. Inspired by Shiite ascendancy and by the diversion of American power and resources into Iraq, Iran has pressed its agenda across the region, which in turn has alarmed Sunni Arab countries, especially Saudi Arabia.

8- Conclusion

The Iraq invasion was mixture of economic and ideological agenda. The Neoconservatives and the oilmen targeted the country for different purposes. Thus, the act proved America's real interests. It exposes the United States fake ideals of justice, democracy, and freedom. Also, it dimensioned the reality of the 9/11 as an American done, that attempted to implement the notions of fear, vulnerability, and insecurity to unite the American populace behind a courage wartime leader, who holds their destiny at his hands.

Holding the gun in a hand and the Bible in the other. In the path of fighting terror, the United States has been grounding and justifying her crimes on the right of humanity. While money earning appeared to be the major driving cause behind many American conflicts.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

We concluded that after the fall of the USSR, The United States emerged as a representative of the unipolar system, and according to that it has been acting as an organizer of the international community. Power and identity were the main factors to help the US take in position as a world leader as they played a great role in shaping the American foreign policy; USA has always believed its political ideals are universally applicable. Its claims for exporting democratic values to the world and mainly to the Middle East was their ultimate goal to the American foreign policy at the beginning of the 21st century.

As many in the world hoped for the end of wars and a steady move towards world peace, the 11 September attacks in 2001 were a turning point in the world history and reshaped the American foreign policy administration, it revealed the emergence of a new type of conflict, which was a confrontation between the United States and the forces of terrorism, the American foreign policy leaders and in order to ensure the US national security and interests. They called to adopt an ideological war against terrorism. This decision shades the light on some countries mainly in the Middle East that America considered complicit with terrorism.

Through history the United States participated directly, or indirectly, in many wars in the Middle East to prevent any player to challenge its role. Its foreign policy is based on the marriage between those human values and the Realpolitik that seeks to maintain its position in the world. Actual post “9/11 attacks” practices revealed the excessive use of US military power and the obvious threat to the national security of several countries under the pretext of fighting terrorism. The war against Iraq was not an act of valor to protect the Americans from the terrorist Saddam's WMD as they claimed. In Fact, their foreign policy aimed to conceal pre-emptively any possible emerging of Islamic rival in the Middle-East.

The other benefactor from the occupation of Iraq was the oil interests. The United States had been conducting by its energy security since the early aftermath of WWII. The Big Oil was in a continuing struggle for dominating the oil global markets. The U.S. foreign policy decision makers and oil cartels knew that the domestic oil production will not satisfied the

U.S. requirements. Hence, the Caspian region, Latin America, the former Soviet Union Republics and the Middle-East were the basic stages for the U.S. foreign geopolitics. It is known also, that the oil cartels never hesitated to act violently and illegally to achieve the desired revenues.

The US support to the authoritarian regimes that serve its strategies in the region, and the failure of its policies in Iraq and Afghanistan after the large number of victims because of the civil wars puts its policies there under questioning. Therefore, we concluded that The Iraq invasion was mixture of economic and ideological agenda. The Neocons and the oilmen targeted the country for different purposes. Thus, the act exposes the U.S. fake ideals of freedom, democracy, and justice. Also, it characterizes the reality of the 9/11 as an American done, that attempted to implement the notions of fear, vulnerability, and insecurity.

The United States took advantage of the 9/11 attacks to interfere in the internal affairs of Arab countries in the Middle East, and to control the most important oil production sites in the world in order to secure for itself energy sources for its own interests. However, these American interventions produced negative secretions, which continued to be seen in both the Arab and international levels. The events of September 11, negatively affected the Arab countries, where Iraq was occupied, and looted its wealth under the pretext of reconstruction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1- BOOKS:

- ,Burbach. R & J, Tarbell. Imperial overstretch: George W. Bush and the hubris of the empire.(Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing Ltd.2004) ;
- Al-Roubaie, Amer, and Wajeeh Elali. "THE FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ." *Arab Studies Quarterly*, vol. 17, no. 3, 1995;
- Atheer. Ayoub ,Iraq befor and after 2003 (Uppsala University);
- Chomsky. Noam. Is Imperialism stupid? (In Khaleej Times.2004) ;
- Donnelly. Thomas. Rebuilding America's Defenses (a report of the Project of the New American Century: September 2000) ;
- Drèze, Jean, and Haris Gazdar. "Hunger and Poverty in Iraq, 1991." *World Development*, vol. 20, no. 7, 1992;
- Foner. Eric. Give Me Liberty: 3rd Edition (Harvard university :2006) ;
- Greenberg, Karen J. *Rogue Justice: the Making of the Security State*. Broadway Books, an Imprint of the Crown Publishing Group, 2017;
- Harding. J, After Iraq: War, imperialism and democracy .(Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing Ltd.2004);
- Kellner.D, Pre-emptive strikes and the war on Iraq: A critique of Bush administration unilateralism and militarism.(*New Political Science* 2004) ;
- Kristol, Irving. Neo-Conservatism: The Autobiography of an Idea. New York: The Free Press, 1995;
- Litwak,Robert S, The Imperial Republic after 9/11 (The Wilson Quarterly 2002);
- Mckeever, Robert J., and Philip Davies. Politics USA. 2nd ed. England: Pearson, 2006;
- Miller,Christian. *Blood Money: Wasted Billions, Lost Lives, And Corporate Greed in Iraq* .Back Bay Books .2010;
- Reifler, Jason; Gelpi, Christopher; and Feaver, Peter, "Success Matters: Casualty Sensitivity and the War in Iraq"" (2006). *Political Science Faculty Publications*;
- Routledge, Ian. *Addicted to oil: America's Relentless Drive for Energy Security*. New York: I.B. Tauris, 2005;

- Seikal, Amin. *Islam and the West: Conflict or Cooperation?* . Palgrave, NY, 2003;
- Zalloum, Abdulhay Yahia. *Oil Crusades: America Through Arab Eyes*. London: Pluto Press, 2007;

2- ARTICLES:

- Chen, James. *USA Patriot Act*. March 11, 2007
- El Mansour, Mohamed. "The US-Middle East Connection: Interests, Attitudes
- Harrison, Ann. "Behind the USA Patriot Act," . November 5, 2001.
- History.com editors. *Reaction to 9/11*. A&E Television Networks, August 13, 2010;
- De Lorenzo Joshua. "Introduction to the American Foreign policy". New York State High School Regents Exam Prep Center.2000;
- President Carter, in his "State of the Union" address, January 1980.
- Robert, M. Danin. "Defining US interests in the Middle East.
- The Project for The American New Century". www.ProjectfortheNewAmericanCentury.com;
- USA PATRIOT Act" (U.S. H.R. 3162, Public Law 107-56).
- Wong ,Edward. . *Overview: The Iraq War*. (Feb.15,2008.)

3- Websites:

- <http://www.teachmideast.org/essays/28-history/110-the-us-middle-east-connection-interests;>
- [http://www.chomsky.info/articles/20050704.htm;](http://www.chomsky.info/articles/20050704.htm)
- <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/6170801.stm> .;
- [http://news.bbc.co.uk/Hezbollah;](http://news.bbc.co.uk/Hezbollah)
- [http://www.newamericancentury.org.](http://www.newamericancentury.org)
- <http://www.teachmideast.org/essays/28-history/110-the-us-middle-east-connectioninterests;>
- [https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/ref/timestopics/topics_iraq.htm;](https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/ref/timestopics/topics_iraq.htm)
- [https://dictionary.cambridge.org/Neo-Conservative;](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/Neo-Conservative)
- [https://www.britannica.com/Taliban;](https://www.britannica.com/Taliban)
- [https://www.cfr.org/project/defining-us-interests-middle-east;](https://www.cfr.org/project/defining-us-interests-middle-east)
- [https://www.history.com/topics/21st-century/reaction-to-9-11,](https://www.history.com/topics/21st-century/reaction-to-9-11)