

**REPUBLIQUE ALGERIENNE DEMOCRATIQUE & POPULAIRE**  
**MINISTERE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR & DE LA RECHERCHE**  
**SCIENTIFIQUE**  
**UNIVERSITY OF AMMAR THELIDJI OF LAGHOUAT**  
**FACULTY OF LETTERS, AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**



**American Foreign Policy in The Middle East: a case study**  
**Iraq and Syria**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Literature and Civilization

**Submitted by:**

Benelmouaz Khaled

Mohamed Rida

**Supervised by:**

Mr. Nebeg Raouf

**Academic year: 2021-2022**



### Acknowledgements

In the Name of Allah, the Most Merciful and the Most Compassionate

I would like to express our special thanks of gratitude to our supervisor Mr. Nebeg Raouf for his patience and guidelines throughout the course of this thesis.

I am also thankful to all teachers of the English Department at Ammar Thelidji University, particularly the members of the jury for their cordial support, valuable information and guidance which helped a lot to complete my university study

### Dedication

Words are not enough to express my immense acknowledgements. I am grateful to my parents for their upbringing, sacrifice, education and support throughout my whole life especially my mother, to whom I owe a great debt of gratitude and respect.

I would like also to express my thanks to all my, brothers, sisters and fiance, Hiba for the generous support they provide me throughout my entire life.

### Abstract

Many authors, scholars, and historians have found American foreign policy to be a significant issue for discussion and evaluation over the previous century, particularly following WWII. This study will look at how the major events in the American foreign policy war changed from an isolationist to an interventionist stance. The main objective of American foreign policy is to create a stable world in which every nation that is not an ally is seen to be the adversary. For this reason, this study aims to examine US foreign policy in the Middle East, where the country vented all of its resentment. In addition to the true reasons for American engagement in the Middle East, particularly in Kuwait, Iraq and lately Syria. While it is a well-known topic among academics to investigate the true motivations behind American participation in Iraq, this study will address the Iraq war and the American foreign policy towards Syria following the 9/11 attacks in an in-depth examination of two cases. This piece of work will highlight the American foreign policy toward the two Arabs opposing countries Iraq and Syria to the US existence in the region, and the flimsy excuses the US made to intervene in Iraq such as the possession of weapons of mass destruction and the harbouring of terrorist groups. In addition, it will show how the US managed to isolate Syria and prevent it from playing its natural role as a leader in the region.

**Key words:** Foreign Policy, US, Middle East ,WWII, Kuwait, Syria, 9/11, Iraq.

List of abbreviations

CIA: Central Intelligence Agency.

EU: European Union.

ISIS: Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

ISIL: Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

NAFTA: North American Free Trade Agreement.

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

OPEC: Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries.

UN: United Nations .

US : United States.

WWII : Second World War.

WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
Abstract.....	III
Résumé.....	IV
ملخص.....	V
List of abbreviations.....	VI
Table of content.....	VII
General Introduction.....	01

***Chapter one: Theoretical background of The American  
Foreign Policy***

Introduction:.....	05
1. Theories of American Foreign Policy.....	05
1.1. Offensive Realism.....	05
1.2. Deffensive Realism.....	06
1.3. Liberalism.....	07
1.4. Marxism.....	08
1.5. Neoclassical Realism.....	09
1.6. Constructivism.....	10
2. Aims of American Foreign Policies.....	12
3. Tools of Enforcing Foreign Policies.....	16

Conclusion.....19

***Chapter Three: US Foreign Policy in Iraq 2003***

Introduction:.....21

2.1. The US-Iraqi Relations before the Invasion (1980-2003).....21

2.2. Causes of the Iraq invasion.....22

2.1.1. Alleged Reasons for the Invasion.....23

2.1.1.1. Possession of WMDs.....23

2.1.1.2. The Need to End Dictatorship and Spread Democracy.....24

2.1.1.3. Protection of US National Security.....25

2.2.2. Actual Causes of the Invasion.....26

2.2.2.1. The Pursuit of Iraqi Oil.....27

2.2.2.2. The Project for a New American Century.....28

2.2.2.3. Eliminating an Enemy of Israel.....28

2.3. Consequences of the Iraq invasion.....29

2.3.1. Human costs.....29

2.3.2. Humanitarian and Social Crisis.....30

2.3.3. Dependence on The US.....31

2.3.4. Sunni-Shiite Tension.....31

2.3.5.The Emergence of Al-Qaeda in Iraq.....31

2.3.6.The ascendancy of Iran.....32

2.3.7.Limits of US Power in the Middle East.....33

Conclusion.....33

***Chapter three: US Foreign Policy in Syria 2003***

Introduction.....35

3.1.U.S-SYRIA RELATIONS.....35

3.2.Iraq-Syria relations.....37

3.3.Syria’s reaction to the Iraq invasion of 2003.....40

3.4.The impact of the Iraq war on Syria.....43

3.4.1.An Enduring Alliance between Syria and Iran.....43

3.4.2.The Emergence of terrorist groups in Syria.....44

3.4.3.Kurdish Ambitions.....45

3.4.5.The Syrian civil war.....46

Conclusion .....46

General Conclusion:.....47

Works cited.....49

The term Foreign Policy is a broad subject. It is the nation's strategies and self-interests toward the countries of the world, including the government's relations with allies and adversaries. The nation's policy consists of the rules that the state follows to protect and preserve its domestic and foreign systems around the world. Furthermore, the term foreign encompasses everything. The international system encompasses all national affairs and actions throughout the world, including neutral countries. It depicts the associations and assistance of each homeland's alliance towards a different one. It also includes policies related to trade and security. Additionally, foreign policy enhances the global cooperation system by containing the techniques the state employs to advance its national and international goals.

American Foreign Policy in the world has recently been a prominent issue by scholars and researchers due to America's position as the world's dominant country in several sectors and changes in foreign diplomacy. The people of the United States believe that the rights and benefits of freedom apply to everyone on earth and that they must communicate a message to other nations that they believe to be from god. However, much like other governments, America bases its Foreign Policy on self-interest and the pursuit of its stated objectives. Moreover, in recent decades, US influence in the Middle East has become extremely relevant to American interests.

### **Problematic of research:**

The work being presented will be centred on American foreign policy around the world, especially in the Middle East region, and the kinds of tactics it employs against rival nations there like Iraq and Syria. The US's post-first Gulf War policies are frequently highlighted in this work. Additionally, it illustrates the US's policy of isolation and intervention in light of major events, including the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, the 9/11 attacks, and other conflicts. It will go into great detail about American relations with both Iraq and Syria, as well as the hijackers' 9/11 assaults and the US response strategy. Review the main American interventions in the Middle East, including those in Iraq, along with their justifications and the relationship between the US and Syria.

This piece of writing seeks to demonstrate the kind of global foreign policy practised by the United States. because it places a lot of emphasis on the one used in the Middle East. Additionally, it will show how America evolved from isolationism to interventionism and explore the major post-World War II events. Additionally, it tries to highlight the disparity between America's associations with Iraq and its interactions with Syria. The paper aims to explain the fundamental motives behind America's choice to invade Iraq and the effects of that action on several fronts. this raises the following inquiries: What are the fundamental tenets of American foreign policy toward the rest of the globe, and specifically the Middle East?

### **Sub-questions:**

- 1) What are the principal strategies employed by America in the Middle East?

What are the main reasons behind the American intervention in Iraq?

- 2) Since the leaders of both Syria and Iraq are Arab nationalists, why did the US invade Iraq rather than Syria or both at once if it was afraid of Saddam Hussein's rule, which is similar to Assad's regime?

### **Hypotheses:**

- 1) US foreign policy in the Middle East was based on the idea of imperialism, taking into account the enormous wealth of petroleum resources and declaring war on terrorism.
- 2) The oppressive government of Saddam Hussein, his bold desire to conquer nations like Iran and Kuwait, and his antagonism to US global leadership are the causes of the American war against Iraq.

The analysis that follows will demonstrate US foreign policy in the world. It will cover the main tactics used by the US in its dealings with various nations. This piece of work includes a variety of definitions, quotations, and points of view to explain US Foreign Policy through the 20th and 21st centuries. The methodology is descriptive-analytical, in which qualitative data will be gathered and examined considering the American foreign policy developments through history taking into consideration facts and the current political issues.

The current study will have three chapters, as well as a general introduction and a general conclusion. The first chapter of the paper addresses the theoretical foundations of American foreign policy, including defensive and offensive realism, liberalism, Marxism, neoclassical realism, and constructivism, which can be used to describe US Foreign Policy behaviour. The chapter will disclose the goals of US foreign policy in general, as well as several examples from WWII to the present. At the end of the chapter, we'll look at how the United States enforces its foreign policy through the employment of diplomatic means.

The second chapter will also examine American foreign policy in Iraq, particularly in 2003, look into the main causes of the invasion, and decide whether to start a war. The second chapter of the paper focuses on how American aggression has affected the Iraqi government, particularly in all spheres, including the military and geopolitics as well as the economy, society, and politics.

The final chapter, however, will focus on Iraqi-Syrian relations, the history of US-Syrian relations from 1944, following the US determination that Syria had achieved effective independence from a French-administered mandate, until 2003, when the US decided to invade Iraq, as well as the Syrian government's reaction to the American invasion and the consequences of the Iraqi invasion on the country.

This research is undertaken to explore the main theories of American Foreign Policy and to describe the invasion of Iraq by the US in 2003. Moreover, it describes the US-Syria relations before and after the impact. Our exploration of the topic can be just an opening for a further study of the subject matter, critics predicted the US intervention in Syria and argued that the final target for full American supremacy in the Middle East is Iran

## **Introduction**

This chapter reviews major theoretical perspectives on US Foreign Policy as well as how these theoretical perspectives explain foreign policy decision-making and conducting of The US. First, the first chapter will examine defensive and offensive realism, liberalism, Marxism, neoclassical realism, and constructivism which can be based on understanding US Foreign Policy behaviour. Then, the chapter will reveal the aims of US Foreign Policy in general and will also give some examples from WWII up to now. At the end of the chapter, we will see how The US enforces its Foreign Policy through the use of certain diplomatic tools.

### **1. Theories of American foreign policy**

#### **1.1.1. Offensive Realism**

According to offensive realists, weaker governments are increasingly banding up with the strongest or most threatening power out of fear or profit, rather than balancing against it. As a result, offensive realists' strategy for maximizing power and gaining hegemony is to take advantage of smaller states' proclivity to join the superior power's bandwagon.<sup>1</sup> Once established as the dominant power in the international system, the hegemon must defend its dominance by maintaining a large power disparity between itself and potential challengers. It will use force to prevent any challenge to its dominance. Without such safeguards, its adversaries are likely to grow stronger at its expense, posing a threat to its security as well as superiority. This is what

---

<sup>1</sup> Schweller, Randall L. "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In." *International Security*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1994, pp. 72–107, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2539149>. Accessed 7 Apr. 2022.

Mearsheimer emphasizes: "the best way to ensure their survival is to be the most powerful state in the system."<sup>2</sup> According to Mearsheimer, The United States is the only state that has ever achieved hegemony in the international system.<sup>3</sup>

A careful reading of US Foreign Policy in the nineteenth century reveals that The US successfully expanded across North America and gained several offshore territories following the Spanish and American War (1898). As a result, Mearsheimer concludes that The United States is "well suited to be the poster child for offensive realism." When The United States became a regional hegemon, offensive realism predicted that the goal of US Foreign Policy would be to prevent the emergence of a hegemonic state in other parts of the world. It means that the United States has attempted to prevent the emergence of a hegemon in either The European or Asian continents. Offensive realism supports an offshore strategy, Mearsheimer believed that this is also the strategy pursued by The United States since the end of World War II.<sup>4</sup>

### 1.1.2. Defensive Realism

Defensive realism focuses on maximizing security through balancing, deterrence, and multilateral arms control. Power maximization, according to defensive realists, can be counterproductive and harm state security.<sup>5</sup> They believe that states are concerned with maintaining the status quo and that the primary goal of states is survival or security rather than power maximization. According to defensive realists, states must protect themselves from threats and minimize relative loss; further, expansion is not necessary for state survival and may backfire.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Mearsheimer, John J." *The Tragedy of Great Power Politic*'s. New York: Norton, 2001.pp33.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Jervis, Robert. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics*, vol. 30, no. 2, 1978, pp. 167–214, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009958>. Accessed 7 Apr. 2022.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

Furthermore, defensive realism contends that hegemonic status in the international system is impossible due to the efficient operation of the equilibrium mechanism.

To put it another way, because the balancing tendency is inherent in international politics, a countervailing coalition will be formed to prevent a threatening power from achieving its hegemonic objectives.<sup>7</sup> As a result, for the sake of security, states should exercise restraint and refrain from threatening others. According to its main line of argument, defensive realism predicts that US foreign policy behaviour will be characterized by constraint, especially when The US' degree of security is very high. However, recent US history indicates that this prediction appears to be incorrect, as the US has sought to maintain its primacy and hegemony in world politics by increasing its relative power over other states. Defensive realism assumes that this is due to domestic politics, which can prevent the US from following the imperatives of global politics.<sup>8</sup>

### **1.1.3. Liberalism**

Many people may be surprised that liberalism is regarded as one of the most important theories of US Foreign Policy because The United States has sought to promote the values of liberty and democracy since it declared independence in 1776. The core character of liberal theory implies that US Foreign Policy should reflect and promote the liberal and democratic features of US domestic institutions more vividly. According to this logic, the primary goal of US Foreign Policy is to provide people all over the world with individual freedom and human rights. Arguably, this is likely to benefit The US itself because the security of The US is increased when more nation states support liberalism.

---

<sup>7</sup>. Waltz, Kenneth." Theory of International Politics." New York: McGraw Hill, 1979.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

This is also advantageous to the rest of the world because at the heart of the liberal theory is the goal of bringing freedom and human rights to all. Though liberals agree that The United States Foreign Policy should better reflect the country's political values and identities, they disagree on how to best extend the value of liberty and freedom around the world.<sup>9</sup> One of the central tenets of US foreign policy has been the spread of democracy and liberty. The difficulty for US Foreign Policymakers is deciding whether to promote democracy directly through foreign aid for freedom movements, diplomatic negotiations, or indirectly through other means. Military intervention and regime change promote democracy in non-liberal countries. Two other major components of the liberal theory of US Foreign Policy are encouraging free trade and viewing international institutions as facilitators of international cooperation.<sup>10</sup>

#### 1.1.4. Marxism

Marxism is a theory that explains US Foreign Policy behaviour by focusing on internal economic factors rather than the structure of the domestic political system. The Marxist theory emphasizes the capitalistic nature of The US economy and the burdens it bears in shaping the country's expansionist and imperialist foreign policy. The central argument of Marxist theory is that US Foreign Policy serves to advance the interests of the capitalist class in US society and the vast enterprises they own. Marxists argue that the real reason for most of The US interventions in Latin America, The Middle East, Asia, and elsewhere was to meet the needs of The US domestic economy for cheap raw materials and markets.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Kloppenber, James T. "In Retrospect: Louis Hartz's 'The Liberal Tradition in America.'" *Reviews in American History*, vol. 29, no. 3, 2001, pp. 460–78, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30030991>. Accessed 8 Apr. 2022.

<sup>10</sup> Ikenberry, G. John., et al. *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies, and Impacts*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

<sup>11</sup> Kolko, Gabriel. "*The Roots of American Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Power and Purpose*". Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

According to Marxist theory, The United States Foreign Policy aims to provide and sustain stability in the international system for the expansion of capitalism to protect the capitalist class's interests. It implies that the wars fought by The US in Vietnam, Bosnia, and Iraq, or elsewhere, were fought to bring stability to the international system, the stability that capitalists desperately needed to invest their capital in overseas markets and reap greater profits. The United States has attempted to address its domestic economic difficulties by pursuing expansionism, which entails seeking access to new markets, investment opportunities, and raw material sources beyond its borders.<sup>12</sup>

### 1.1.5. Neoclassical Realism

Attempts are still being made to combine external/systemic and internal/domestic determinants to develop a foreign policy theory that is more explanatory than either external or internal theories. The emergence of neoclassical realist theory is one of the best examples of this effort. The interactions between systematic and domestic factors, according to neoclassical realists, are the best way to understand US Foreign Policy and explain US external behaviour. According to neoclassical realism, systematic factors play an important role in explaining US Foreign Policy behaviour, however, if internal factors are deemphasized, our understanding of US Foreign Policy formulation and implementation will be incomplete.<sup>13</sup>

For example, a state's relative power is a systematic power that is important for establishing the independent variables of a Foreign Policy. However, neoclassical realists believe that power distribution in the international system is incapable of providing a clear and convincing explanation for US Foreign Policy implementation. To put it another way, domestic factors had to be considered to understand how US leaders base their foreign policy decisions on systemic factors. places domestic politics as an intervening variable between the distribution of power and foreign policy

---

<sup>12</sup> Williams, William A. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. New York, Norton, 1979.

<sup>13</sup> *ibid*

behaviour”.<sup>14</sup> Foreign policymakers' perceptions of relative power distribution in the international system, as well as governmental structure, are two important intervening variables, according to neoclassical realists. It follows that domestic factors such as individual and governmental sources are critical for gaining a comprehensive picture of US foreign policy behaviour.<sup>15</sup>

### 1.1.6. Constructivism

Contrary to the balance of power theory of realism and the democratic peace theory of liberalism, constructivism is a theory that includes actors and factors that neither external nor internal theories do. In terms of actors, constructivists acknowledge the primacy of states while also emphasizing the role of other actors such as state agencies, social communities, international organizations, and think tanks in any dynamics in international politics.<sup>16</sup>

In terms of factors, constructivists believe that human consciousness and its influence on global politics are important. The concept of human consciousness, according to constructivism, should be viewed as the starting point for explaining human behaviours.<sup>17</sup>

This is a significant departure from the materialistic assumptions of defensive realism, offensive realism, neo-classical realism, and liberalism, which rely on a rational actor model to explain state behaviour in the international system. They contend that states, as unitary actors in anarchy, seek to maximize their self-defined interests and that their pursuit of survival, power, and wealth appears

---

<sup>14</sup> Waltz, Kenneth N. “Structural Realism after the Cold War.” *International Security*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2000, pp. 5–41, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2626772>. Accessed 8 Apr. 2022.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Weber, Martin. “Between ‘Is’ and ‘Ought’: IR Constructivism, Critical Theory, and the Challenge of Political Philosophy.” *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 20, no. 2, June 2014, pp. 516–543, doi:10.1177/1354066112466573.

busse, Nikolas. “Constructivism and Southeast Asian security.” *Pacific Review* 12 (1999): pp44.

to be endless. Constructivism, which does not emphasize such material factors, asserts that states are social actors whose actions adhere to domestic and international rules. According to this logic, interactions between states are naturally social and more flexible.<sup>18</sup>

Identity is associated with ideas by constructivists. In constructivist terms, this renders material forces essentially meaningless. People have their ideas about how to socially construct the meanings of their world. The possession of nuclear weapons by China, Russia, and Iran means something different to The United States than the possession of nuclear weapons by France and The United Kingdom. Their nuclear weapons are undeniably similar in terms of materials. However, British nuclear weapons are not harmful from the standpoint of The US because of the identity as a friend that The US has bestowed upon The United Kingdom nuclear weapons in Iran's hands are regarded as dangerous because The US has established a different identity for Iran. From a constructivist standpoint, this exemplifies how identity matters in international politics.<sup>19</sup>

In the logic of constructivism, ideas and identity play a critical role in explaining US Foreign Policy. The analysis and explanation of US external behaviours should begin with national ideas. Foreign policy and self-definition play a role in shaping US identity. According to constructivism theory, identity is always about others and emerges from distinguishing oneself from others. According to constructivism theory, identity is always about others and emerges from distinguishing oneself from others. As a result, during The Cold War, The United States' national identity as a defender of liberty, democracy, and human rights was shaped in part by its proximity to The Soviet Union, which was perceived to be totalitarian.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, pp 45

<sup>19</sup> Houghton, David Patrick. "Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Toward a Constructivist Approach." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 3 (2007): 24-45.

Constructivist theorists point to the NSC-68<sup>20</sup> document as evidence of the importance of ideas in enhancing identities because it sketched out the US Cold War Containment Policy and distinguished US national identities and The Soviet Ones.<sup>21</sup>

## 2. Aims of American Foreign Policies

What is the definition of Foreign Policy? On numerous levels, we can consider it as “the goals that a state’s officials seek to attain abroad, the values that give rise to those objectives, and the means or instruments used to pursue them.”<sup>22</sup> This definition focuses on some of the most important aspects of US foreign policy, such as national goals abroad and how the US attempts to achieve them. It's also worth noting that we make a distinction between foreign and domestic policy. It's also worth noting that we separate foreign policy, which is concerned with the outside world, from domestic policy, which is concerned with the United States internal affairs, even if the two sorts of policies can become extremely entwined. As an example, while discussing educational strategies aimed at increasing the number of Hispanic Americans who attend and graduate from a U.S. college or university, one might refer to Latino politics as a domestic issue.<sup>23</sup>

The first goal is to protect the lives of Americans while they are in the country and when they travel abroad. The goal is to defend the country's friends or countries with which The United States has a positive and mutually beneficial relationship., which is linked to this security purpose. Threats

---

<sup>20</sup> NSC-68 : a top secret report written by Paul Nitze, the document concluded that , following the end of WWII ,revived Russian expansionism required the U.S to embark upon a massive political , economic , and military build up to contain the Soviet threat and expansion of communism. Atomic Heritage Foundation.

<sup>21</sup> Houghton, David Patrick. “Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Toward a Constructivist Approach.” *Foreign Policy Analysis* (2007)PP: 24-45.

<sup>22</sup> Kegley, Charles W., and Eugene R. Wittkopf. *American Foreign Policy : Pattern and Process*. 7th ed, Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth

<sup>23</sup> Camacho Liu, Michelle.“ *Investing in Higher Education for Latinos: Trends in Latino College Access and Success*”. NationalConferenceofStateLegislatures, WashingtonDC, 2016, <http://www.ncsl.org/documents/educ/trendsinalatinosuccess.pdf>.

and risks in the international domain can take many forms, including military threats from other countries or terrorist groups, as well as economic threats from boycotts and high trade tariffs.<sup>24</sup>

In an economic boycott, The US stops trading with another country until or until that country alters a policy that The US opposes. When commerce is suspended, items from The United States cannot be sold in that country, and goods from that country cannot be sold in The United States. For example, as Iran's Nuclear Energy Program progressed in recent years, The US and other countries imposed an economic boycott on the country. The recent Iran nuclear deal is a contract in which Iran pledges to suspend nuclear development in exchange for the lifting of economic sanctions by The US and six other countries, allowing trade with Iran to resume. Tariffs, or costs charged for transferring commodities from one country to another, are also trade barriers. Protectionist trade policies boost tariffs, making it more difficult for imported items to compete in price with domestic goods, which are now more expensive. These trade restrictions are hoped to be reduced by free trade agreements.<sup>25</sup>

The United States' second major priority in Foreign Policy is to maintain access to critical resources and markets around the world. Natural resources, such as oil, and economic resources, such as foreign capital investment in domestic infrastructure projects such as buildings, bridges, and weapons systems, are examples of resources. Of course, having access to the global market also means having access to things that American consumers would be interested in, such as Swiss chocolate and Australian wine. Foreign Policy in The United States also aims to promote the interests of American businesses, both in terms of selling domestic products in overseas markets and supporting global economic development, especially in developing countries.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup>Krutz, Glen, and Sylvie Waskiewicz. "Ch. 1 Introduction - American Government 3E." *OpenStax*, OpenStax, 28 July 2021, [openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction](https://openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction).

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

The preservation of the world's power balance is a third major goal. A balance of power exists when no single nation or region is militarily more powerful than the rest of the world. Although achieving a perfect balance of power is unlikely, overall stability, or predictability in government operations, robust institutions, and the lack of bloodshed inside and between states may be.

Many sections of Europe are now more politically free than they were during The Soviet bloc's years, and there is less fear of nuclear war than there was when The United States and The Soviet Union had missiles aimed at each other for four decades. Despite the European Union's (EU) mainly stabilizing influence, which now includes twenty-eight member countries, multiple wars have erupted in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Furthermore, The EU faces some obstacles, including The United Kingdom's desire to exit The EU, the ongoing debate over how to settle Greece's national debt, and the crisis in Europe caused by thousands of Middle Eastern refugees. Terrorist attacks in The United States, Asia, and Europe have introduced a new sort of enemy into the power equation: non-state or nongovernmental organizations like Al-Qaeda<sup>27</sup> and ISIS<sup>28</sup> (or ISIL), which are made up of various terrorist cells spread over several nations and continents.<sup>29</sup>

The protection of human rights and democracy is the fourth primary priority of US Foreign Policy. Peace and tranquillity are the payoffs of other US Foreign Policy aims, such as stability. While considering its strategic interests when considering foreign policy strategy, The United States still tries to support international peace through many aspects of its Foreign Policy, including foreign aid and support for and participation in international organizations such as the United Nations, NATO, and The Organization of American States.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> **Al-Qaeda** : officially known as Qaeda al-Jihad, is a multinational militant Sunni Islamic extremist network composed of Salafist jihadists. It was founded in 1988 by Osama bin Laden, Abdullah Azzam, and several other Arab volunteers during the Soviet-Afghan War. [Wikipedia](#)

<sup>28</sup> **ISIS**: is an Islamist militant jihadist group and formerly unrecognized quasi-state that follows a Salafi jihadist doctrine based on the Sunni branch of Islam

<sup>29</sup> Krutz, Glen, and Sylvie Waskiewicz. "Ch. 1 Introduction - American Government 3E." *OpenStax*, OpenStax, 28 July 2021, [openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction](https://openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction).

<sup>30</sup> Ibid

The United Nations (UN)<sup>31</sup> is the world's most powerful international organization today. The General Assembly and the Security Council are the UN's two primary institutional entities. All member countries are represented in the General Assembly, which admits new members and approves The UN budget with a two-thirds majority vote. The Security Council consists of fifteen countries: five permanent members (including the United States) and 10 non-permanent members who rotate every five years. The Security Council, which determines all decisions about international peace and security, binds the whole membership. The International Court of Justice at The Hague (Netherlands) and The UN Secretariat, which comprises The UN Secretary-General and UN staff directors and employees, are two other major UN units.<sup>32</sup>

In waging the war on terrorism, one recurring challenge for The US is to what extent it should collaborate with The UN to carry out multilateral anti-terrorist programs around the world, rather than following a unilateral "go it alone" policy. The fact that The US government has such an option shows that accepting world-level governance in Foreign Policy is entirely elective for The US (or any other country). If The US believed it was bound by UN opinion in how it waged its war on terrorism, it would seek approval from The UN Security Council.<sup>33</sup>

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is another cross-national organization to which The United States is linked, and which exists to strongly represent Western allies and, as a result, foster peace (NATO)<sup>34</sup>. After World War II, NATO was founded as the Cold War between East and West began to emerge. NATO's purpose is to safeguard Europe's and the West's interests while also

---

<sup>31</sup> The UN :The United Nations is an intergovernmental organization whose purpose is to maintain international peace and security, develop friendly relations among nations, achieve international cooperation, and be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations

<sup>32</sup> Krutz, Glen, and Sylvie Waskiewicz. "Ch. 1 Introduction - American Government 3E." *OpenStax*, OpenStax, 28 July 2021, [openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction](https://openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction).

<sup>33</sup> Ibid

<sup>34</sup> NATO: The North Atlantic Treaty Organization also called the North Atlantic Alliance, is an intergovernmental military alliance between 30 member states, of which 28 are in Europe and the other 2 in North America. Established in the aftermath of World War II, the organization implements the North Atlantic Treaty, signed 4 April 1949

ensuring assistance and defence from partner countries while being more militaristic than the UN. While it is a powerful military alliance, it has not tried to grow by annexing other countries. Rather, the key objectives are European peace and stability. At first, NATO's membership was limited to Western European countries and the United States. However, after the end of the Cold War, more Eastern European countries, such as Turkey, joined NATO.<sup>35</sup>

In addition to participating in The United Nations and NATO, The United States gives hundreds of billions of dollars in international aid each year to better the lives of individuals in developing countries.<sup>36</sup> These countries' foreign debts may also be forgiven by The US. Developing countries are, by definition, underdeveloped in terms of infrastructure and social services, and hence face instability. Assisting countries in modernizing and developing stable governments is considered to be a benefit to them as well as a support for global stability. Another perspective on US aid is that it is designed to buy influence in developing nations, secure a position in the region, gain access to resources, or build dependence on The US.<sup>37</sup>

### **3. Tools of Enforcing Foreign Policies**

The US pursues its four main Foreign Policy objectives through a variety of Foreign Policy types or separate substantive areas of Foreign Policy in which The US is involved. Trade, diplomacy, sanctions, military/defence, intelligence, foreign aid, and global environmental policy are examples of these sorts.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Krutz, Glen, and Sylvie Waskiewicz. "Ch. 1 Introduction - American Government 3E." *OpenStax*, OpenStax, 28 July 2021, [openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction](https://openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction).

<sup>36</sup> Ibid

<sup>37</sup> Ibid

The way The United States interacts with other countries to facilitate the flow of commerce, commodities and services between them is known as trade policy. When a government refuses to allow other countries to sell goods and services within its borders or charges them exorbitant tariffs (or import taxes), it is considered to be indulging in protectionism.<sup>39</sup> A free trade strategy, on the other hand, is one in which a country allows unrestricted movement of products and services between itself and other countries. The United States has been a proponent of free trade at times and protectionist at others. The implementation of The North American Free Trade Agreement in 1991 was perhaps its most pro-free trade measure (NAFTA)<sup>40</sup>. Trade obstacles and other transaction expenses for commodities travelling between The United States, Mexico, and Canada were abolished as a result of this agreement.<sup>41</sup>

Critics argue that a free trade strategy is problematic, and instead supports protectionist policies that safeguard American companies and their products from cheaper imports. One of the most visible recent examples of protectionist legislation happened in the steel industry, where U.S. corporations competed with Chinese factories in particular in the worldwide steel market. The link between a country's inflow and outflow of goods is known as the trade balance. Although The United States sells many goods and services around the world, it has a trade deficit, meaning that more goods and services are imported from other nations than are exported to be sold outside. The current trade imbalance in The United States is \$37.4 billion, indicating that the value of what The US imports from other nations exceeds the value of what it sends to other countries. Some have advocated for protectionist trade measures as a result of the trade deficit.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid

<sup>40</sup> **NAFTA**: an agreement signed by Canada, Mexico, and the United States that created a trilateral trade bloc in North America. The agreement came into force on January 1, 1994, and superseded the 1988 Canada–United States Free Trade Agreement between the United States and Canada

<sup>41</sup> Krutz, Glen, and Sylvie Waskiewicz. “Ch. 1 Introduction - American Government 3E.” *OpenStax*, OpenStax, 28 July 2021, [openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction](https://openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction)

<sup>42</sup> US Census Bureau . “Foreign trade : US International Trade Data” [.https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/data/index.html](https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/data/index.html).

Foreign Policy is often confused with Diplomacy in the minds of many people. Diplomacy is the development and maintenance of a formal relationship between countries that governs their interactions on issues such as tourism, trade taxation, and plane landings on each other's runways. While diplomatic ties are not always bright, when they are, it indicates that things between the countries are doing well. The exchange of ambassadors formalizes diplomatic relations. Ambassadors are country representatives who live in the other country and keep an office (known as an embassy). Calling them home symbolizes the conclusion of the partnership, much as swapping ambassadors formalizes the bilateral relationship between countries. When The US government is trying to resolve a disagreement with another country, Diplomacy is usually the first step.<sup>43</sup>

The US military and defence complex exists to give The United States the ability to conduct war against other state and non-state entities at the more severe end of the Foreign Policy decision-making spectrum, and usually as a last resort when diplomacy fails. As the 2003 Iraq War and the 1989 expulsion of Panamanian President Manuel Noriega, show such wars can be aggressive. It can also be defensive, as a response to external aggression, like in the 1991 Persian Gulf War<sup>44</sup>, also known as Operation Desert Storm. The potential for military action, as well as the fact that hundreds of US military stations are strewn over the globe, can be a source of foreign policy power for The US. Other international states, on the other hand, may perceive such an approach as Imperialist in Diplomacy.<sup>45</sup>

Intelligence strategy is concerned with defence and encompasses the overt and covert collecting of information from foreign sources that could be of strategic relevance to The US. Perhaps more than any other aspect of Foreign Policy, the world of intelligence catches the public's imagination.

---

<sup>43</sup> "Diplomacy: The U.S. Department of State at Work." *U.S. Department of State*, 2009–2017. [state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/107330.htm](https://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/107330.htm). Accessed 9 Apr. 2022.

<sup>44</sup> **The Gulf War:** The Gulf War was an armed campaign waged by a United States-led coalition of 35 nations against Iraq in response to the Iraqi invasion and annexation of Kuwait.

<sup>45</sup> "Diplomacy: The U.S. Department of State at Work." *U.S. Department of State*, 2009–2017. [state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/107330.htm](https://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/107330.htm). Accessed 9 Apr. 2022.

Many books, television dramas, and movies (with varying degrees of reality) entertain us with stories about US intelligence operations and people.<sup>46</sup>

The final two types of Foreign Policy are Foreign Aid and Global Environmental Policy. With each, The US acts as a strategic actor with its interests in mind, but it also works as an international steward aiming to serve the common good, as it does with the other sorts. The US gives material and economic aid to other countries, particularly developing countries, to strengthen their stability and the quality of life of their populations. Humanitarian aid is a term used to describe this type of assistance; the United States contributed \$32 billion in 2013. Military aid (which totalled \$8 billion in 2013) is categorized as military/defence or national security policy. The total US foreign aid budget for 2013 was substantial, at \$40 billion, although accounting for less than 1% of the total federal budget.<sup>47</sup>

Climate change and global warming, the thinning of the ozone layer, rainforest degradation along the Equator, ocean pollution, and species extinction are all issues that global environmental policy addresses. The US commitment to such concerns has shifted dramatically throughout the years. The United States, for example, was the largest country to refuse to sign The Kyoto Protocol<sup>48</sup> on greenhouse gas emissions in 1997. Few would argue, however, that The US government has not been a global leader in environmental issues.<sup>49</sup>

## Conclusion

In summary, this chapter has provided insight into important theoretical approaches to US Foreign Policy: defensive and offensive realism, liberalism, Marxism, neoclassical realism, and

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid

<sup>47</sup> Ibid

<sup>48</sup> **The Kyoto Protocol:** The Kyoto Protocol was an international treaty which extended the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change that commits state parties to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, based on the scientific consensus that global warming is occurring and that human-made CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are driving it.

<sup>49</sup> “Diplomacy: The U.S. Department of State at Work.” *U.S. Department of State*, 2009–2017.[state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/107330.htm](https://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/107330.htm). Accessed 9 Apr. 2022

constructivism, all of which can be used to comprehend US foreign policy behaviour. Also, it highlighted the main four goals of the American foreign policies, and how The US pursues them through different policy types such as diplomacy, trade, sanctions, military intervention, intelligence, foreign aid, and global environmental policy.

**Introduction:**

The invasion of Iraq by US forces in 2003 has become one of the most contentious and criticized political decisions since World War II. The invasion received widespread support from The United Kingdom, Australia, and Poland. The operation lasted 21 days and resulted in the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's government and the start of the full-fledged Iraq War.

**2.1. The US-Iraqi Relations before the Invasion (1980-2003):**

The United States placed its relationship with Iraq in a position secondary to other regional interests, primarily oil and the fight against the spread of communism. US leaders played a significant role and assisted Saddam Hussein in establishing a dictatorship government, as many interviews and documents of the former US political elite attest. US-Iraqi relations have waned during the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, starting from their peak in 1950 to their nadir between 1990 and 2003. As a result of the US sending Iraq military supplies that included lethal biological viruses like anthrax and the bubonic plague, the Iraqi authorities gained more independence and power to carry out their barbaric actions.

When Saddam Hussein attacked the Kurdish city of Halabja in the northern Kurdistan region of Iraq on March 16, 1988, he used chemical gas to fight his people. The attack resulted in more than 5000 deaths, the majority of whom were civilians, including women, children, and men. US leaders denounced Saddam Hussein's actions and deemed them to be inhumane deeds.

However, it should not be forgotten that the US supported Saddam, who established a dictatorship, and that the Iraqi leader received excellent military advice as well as American war strategies and tactics. Frank C. Carlucci, the US secretary of defence at the time, regarded the information provided to Iraq as a general order of battle, not operational intelligence, and he said *“I certainly have no knowledge of US participation in preparing battle and strike packages, Carlucci also emphasized that he had not anticipated that Iraq*

*would use chemical weapons* ”<sup>1</sup>. Even so, the United States did not support Saddam Hussein's actions when he used chemical gas against the Kurdish city of Halabja, and as a result, US-Iraqi relations began to deteriorate, particularly after Ronald Reagan changed US policy in the Middle East, including Iraq, in an effort to secure the region.<sup>2</sup>

Following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the United States joined a coalition against Hussein that included 22 other countries. It goes without saying that Iraq and the US maintained positive ties for the majority of Saddam Hussein's administration since he opposed the Soviet Union's communist ideology, which favoured the US. In addition, Hussein had long served the (CIA) and had been employed by the US to further its own goals.

However, since Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the two nations' ties did not remain cordial indefinitely. Following that time, everything changed; friendly ties had been replaced by hostile ones, and after Iraq invaded Kuwait, the international community wanted to take action in accordance with the United Nations Charter because Hussein had used force against a neighbouring country, which was against the law internationally. All states are equal on the basis of law, according to Article 1/1 of the United Nations Charter. All governments should abstain from threatening or using force in order to maintain international peace and security, stop and eliminate any threats to the peace, and put an end to any acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.

## **2.2. Causes of the Iraq invasion:**

It is necessary to examine both the official reasons for the invasion announced by George Bush's administration and the real reasons identified by most specialists studying the specifics of the operation. As a result, the exploration and refutation of the alleged reasons for the invasion and the analysis of its true causes will aid in revealing the controversies between

---

<sup>1</sup>Patrick, E.Tyler. “New York Times Officers Say the US Aided Iraq in Wardespite Use of Gas,” 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Ahmad, Paiman. (2014). The US-Iraqi Relations 1945-2003. 10.13140/RG.2.1.1915.7608.

them and understanding the specifics of the American government's motivation to launch a full-scale war in Iraq.

### **2.1.1. Alleged Reasons for the Invasion:**

#### **2.1.1.1. Possession of WMDs :**

Saddam Hussein's possession of WMDs, and the resulting huge threat to global peace and the security of the American nation, were cited as the primary reasons for Bush's decision to launch an invasion of Iraq. The findings of the UN weapons inspections, which revealed that Iraq was on its way to disarmament, did not persuade the American government, and it was declared that passively waiting for disarmament could give Hussein more time to develop and use WMDs. Based on this claim, American forces and several other national forces began invading Iraq and bombing strategic targets.

Despite the US's confidence in the presence of WMDs in Iraq, numerous commissions have found that the claim about WMDs was not well-founded. Numerous weapons inspectors discovered no WMDs in Iraq after the American-led war ended. Indeed, the claim about WMDs appears to be a blatant lie used by Bush's administration to justify the illegal invasion of a sovereign state. Such action aided the government in gaining public support, as the prospect of WMDs being used against American citizens is frightening enough to convince people that the armed forces must combat the owners of the weapons.

This strategy was especially effective following the World Trade Center attacks in 2001, which made millions of Americans feel insecure and concerned about national security. As a result, the presence of weapons posing a serious threat to the safety of the American people

was necessary for making the invasion politically feasible.<sup>3</sup> Though Bush stated that even if he had known Iraq did not have WMDs, he would have launched the invasion and war, such a claim appears to be insincere, as the government could not receive enough support and justify its actions to the citizens and world community if the public was misinformed about the weapons in Iraq.

### **2.1.1.2. The Need to End Dictatorship and Spread Democracy:**

Another justification the US government gave for starting the invasion of Iraq was the need to end dictatorships that violated Iraqis' human rights and spread democracy throughout the country. Bush's administration declared open aggression against a sovereign state acceptable and even necessary to combat dictatorships that cause human suffering.<sup>4</sup> The invasion's humanitarian goals were used to justify the aggressive invasion of a sovereign country. Millions of Americans were persuaded by America's policy of spreading democracy throughout the world that the invasion of Iraq was a noble and equitable action.

Though the regime of Saddam Hussein committed certain violations of human rights, Iraq could not be considered the country with the highest level of such violations, as numerous countries faced far more serious problems and expressed greater concern about the security of their populations. Furthermore, there is some controversy about the US administration's actions, as it supported Iraq's government during the Iran-Iraq war, during which Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons against Iranian soldiers. At the time, the United States did not show much concern about Hussein's deliberate violation of human rights. However, when it came to proclaiming the urgent need to overthrow Hussein's government, the American administration masterfully used them to justify its unlawful aggression against Iraq.

---

<sup>3</sup> Betts, Richard K. "Two Faces of Intelligence Failure: September 11 and Iraq's Missing WMD." *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 122, no. 4, 2007, pp. 585–606. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20202928>. Accessed 15 Aug. 2022.

<sup>4</sup> Boaduo, Nana Adu-Pipim. "Invasion of Iraq: Introspective Analysis of US Long Term Foreign Policy in the Middle East." *Journal of Political Studies* 19 (2012): 87.

The consequences of such actions include a severe political and social crisis in Iraq, as well as massive civilian casualties. It is clear that the country has not become more democratic than before the US army's invasion. The invasion of Iraq should not be considered a humanitarian intervention because the United States and its allies abused democratic ideals for self-serving purposes and did not improve Iraqis' lives. The American invasion destabilized the country and used humanitarian values to justify interfering in the affairs of a sovereign state.

### **2.1.1.3. Protection of US National Security:**

Another justification for the invasion of Iraq was the urgent need to protect US national security from Iraqi aggression. This claim was based on the assumption that Saddam Hussein was involved with terrorist groups. As the war on terrorism declared by the US government after September 11th was viewed as a necessary step towards preventing similar tragic events, such rationale played an important role in ensuring public support for aggression against Iraq. The widely publicized claim that Saddam Hussein was linked to Osama bin Laden's al-Qaida terrorist network, which was responsible for the World Trade Center attack, aided in the acceptance and justification of the invasion of Iraq by the majority of citizens.

Protecting US national security from terrorist attacks has little in common with the Iraq invasion. Furthermore, the Pentagon-sponsored study, which examined nearly 600,000 Iraqi documents, found no evidence of a link between Saddam and al-Qaida. Despite the American government's misleading claims, the aforementioned study demonstrated that Saddam Hussein's regime had not established "operational links" with al-Qaida.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Strobel, Warren, and Washington. "Saddam's Links to Al-Qaeda Refuted." *The Age*, The Age, 12 Mar. 2008, [www.theage.com.au/world/saddams-links-to-al-qaeda-refuted-20080312-ge6u0a.html](http://www.theage.com.au/world/saddams-links-to-al-qaeda-refuted-20080312-ge6u0a.html).

The study established that Saddam Hussein had provided support to certain terrorist groups in the Middle East fighting against his regime's enemies. Though the link between Saddam's regime and terrorism against Iraqi exiles and Shia Muslims is clear, no evidence supports the notion that the Iraqi government supported terrorism against the US and was involved in organizing the World Trade Center terrorist attacks.

As a result, the US administration had no solid reasons to invade Iraq to protect the US from terrorism, because Saddam had done nothing to endanger US security. The US government expertly used national security to justify its illegal aggression against Iraq, but it lacked an objective basis. Iraq posed little threat to the US and was incapable of endangering US national security, as Bush's administration was well aware.

### **2.2.2. Actual Causes of the Invasion:**

Because the official reasons for the US invasion of Iraq are easily debunked, it is critical to understand the true reasons for American aggression against Saddam Hussein's regime. The examination of Bush's motivations will aid in revealing that the American government's deception had little in common with the true causes of the invasion.

#### **2.2.2.1. The Pursuit of Iraqi Oil:**

Most experts believe that the pursuit of oil was the primary reason for the US invasion of Iraq. Iraq has the world's second-largest oil reserves, and gaining control of them and excluding competitors in a tightening oil market was one of the main reasons the US administration decided to launch an attack on a sovereign state that posed no threat to America.

Because its economy is heavily reliant on oil imports, the United States is one of the world's largest consumers of oil. Furthermore, due to limited oil reserves and rising global demand, the United States and other developed countries proposed that Oil and Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC)<sup>6</sup> open their fields to foreign investment. As OPEC countries resisted such a proposal, the US was forced to seek alternative means of ensuring continuous access to the vast amount of oil in the Middle East. As a result, the primary reason for the US invasion of Iraq can be identified as gaining control over oil-producing regions.

#### **2.2.2.2. The Project for a New American Century:**

The grand strategy of the United States under Bush to assert coercive global hegemony is the starting point for understanding the Iraq invasion. The Project for a New American Century openly acknowledges this hegemonic ambition. In response to the 9/11 attacks, the Bush doctrine and the 2002 National Security Strategy were developed. They make clear the coercive turn, the call for full spectrum dominance, the strategy of dealing with US resistance not just through traditional containment but also through preventive wars, the use of unilateralism with ad hoc coalitions of the willing, and the belief that countries not supporting the US in the fight against terrorism are against it, and the claim that only the US liberal media are to blame for the rise of terrorism.

All of this, of course, represents a significant departure from the traditional US foreign policy, which prioritized diplomacy over military force and was based on the containment of threats. It is also believed that hegemony was grounded in consent obtained through multilateral consultation (deviation), making it necessary for it to be constrained by international law and institutions. The architects of the Bush administration strategy, in contrast, had long pushed for a hegemonic approach based on the application of America's superior military capabilities.

---

<sup>6</sup> **OPEC**: The Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) is a cartel comprised of 13 oil-exporting countries. A cartel can be defined as a coalition of independent parties formed to promote a mutual interest through market control or price manipulation. [capital.com](http://capital.com)

### **2.2.2.3. Eliminating an Enemy of Israel:**

Eliminating an enemy of Israel was a major goal of the 2003 invasion, prominent neoconservatives' ideological and personal ties to the state of Israel, particularly the Likud Party, were facts that have drawn much attention, and George W. Bush was undoubtedly the most pro-Israel American president since the creation of Israel in 1948. It does not imply that the Bush administration initiated this conflict. That administration's war supporters, particularly the president and the neocons, thought that defeating an adversary of Israel was a significant advantage granted by the office for international freedom to help Israel's security.

The neoconservatives believed that the US and Israel shared the same interests in the Middle East, particularly when it came to the Bush administration's definition of the war on terror, which made a little practical or strategic distinction between al-Qaeda, Hamas, and Hezbollah, or between the US campaign against al-Qaeda and Israeli counter-terrorism operations in the West Bank, Gaza, and southern Lebanon.<sup>7</sup>

## **2.3. Consequences of the Iraq invasion:**

The invasion's outcomes are wholly unfavourable, despite the noble intentions of its proponents, who claimed that it would benefit both American society and the people of Iraq in a variety of ways. Among the most significant effects of the invasion are the numerous civilian deaths, the devastation of Iraq's healthcare system, and the complete reliance on the US.

### **2.3.1. Human costs**

Thousands of soldiers and civilians died as a result of the invasion and the war that followed. Nearly 5,000 soldiers from the coalition forces were killed between 2003 and 2010, according

---

<sup>7</sup> Mulloy, D.J. "A Review of Jeffery Record. Wantingwar: Why the Bush Administration Invaded Iraq." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 23, no. 4, 2011.

to surveys, while estimates of the number of violent deaths among civilians in Iraq range from 60,000 to 600,000 people.<sup>8</sup>

The majority of civilian deaths in Iraq were the result of horrific bombings carried out by US-led forces to eliminate targets with significant strategic value. The bombings meant to destroy these targets, however, resulted in the deaths of thousands of innocent people, including children and women, as they frequently hit homes where civilians lived and caused serious injuries that ultimately led to fatalities.

In addition to airstrikes, clashes between US and Iraqi troops killed a large number of civilians. The enormous number of civilian fatalities exemplifies the war's devastating effects. Despite being billed as an operation to defend the Iraqi people from Saddam Hussein's aggressive dictatorship and advance democracy, the invasion of Iraq instead caused thousands of innocent people to perish and spread terror.

### **2.3.2. Humanitarian and Social Crisis:**

The invasion of Iraq caused many people to flee the country in addition to many deaths. Due to the horrific living conditions and the constant risk of being hurt or killed, millions of Iraqis fled the country during the US military campaign.

In addition, Iraq experienced a severe humanitarian crisis as a result of the millions of combat casualties who suffered grave physical and mental health issues. A sizable portion of the populace has experienced violence, rape, torture, and family member deaths. The population of Iraq, including children, is now experiencing higher rates of serious psychological issues as a result of this circumstance. Many women lost their husbands, and many children lost their parents. Numerous thousands of desperate people were left without a

---

<sup>8</sup> Zeger, Scott. (2007). Estimating excess deaths in Iraq since the US—British-led invasion. *Significance*. 4. 54 - 59. 10.1111/j.1740-9713.2007.00225.x.

place to live or a means of support as a result of the situation's severe humanitarian crisis. Increased disease and death rates are directly correlated with worsening living conditions.

Although Iraq's health system was established and efficient before the war, the invasion destroyed it and caused a long-lasting crisis in the delivery of healthcare services. Indicators of maternal and child health declined after the war, and the population's general health score significantly dropped. Cholera emerged as a result of factors exacerbated by the war, such as poverty and poor hygiene in hospitals due to the increased number of patients.

### **2.3.3. Dependence on The US:**

The US invasion of Iraq had several effects, one of which was to make the nation heavily dependent on the US. Iraq now needs assistance from overseas to address its issues and ensure the relative viability of its economy due to the tremendous humanitarian disaster the war and subsequent local conflicts have generated. In this sense, the United States has taken control of Iraqi politics and can influence the country's leadership as necessary. As a result, in addition to seizing control of the oil reserves, the United States has made Iraq dependent on its judgement and susceptible to manipulation.

### **2.3.4. Sunni-Shiite Tension:**

Sunni Arabs, a minority in Iraq but historically the dominating group dating back to Ottoman times, held top posts under Saddam Hussein's dictatorship. For the first time in the contemporary Middle East, the U.S.-led invasion allowed the Shiite Arab majority to seize power in any Arab nation. This significant occasion strengthened Shiites throughout the area, which drew the mistrust and animosity of Sunni rulers.

The new Shiite-dominated administration and foreign soldiers were the targets of an armed uprising by some Iraqi Sunnis. In Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, and other Arab nations with a mixed

Sunni-Shiite population, sectarian tensions were strained as the rising violence turned into a brutal and destructive civil war between Sunni and Shiite militias.<sup>9</sup>

### **2.3.5. The Emergence of Al-Qaeda in Iraq:**

Religious fanatics of all stripes, who had been repressed under Saddam's cruel police state, started to emerge in the disorganised years following the regime's overthrow. The establishment of a Shiite administration and the presence of US forces created an ideal situation for Al-Qaeda. Al-Qaeda pretended to be the guardian of Sunnis, formed relationships with both Islamist and secular Sunni insurgent organisations and started annexing territory in the northwestern tribal region of Iraq.<sup>10</sup>

Many Sunnis quickly turned against Al-Qaeda as a result of the organization's ruthless tactics and extreme religious agenda, but a unique Iraqi branch of Al-Qaeda, known as the Islamic State in Iraq, has endured. The group, which focuses on vehicle bombing attacks, is still targeting Shiites and government forces while extending its operations into the neighbouring country of Syria.

### **2.3.6. The ascendancy of Iran:**

Iran's rise to become a regional giant reached a turning point with the overthrow of the Iraqi government. The biggest regional foe of Iran was Saddam Hussein, with whom it fought a bloody 8-year war in the 1980s. However, Shiite Islamists with strong ties to the Shiite Iranian government have taken the place of Saddam's Sunni-dominated rule<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Manfreda, Primoz. "Impacts of the Iraq War on the Middle East." ThoughtCo, Sep. 9, 2021, [thoughtco.com/iraq-war-effect-on-middle-east-2353056](https://www.thoughtco.com/iraq-war-effect-on-middle-east-2353056).

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

The US-backed Sunni regimes in the Persian Gulf suffered a geopolitical catastrophe with the fall of Iraq to Iran. The hostility between Sunnis and Shiites grew as Saudi Arabia and Iran started to compete with one another for control of the region and influence, igniting a new cold war. Despite the Sunni minority's adamant opposition, Iran is currently the most dominant foreign actor in Iraq, with a vast commerce and espionage network there.

### **2.3.7.Limits of US Power in the Middle East:**

Many supporters of the Iraq War believed that overthrowing Saddam Hussein was simply the beginning of the process of creating a new regional order that would replace Arab dictatorships with democratic regimes that were sympathetic to the United States. However, the unforeseen support for Iran and Al-Qaeda made it plain to the majority of observers that the US was only partially successful in changing the Middle Eastern political landscape by military action.

On the back of domestic, popular protests, the campaign for democracy culminated in the Arab Spring in 2011. Little could be done by Washington to defend its allies in Egypt and Tunisia, and it is still very unclear how this situation would affect US regional dominance.

Despite its declining need for the region's oil, the US will continue to be the most dominant foreign force in the Middle East for some time to come. But the failure of the Iraqi state-building initiative gave rise to a more cautious, "realist," foreign policy, which was reflected in the US's hesitation to become involved in the Syrian civil war.

### **Conclusion:**

The fundamental reasons for the operation had a solely materialistic bent, according to a review of the premises underlying the US invasion of Iraq. Even though the US administration stated that Saddam Hussein's regime was violating human rights and had WMDs, as well as posing a threat to US national security, none of these claims appeared to

be true. There is no doubt that Iraq lacked WMD and posed little threat to US national security. Additionally, Saddam Hussein's tyranny did not have as many terrible effects as to need the invasion of foreign armed troops. The invasion's true motivation appears to be the American government's willingness to seize control of oil reserves in order to maintain its position as world leader.

Thousands of civilian casualties, social and humanitarian crises, poverty, and the spread of diseases were the results of the invasion, which was described as an operation with the noble goal of spreading democracy. In addition, Iraq became far more susceptible to American judgments. US government masterfully employed deceit to win public support for actions that cannot be justified owing to their unlawful character and the numerous innocent lives they claimed. The US government initiated the invasion of Iraq to fulfil its mercenary goals.

**Introduction:**

The invasion of Iraq by US forces in 2003 had a deep impact on the whole region of the Middle East in general but had affected and changed Syria forever. In this final chapter, the discussion is all about Iraqi-Syrian relations, the history of US-Syrian relations, as well as the outcomes of the invasion of Iraq on the country.

**3.1.U.S-SYRIA RELATIONS:**

The United States established diplomatic relations with Syria in 1944 following the U.S. determination that Syria had achieved effective independence from a French-administered mandate. Syria severed diplomatic relations with the United States in 1967 in the wake of the Arab-Israeli War. In 1974, ties were re-established. Since the list's inception in 1979, Syria has been on it due to its ongoing support of terrorism and terrorist organizations, its former occupation of Lebanon, its pursuit of WMD and missile programs, its use of chemical weapons, and its ongoing attempts to thwart U.S. and international stabilization efforts in Iraq and Syria.<sup>1</sup>

Syria is subject to legislatively mandated sanctions, such as export restrictions under the Syrian Accountability Act and a ban on receiving the majority of American aid or purchasing American military hardware. Subsequent Executive Orders have been issued in response to the continuous bloodshed and human rights violations occurring in Syria since the war first broke out in that country in March 2011.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "U.S. Relations with Syria - United States Department of State." *U.S. Department of State*, U.S. Department of State, 15 Apr. 2021, [www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-syria/](http://www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-syria/).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

On several regional concerns, the United States and Syria cooperated somewhat between 1990 and 2001, but relations deteriorated from 2003 to early 2009. The failure of the Syrian government to stop Syria from becoming a major transit country for foreign fighters entering

Iraq, the Syrian government's refusal to deport former Saddam Hussein regime members who were aiding the insurgency in Iraq from Syria, its interference in Lebanese affairs, its protection of the leaders of Palestinian rejectionist groups in Damascus, its record on human rights, and its pursuit of WMDs were all causes for concern for the United States.<sup>3</sup>

In light of developments in the nation and the region, the United States started reviewing its Syria policy at the beginning of 2009. This led to an effort to engage with Syria to identify areas of shared interest, ease tensions in the region, and advance Middle East peace.

It's your turn, Doctor, was written in political graffiti on walls in the southern city of Dara'a in late February 2011, prompting the Syrian government to detain a group of Syrian schoolchildren for implying that Assad would suffer the same fate as other regional dictators. The armed conflict that has lasted more than nine years, claimed more than 500,000 lives and uprooted more than 12 million people from their homes both inside and outside of Syria as a result of the government's harsh response to the Syrian people's call for freedom and dignity.

The UN-facilitated, Syrian-led process required by UNSCR 2254 has the support of the United States. The Syrian problem cannot be resolved through military means. As we've seen, the military activities of the Syrian government, Russia, and Iran only lead to more death and damage.<sup>4</sup>

Since ISIS's emergence in 2014, the U.S. government has collaborated closely with the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS to bring about the terror organization's long-term destruction. By, with, and through local allies, the Coalition succeeded in eradicating ISIS from Syria's

---

<sup>3</sup> *ibid*

<sup>4</sup> *ibid*

territory in March 2019. The Coalition is still dedicated to the long-term defeat of ISIS through stabilization assistance to freed areas, enabling displaced people's returns, identifying

permanent solutions for captured foreign ISIS members, and advancing efforts for justice and accountability in Syria and Iraq.<sup>5</sup>

### 3.2. Iraq-Syria relations:

Along with these points of contention, Washington was concerned about the growing ties between Damascus and Baghdad. Indeed, there have been discernible efforts to turn over a new leaf in Bashar's relations with Iraq under Saddam Hussein since he rose to power. It should be noted, however, that the trend toward better relations between Syria and Iraq began in 1997, under Hafiz al-Asad. Since the early 1980s, relations between Syria and Iraq had deteriorated due to Syria's support for Iran in the Iran-Iraq War, as well as personal, political, and ideological differences between the two Ba'ath regimes.<sup>6</sup>

However, Asad realized in 1997 that Saddam Hussein was no longer a real threat to Syria, and he apparently wanted to use closer relations between the two countries as a bargaining chip against the US and Israel. Syrians were shocked by Israel's election of Benjamin Netanyahu as Prime Minister, as well as the prospect of escalation of Syrian-Turkish relations to the point of armed conflict. In any case, while Hafiz al-Asad did renew relations between Syria and Iraq, he did so cautiously, not introducing anything substantive to these relations and certainly not turning them into any kind of strategic or intimate alliance.<sup>7</sup>

So far, Bashar has been revealed in all his inexperienced youth when it comes to his relations with Iraq. He has shown extreme bravery, especially in comparison to his father's cautious policies. His government did not hesitate to express explicit and unequivocal support for Iraq,

---

<sup>5</sup> "U.S. Relations with Syria - United States Department of State." *U.S. Department of State*, U.S. Department of State, 15 Apr. 2021, [www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-syria/](http://www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-syria/).

<sup>6</sup> KIENLE, EBERHARD. *Ba'th v. Ba'th: The Conflict between Syria and Iraq*. *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Jan. 1992, [doi.org/10.1093/jis/3.1.128](https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/3.1.128).

<sup>7</sup> Delvoie, Louis & Zisser, Eyal. (2001). Asad's Legacy: Syria in Transition. *International Journal*. 56. 700. 10.2307/40203614.

---

even going so far as to attempt to form a unified pan-Arab front against the United States' intention to attack that country. Damascus also became a popular destination for senior

Iraqi officials, led by Deputy Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki. Damascus also became a popular destination for senior Iraqi officials, led by Deputy Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki.<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, Syria's relations with Iraq's anti-Saddam Hussein opposition cooled, and the Syrians limited their activities. For example, in early 2001, an Iraqi opposition radio station operating in Syria was shut down, and the publication of anti-Iraq newspapers in Damascus was prohibited. However, the Syrians maintained contact with Kurdish movements, a move intended to maintain some Syrian influence in Iraq in the event of an American attack, and even more so in the event of the Iraqi state's political breakdown. Syrians feared the establishment of a Kurdish state in northern Iraq, which would have consequences for the Kurdish population in northeastern Syria.<sup>9</sup>

moreover, in the autumn of 2000, Iraq began exporting oil through Syria. Iraqi oil flowed through Syria via the Kirkuk-Banyas pipeline in quantities ranging from 150,000 to 200,000 barrels per day (BPD). This oil was transferred to Syria for domestic use, allowing Syria to increase its own oil exports. Washington was quick to express its outrage at Syria's flagrant violation of the boycott of Iraq. In response to the protest, Bashar explained to Secretary of State Powell and later to President Bush that the oil flow was part of a technical examination of the pipeline, which had been idle for nearly two decades, and that once the examination was completed, the oil flow would be stopped.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Lawson, Fred H. "Syria's Relations with Iran: Managing the Dilemmas of Alliance." *Middle East Journal*, vol. 61, no. 1, 2007, pp. 29–47. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4330355>. Accessed 6 Sep. 2022.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

It was reported at the end of 2000 that shortly after the Palestinian intifada began, Saddam Hussein moved Iraqi forces to the Syrian border, possibly as a warning signal to Israel, but clearly to exploit the situation to improve his regional standing. In the summer of 2002, reports surfaced that Syria had turned a blind eye to the smuggling of weapons from Eastern Europe to Iraq through Syria, involving Firas Talas, the son of Syrian Defense Minister

Mustafa Talas and a well-known Damascus businessman. The Syrians were quick to deny the reports this time. Finally, it was reported in late 2002 that the Syrians had allowed Iraq to conceal some of its weapons of mass destruction on their territory and had even assisted in the transfer of Iraqi weapons to Hizbollah. Syrians have also denied these reports.<sup>11</sup>

After Bashar took power, Syria refused to form any kind of strategic alliance with Iraq or even renew diplomatic relations with the country. The Old Guard that surrounded Bashar apparently prevented Syria and Iraq from developing closer ties. During a visit to Damascus, Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq 'Aziz proposed that Syria ratify the "National Action Treaty" that the two countries signed in the late 1970s when relations were good, but that Saddam Hussein cancelled when he came to power in 1979.<sup>12</sup>

Syrian Defense Minister Talas responded with mockery, saying, "Hafiz al-Asad died without ever learning why Saddam cancelled the Treaty, or why he was so quick to accuse Syria of plotting a coup against him."<sup>13</sup> It's possible that the Syrians' fear of the reactions of Iran and the Gulf States kept Asad from getting too close to Iraq. After all, it was Bashar al-Asad, not his father, who called Saddam Hussein "a beast of a man" during a visit to Kuwait.

Ties between Syria and Iraq were first and foremost economic, both during Hafiz al-rule Asad's and that of his son Bashar. Because of the dramatic increase in trade between the two

---

<sup>11</sup> Levitt, Matthew. "Syrian Sponsorship of Global Terrorism: The Need for Accountability." *The Washington Institute for Near East Policy*, 18 Sept. 2002.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> "Interview with Syrian Defence Minister." *Al-Ra'y Al-'Amm*, 24 Dec. 2001.

countries, which reached at least \$3 billion by the end of 2002, Iraq became a milk cow for Syria. The expansion of trade between the two countries both direct and for goods transported through Syria to avoid UN sanctions was accompanied by a series of economic agreements,

including the establishment of a Syria-Iraq free trade zone and one on joint investments in the two countries.<sup>14</sup>

In flagrant violation of the sanctions, an airline route between Baghdad and Damascus was inaugurated, and a railroad line between Mosul and Aleppo was opened in July 2001. The resumption of oil flow between Kirkuk and Baniyas accounted for approximately one-third of Syria's own production. The Iraqi oil was sold to Syria at a lower price, and Syria used it for its domestic market, allowing it to increase its own oil exports and profit.<sup>15</sup>

### **3.3.Syria's reaction to the Iraq invasion of 2003:**

American plans to strike Saddam Hussein sparked new tensions in Syrian-US relations, with Syria quickly siding with Iraq, hosting Iraqis in the Presidential Palace in Damascus. Syria has also joined the efforts to derail Washington's efforts to garner broad international support. When Security Council Resolution 1441, which included a strong demand that Iraq agrees to renew international inspections or face the consequences, came up for approval on November 8, 2002, Syria gave its approval.

However, the Syrians attempted to portray their vote as a "Syrian diplomatic victory" or, alternatively, as a response to the Arab consensus that Syria was asked to represent in the Security Council. They even boasted that their vote had prevented or at least postponed the

---

<sup>14</sup> Kienel, Eberhard. *Ba'th v. Ba'th: The Conflict between Syria and Iraq*. Journal of Islamic Studies, Jan. 1992, doi.org/10.1093/jis/3.1.128.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

American attack on Iraq. The Iraqi press, on the other hand, called Syria's vote on the issue a "betrayal of the Arab cause." Nonetheless, official Baghdad refrained from harshly condemning the Syrians because it recognized the pressure and constraints on Damascus.

Along with its efforts to thwart Washington's efforts in the international arena, Syria adopted a strident anti-American stance, accusing Washington of a "hidden agenda" aimed at

establishing a new American order in the Middle East for itself and on behalf of Israel. Syrian Vice President Abd-al Halim Khaddam, for example, warned that:

...the American attack on Iraq is designed to bring about the partition of that country, which is a strategic objective of Israel. In fact, it is part of the longstanding Zionist aim of breaking up the national fabric of the countries of the region... We are defending Iraq, which is an Arab country, and the fate of all the Arabs is bound up with its fate. We are not Finland and therefore we cannot relate to Iraq's fate with equanimity. Iraq is a strategic hinterland for Syria in its conflict with Israel. We supported Kuwait when Iraq invaded its territory, but today Iraq is under attack and therefore we are standing at its side.<sup>16</sup>

The Syrian public's hostility toward the US had already begun in early 2002, following Israel's Operation Defensive Shield. This hostility, actively encouraged by the regime, manifested itself in street demonstrations near the American Embassy in Damascus and, later, in organized boycotts of American goods and cultural symbols. In Damascus, a popular committee was formed to encourage a boycott of American products. "No entry for Americans" signs appeared in restaurant windows, and the American consul in Damascus was led out of the "Ocsigen" Restaurant in Bab Tuma, Damascus' Christian Quarter. After that incident, the restaurant's owners became heroes.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> "Syrian Vice President `Abd-Al Halim Khaddam Interview." *Syrian Arab News Agency* [Damascus ], 6 Sept. 2002.

<sup>17</sup> Delvoie, Louis & Zisser, Eyal. (2001). Asad's Legacy: Syria in Transition. *International Journal*. 56. 700. 10.2307/40203614.

Nonetheless, the street demonstrations in Damascus near the American Embassy were more subdued than previous events. Demonstrators protesting the American "Desert Fox" attack on Iraq broke into and damaged the ambassador's residence in December 1998. One of the protesters even removed the American flag from the building's roof. This sparked a diplomatic incident between the United States and Syria, especially after Syrian Defense Minister Mustafa Talas described the demonstrator's actions as "heroic." Syrians were forced

to apologize, disassociate themselves from Talas's statement, and pay compensation to the US for damage caused by the demonstrations to the Ambassador's residence and the American Cultural Center. This time, the Syrians did not take any unnecessary risks and prevented the demonstrators from approaching the American Embassy.<sup>18</sup>

Syria's protest against the United States became even harsher on the eve of the outbreak of the war. According to Bashar, the US "is only interested in gaining control of Iraqi oil and redrawing the map of the region in accordance with its worldview." "In the past, we did not sense the danger closing in on us in the face of fateful developments such as the Sykes-Picot Agreement, the Balfour Declaration, and the establishment of the State of Israel, but the danger to Arabs inherent in the Iraq war is no less than any of those," he added.<sup>19</sup>

He warned the Arabs about the United States' friendship, which he called "more fatal than its hostility." Bashar also compared the US to "a car speeding towards a concrete wall, but even if the power of an American car allows it to penetrate a concrete wall, it is liable to discover that on the other side of the wall there will be no bed of roses either, but it will lead to an abyss... because Bush does not understand that for Arabs, honour is more important than anything else, even food."<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

Syria was mobilized, albeit primarily verbally, against the United States from the start of the war. This mobilization reached a climax when Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shara declared before the People's Assembly's Foreign Affairs Committee, "We want Iraq's victory." Following that, al-Shara compared the US to the Third Reich and President Bush to Adolf Hitler. In an interview with the Lebanese newspaper Al-Safir, Bashar warned that Syria could be the next US target, adding that "Syria does not intend sitting idly by" given Washington's moves. The Syrian authorities also permitted, if not encouraged, thousands of demonstrators to take to the streets of Damascus and other cities throughout Syria to protest the American attack on Iraq.

Simultaneously, the Syrian media launched an anti-American campaign. According to Radio Damascus, the American-British attack violated the most fundamental human values and rights, as well as international law. "Our experience shows that Israel's interests, not the interests of the United States, govern American policy. After all, it was Likud supporters in the corridors of the American administration who pushed for the attack on Iraq." Radio Damascus also announced, "The forces of evil in the world have banded together to seize control of the Arab Nation's wealth and resources. The world's superpower is currently acting in a biased manner to achieve its goals, and its Satanic arms harm peaceful peace-loving peoples."<sup>21</sup>

The US, particularly Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, quickly responded by accusing Syria of assisting Iraq by smuggling night-vision goggles and other equipment into Iraq, as well as accusing Syria of allowing Arab volunteers to reach Iraq through Syria. Shortly after, senior American officials accused Syria of allowing Iraqi leaders to flee through its territory. Secretary of State Colin Powell threatened sanctions against Syria, and President Bush, in a strong message to the Syrians, accused them of developing chemical weapons, which worried the US and could force it to take action against Syria.

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

The Syrians initially dismissed these accusations out of hand, but they were clearly disturbed by the strong language used. In fact, they were quick to close their border with Iraq and begin sending conciliatory messages to Washington, expressing their desire to resume dialogue with the American administration.

### **3.4.The impact of the Iraq war on Syria:**

#### **3.4.1.An Enduring Alliance between Syria and Iran:**

Syria and Iran have formed an enduring alliance that has transcended the fundamental differences that separate the two countries, owing to a convergence of Middle Eastern interests and a shared antipathy toward the West (e.g., Arab versus Persian, secular versus theocratic, Sunni-majority versus Shiite).

While the countries have been allies since the late 1970s, their relationship has grown noticeably stronger in the last three years as both Syria and Iran have become increasingly isolated from the West. Both countries are staunchly opposed to the US role in Iraq, and they both back Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Palestine. Indeed, they are united in their hostility toward the United States, and they seek to establish a new Middle East order that rejects American influence in the region.

The two nations' cooperation has grown in a number of areas. Military agreements were signed with the nations in March 2007 and June 2006, including a mutual defence treaty (the language of which has never been made public). (The nations had earlier signed a "strategic

cooperation" agreement in 2004.) Iranian missile supplies to Syria and continuous intelligence collaboration with Tehran apparently giving equipment and training to Syrian operatives are also reportedly part of the security and military cooperation.

### **3.4.2. The Emergence of terrorist groups in Syria:**

After the fall of Iraq and the dismantling of the Iraqi army, hundreds of armed experienced men became unemployed; most of them formed alliances with terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda and secular Sunni insurgent groups and began seizing territory in the Sunni tribal

heartland of north-western Iraq; thousands of armed men later formed the most famous Islamic terrorist group (ISIS), which played a major role in the Syrian civil war that began in 2011.

### **3.4.3. Kurdish Ambitions:**

Iraqi Kurds were one of the main beneficiaries of the Iraq war. The Kurdish entity in the north, which had been de facto autonomous since the 1991 Gulf War and had been protected by an UN-mandated no-fly zone, was now officially recognized by Iraq's new constitution as the Kurdish Regional Government (KRG). Rich in oil resources and policing by its own security forces, Iraqi Kurdistan became the country's most prosperous and stable region.

The Kurdish Regional Government (KRG) is the closest any of the Kurdish people - divided primarily between Iraq, Syria, Iran, and Turkey - have come to real statehood, bolstering Kurdish independence dreams elsewhere in the region. Syria's civil war has provided an opportunity for Syria's Kurdish minority to renegotiate its status while forcing Turkey to consider dialogue with its Kurdish separatists. The oil-rich Iraqi Kurds will undoubtedly play a key role in these developments.

**3.4.5. The Syrian civil war:**

Many people do not believe it, but the fall of Iraq was the catalyst for the Syrian civil war. Following brutal government crackdowns on pro-democracy protests inspired by Arab Spring demonstrations against oppressive rulers across the Middle East, the Syrian Civil War erupted in March 2011. Hundreds of rebel factions emerged as violence erupted across the country. Terrorist groups, including IS and AQ, took advantage of the chaos and joined the fighting, raising international concerns about Syria becoming a haven or breeding ground for terrorist threats.

The US initially responded to the civil war in Syria between the Assad regime and rebel forces by providing non-lethal aid and intelligence support to rebels within the Syrian Free Army. It was later revealed that the CIA had also established a large programme to train and equip the rebels fighting Assad, which was reportedly terminated by President Donald Trump years later.

**CONCLUSION:**

Syrian-American relations have always been based on caution and distrust. Since its inception, new Syria has posed a threat to American interests in the Middle East region, as well as a real threat to the newly formed state of Israel, the United States' representative in the region. The US tried to build a good relationship with Syria, but they were always at odds with Arab nationalist leaders who would rather die than normalise relations with America and Israel. As a result, the US needed to find a way to remove those Arab nationalists and Iranian allies from the corridors of power.

### General Conclusion

In this paper, we have dealt with American Foreign Policy in the Middle East: American Foreign Policy in Iraq and Syria as a two cases study. using the descriptive approach during the process, we tried to describe how similar, yet, different American Foreign Policy in the Middle East toward the countries of Iraq, and Syria,,and describe the shift from isolationism to interventionism in one way or another in the rich chaotic region. we have brought insight into prominent theoretical approaches to US foreign policy: defensive and offensive realism, liberalism, marxism, neoclassical realism, and constructivism which can be based on to understand US foreign policy behaviour. . Also, we highlighted the main four goals of the American foreign policies, and how The US pursues them through different policy types such as diplomacy, trade, sanctions, military intervention, intelligence, foreign aid, and global environmental policy.

furthermore, we have explained in detail that the fundamental reasons for the war on Iraq in 2003 had a solely materialistic bent. That was by a review of the premises underlying the US invasion of Iraq.even though the US administration stated that Saddam Hussein's regime was violating human rights and had WMDs, as well as posing a threat to US national security, non of these claims appeared to be true. There is no doubt that Iraq lacked WMD and posed little threat to US national security. Additionally, Saddam Hussein's tyranny did not have as many terrible effects to need the invasion of foreign armed troops. the invasion's true motivation appeared to be the American government's willingness to seize control of oil reserves to maintain its position as the world leader.

Moreover, we have described in the final chapter how American-Syrian relations were always built on caution and suspicion even before the American war on Iraq in 2003. we showed that Syria posed a threat to the American interests in the Middle East region since its independence, as well as a real threat to the newly formed state of Israel, the United States representative in the region. The US tried to build a good relationship with Syria, but they were always at odds with Arab nationalist leaders who would rather die than normalise relations

with America and Israel. As a result, the US needed to find a way to remove those Arab nationalists and Iranian allies from the corridors of power.

It can be concluded that the US Foreign Policy in the Middle East is based on imperialism and greed. although the US claims to be stabilizing the region, the Middle East is in a state of turmoil since its first contact with the US. A stable Middle East is not good for the American interests in the region, to gain access to the enormous reserves of oil the region possesses, the Middle East should always be in chaos and turmoil.

This research was conducted regarding the questions asked earlier in the introduction. It had limited sources, most of them discussing the American foreign policy towards Iraq and Syria before and after 9/11, American-Iraqi relations, Iraqi-Syrian relations and American-Syrian relations. Our exploration of the topic can be just an opening for a further study of the subject matter, critics predicted the US intervention in Syria and argued that the final target for full American supremacy in the Middle East is Iran.

1. Ahmad, Paiman. (2014). *The US-Iraqi Relations 1945-2003*.  
10.13140/RG.2.1.1915.7608.
2. Betts, Richard K. "Two Faces of Intelligence Failure: September 11 and Iraq's Missing WMD." *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 122, no. 4, 2007, pp. 585–606. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20202928>. Accessed 15 Aug. 2022.
3. Boaduo, Nana Adu-Pipim. "Invasion of Iraq: Introspective Analysis of US Long Term Foreign Policy in the Middle East." *Journal of Political Studies*, 2012.
4. busse, Nikolas. "Constructivism and Southeast Asian security." *Pacific Review* 12 (1999) pp44.
5. Camacho Liu, Michelle. "Investing in Higher Education for Latinos: Trends in Latino College Access and Success." National Conference of State Legislatures, Washington DC, 2016, [http://www.ncsl.org/documents/educ/trends\\_in\\_latino\\_success.pdf](http://www.ncsl.org/documents/educ/trends_in_latino_success.pdf).
6. "Diplomacy: The U.S. Department of State at Work." *U.S. Department of State* 2009–2017. [state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/107330.htm](http://state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/107330.htm). Accessed 9 Apr. 2022
7. Delvoie, Louis & Zisser, Eyal. (2001). *Asad's Legacy: Syria in Transition*. *International Journal*. 56. 700. 10.2307/40203614.
8. Jervis, Robert. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics*, vol. 30, no. 2, 1978, pp. 167–214, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009958>. Accessed 7 Apr. 2022.

9. Houghton, David Patrick. "Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Toward a Constructivist Approach." *Foreign Policy Analysis* (2007): 24-45.
10. Ikenberry, G. John., et al. *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies, and Impacts*. Oxford University Press, 2000
11. Krutz, Glen, and Sylvie Waskiewicz. "Ch. 1 Introduction - American Government 3E." Pentax, OpenStax, 28 July 2021, [openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction](https://openstax.org/books/american-government-3e/pages/1-introduction)
12. Kegley, Charles W., and Eugene R. Wittkopf. *American Foreign Policy : Pattern and Process*. 7th ed, Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth
13. Kolko, Gabriel. *The Roots of American Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Power and Purpose*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969. 1979.
14. Kienel, Eberhard. *Ba'th v. Ba'th: The Conflict between Syria and Iraq*. *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Jan. 1992, [doi.org/10.1093/jis/3.1.128](https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/3.1.128).
15. Levitt, Matthew. "Syrian Sponsorship of Global Terrorism: The Need for Accountability." *The Washington Institute for Near East Policy*, 18 Sept. 2002.
16. Lawson, Fred H. "Syria's Relations with Iran: Managing the Dilemmas of Alliance." *MiddleEast Journal*, vol. 61, no. 1, 2007, pp. 29–47. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4330355>. Accessed 6 Sep. 2022
17. Mulloy, D.J. "A Review of Jeffery Record. Wantingwar: Why the Bush Administration Invaded Iraq." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 23,no. 4, 2011, *International Security*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1994, pp. 72–107,

20. Mearsheimer, John J." *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton, 2001.pp33.
21. Manfreda, Primoz. "Impacts of the Iraq War on the Middle East." ThoughtCo, Sep. 9, 2021, [thoughtco.com/iraq-war-effect-on-middle-east-2353056](https://www.thoughtco.com/iraq-war-effect-on-middle-east-2353056).
22. Patrick, E.Tyler. "New York Times Officers Say the US Aided Iraq in War despite Use of Gas," 2002.
23. Syrian Vice President Abd-Al Halim Khaddam Interview." *Syrian Arab News Agency* [Damascus ], 6 Sept. 2002
- 24, Schweller, Randall L." *Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In.* "
25. Strobel, Warren, and Washington. "Saddam's Links to Al-Qaeda Refuted." *The Age*, The Age, 12Mar.2008.
- 26."U.S. Relations with Syria - United States Department of State." *U.S. Department of State*, U.S. Department of State, 15 Apr. 2021, [www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-syria/](https://www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-syria/).
- 27.US Census Bureau. "Foreign trade: US International Trade Data" [.https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/data/index.html](https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/data/index.html).
28. Waltz, Kenneth." *Theory of International Politics*." New York: McGraw Hill.
29. Waltz, Kenneth N. " *Structural Realism after the Cold War.*" *International Security*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2000, pp. 5–41, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2626772>. Accessed 8 Apr. 2022.
30. Williams, William A. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*.New York, Norton, 1979.

31. Weber, Martin. "Between 'Issues' and 'Oughts': IR Constructivism, Critical Theory, and the Challenge of Political Philosophy." *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 20, no. 2, June 2014, pp. 516–543.
32. Zeger, Scott. (2007). Estimating excess deaths in Iraq since the US—British-led invasion. *Significance*. 4. 54 - 59. 10.1111/j.1740-9713.2007.00225.x.

## **résumé**

De nombreux auteurs, chercheurs et historiens ont trouvé que la politique étrangère américaine était un sujet important de discussion et d'évaluation au cours du siècle dernier, en particulier après la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Cette étude examinera comment les événements majeurs de la guerre de politique étrangère américaine ont fait évoluer la position isolationniste vers une position interventionniste. L'objectif principal de la politique étrangère américaine est de créer un monde stable dans lequel chaque nation qui n'est pas un allié est considérée comme un adversaire. Pour cette raison, cette étude vise à examiner la politique étrangère américaine au Moyen-Orient, où le pays a déversé tout son ressentiment, ainsi que les véritables raisons de l'engagement américain au Moyen-Orient, en particulier au Koweït, en Irak et dernièrement en Syrie. Alors qu'il s'agit d'un sujet bien connu des universitaires que d'enquêter sur les véritables motivations de la participation américaine en Irak, cette étude abordera la guerre d'Irak et la politique étrangère américaine envers la Syrie après les attentats du 11 septembre 2001 dans un examen approfondi de deux cas. Ce travail mettra en lumière la politique étrangère américaine envers les deux pays arabes opposés à l'existence des États-Unis dans la région, l'Irak et la Syrie, ainsi que les piètres excuses avancées par les États-Unis pour intervenir en Irak, telles que la possession d'armes de destruction massive et l'hébergement de groupes terroristes. En outre, il montrera comment les États-Unis ont réussi à isoler la Syrie et à l'empêcher de jouer son rôle naturel de leader dans la région.

**Mots clés :** Politique étrangère, États-Unis, Moyen-Orient, Seconde Guerre mondiale, Koweït, Syrie, 11 septembre, Irak.

## المخلص

وجد العديد من المؤلفين والعلماء والمؤرخين أن السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية كانت قضية مهمة للمناقشة والتقييم على مدى القرن الماضي ، لا سيما بعد الحرب العالمية الثانية. سنتظر هذه الدراسة في كيفية تغير الأحداث الرئيسية في حرب السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية من موقف انعزالي إلى موقف تدخلي. الهدف الرئيسي للسياسة الخارجية الأمريكية هو خلق عالم مستقر يُنظر فيه إلى كل دولة ليست حليفة على أنها الخصم. لهذا السبب ، تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى فحص السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة في الشرق الأوسط ، حيث عبرت البلاد عن كل استيائها. بالإضافة إلى الأسباب الحقيقية للانخراط الأمريكي في الشرق الأوسط ، وتحديدًا في الكويت والعراق ومؤخرًا سوريا. في حين أنه موضوع معروف بين الأكاديميين للتحقيق في الدوافع الحقيقية وراء المشاركة الأمريكية في العراق ، فإن هذه الدراسة ستتناول حرب العراق والسياسة الخارجية الأمريكية تجاه سوريا بعد هجمات 11 سبتمبر في فحص متعمق لاثنتين. يسلم هذا العمل الضوء على السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية تجاه الدولتين العربيتين المعارضتين العراق وسوريا للوجود الأمريكي في المنطقة ، والأعداء الواهية التي قدمتها الولايات المتحدة للتدخل في العراق مثل امتلاك أسلحة دمار شامل و. إيواء الجماعات الإرهابية ، كما سيظهر كيف تمكنت الولايات المتحدة من عزل سوريا ، ومنعها من لعب دورها الطبيعي كقائدة في المنطقة.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** السياسة الخارجية ، الولايات المتحدة ، الشرق الأوسط ، الحرب العالمية الثانية ، الكويت ، سوريا ،

11 سبتمبر ، العراق