People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Amar Thelidji University, Laghouat
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English

The US New Imperialist Trend through the Mass Destruction Weapons Imposture in Iraq after the September 11th Attacks

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for Master Degree in Civilization and Literature

By:

Mrs.Boutiba khadidja

Board of Examiners:

- Miss. Hocine Aicha, University of Laghouat, Chairman
- Dr.kabache Taieb, University of Lagouat, Supervisor
- Mrs. Nouiwa Wafa, University of Laghouat, Examiner

2020-2021

DEDICATION

I DEDICATE THIS DISSERTATION TO MY PARENTS, MY BROTHERS AND MY SISTERS; TO MY HUSBAND WHO HAS SUPPORTED ME; EVERY TIME.

TO MY DAUGHTERS ABIR ELYASSAMINE, FATIMA EL ZAHRA, LINA MIRAL AND TO MY SON, AHMED YOUCEF.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I thank Allah for having helped me accomplish this work.

I would thank my supervisor Dr. Kabache Taieb for providing me assistance, support and guidance throughout the different parts of this dissertation to whom I would also like to express my gratitude and appreciation for his patience with me during my completion of this work.

I am so grateful for the jury members and the president for their time and effort to evaluate my work.

Last but not least, I heartedly want to express my sincere gratitude to the staff Department of English and University of Ammar Telidji of Laghouat during my five years of study.

Abstract

The September eleventh attacks contributed to shaping the American neo-imperialism in the world. The hijackers are Arabs who made the region vulnerable to unjust American imperialism. The Bush Doctrine and his agenda in the Middle East were in favor of the war on terror. It included using military forces in Iraq and taking down Saddam Hussein's regime, Iraq's ideology, education, and even culture. Iraq and other Arab countries are oil-rich countries; such a fact made them a field of colonial ambitions since ages. This study aims to show the imperial actions of the U.S. in Iraq after the 9/11 attacks. It sheds light on the pretexts that were given by the Bush administration to invade Iraq and revealing the real causes of the occupation. America has accused Iraq of involvement in terrorism attacks and having mass destruction weapons, but none of those allegations have been proven. America's invasion of Iraq and the use of military forces were therefore unjustified, but rather to achieve colonial ambitions boosted by economic impulses. As a matter of fact, America has pursued different imperialist policies in the rest of other countries according to its relations with the country and the extent to which it is threatened or paved for its interests in the Middle East. In this research the approaches that used are the historical and descriptive approaches in order to depict American new imperialism in the Middle East and to shed the light on the real goals of US in Iraq. This research resulted in discovering the strategies and the pretexts of US and its hidden intentions in the Middle East and the real motives to invade Iraq.

Table of Contents

Number	Topic	Page #
-	**Dedication**	I
-	**Acknowledgement**	II
-	**Abstract**	III
-	**Table of Contents**	IIV
-	**List of abbreviations**	IV
-	**General Introduction**	01
	Chapter One: US Foreign Policy and Imperialism	
01	**Introduction**	06
02	**Definition of Imperialism**	06
03	**The impulses that Made US an Imperialist Nation**	08
3.I.	**The Origins of American Imperialism**	08
3.2	**American Continental Expansion**	09
3.2.1.	**The Purchase of Louisiana 1803**	09
3.2.2.	**American Pursuit to Conquer Canada**	10
3.2.3.	**American Expansion in the North**	11
3.2.4.	**The War with Mexico**	11
3.2.5.	**The Civil War 1861**	12
3.3.	**The American-Spanish War and its Legacy**	13
3.3.1.	**The U.S. Interventions in the Caribbean and Latin America**	16

3.3.2.	**Anti-Imperialists League**	16
3.4.	**World Wars (I and II) and the Shift Toward the Middle East**	17
3.4.1.	**World War I and the role of US in the war**	18
3.4.2.	**Leaving Isolation Again in 1941**	19
04	**US New Imperialism after the Cold War**	21
05	**US Ambitions in the Middle East**	22
06	**Iraq-Iran War**	25
6.1	**Iraqi Invasion of Iran**	25
6.2	**Protracted Conflict**	26
6.3	**Ceasefire, Peace Agreement and Legacy**	27
07	**The Gulf War (1990-1991)**	27
08	**Conclusion**	34
Chapter Two: September Attacks and US Invasion of Iraq		
01	**Introduction**	36
02	**The Pre-September 9/11 Political Atmosphere**	37
03	**Historical Facts on 9/11 Attacks**	39
04	**Global Effects of the 9/11 Attacks**	40
05	**Political Changes after 9/11 Events**	40
06	**American War on Iraq**	43
6.1	**The Relationship between Saddam Hussein and Al-Qaida**	43
6.2	**Possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction**	45
6.3	**American Invasion of Iraq**	48
6.4	**American Lies Promoting the Occupation of Iraq**	49
6.4.1	**Absence of Link between Iraq and al-Qaida**	49

6.4.2	**Absence of WMD in Iraq**	50
07	**Real Objectives of the War**	53
08	**Ensuring Oil Supplies**	53
09	**The Total Conspiracy of the UN against Iraq**	54
10	**Conclusion**	58
-	**General Conclusion**	60
-	**References**	64

List of abbreviations

AUMF	Authorization for Use of Military Force
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
OPEC	Organizations of Petroleum Exporting Countries
UNO	United Nations Organization
UNSCOM	United Nations Special commission
UN	United Nations Security Council
USSR	the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
US	United States
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WWI	World War I
WWII	World War II

General Introduction

General Introduction

American imperialism is one of the most important topics that several historians and policy experts keep debating about. Because of this complex case, there are lots of differences about whether America is an empire or a democratic nation. Unlike the old Empires which considered themselves as great empires in the world, Americans identified themselves as imperialists and this is due to the fact that the founding fathers of America contradicted themselves in many occasions concerning imperialism. Americans are normally required not to intervene in other countries' businesses because this contradicts with their creed that calls for liberty, freedom and individualism.

Many thinkers argue that America does not have the tenets of being an empire but if we take into consideration the definition of imperialism as "a situation in which one country has a lot of power or influence over others, especially in political and economic matters" **(Cambridge Dictionary)** , we clearly understand that any political or economic control of one powerful nation, directly or indirectly, over other countries is an act of imperialism. America outspokenly proves its existence politically, economically and militarily in the world and this has been proved through intervening in international affairs through its growing power. Historically speaking, for instance, the Spanish war at the end of the 19th century marked the American official colonization of territories from different parts of the world such as Cuba, Porto Rico, Guam and the Philippines in addition to the annexation of Hawaii.

But after the Second World War, the intervention of America had been more indirectly than directly through economic and cultural hegemony. After the Cold War and through capitalism America's unipolarity facilitated interventions all over the globe, this granted easy access to the international markets as America was the most productive nation on earth. In fact, the U.S. proclaimed its responsibility for the world's stability and leadership, but after waging war on terrorism following September attacks, the U.S. started to suffer from a crisis of legitimacy, especially after the invasion of Iraq and its fight against the so-called "axis of

evil". Claiming of possession mass destruction weapons were unsubstantiated and instead of liberating the Iraqi people, Iraq actually was invaded and became under the control of the Americans. The idea of America being an empire was reinvigorated in the political world. the US was supported by the governments of the region before taking down the regime of Saddam Hussein and the chief among them was Saudi Arabia even though most of the hijackers attack were of Saudi Arabia.

America became the most powerful system in the world with its great influence on the whole glob either by supporting and protecting its allies or taking down what they call the rogue states which were the countries against its interests, besides, the economic hegemony by establishing private banks and exploiting resources and materials. All these make it interesting to debate how America managed to vindicate its new form of imperialism. ,

The aim of this paper is to focus on the influence of the United States in the Middle East. It attempts to provide proofs that America is an imperial power, by revising the justifications given by policymakers in the U.S military interventions and assessing the way it exports its culture, democracy and influence in the Middle East. This work seeks to compare the old imperial America to the contemporary American empire.

In the light of what has been presented. this research paper will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. How does the U.S. justify Imperialism? ▪ Why did the U.S. occupy Iraq and what are the pretexts it used to justify it? ▪ What are the real motives behind the imperialist acts in Iraq? ▪ What was the conspiracy of the UN and the neighboring against the Iraq?

2. To what extent does neo-imperialism differ from classical imperialism? ▪ Why did America change its tactics and strategies in its imperial actions in the Middle East?

This research highlights America's attempts to establish a stabilized global system under its supervision through spreading democracy and liberty based on the ideology of American exceptionalism. This work has supposed other motives to the imperial American acts in the

Middle East such as the economic interest; the region provides new markets and it represents a great portion of the world's oil stocks. Moreover, the protection of Israel is one of the priorities of America in the region. Another factor is the geostrategic position of the area and its proximity to the Strait of Hormuz and the Suez Canal. This study suggests also that oil shaped the relations between Iraq and America because oil is the most vital substance in the world. After the war of Iraq and its terrible losses, America tended to use soft-imperialism that is based on cultural influence and economic interests. This work assumes that America never stopped being an empire but found new ways to apply it using soft mechanisms and avoiding direct military confrontations for the benefit of its economy and other interests.

Through this study of U.S neo-imperialism in the middle East after the war on terror, it is important to mention works such as Hegemony or Survival by **Noam Chomsky (2003)** where he discusses the impact of globalization on the American foreign policy and how it became an imperialist global power after WW1. There is another work that shaped the studies about imperialism which is the work of Edward Said's Cultural Imperialism that sheds light on the origins of Soft-Imperialism and linked it to the practice of power in the time of formal empires. This cultural influence is based on the continuation of old political practices by the superpowers. Similarly, in his work Colossus, Nail Ferguson goes through the American Imperialism in details in the 20th century. According to him, America should embrace imperialism and argues that America has always been an empire but some of the Americans are just in denial of this fact.

The approaches that use in this research are the historical approach to show the development of the new imperialism and the descriptive approach to depict American imperialism and its changes to serve the interests of the US and make America as a global power

This research is divided into two chapters, the first deals with the old American imperialism starting from the early settlement, continental expansions, to overseas

expansions. It also tackles the theories and ideologies that influenced American domestic and foreign policy. The second chapter is about contemporary imperialism that was characterized by the War on Terror following al-Qaida attacks on the U.S. and the invasion of Iraq as an outcome of these attacks.

Chapter One

US Foreign Policy and Imperialism

1.Introduction
2.Definition of Imperialism
3. The impulses that made US an imperialist nation
3.I. The origins of American Imperialism
3.2 American Continental Expansion
3.2.1. The Purchase of Louisiana 1803
3.2.2. American pursuit to conquer Canada
3.2.3. American expansion in the North
3.2.4. The War with Mexico
3.2.5. The Civil War 1861
3.3. The American-Spanish War and its Legacy
3.3.1. The U.S. Interventions in the Caribbean and Latin America
3.3.2. Anti-Imperialists League
3.4. World Wars (I and II) and the Shift Toward the Middle East
3.4.1. World War I and the role of US in the war
3.4.2. Leaving Isolation Again in 1941
4.US new imperialism after the Cold War
5. US ambitions in the middle East
6.Iran-Iraq War
6.1. Iraqi Invasion of Iran
6.2.A Protracted Conflict
6.3. Ceasefire, Peace Agreement and Legacy
07.The Gulf War (1990-1991) :

US Foreign Policy and Imperialism

1. Introduction

There are various definitions of imperialism, but all scholars and thinkers agree that it refers to the relationship between a dominant over a submissive one. America with its special way of foundation managed to create its own way of empire that was influenced by many ideologies and theories. Though it was not an official empire, it behaved like empires from day one of its establishment by engaging in continental expansions, overseas expansions, participating in World Wars and becoming an international power.

2. Definition of Imperialism

Imperialism defined as "the policy, practice, or advocacy of extending the power and dominion of a nation especially by direct territorial acquisitions or by gaining indirect control over the political or economic life of other areas**". (Meriam webster "imperialism").**

In other words, imperialism can be formal and achieved through colonizing the weaker countries and imposing new cultures and rules over the indigenous populations there, or it can be informal by having an influence and control over their authorities. Richard Drayton gives a more detailed definition of imperialism:

> Imperialism, in all its contexts, is a regime through which external entities derive maximum gain from the labour and resources within a territory. A foreign power, with or without formal colonization, although always with local collaborators, secures a protected and privileged sphere for its economic actors. There the relationship of labour to capital is manipulated via the suppression of taxes, wages, social or environmental protections, by forms of coercion which drive labour towards that direction of employment and limit its legal or practical ability to resist the regime and from which tribute, commodities and profit may be freely expatriated.

Drayton expanded the circle of imperialism and demonstrated a comprehensive definition of it by exposing it layer by layer. Unlike the old definitions of imperialism that linked it to colonization and the direct rule of a country, this definition broadens the scope of imperialism to indirect, cultural and economic.

The beginning of American imperialism can be traced back to the early settlements of the puritans in America. The puritans' beliefs and thoughts were imbued with a Christian encouragement to achieve their divine mission of bringing civilization which was their holy pretext to colonization. They believed that America is the land where they would build a religious empire and as first steps, they started by expanding in the eastern part of the new world. Killing the native Americans and taking their lands were justified religiously by fighting Satan who possessed the Indians. Also, for them seeking wealth is a religious duty that needed lands to fulfill it **(Jones, 2015, pp. 172–86)**. This ideology of the puritans was bequeathed to the generations that follow and contributed to the creation of the American Exceptionalism which is the pillar of imperialism.

America fought against the British Empire for the belief that the government should be with the consent of the governed like when Abraham Lincoln said "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent" **(Jaffa 1958, pp. 745–753)**.The Founding Fathers took freedom, liberty and individualism as their creed but they kept an imperial ambition to their newly established nation. George Washington, in his farewell speech, warned his people from entanglements with other nations saying, "nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded" **(qtd.in Pruitt)**. However, multiple times, he spoke about his country being an infant empire" that it might not be one at that time but for sure it would be in the future with a considerable weight at the level of empires **(Ferguson, 2005, p 53).**

Like having imperial ambition was not enough, the founding fathers actually were proud imperialists. William Drayton, the chief of the highest court in South Carolina, wrote in 1776

"The Almighty has made choice of the present generation to erect the American empire to be the most glorious of any upon record" **(Ibid).**Just a few years after independence, the Americans started a series of continental expansions. Hoping for a great position in the world, the founding fathers thought that the 13-colonies' territory was not enough to establish the desired goal. In fact, they thought of continental expansions with varied motives but a unified aim which is a powerful empire.

3. The impulses that made US an imperialist nation

3. 1. The Origins of American Imperialism

The American expansions were justified by many ideologies among them the idea of American exceptionalism. Robert G. Patman defines American exceptionalism as "an informal ideology that endows Americans with a pervasive faith in the uniqueness, immutability and superiority of the country's founding liberal principles and also with the conviction that the USA has a special destiny among nations" **(Robert G. Patman, 2006, pp. 963–986).**Based on the idea of exceptionalism, the Americans sought after spreading freedom and democracy as they considered it their divine mission to civilize the others. It is related to their self-image and how they perceive themselves as the outstanding and chosen people to prosper.

Americans included scientific theories in their ideologies to confirm their superiority. Social Darwinism was extracted from Darwin's scientific theory of the natural selection and the survival of the fittest by applying it on the human races. This ideology was implemented by politicians to serve their agendas. They came up with interpretations of this theory that categorize people and classify them into superior and inferior, whites and non-whites, civilized and uncivilized, dominion and submission, to justify wars, colonization and imperialism. Also, holding the white man's burden was a chief justification to the American expansion and intervention in other countries' affairs since they believed that as ancestors of the Anglo-Saxon race, they have a divine mission of bringing civilization and spreading Christianity.

Another ideology that gained great popularity in the 19th century was Manifest Destiny. Unlike social Darwinism that is related to science, Manifest Destiny has to do with religion which was used as a rationalization to the expansion policy. It is defined as the religious belief of the necessity to continue the expansion as it is unavoidable and according to this belief, Americans have the right and duty to extend their territories in the North of America (**"MANIFEST-DESTINY |7**Definitions of Manifest-Destiny -Your Dictionary"). This ideology shaped the American westward expansion and the Purchase of Louisiana in 1803, as it was used as a justification to validate the acquisitions of new lands throughout the Northern Continent.

3.2 American Continental Expansion

Thomas Jefferson (1801-1805) was the first one who encouraged exploration and considered it one of his priorities to expand the territory to the northwest to facilitate trade with Asia. One way for that was to find an all-water passage like the Mississippi River, Missouri River, the Atlantic Ocean to the west and the Columbia River from the Pacific Ocean to the east. To accomplish his plans, Jefferson appointed Meriwether Lewis as a commander to the expedition and the latter chose William Clark as his co-commander. Though they were not able to find a water passage as they wanted, they managed to provide new geographic maps ("Expansion and Exploration in the New Republic: The Louisiana Purchase"). The ambitious Americans and with the motivation of expanding their commerce and lands, they had their eyes on New Orleans for its strategic location that would grant them importation of their products.

3.2.1. The Purchase of Louisiana 1803

The settlers were claiming the lands of the indigenous people in the west near the Appalachian Mountains and the Mississippi River. territories like Kentucky, Tennessee and Ohio announced their statehood and joined the union in 1803. Meanwhile, they kept an eye on the negotiations between the Spanish and the French about Louisiana's fate and in a secret treaty, Spain ceded it to France in 1800. Unexpectedly, the leader of France Napoleon Bonaparte gave up his ambitions of building a French empire in America and offered Louisiana to sell for $15

million. In 1803 the Americans acquired Louisiana territory from the French in what was known as the Louisiana Purchase. The acquisition included almost the whole land between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains which resulted in the multiplication of the size of the Malunited States. Nevertheless, the American authorities rushed to include West Florida in the purchase of Louisiana by taking the advantage of the absence of borders or geographical maps to the region. Although America expanded its territory without infringement, it was confronted with resistance from the inhabitants of Louisiana whom the majority were against becoming Americans. Many natives resisted the American settlers to protect their lands but they were pushed and dislodged to the western lands of the Mississippi. **DeRogati (2003)**commented about how Americans expanded without considering the indigenous population because "the practice of viewing land as a "tabula rasa" is a common feature of those who conquer and colonize indigenous people, who often are remapped and renamed in the process" **(DeRogati ,2003, p22).**

Even though America was not an Empire at that time, it automatically acted like the traditional empires by the expansion and acquisition of lands at the expense of the original inhabitants and exposed them to new ruling and authorities other than own.

3.2.2. American Pursuit to Conquer Canada

The US declared war against Great Britain in 1812 because of the British constant confiscations of American ships and loads. Since the American army was not strong enough to confront the British, Madison's plans to annex Canada were toast and ended up signing a treaty of Ghent in 1814 in which both parties gained no extra lands or benefits. The indigenous populations were positioned deliberately between Canada and the US by Great Britain; However, The Americans deprived the natives of their lands in the west and pushed them away. Despite their courageous participation in the war against the Americans, the British gave up on them later and sacrificed them to secure Canada. **(Renehan,2007, pp 24-25).**

The British empire treated the Native Americans, the US kept expanding westward without looking for the rights of the natives they considered the lands of the Indians as virgin lands. the

Indigenous population could offer only little resistance to the Americans because of the unequal power and living conditions in cold and isolated areas which caused to minimize their number

3.2.3. American Expansion in the North

The willingness to acquire Oregon was fueled with the belief in Manifest Destiny that America should extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. In 1830 American settlers headed to Oregon. Despite the difficulties, their number was increased and they were twice as many as the British there which caused tension between Britain and America about the fate of Oregon. With the election of James K. Polk in 1844, who was a pro-Manifest Destiny reasoning, he claimed that Oregon territory belongs to the US.

But Britain's willingness to ally Mexico against this ruined Polk's plans and put him in a difficult position with his people. With increasing pressure on the American President and for economic reasons for Britain, the two countries signed the treaty of Oregon in 1846 (Belshaw). While the treaty granted the United States the land south of the 49th parallel, it gave Britain the land north of the parallel including Vancouver Island. Establishing borders The expansion of the united states.

3.2.4. The War with Mexico

The war with Mexico were traced back in 1846 were traced back to the actions that happened in Texas ten years ago. In 1835, Americans who immigrated to Texas and settled there started a rebellion against the Mexican authorities there and declared Texas as an independent state in 1836. They demanded annexation to the Union as they considered themselves part of the United States. However, their request was denied and turned down by the Congress in fear of war with Mexico. It was during President John Tyler's mandate that Texas was officially annexed in 1845 **(Welk 1).**

In 1846 American and Mexican soldiers had a conflict in the frontiers and the US seized the chance to take away lands from Mexico. By 1847, the Mexican army was defeated and as a result, many parts of its territory such as California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Coloradoand New

Mexico were latched by the American government. This can be only interpreted as an act of imperialism.

3.2.5. The Civil War 1861

The success of westward American expansion allowed it to build an agricultural empire in the South and industrial power in the North thanks to the technological developments and railways. The variance between the Northern States and the Southern States in the economic activity led to a main difference between the two which is slavery. The Northerners called for the abolition of slavery because they saw it as a stain in the US history and a contradiction to the American creed and constitution that call for freedom and acknowledge that all men are equal. On the other hand, the Southerners insisted that slavery cannot be abandoned because they are neither ready to give up their farmlands nor ready to do the hard labor by themselves. In a way, this dispute about slavery stimulated a race between the North and the South on extending and adding more states so that the one with more states would have the final word concerning the issue. Eleven Southern states seceded from the Union when Abraham Lincoln came to office in 1860 which caused a war that lasted for four years and ended with the victory of the North **("Slavery, Civil War and Westward Expansion").**

After The Civil War, there was an economic growth especially after the discovery of gold in California. Many Americans immigrated to California on adventures to find gold and get rich but after two decades miners broaden the area of gold searching to Dakota, Nevada, Colorado and Montana. When miners head to Colorado they go through the grasslands in the west of Rocky Mountains, where the Amerindians lands. The constant greed of the Americans encouraged them to exploit the grass of the Amerindians lands to feed their animals and hunted the buffalo which was the main provider of Amerindians' food and clothes just for pleasure. Many parts of their lands were taken by the American farmers and ranchers. Moreover, they wanted to deprive them of their lands and put them in reservations in harsh natural conditions that no white would like to live in. This unfair treatment of the indigenous people was an imperial behavior that was

triggered and justified by Manifest Destiny where the white race had the right to do anything for its benefits even oppressing the other races. The Amerindians resisted courageously but again their power was not enough to defeat a strong army with advanced weapons.

The Indians were perceived as social illness to a civilized white society that required a remedy. The white Americans saw themselves as the only ones entitled to hold civilization and treated the natives just like obstacles that needed to be removed to spread the American principles (Miller 20). Fabian Hilfrich elaborates about this American attitude:

> American nationalism was based on exceptionalism and democracy and with the vague meaning and interpretations of these two concepts, many Imperialists and anti-imperialists managed to misuse the American creed in favor of their benefits**(Hilfin Fabian,2013, pp 50-76).**

As it was mentioned before, Americans expanded to new lands based on the perception of their self-image of being a superior race. They manipulated their religious teachings and science discoveries just to serve as justifications for their continental expansions in the North of American continent and to mistreat the other races like the Indians and the Blacks.

3.3. The American-Spanish War and its Legacy

As a last attempt to put pressure on Canada and annex it to the US territory, The Americans accepted the offer of Russia to purchase Alaska though it was considered a stupid move by many Americans. Alaska was granted statehood later in 1959 (“Milestones: 1866-1898 - Office of the Historian”). After the purchase of Alaska, America had not included any new lands and the continental expansion came to an end. However, the competition of the great powers on claiming new colonies made America set her sight on the oversee.

After securing its frontiers and finishing with continental expansions, the U.S. was tempted with overseas expansions. By the end of the 19th century, America became a world superpower because of its economic boom in addition to its strong navy. For this, many Americans expressed their desire to find new markets to their production among them Albert J. Beveridge, senator for

Indiana and called for finding new markets to their products saying, "We will establish trading posts throughout the world as distributing points for American products…. Great colonies governing themselves, flying our flag and trading with us, will grow about our posts of trade" (**Steph**).

Meanwhile, great powers like Britain, France and Germany hurried on claiming new colonies and divided the world between them. Americans thought that they need to enter the race since having colonies oversee meant markets to their goods, sources for raw materials and security of their sphere of influence in other continents of the world. Senator Orville Platt, who was in favor of expanding overseas, said "we are the most advanced and powerful nation on earth and our future demand an abandonment of the policy of isolation. It is to the ocean our children must look, as they looked to the boundless west" ("An American Imperialism"). Many Americans shared the same idea and asked for a continuation in expansion as Henry Cabot Lodge described, "The U.S. must expand to compete!" ("American Imperialism" 2). However, a group of Americans was against becoming an empire as they believed that it contradicts their American values.

The U.S. was not satisfied with the existence of the Spanish in Cuba but its commitment to Monroe Doctrine prevented any interference there until when the American ship called "The Main" was destroyed in the harbor of Havana. The ship was sent to parade the American power there and show sympathy with the Cuban rebels against Spain, but the reasons to destroy and the doers of this incident remained unclear as nobody claimed the responsibility for these violent events. victims in the explosion of the ship and voices calling for revenge escalated quickly, especially, after newspapers started to throw accusations on Spain. Although President McKinley was hesitant of declaring a war against Spain and tried to cool things through diplomacy the popular pressure which was ignited by media that described how the Spanish was cruel toward the Cubans, an anti-Spanish sentiment developed in America and many politicians even some of the isolationist called for a war against Spain (Rise). Senator Redfield Proctor of Vermont stated

that he changed his mind from being pro isolation to intervention after a visit to Cuba, he said: "because of the spectacle of a million and a half people, the entire native population of Cuba, struggling for freedom and deliverance" **("Digital History").**

Congress declared war with the condition of accepting the Teller Amendment which stated that Cuba should be granted independence from the Spanish. The war lasted only a few months and the U.S. was victorious. As a result, Spain gave up its colonies to the U.S. which made America owning new territories overseas. The United States with its triumph managed to take the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Guam in the treaty of Paris 1898 and formally annexed Hawaii in the same year. Concerning Cuba, the U.S. adopted the Platt Amendment that gave it the right to intervene in Cuba, in addition, to be able to purchase and rent Cuban naval bases and lands **(Ibid).** Before the war, Americans claimed that they waged this war to liberate the oppressed but how they behaved was far away from liberation for many reasons. Firstly, they accepted no representation for Cuba or the Philippines in the negotiation. Then they evaded from the Teller Amendment and enforced the Platt Amendment that does not preserve the Cuban national sovereignty. After turning down the Annexation of Hawaii in the 1870s since it was a planned coup d'état against the Queen by American sugar planters, the U.S. seized the opportunity and annexed it. The Americans fought with the Filipinos against Spain, yet they were unwilling to grant them liberty after the Spanish. President McKinley, in an imperial speech par excellence, clarified that they refused to give the Philippines back to Spain or any European power and justified the annexation by saying, "...that we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for government … that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all and educate the Filipinos and uplift and civilize and christianize them" **("Manifest Destiny, Continued: McKinley Defends U.S. Expansionism").** Manifest Destiny and spreading civilization remained the same justification for U.S. foreign policy. Confusion and contradiction are the overwhelming feelings when the American policy is traced.

3.3.1. The U.S. Interventions in the Caribbean and Latin America

The legacy of the war with the Spanish and the new position in the world freed the Americans a little from their old pledges and put them in a more comfortable situation. One way for that was through the use of its economic power and military, they worked on the creation of pro-American governments. This method would save time, money and souls besides diminish controversies related to wars and territories. It was also acceptable for the U.S. to have governments that are aligned with American fashion **(Ferguson, 2005, p 75).**

President Wilson in a declaration to the media said that the U.S would deal only with the "Good-governments" in Latin America and it expelled dictatorships and revolutionaries. However, when Columbia refused to let the Americans build a canal in Panama, the Americans supported and incited Panama insurgency against Columbia. America recognized the independence of Panama in 90 minutes and soon Panama gave the U.S. the right to build the canal (Ferguson 78). it is no surprise that America contradicts its rhetoric with its actions.

As the Caribbean and Latin America were nothing less than the U.S. sphere of influence, interventions there were constant and they were given the name of "The Banana Wars". America established bases in the Gulf of Cuba, interfered 16 times in Haiti and the country was under its supervision financially and politically. Moreover, a dictator called Anastasios Samosa installed himself as the head of the state of Nicaragua, he was welcomed by the American authorities despite their previous declarations that they would never support dictatorships. As an exchange, The American were given rights to establish a new canal and naval base on the Gulf of Nicaragua **(Ferguson ,2005, p79).**

3.3.2. Anti-Imperialists League

The league was founded in 1899 and its chief purpose was to end the Philippines occupation. The members of the league like Mark Twain, William James, David Starr Jordan and Samuel Gompers justified their opposition with economic, religious and ethical reasons. In their platform, they described Imperialism saying, "We hold that the policy known as imperialism is

hostile to liberty and tends toward militarism, an evil from which it has been our glory to be free.**" ("Internet History Sourcebooks")**They militated against imperialism because it contradicted with their principles of liberty and the government with the consent of the governed. They also refused any attack or aggression on any country and condemned any cruel treatment that accompanied it.

This league disappeared years later as more imperialism supporters justified and encouraged overseas expansion. Senator Albert Beveridge from Indiana (1899-1911) explained in his campaign address "The March of the Flag" why it was important for the U.S. to be an imperial power and replied to the anti-imperialists:

The Opposition tells us that we ought not to govern a people without their

> consent. I answer, the rule of liberty that all just government derives its authority from the consent of the governed, applies only to those who are capable of self-government. We govern the Indians without their consent, we govern our territories without their consent, we govern our children without their consent **("Beveridge, 'March of the Flag,' Speech Text").**

With the arrogance of the white supremacist who despise the other races, Beveridge argued about the importance of Imperialism and how America needed it so much at that time for its economy and prosperity. He also considered it a duty to govern the incompetent races and questioned their ability to govern themselves in the first place thus colonizing them was not a crime. Economy, geo-strategy, racial superiority and religious mission besides democracy and civilization were all the motives and the justifications for the American imperialistic behavior and it remained the same until the break out of World Wars.

3.4. World Wars (I and II) and the Shift Toward the Middle East

World War I contributed to the flourishment of the American economy as it was the biggest producing country in the world at that time. The U.S. seized the opportunity of the wars to fill the

treasury while the other superpowers were fighting. However, the Americans found themselves obliged to participate in the wars later on.

3.4.1. World War I and the Role of US in the War

The war started in 1914 between Britain, France and Russia on one side and Germany besides Austria-Hungary on the other side. President of the U.S. Woodrow Wilson and his administration tried to stay out of the issue by keeping a neutral position and continuing trade relations with Europe and the rest of the world. While the superpowers were incurring great losses, America was benefiting from the war by supplying weapons and ammunition. It was all good until the British navy blocked any ships from getting to Germany to prevent any weapon or ammunition supplies to its enemy.

American ships fear of challenging the British Blockade outraged the Germans which led to a series of provocations such as blowing up ships regardless of the nature of the load whether it carried weapons, food, or even civilians in the French and British territorial. These random destructions were many times occasions when many Americans died resulting in a public resentment against the Germans. In 1917, Germany was worried about losing the war if America kept providing them with supplies, as a result, their navy destroyed many American ships. American media got a copy of a telegram that showed, the German foreign secretary, Arthur Zimmermann aiming at convincing Mexico to join the war and promising to give them back Texas, Arizona and New Mexico if they were won. The claim of the media added fuel to fire and a national sympathy to the alliance had widened. Furthermore, American debts to Europe had witnessed such an increase that they wanted to ensure their dues would be paid by taking the alliance side.

In April 1917, the U.S. declared war on Germany and sided with the alliance. This entrance represented the first American interference in the word's affair since the war with Spain. The Americans were not really ready when they declared the war so they initiated recruiting campaigns and encourage mass productions of ships, weapons and food in short amounts of time.

By 1918, America was able to turn the tide to the Alliance and pushed Germany to ask for a truce. The war was ended with a unilateral agreement called the treaty of Versailles in 1919, this treaty stipulated that Germany needed to cede most of its navy, give up its weapons and withdraw from any occupied territory. Though the warnings of the U.S. from being too harsh on Germany might lead to another war, the great powers ignored these warnings.

3.4.2. Leaving Isolation Again in 1941

The aftermath of WWI presented the U.S. as an effective power in the international community but inside the country, many Americans preferred peace in the time of isolation rather than the conflicts during interventions. Consequently, the U.S. worked on the refinement of the Latin-America and the U.S. relations by passing the Good Neighbor Policy that ends interventions in the region. America hoped for gaining prestige and improve its image in the area **("United States - World War II").**

WWII broke out in 1939 with Germany's encroachment on Poland and it created a military alliance with Italy and Japan. As a result, Britain and France declared war on Germany. The U.S. wanted no business with this war although President Franklin Roosevelt wanted to help Britain and France and all that he could afford was to provide arms and ammunition sales. In 1941, a surprising attack from Japan on Pearl Harbor naval base which resulted in demolishing nearly 200 aircraft and damaged 18 battleships. The congress waged war against Japan in December 1941 but three days Later the axis declared war on America which made the U.S. official entry in the war **("Take A Closer Look: America Goes to War")**. With the help of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., the superpowers could defeat Hitler after four years and were able to stop the German incursion into Europe but WWII was only ended with America attacking Japan with atomic bombs in September 1945.The end of WWII marked the emergence of new superpowers, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R and the decline of the conventional powers, Britain and France. These great powers with wide territories soon started a competition of dominion in the whole world from Europe to the Middle East. The competition was at many levels like scientific discoveries, arms race, the

sphere of influence, economic interests and space invasion. The Arab Peninsula caught a lot of attention by the American thanks to the crises and controversies that emerged there like the Arab-Israeli conflict in 1948, the Suez Canal issue in 1956and the 1973 oil crisis. As a power that seeks order and peace in the word, the U.S. believed that it is their responsibility to end the chaos in the region. Not only the crisis that made Americans shift their interest there but also the eagerness of their arch-rival (U.S.S.R) to spread and protect their influence in the Arab world. Another chief reason is the oil preserves in these countries which the west needs the most **(Halabi, 2009,p 1)** One special thing about the Arabian area is the concentration on how politics, economy, and religion play a major role in the definition of the relations between the region and the rest of the world. The region was divided between a French and a British control which was in different forms before the liberation movement took the region by storm. After WWII, the region gave a new image and aura, Karol R. Sorby describes it as "the most significant changes flowed neither from the experience of the military campaigns nor from the influence of the great political and moral issues of the world struggle. They were discernible in the spirit and temper of the people" **(Sorby,2001,pp 78- 79).**

A movement of Arab nationalism rose at that time. This movement was influenced by Communist ideas , which carried with it a discontent against western imperialism. Arab people were deeply affected by its principles and looked with suspicion to America's interest in the region. These doubts were soon to be confirmed when the U.S. showed support to Israel and acted as a protector to its existence in the region by preventing weapons exports to the Arab countries. Furthermore, America worked on the stabilization of the area to ensure the oil supply and played a major role in protecting the U.S. pro-regimes so that the oil reserves would be safe **(Halabi, 2009, p 6).**

Throughout the Cold War period, Americans' interventions in the Arab World were mainly to protect their economic interests and the existence of Israel. By the end of this war,

America became the sole superpower in the world which needed to assume more responsibilities in disseminating democracy and freedom. As an oil-rich area, the Arabian 4 own security was at stake. As a reaction, America declared war on terror and sought to fight the alliance.

4.US new imperialism after the cold war

The end of the Cold War in 1989 and the subsequent breakup of the Soviet Union changed the global situation fundamentally, leaving the United States as the only superpower. The Cold War justification for foreign military interventions thereby disappeared, but new reasons for such ventures multiplied. In varying scales of magnitude, U.S. armed forces were deployed in Panama (1989), Somalia (1992), Haiti (1994), Bosnia (1995) and Kosovo (1999), the latter including a bombing campaign against Serbia. By far the largest overseas operation was the Gulf War of 1991 against Iraq, which involved more than 500,000 U.S. troops to protect the industrial world's oil supply, but motives for the other interventions varied widely. In Somalia, for example, where no visible U.S. interests were at stake, the goal was to remove the obstacles to feeding a starving population and in Bosnia and Kosovo it was to prevent the out-break of regional war and prevent mass genocide. Some saw the United States as world policeman, others as global bully, but none could deny the reality of the nation's power and influence virtually everywhere on the globe.

As the world's strongest and wealthiest nation for the last half century, the United States was responsible for its full share of neo-imperialist hegemony. At times, however, it acted abroad in conjunction with less powerful nations that lacked the American capacity to project force quickly to crisis areas. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Gulf War both saw U.S. military power enlisted in the service of a broad coalition of nations and interests. Operating within a highly competitive global economy, U.S. economic power was great but hardly hegemonic, while its cultural influences were eagerly received in large parts of the world even if deeply resented in others. No single definition can contain the enormous variety of American activities, motives and effects on the world certainly, the term "imperialism" cannot. **(americanforeignrelations.com)**

5.US Ambitions in the Middle East

In 1970, domestic production of crude oil peaked, with an average of nearly 10 million native-born barrels entering the world market every day. Domestic production then steadily declined through the rest of the century—in part because Europe, which had depended on American oil during World War II, began to look toward the Middle East for imports—and bottomed out at 5 million barrels per day in the final year of Bush II's presidency. The '70s also saw the beginning of an increase in US oil imports from abroad, especially the Middle East, making for the American economy's now notorious dependence on "foreign oil." The aspirations of the average American depended on that oil's availability: "an unspoken premise underlying that way of life was that there was more still to come."

When America backed Israel in the Yom Kippur War, Arab OPEC members, along with Egypt and Syria, proceeded to shut down oil exports to the US. The embargo posed what felt like a "direct existential threat" to the American economy, Bacevich writes and it provoked some clamor for military action among hawkish pundits and political scientists. But it wasn't until the upheavals of the late '70s—the Iranian Revolution, the subsequent hostage crisis in Tehran and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan—that the US fully militarized its relationship to the Middle East. Afghanistan had represented a buffer zone between the Soviet Union and the Middle East, but now it looked more like a staging ground for a sustained Soviet presence. In his 1980 State of the Union address, Carter accused the Soviets of "attempting to consolidate a strategic position" that could impede US access to "more than two thirds" of the oil available worldwide. "Let our position be absolutely clear," he said. "An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force." This statement, Bacevich writes, "subsequently enshrined as the Carter Doctrine, inaugurated America's War for the Greater Middle East."

The war began as a project in regional management. In 1980, Carter established a task force to monitor and respond to the Soviet threat. Three years later it was replaced by US Central Command, or CENTCOM, which was assigned an "area of responsibility"—Bacevich is aware of the phrase's imperial connotations—that included the countries of the Persian Gulf plus much of North and East Africa, as well as Afghanistan. Early plans focused on repelling a massive Soviet invasion of Iran. That invasion never took place, but the new bases and upgraded ports that the Pentagon scattered throughout the Middle East served to embed US military infrastructure in the region. The tools required for military solutions to future problems in that part of the world were now close at hand.

If an imaginary threat justified US military buildup in the region, real threats prompted military action. In 1980, Saddam Hussein, who had formally assumed Iraq's presidency a year earlier, incorrectly calculated that Iran's post-revolution vulnerabilities would make one of its oil-rich border provinces easy pickings for a land grab. The resulting Iran-Iraq War, which Bacevich refers to as the First Gulf War, with the US backing Iraq, continued until 1988, making it the longest conventional war of the 20th century. It was the first major military conflict to occur in the era of the Carter Doctrine and the first in what Bacevich calls "a series of armed conflicts . . . to determine who will exercise dominion over the core of the Islamic world." The reasoning behind America's involvement in the Middle East—protect the oil—was perfectly coherent, but as Bacevich shows, the strategy and tactics employed in the service of oil protection were confused from the start. With the 1986 bombing of Libya, for example, the US wanted to provoke a confrontation: Operation El Dorado Canyon dropped bombs on Libya's airfields, important components of its air-defense network and Muammar Qaddafi's compound. The deployment of American marines in Lebanon, by contrast, was ostensibly a peacekeeping mission, although it's not clear why Ronald Reagan believed marines would help to relieve the sectarian strife of the Lebanese Civil War. Ultimately the marines became targets themselves; the 1983 suicide bombing of a barracks in Beirut killed more than two hundred of them.

Bacevich reserves special contempt for America's conduct in the Iran-Iraq War. Content to watch Saddam beat up on the Iranian clerics, the US was disturbed to see Iran repel the invaders. Scattered anticolonial terrorist attacks were one thing, but a revolutionary Islamic republic with regional standing presented serious problems. In 1983, the US sent Donald Rumsfeld to Iraq to be videotaped shaking Saddam Hussein's hand and diplomatic relations were reestablished in 1984. When France and the Soviet Union organized the sale of advanced weaponry to Iraq, the US did not object. Israel, meanwhile, was secretly selling American-made arms to Iran. "Israel and the United States," Bacevich writes, "thus found themselves supporting opposite sides in a war in which *both* warring parties were stridently anti-Israel *and* anti-American." In 1985, the US would begin to divert arms secretly to Iran without abandoning its maintenance of the Iraqi army.

American involvement in the Iran-Iraq War culminated with Operation Praying Mantis, in which US forces, no longer willing to work through proxies, destroyed much of Iran's navy. A few months later, the USS *Vincennes* shot Iran Air flight 655, which it mistakenly identified as an attacking fighter jet, out of the sky, killing 290 passengers. "I will never apologize for the United States," said vice president George H. W. Bush, providing his son with a template for future use. "I don't care what the facts are. I'm not an apologize-for-America kind of guy." None of the pundits who congratulated Reagan on America's "decisive" intervention in the conflict seemed to notice that in terms of its original purpose—the maintenance of regional stability—the intervention had decisively failed.

After the fall of the Soviet Union, the US no longer had any fig leaf to hide its naked pursuit of oil. Nonetheless, the image of an encroaching Middle Eastern tyranny overrunning the world's oil resources proved an adequate excuse for the US to conduct its most significant military operation since the Vietnam War. Offended that Kuwait's ruling family wanted him to repay the billions Iraq had borrowed during its war with Iran, Saddam Hussein invaded the tiny country. This posed a major threat to Saudi Arabia, a country that, as Bacevich notes, "every US

president since Franklin D. Roosevelt had vowed to protect" on the basis of its status as the world's preeminent oil-producing state. And protect Saudi Arabia America did, with Operation Desert Storm, which succeeded so quickly and decisively that one pundit identified the Nazi invasion of France as its main historical analogue. **(Nplusonemag.com/issue-26/reviews/why-are-we-in-the-middle-east)**

06. Iran-Iraq War

Tensions between Iran and Iraq began almost immediately after the establishment of the latter nation in 1921, in the aftermath of World War I. By the 1970s, one enduring source of conflict involved control of the Shatt al-Arab, the waterway formed by the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, the southern end of which forms the border between the two nations. Signed in 1975, the Algiers Agreement reduced Iraqi control over the waterway in exchange for Iran's withdrawing support for a Kurdish insurgency in northern Iraq.

A turning point occurred with the Iranian Revolution of 1978-79, which toppled the pro-Western government of Shah Mohammad Reza Pallavi in favor of a fundamentalist regime led by Shi'ite Muslim cleric Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Saddam Hussein, who became president of Iraq and leader of the country's Ba'ath Party in July 1979, counted on the support of his nation's minority Sunni Muslim population and feared an expansion of Iran's revolution to Shi'ite-dominated Iraq. Saddam also sought to overturn the border agreements of 1975 and reassert control over both sides of the Shatt al-Arab, Iraq's only access point to the Persian Gulf.

6.1. Iraqi Invasion of Iran

Mindful of Iran's weakened military in the wake of its revolution, Saddam decided on a preemptive strike against Iran. On September 22, 1980, Iraqi forces launched air strikes on Iranian air bases, following up with a ground invasion of the oil-producing

border region of Khuzestan. The invasion was initially successful, with Iraq capturing the city of Khorramshahr and making other territorial gains by November.

But the Iraqi advance soon stalled in the face of a stiff Iranian resistance, powered by the addition of revolutionary militia to the regular armed forces. In 1981, Iran launched a counteroffensive; by early 1982, they had regained virtually all of the lost territory. By the end of that year, with Iraqi forces withdrawn to pre-war border lines, Iraq attempted to seek peace. Under Khomeini's leadership, Iran refused, insisting on continuing the conflict in an effort to topple Saddam's regime. In July 1982, Iran invaded Iraqi territory in an unsuccessful attempt— the first of many—to gain control of the Iraqi port city of Basra. **(topics/middle-east/iran-iraq-war)**

6.2.A Protracted Conflict

With Iran now on the offensive, Iraqi defenses solidified and the war settled into a virtual stalemate along a front running roughly along the border. Both sides launched air and missile attacks against cities, military sites and oil facilities and transports, prompting the United States and other Western powers to send warships to the Persian Gulf to regulate the output of oil to the global market.

While Iran enjoyed a large numerical advantage, Iraq had more sophisticated weaponry and a better-trained officer corps, thanks to direct support from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and other Arab states and tacit support from Western nations including the United States.

In the aftermath of the 1979-81 hostage crisis involving diplomats at the U.S. embassy at Tehran, Khomeini's regime remained largely isolated from the international community; Iran's only allies during the conflict were Syria and Libya. Iraq continued to seek peace, but drew outrage from the international community for its use of chemical weapons against Iranian troops as well as Kurdish civilians in Iraq, who were thought to be sympathetic to **Iran. (Ibid)**

6.3. Ceasefire, Peace Agreement and Legacy

In the spring of 1988, with Iran demoralized by its many failed offensives over the years, Iraq launched its own series of ground attacks. Iraqi battlefield gains convinced Iran's clerical leaders they had little hope of decisive victory. That July, the two nations agreed to accept a United Nations-brokered ceasefire under Security Council Resolution 598; the war ended formally on August 20, 1988. Though total casualty figures in the Iran-Iraq War are uncertain, estimates range from 1 to 2 million, with the total number killed reaching an estimated 500,000, including tens of thousands of Kurds killed by Iraqi forces.

As nearly all Arab nations had supported Iraq during the war in order to contain Iran, Iraq emerged from the conflict with more power in the region than it had before, fueled by a strengthened military and the ruthless ambition of its leader. On August 2, 1990, Saddam ordered the invasion of Kuwait, beginning the first Persian Gulf War.

(topics/middle-east/iran-iraq-war)

07.The Gulf War (1990-1991) :

The Gulf War, which took place between 1990 and 1991, was a conflict between Iraq and Kuwait for some historical, territorial and economic matters. It was internationalized through the involvement of thirty-two countries to oblige the Iraqi forces to vacate the Kuwaiti lands. But this war did not emerge overnight. It went through different stages and it took different dimensions.

According to some historians and analysts, the origins of this war go back to the 1970s when Iraq decided to build a nuclear reactor with a capacity of 70 megawatts, to produce the enriched uranium (**Saad Ed-dine El-chazeli, 1992, p16).**It is used in producing atomic bombs. Iraq's decision aimed at establishing equilibrium of force with Israel in the region, especially after the Israeli-Arab war of 1973. During that conflict, it became evident that Israel had a nuclear power, after

the declarations of the Israeli President Ephraim Katzir **(Ian Beckerton& Carla L. Klausher, 1991, p97).**

On one hand, the Iraqis realized that if the west had to choose, Israel would be its favorite ally. On the other hand, the emergence of an Iraqi nuclear power was mainly due to an agreement and contribution of some powerful countries like the United States, France and Germany. The co-operation of these countries continued as long as Iraq guaranteed and protected their interests in the region as a proxy. When its role was over, they changed their policies.

During the eight-year long Iraqi war with Iran, Saddam got a complete and open support from the United States and its allies. They wanted him to abort the Iranian efforts to eject the western powers and spread the Islamic revolutionary spirit in the neighboring Gulf countries. Saddam achieved his mission and ended the war by defeating Iran in 1988. After the end of the war, Iraq was seen differently by its western allies especially the U.S. At the military level, Iraq benefitted of cutting-edge military equipment and training but its economy was extremely hurt with the accumulation of debts and budget deficits. This economic unrest engendered an increase in unemployment and inflation and led to a serious social and political instability manifested in four series of coup attempts to remove Saddam from power **(Kenneth. M. Pollack, 2002, p11).** At that time, he needed the U.S. help for the reconstruction of his country's economy. For that reason, he decided to sell America Iraq's oil at $1.24 below market rate to strengthen their strategic co-operation. Despite these efforts, some voices started to rise inside and outside the U.S. government to sanction Iraq. They evoked points like Iraq's human rights abuses and the development of the Iraqi program of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). However, the prevailing idea was to use Iraq as America's new proxy in the region to fill Iran's place by praising its efforts in protecting U.S. interests during the war**(Laurie Milroie& Daniel Pipes, 1987, pp. 14-15).**

When President George Bush came to power in 1989, he tried to follow the same policy of the Reagan administration toward Iraq, by using it as a strategic ally in the Persian Gulf region. This policy was reinforced by a new National Security Directive called NSD-26 signed by

President Bush on October 2, 1989 stating that "*The United States should propose economic and political incentives for Iraq to moderate its behavior and to increase our influence with Iraq*"**(Kenneth. M. Pollack, op. cit., p28)**. For this reason, the U.S. government continued providing Iraq with a $1 billion credit and a $200 million each year as a development loan**(Bruce W. Jenstleson, 1988, pp 406-408).**

In fact, Iraq's importance grew in the Arab peoples' eyes, because they saw in President Saddam the hero that would take their revenge from Israel, especially after his acquisition of a nuclear capacity. This idea inspired Saddam to take the leadership in the region and in this case, the Bush administration had to choose between the two allies, Israel and Iraq, or try to arrange the situation by finding a compromise. However, Saddam wanted to preserve his popularity among the Arab peoples when he launched a test of modified Scud missiles called Al-Abid in December 1989. He triggered a diplomatic crisis with Israel, which considered this test as a threat. This feeling grew when Saddam inaugurated Iraq's first uranium facility program in February 1990and started to voice a gradual anti-American discourse.

It was widely believed by Arab peoples that the emergence of an Arab force in the Gulf region did not suit some Western powers, especially the United States. Acts like destruction of the Iraqi reactor on June 7th, 1981 by Israel with the co-operation of French scientists who were supposed to contribute to the reactor's construction and the silence of the United States fed that latent feeling of hatred and enmity **(David Wurmser, 1999, p61).**

Israel and America's future was linked as strategic allies. If Israel was threatened by the emergence of an Arab power in the region, then America's interests could be in danger, especially that a great part of America's economy depends completely on the Persian Gulf oil and this is what motivated the Americans to prepare a large deployment for the Gulf War. It was the fruit of years of preparation and planning, not only aiming at Saddam's removal from power or the destruction of the Iraqi force, but to settle in the Gulf region and protect America's interests.

For America, it was not only a question of making profits; it was also a question of existence, to confirm to the world its supreme leadership in the new era of tutored international order**(Roman O. Reyhani,2007, pp 25-29**)or Globalization . Evidence that convinced Saddam that Israel and America relied on each other was the murder of Dr. Gerald Bull by Mossad assassination team, the designer of the project of the supergun that was adopted by Iraq and that could launch WMD missiles and short-range satellites. After this assassination, a war of words started between Iraq and Israel and President Saddam declared in a speech, "*We will make the fire eat up half of Israel if it tries to do anything against Iraq*"and Israel responded that it would retaliate massively against any Iraqi aggression**(US Field Manual (1956) paragraph 36).**

Before August 1990, President Saddam had some objectives of a great significance for Iraq's future. These priorities consisted in demarcating Iraq-Kuwait borders so that the oil well of Rumaila fell in the Iraqi side and getting a waterway. The Iraqi president also wanted his neighbors, (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the UAE) to renounce their debts and give Iraq a new credit of $30 billion for its economy's reconstruction. He also wanted these countries to respect the shares limited by OPEC's production limitations of each member country in order to keep the price of $25 the barrel. Saddam Hussein mentioned these points in several Arab summits (**Roman O. Reyhani, op. cit, pp. 54-60)**and warned the GCC countries in particular that "…*if words fail to afford us protection, then we will have no choice but to resort to effective action to put things right and ensure the restitution of our rights.*"**(Kenneth. M. Pollack, op. cit., pp. 33-34).**

Indeed, when he failed to achieve his goals, he resorted to force and invaded Kuwait in August 1990 (**Judith Miller &Milroilorie, 1990. p. 116**)**.**

The occupation was not a spontaneous reaction, but it was felt long before the attack because Saddam was convinced, in any way, that Kuwait was part of the Iraqi soil, which is historically sustained but was no more the case. In mid-July 1990, Iraq started to deploy its Republican Guards on the Kuwaiti border, to show its intention. The U.S. ambassador in Baghdad, April Glasper, transmitted a message from the Bush administration to President

Saddam trying to understand his real motivation. Saddam said, "Iraq was being strangled by Kuwait and the UAE with U.S. encouragement…and that he intended to deal with this problem by whatever means…and that the U.S. should stay out because America did not have the stomach for a fight with Iraq" (**Micah L. Sifry, & Cerf Christopher, 1991, pp.122-133**).

America proposed to Kuwait and the UAE a common military parade in the region to dissuade Saddam, but Kuwait refused the offer as a sign of good will towards Iraq. In this process of pacification, a meeting was organized in Saudi Arabia by King Fahed, between Iraq and Kuwait, but the Iraqi delegation refused to make any concession and so did their neighbors. This attitude gave Iraq a pretext to launch an offensive on Kuwait. In the same night, Iraq started the invasion that had lasted for 36 hours.

The invasion was seen by the U.S. government as a threat to its interests in the region. For this reason, the Bush administration started a propaganda war against Saddam to convince the world and mainly countries in the region, of the threat that the regime represented for their interests and sovereignty. Not in Iraq's, because the latter found itself completely isolated. On 30 November 1990, President Bush proposed a meeting between the two ministers of Foreign Affairs, the American James Baker and the Iraqi Tarik Aziz to solve the problem peacefully. However, this U.S. initiative was useless, because this proposal was no more than a warning to Saddam. Trying to give the conflict a new dimension, Iraq replied that the United Nations had to execute the resolutions concerning the Palestinian problem which remained 23 years without a solution, before trying to impose those issued against Iraq. President Saddam hinted at those issued against Israel. They remained without any application (**Saad-eddine El-chazeli, op. cit, pp.544-545**).

From a military point of angle, the formation of the coalition was necessary for three important reasons. Some member countries participated with armed forces and military equipment and others with information and/or money. However, the role of countries of the Gulf region, in addition to all those points, was a geo-strategic one because the military build-up of the

coalition was concentrated there as the only appropriate point to launch hostilities [**William Head & Tilford Jr, 1996, p24.),**

It was true to a certain extent that the U.S. military force was strong enough to crush the Iraqi one, but this fact did not undermine the Iraqi force. Iraq had the strongest military force in the Arab world. Thus, an Iraqi defeat did not mean a U.S. victory and in fact, this was expected by Washington. The U.S. Centre for Defense Information (CDI), expected a number of 10,000 casualties and35,000 injuries among the American forces during the first three months of war. For this reason, the Bush administration saw the coalition as the best way to avoid huge losses [**Saad-eddine El-Chazeli, op. cit., p. 123).**

After having realized all these points, the administration started to look for a financial support, because the war costs could have caused serious economic problems for the United States at the external as well as the internal levels. The financial support was not used only to reinforce the military contribution in war. It was also used for defraying countries that were damaged as a result of the economic sanctions imposed on Iraq. It aimed at preserving a mutual friendship with them and especially with some states opposing the invasion. The administration succeeded in realizing its aim by having a large contribution from the opposing countries. At the top of the list was Saudi Arabia that contributed with $ 48 billion. It was followed by Kuwait with $ 22.6 billion and the other Gulf States with $ 4.4 billion. Japan contributed with $ 13.4 billion without significant military support since its military power was limited after WW II and Germany participated with $ 11.5 billion. These countries were considered as the major contributors **(The International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1991, p. 242).**

These huge amounts of money might seem to be irrational, or one might doubt about the truth of their estimations. However, this was an investment for some and a price for political considerations for others. According to some analysts, the attitude of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and other countries in the region was motivated by personal or national backgrounds. They also supposed that for other countries, it was an economic investment because this war enabled the

American control over oil markets and, thus favored most, if not all, developed countries **(Saad-eddine El-chazeli, op. cit., p. 571).**

One of the strongest arms used by the Bush administration during the war was the United Nations, by issuing resolutions that served the American war plan. Those resolutions played an important role in strangling Iraq by imposing an economic embargo on its trade, freezing its foreign assets and legitimizing the use of force against its land. Therefore, the UN was at the center of conflict. It was a neutral international peacekeeping institution but a weapon in Bush's hands. The unquestionable UN sustenance of the U.S. government reinforced U.S. feeling of supremacy and encouraged Bush to declare publicly on 30 August 1990, "…we are the world's gendarmes, the protectors of the imperialist order. This costs us a lot, while others who profit as much as we, if not more, from the maintenance of this order are not able to contribute effectively to the effort…"**(Andre Gunder Frank & Jaber Salah,. p.39).**.

The conflict became an international concern after the U.S. led the campaign that deployed an international military coalition. Following massive aerial attacks on Iraq, known as "operation Desert Storm" the coalition ended the hostilities with a large ground attack under the codename "Desert Sabre". It culminated in Iraq's defeat in February 1991 without a complete invasion or occupation of its territory **(Ibid., p.p. 410-18)**.

The occupation option was risky in terms of costs and diplomatic relations with the Soviets Most importantly, America set foot in the region to watch out for its interests by establishing military bases that were supposed to preserve peace and stability in the region. However, the conflict did not end as Washington continued to consider Iraq as a threat under the pretext that it supposedly developed Weapons of Mass Destruction. The UN inspection did not confirm these allegations. In the period that followed the war, Iraq remained under harsh UN sanctions that aimed at disarming Iraq and obliging Saddam pay debtors and the damages caused to other countries.

Conclusion

US became a dominant empire after adopting some tenets such as Monroe Doctrine, Manifest Destiny, through the expansion over the world and applying neo-imperialism. US wanted to control the world. It played the role of protector of peoples by intervening in their own affairs, attempting to resolve conflicts and taking the responsibility to keep the international peace. But that was only a propaganda and concealment of bad intentions. The real motives were to impose their hegemony on the Middle East and exploit its wealth and raw materials especially oil.

Chapter Tow

september attacks and US invasion of Iraq

1.Introduction

2. The pre-September 9/11 political atmosphere

3.Historical facts on 9/11 attacks

4.Global effects of the 9/11attacks

5.Political changes after 9/11 events

6. American Iraq war

6.1. The relationship between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaida

6.2. Possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction

6.3. American invasion of Iraq

64.American lies promoting the occupation of Iraq

6.4.1. No Link Between Iraq and al-Qaida

6.4.2. Absence of WMD in Iraq

7. Real objectives of the War

8. Ensuring oil supplies.

09. The total conspiracy of the UN against Iraq

1. Introduction

The beginning of the 21st-century witnessed a change in the world's political scene. America emerged as a main superpower in the globe following the end of the Cold War, it has evolved its empire and adapted it to the new circumstances. The 9/11 attacks served as a turning point in the history of American foreign policy. Those sudden attacks on American soil frustrated both the government and the people as it was the first time for Americans to get attacked since the bombardment of Pearl Harbor during the World War. With the emergence of new threats to its position in the world, the U.S. found it necessary to cope with the new troubles with new methods and solutions in the form of what many thinkers and historians describe as "the American neo-imperialism". The American investigations claimed that the executors of the planes hijack were from Middle Eastern nationalities and were affiliated to al-Qaida. As many al-Qaida leaders and members, including the most prominent leader Oussama bin Ladin were settling in Afghanistan, the U.S. and Britain launched air attacks that targeted Taliban and al-Qaida in Afghanistan on October 7th, 2001.Soon, the allies sent military troops to Afghanistan. Two years later, America shifted its focus to Iraq. While many of their military troops were still in Afghanistan, the US declared war and started air strikes against Iraq on March 7th, 2003. In less than three weeks, the US was able to take down Saddam Hussein. This chapter aims to check the justifications of the war on Iraq that were given by the Bush administration and seeks to discuss the means and tools the American authorities used to gain global legitimacy for the invasion It also investigates the effects of this war on both sides and explores the real motives for the occupation.

2. The Pre-September 9/11 Political Atmosphere

The term “terrorism” is one of the most overloaded and contested terms in contemporary political vocabulary. First used to describe the “reign of terror” following the radical phase of the French Revolution, the term was used in the nineteenth century to describe the violent activities of Russian revolutionaries. By the late 1960s, the Nixon administration was using the term “terrorism” to describe a wide range of activities and groups. It established a Cabinet Committee to Combat Terrorism in 1972 and subsequent US administrations continued to develop agencies and task forces to fight terrorism, which became a widespread designation to label groups that the US government or its allies were fighting. But during this era, the US was also widely accused of crimes against civilians in Vietnam and elsewhere, as well as using violence to intervene in other countries' politics, so the term “state terrorism” began to emerge, a term also frequently applied to Israel (**Herman, 1998**). Hence, terrorism was highly constructed and contested with one group's “terrorists” another group's “freedom fighters.” Varied political groups labeled as terrorists have long constructed media spectacles of terror to promote their causes, attack their adversaries and gain worldwide publicity and attention. There had been many major terror spectacles before, both in the US and elsewhere. Hijacking of airplanes had been a standard form constructing spectacles of terror, but the ante was significantly upped in 1970, when the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine hijacked three Western jetliners. The group forced the planes to land in the Jordanian desert and then blew up the planes in an incident known as “Black September” which was the topic of a Hollywood film. In 1972, Palestinian gunmen from the same movement stunned the world when they took Israeli athletes' hostage at the Munich Olympic Games, producing another media spectacle turned into an academy award-winning documentary film. In 1975, an OPEC (Organization for Petroleum Exporting

Countries) meeting was disrupted in Vienna, Austria when a terrorist group led by the notorious Carlos the Jackal entered, killing three people and wounding several in a chaotic shootout. Americans were targeted in a 1983 terror campaign in Beirut Lebanon orchestrated by a Shiite Muslim suicide bomber, in which 243 US servicemen were killed; this led the US to withdraw its troops from Lebanon. In 1985, US tourists were victims of Palestinians who seized the cruise ship Achilles Lauro, when Leon Klinghoffer, 69, a crippled Jewish American, was killed and his body and wheelchair were thrown overboard. In 1993, the World Trade Center was assaulted in New York by Islamist radicals linked to Osama bin Laden, providing a preview of the more spectacular September 11 attack. In 1995, an American-born terrorist, Timothy McVeigh, bombed the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, killing 168 and wounding more than 500. And the bin Laden group assaulted US embassies in Africa in 1998 and a US destroyer harbored in Yemen in 2000. Consequently, terror spectacle is a crucial part of the deadly game of contemporary politics and the bin Laden group had systematically used spectacle of terror to promote its agenda. But the 9/11 terror spectacle was the most extravagant strike on US targets in its history and the first foreign attack on the continental US since the war of 1812. In a global media world, extravagant terror spectacles have been orchestrated in part to gain worldwide attention, dramatize the issues of the groups involved and achieve specific political objectives. Previous Al Qaeda strikes against the US hit a range of targets to try to demonstrate that the US was vulnerable to terrorist attacks. The earlier 1993 World Trade Center bombing in New York, the embassy assaults in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998and the strike on the USS Cole in 2000 combined surprise with detailed planning and coordination in well-orchestrated, high concept terror spectacle.

Spectacles of terror thus use dramatic images and montage to catch attention, hoping thereby to catalyze unanticipated events that will spread further terror through

domestic populations. The September 11 terror spectacle looked like a disaster film, leading Hollywood director Robert Altman to chide his industry for producing extravaganzas of terror that could serve as models for spectacular terror campaigns. Was Independence Day (1996) – in which Los Angeles and New York were attacked by aliens and the White House was destroyed – the template for 9/11 The collapse of the World Trade Center indeed had resonances of The Towering Inferno (1975), which depicted a high-rise building catching fire, burning and collapsing, or even Earthquake (1975) that depicted the collapse of entire urban environments. For these two Hollywood disaster films, however, the calamity emerged from within the system in the case of the firstand from nature itself in the second. In the September 11 terror spectacle, by contrast, the villains were foreign terrorists obviously committed to wreaking maximum destruction on the US and it was not certain how the drama would end or if order would be restored in a "happy ending **(Ibid.)**

3. Historical Facts on 9/11 Attacks

On the 11th of September 2001, 19 terrorists on a suicide mission took over control of 4 passenger airplanes and used it as bombs on several targets in the United States. Two of the airplanes were used in an attack on the "Twin Towers" of the World Trade Center in New York, resulting in their total destruction. Another airplane was crashed into the Pentagon, the Headquarters of the US Ministry of Defense. The fourth plane crashed near Pittsburgh without hitting any particular target (possibly due to some resistance from crew members and passengers). This tragedy took the lives of 2,973 people. The attacks can be considered as one of the most horrible and tragic terrorist acts in the history of humankind due to the number of irreplaceable losses, as well as the level of impact it had globally. The cumulative loss in terms of rebuilding was estimated at 105 billion US dollars in 2001.

The day after the attacks, the UN Security Council passed resolution # 1368/2001 and following that resolution # 1373/2001, condemning this terrible terrorist act. The international terrorist organization *al-Qaida* took responsibility for the attack. It became clear that in order

to symmetrically react to such new challenges the frames of international legislation norms had tobe expanded. Until the 9/11 attacks, the legitimate use of force was possible in two cases – self-defense as stipulated in Article 51 of the UN Charterand upon obtaining agreement from the United Nations Security Council. It has since become clear that these measures are not dynamic enough to adequately respond to threatening challenges such as international terrorism. **(Goodrich, 2001, pp 1-12).**

4.Global Effects of the 9/11Attacks

The United Nations passed a resolution condemning the 9/11 attacks (Columbia University, 2003). Interpol has focused its attention on bringing the 9/11 terrorists to justice (Interpol, 2001); it has organized an 11 September Task Force in response to the attacks on that day (Interpol, 2003a). The attacks on 9/11 in the United States have directly and indirectly drawn many other countries into the fray against terrorists. Other countries in the world, like Yemen, Pakistan, Kuwait, Tunisiaand Kenya, have also had terrorist events supposedly staged by the group responsible for the 9/11 attacks in the United States—AL Qaeda **(Hosenball*et al.*, 2002; pp. 22–25).**

Palestinian suicide bombers have blown up buses in Israel. Australians were killed in a restaurant in Bali. Terrorists blew up a French oil tanker off of Yemen. France, Germanyand England have made multiple arrests of suspected terrorists. Recently, terrorists blew up a restaurant in the Philippines and killed many foreign tourists **(Gibbs, 2002, pp. 20–30).**

5.Political Changes after 9/11 Events

Perceived national threat had a powerful effect on support for domestic national security policy after 9/11. Americans who perceived substantial terrorist threat were more supportive of policies that would restrict the number of foreign visitors to the United States, expose Arabs applying for a US. visa to more intensive security checks and place Arab Americans under special surveillance. Support for a national identification card and government monitoring of telephone calls and e-mail rose significantly as the perceived threat of future

terrorism increased. Similarly, perceived threat led to greater concern that the government would fail to enact strong antiterrorism measures than that such laws would place undue restrictions on Americans 'civil liberties **(Hetherington &Suhay, 2011, pp546-560.).**

Perceived terrorist threat also increased support for a strong foreign policy, including overseas military action in Afghanistan and broadening U.S. "action to include other countries that harbor and support terrorists" **(Huddy, Feldman, & Weber, 2007, p. 147)**in the months after 9/11 and support for military action in Iraq in 2002 **(Kam & Kinder,2007, pp320-338).**Merola and Zechmeister (2009) exposed subjects in2004 to a video about ongoing terrorism (or good times in the United States) and observed stronger support for the view that the United States should take an active role inworld affairs in the terror condition. The effects of perceived threat on support for domestic and foreign security policies are independent of broad political beliefs, such as political ideology, partisanship, or authoritarianism **(Huddy et al., 2005, pp 593-608).**Some studies report an interaction between threat and authoritarianism, although the direction of the effect differs across studies. Hethering-5 Anxiety and felt security were modestly related (*r* .35 in a measurement model) but had distinct origins. Unlike anxiety, feelings of security were unrelated to emotional or physical proximity to the

attacks **(Huddy, Feldman, & Weber, 2007, pp 131 -153).**

In a further wrinkle to these data, Americans who felt insecure in the days after 9/11 and saw the nation as threatened felt the greatest need for government national security policies **(Huddy, Feldman, & Weber, Ibid)**. They were more likely to support a national identification card, government monitoring of Americans' phones and e-mail, various foreign security policies such as increased surveillance of Arabs in the United Statesand tougher restrictions on visas for foreign students. Overall, feeling insecure after the 9/11 attacks dramatically increased the political effects of perceived threat on support for various national security policies. These effects are independent of anxiety, partisanshipand political ideology.

Political Effects of Anger and Anxiety

Anger and anxiety should have very different effects on support for an aggressive military response to terrorism. On the basis of their typical psychological effects, anger should reduce the perceived risks of aggressive action against terrorists and should increase support for outwardly focused acts of government retaliation, whereas anxiety should lead to an overestimation of risk associated with aggressive government action, foster risk-averse behavior and limit support for aggressive and potentially dangerous antiterrorism policies. Data from national surveys support these predictions. In the months after 9/11, anxiety was associated with less approval of President Bush and increased opposition to military action and overseas involvement in Afghanistan **(Huddy 2005, ibid).**In the second and third waves of the TNSS, respondents were asked a series of questions about terrorism and the war, including feelings of anxiety and anger at anti-United States terrorists. In these data, anxiety was associated with reduced support for the Iraq war, greater perceived risk of the warand the perception that Saddam Hussein posed a risk to the United States. In all respects, anxious individuals were more likely than no anxious individuals to oppose war**(Huddy, Feldman, & Cassese, 2007, ibid).**

Anxiety about terrorism was also associated with decreased support for aggressive military action against terrorists in other national survey data **(Skitka et al., 2006, pp 375-384)** and adult convenience samples **(Sadler,Lineberger, Correll, & Park, 2005, pp 249-258).**These findings are consistent with psychological evidence that anxious individuals are risk avoidant. In contrast, angry individuals, especially those angry at terrorists, were less inclined to see military action as risky and more supportive of it as a consequence **(Huddy, Feldman, &Cassese, 2007; Sadler et al., 2005; Skitka et al., 2006).**In thatness data, anger toward Saddam Hussein and terrorists was linked to the view that a war in Iraq was not risky. Anger was associated with the perception that the war would not hurt the US. economy and would not weaken cooperation from allies, heighten terrorism, or have other adverse consequences for the

United States. At the same time, angry people supported the war more strongly than those who were not angry at terrorists (**Huddy, Feldman, & Cassese, 2007).**

Anger in response to9/11 was linked to support for a strong military response to terrorism **(Lambert et al, 2010, pp886-903)** undertook a series of carefully crafted experiments to demonstrate the existence and differing political consequences of anger and anxiety in reaction to 9/11. They randomly assigned subjects to watch a video about 9/11 and found that it generated both anger and anxiety. The two emotions had differing political effects: Anger increased support for war, whereas anxiety undercut it. They also demonstrated that experimentally aroused anger unrelated to 9/11 increased support for prewar political candidates, whereas experimentally heightened feelings of anxiety (again unrelated to terrorism) undercut support for such candidates. Their research provides strong empirical evidence that anxiety undercuts support for an aggressive response to terrorism, whereas anger promotes it.

6. American War on Iraq

6.1. The Relationship between Saddam Hussein and Al-Qaida

The administration of the president Bush began a campaign to convince all the world of the necessity to take Saddam Hussein down claiming that he had a link to al-Qaida attacks on America. In his speech to the Citadel on December11, 2001, George Bush said that their fight is not only against the terrorism but also all the regimes that support it, especially the countries that have advanced weapons which may cause bigger problems to America if they get to the wrong hands:

> Above all, we're acting to end the state sponsorship of terror. Rogue states are the most likely sources of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons for terrorists. Every nation now knows that we cannot accept– and we will not accept- states that harbor, finance, train, or equip the agents of terror. Those

> nations that violate this principle will be regarded as hostile
>
> regimes. They have been warned, they are being watched,
>
> and they will be held to account
>
> **("Selected Speeches of President George. W. Bush" 91).**

This speech was substantially one of the tools Bush used to influence and convince the public opinion of the necessity of the war on Iraq. He argued that his country would not tolerate any state or regime that provided help or shelter to the terrorists and hinted to countries that have chemical and nuclear powers. In one of his speeches, he even categorized these regimes as the enemy of the world peace and called them the «axes of evil». Axes of evils contain Iraq, Iran and North Korea **(Glassandrew. "President Bush Cites 'Axis of Evil).**

According to Bush's National Security Strategy, the expression of "Rogue states" refers to the regimes that abuse their own people, exploit their national resources, represent a threat to the countries of the region and aspire to have weapons of mass destruction without paying any respect to the international law and treaties (Record 5). From previous addresses, we can understand that the country that fits most into this description is Iraq due to many factors. Firstly, Iraq has a history of aggressing a neighboring country when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990. In a press conference in 2001, President George W. Bush stated that "the primary goal is to make it clear to Saddam that we expect him to be a peaceful neighbor in the region and we expect him not to develop weapons of mass destruction. And if we find him doing so, there will be a consequence" **("Press Conference by the President").**

Bush and his administration started a series of accusations to Iraq of having a link to al-Qaida and thus having a hand in the 9/11 attacks. In his speech in the United Nation, in September 2002, he mentioned that their greatest fear is that "terrorists will find a shortcut to their mad ambitions when an outlaw regime supplies them with the technologies to kill a massive scale" **("Selected Speeches of President George. W. Bush"139)**. He went further with that and gave a direct indictment to Saddam Hussein of having relations with terrorist groups.

He said:

> In 1991, the U.N. Security Council, through resolution 687, demanded that Iraq renounces all involvement with terrorismand permit no terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq. In violation of Security Council Resolution 1373, Iraq continues to shelter and support terrorist organizations that direct violence against Iran, Israel, and Western governments ***(Ibid 141).***

Bush's accusations to Iraq never stopped and continued to be thrown on many occasions, claiming that Saddam Hussein praised the attacks. Also, in his speech to the nation in October2002, he asserted that Iraq and al-Qaida had high-level relations. His administration even argued that there was a meeting between Iraqi officials and Mohamed Atta, who was allegedly one of the hijackers of the 9/11 attacks, in Prague **("Bush Administration Claims vs. Facts").** Furthermore, Condoleezza Rice, who was secretary of state at that time, was asked about an explanation to Rumsfeld's claim that there was indeed evidence that tied al-Qaida with Iraq. She answered:

> We clearly know that there were in the past and have been contacts between senior Iraqi officials and members of al-Qaida going back for actually quite a long time…We know that Saddam Hussein somehow has a long history with terrorism in general. And there is some al-Qaida personnel who found refuge in Baghdad (Warner).

Bush's administration assertions about knowing that there was a contact between Iraq and al-Qaida, made them look like they based their assumptions upon intelligence that was backed with strong evidence.

6.2. Possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction

The U.S. accused Iraq of having WMD which they considered as a threat to their national security and the whole world's stability. For that, President George Bush stated that his

country would work with the United Nations to hold Iraq to account; otherwise, the Americans would be obliged to deal with the problem by leading a coalition, "Saddam Hussein will disarm, or for the sake of peace, for the sake of freedom, the United States will lead a mighty coalition to disarm Saddam Hussein" ***("Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents")*.**

After linking Iraq with terrorism, Bush's administration along with the British government worked on persuading the world that Saddam Hussein for sure had weapons of mass destruction which might endanger the U.S. and its allies in the region. The most important ally for America to protect in the region was Israel which Saddam Hussein represented a big threat to its existence by having biological weapons **(Danju et al. 2013, p 685)**. As Britain was the biggest supporter of America in its war on terror, Prime Minister, Tony Blair said, "We here in Britain stand shoulder to shoulder with our American friends" **(McSmith,The inside Story of How Tony Blair Led Britain to War in Iraq.").**

In an address to the United Nations General Assembly, George Bush indicted Iraq of defiance to every UN resolution in the last decade. He also warned Iraq that actions would be unavoidable if it doesn't comply with the United Nations **(White House ,2003,pp139-146)**. To support these claims, Britain distributed a "dossier" that supposedly contains intelligence information about the availability of Iraqi WMD which could be employed in less than an hour after order (Iraq War).

The unconditional support that Blair granted to America in taking down Saddam Hussein caused him oppositions in public opinion, the other political parties and even his own party which led him to argue that the result of this problem was beyond the cruel treatment of the Iraqi people but critical to the security of the whole world including Britain in the third millennium **(KENNEDY-PIPE and VICKERS, 2007, pp. 205–221).**

The National Security Strategy contained that America has a right to act preemptively if needed. The description of the measures that America would take with Iraq as preemptive procedures was to convince and bring legitimacy to this decision at the level of the local and

international public opinion. Nevertheless, the U.S. intended to use them as a subrogate to diplomatic and nonmilitary measures in their way of dealing with Iraq (Record 7).In other words, Bush's doctrine was about moving from containment and deterrence that marked the cold war to reserving the right to act preemptively in addressing the dangers **(Kaplan et al.146).**

The Americans believed that their country should end the threats while they were evolving there instead of waiting until the disaster reach them home. As this policy was never used before, preemption for them was the only solution to such new circumstances **(Linin and Eiss,2008, p 54).**

On October 16, 2002, the Congress passed the Iraq AUMF resolution which authorized a war on Iraq to eradicate Saddam Hussein system for reasons such as Iraq's failure to cooperate with the United Nations in the disarmament process, Iraq's harboring members of al-Qaida another terrorist groups, self-defense from threats of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction toward America and its alliance.

As a result, the UN security council with one accord passed resolution 1441 that gave Iraq a final chance to comply with its disarmament commitments. Although the inspection commission failed to find weapons of mass destruction, Colin Powell, in his testimony to the United Nations Security Council about Iraq developing biological and weapons of mass destruction said, "Ladies and gentlemen, these are not assertions, these are facts, corroborated by many sources, some of the sources of the intelligence services of other countries" (Powell). In his presentation, Powell asserted that the inspection committee was unable to find WMD because Iraq managed to conceal them. He declared that the US had evidence against Iraq thanks to their intelligence agencies' efforts and some other countries' efforts besides technology. One of the evidences that he used to convince the United Nations to pass an act that legalized a war on Iraq is a tape of two Iraqi military elites talking about the reception of IAEA inspectors in addition to pictures of allegedly active chemical munition bankers **(Ibid).**

6.3. American Invasion of Iraq

Few months between the president's September 12, 2002, speech to the United Nations General Assembly calling for a new resolution on weapons inspections and the beginning of the war in Iraq on March19, 2003, might be considered the long diplomacy. Indeed, it was an international roller-coaster ride, marked by abruptly rising then severely falling expectations that a military conflict could be averted.

On November 8 the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 1441by a unanimous vote of 15 to 0. It called on Saddam 's regime to declare and disarm itself of all weapons of mass destruction and threatened undefined "serious consequences "if it did not comply. The unanimous vote, which included Russia, France and Syria, was widely viewed as a major diplomatic success for Colin Powell. The world seemed united against Saddam, who was once again isolated without identifiable friends among the nations of the world.(**Simon & Schuster, 2003, p.353**).

Given that on September11 the al-Qaeda organization was poised to shatter the major infrastructures of the West it would appear that Bush was the right man for dealing with the current situation. His team, most of them neo-conservatives, was "heavily weighted by hawks many of whom were crucial players in the 1991's Gulfward." Dick Cheney, to take one example, was the Secretary for defense in the Senior Bush's administration. In fact, the Brits were so suspicious initially of this aggressive inner circle that they were relieved that a relatively moderate leader like Colin Powell was appointed Secretary of State. Powell's presence has not stopped the inner circle from being militaristic. The Deputy Secretary for Defense, Paul Wolfowitz, heads the Project for a New American Century (PNAC)to deal with rogue states like Iraq, Syria, Iran and the Palestinian Authority. **(Henry D'Souza,2002, p.16).** The invasion of Iraq is more noteworthy as a manifestation of the Bush Doctrine. In a sharp break from the President's pre-September 11 views that saw America's leadershipand

especially its use of force, restricted to defending narrow and traditional vital interests, he enunciated a far-reaching program that call for something very much like an empire.

6.4.American Lies Promoting the Occupation of Iraq

The Bush administrations emphasized many times that Iraq was supporting al-Qaida and developing WMD, none of these pretexts were proven right after the invasion of Iraq and till now.

6.4.1. Absence of Link between Iraq and al-Qaida

Despite not being able to prove that there was a real link between Saddam Hussein and Oussama bin Laden, Bush's administration kept repeating the same expressions of fear from the transition of WMD to the terrorists by Iraq. The American authorities failed so many times in providing credible evidence that Iraq was behind the attacks of 9/11. Even though both of them were Arabs, Muslims and shared displeasure with America, Saddam Hussein and bin Laden were from completely different religious backgrounds. While Saddam had a secular Stalinist dictatorship that involved crimes against Islamic sects, Oussama was bigoted religiously and held antagonism against laic Arab regimes. Moreover, Iraq was under an international observation led by the UNO and IAEA in addition to the United States. So any proper thinking of Iraqi authorities wouldn't allow them to act recklessly and cooperate with al-Qaida. Also, America based its accusations to Iraq of having links to al-Qaida on the claim that in April 2001, Mohamed Atta, who was one of the hijackers met an Iraqi official in Prague. Intelligence agencies could afford no evidence of this claim, "the CIA has been unable to establish that Atta left the United States or entered Europe in April 2001 under his other name or any known alias". Furthermore, a Terrorism Committee by the UN found no connection between al-Qaida and Saddam Hussein **(Pfiffner,2004, p27).**

After the invasion, when Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was asked about the availability of reliable proof about Saddam Hussein's involvement in the 9/11 attacks, his answer was "I've not seen any indication that would lead me to believe I could say that."

Unlike his Defense Secretary, President Bush was clearer about the situation and told the reporters on September 18, 2003, that his administration does not have any proof of Saddam Hussein's participation in the 9/11 attacks ("IRAQ: Justifying the War"). Thus, the American authorities overstated this information and made a drama out of it just to convince the public of the necessity of this war.

6.4.2. Absence of WMD in Iraq

Assertions from the Bush administration, of Iraq developing nuclear and biological weapons, were the heaviest excuse used to convince people domestically and internationally of the exigency of dealing with this situation. They were also supported by the media that was serving the politicians' agenda as the public opinion was significant to the validation of the war **(Eilders,2005, p624).**Not only did the American administration use media for creating propaganda, it also practiced a kind of pressure on the Intelligence Agencies. As a matter of fact and as mentioned in the Washington Post, intelligence officials alleged that Cheney and his aide Lewis Libby had paid several visits to CIA analysts in charge of investigating al-Qaida which culminated in having results and claims favoring Bush's stand **(Valki, , 2004, p 68)**Furthermore, Intelligence officials were subjugated to the same pressures by other members of Bush's government such as State Secretary Wolfowitz and Undersecretary for Policy Douglas Faith just to back up the government's indictments concerning Iraq(Ibid 69). Another problem with this accusation is the conflict of ideas and lack of coordination between the members of George Bush's administration. While President Bush stated that "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa". Just a few days before the war, Vice President claimed, "We know Saddam Hussein has been absolutely devoted to trying to acquire nuclear weapons. And we believe he has reconstituted nuclear weapons" **(Pfiffner,2004, p30).**These paradoxical declarations contributed to questioning how reliable these excuses are. Moreover, the British were notified by the CIA Director George Tenet that the claim of Iraq buying uranium from

Africa was probably not true because their investigation in Niger showed that the U.S. ambassador had cleared up this hearsay. And even though the CIA expressed their reservation concerning this claim, the president used it in his speech anyway **(Ibid 31).**In a way, the Bush administration managed to conceal facts and exaggerate in many occasions just to go in a war against Iraq no matter what; however, it was only after the war when these accusations were dismissed, as neither the U.S. forces nor the coalition could find any biological or chemical weapons. A report from the CIA's Top Weapons Inspector, Charles Duelfer, professed that Iraq had no actual WMD which made the claims of their existence unfounded and thus the investigation was closed once and for all (CIA's Final Report: No WMD Found in Iraq). In an interview with Aljazeera TV, after 9 years of the invasion of Iraq, Collin Powell who was the Secretary of State blew the lid off the information he gave to the UN Security Council concerning Iraq's WMD and described it as a blot on his record **(Aljazeera).**

Saddam Hussein destroyed his last weapons of mass destruction more than a decade ago and his capacity to build new ones had been dwindling for years by the time of the Iraq invasion, according to a comprehensive US report released yesterday. The report, the culmination of an intensive 15-month search by 1,200 inspectors from the CIA's Iraq Survey Group (ISG), concluded that Saddam had ambitions to restart at least chemical and nuclear programmed once sanctions were lifted.**(theguardian.com/world/2004/oct/07/usa.iraq1)**

Assertions from the Bush administration of Iraq developing nuclear and biological weapons were the heaviest excuse used to convince people domestically and internationally of the exigency of dealing with this situation. They were also supported by the media that was serving the politicians' agenda as the public opinion was significant to the validation of the war **(Eilders, 2005, P 624).**

Not only did the American administration use media for creating propaganda, it also practiced a kind of pressure on the Intelligence Agencies. As a matter of factand as mentioned in the *Washington Post*, intelligence officials alleged that Cheney and his aide Lewis Libby

had paid several visits to CIA analysts in charge of investigating al-Qaida which culminated in having results and claims favoring Bush's stand **(Valki,2004, p 68).**Furthermore, Intelligence officials were subjugated to the same pressures by other members of Bush's government such as State Secretary Wolfowitz and Undersecretary for Policy Douglas Feith just to back up the government's indictments concerning Iraq**(Ibid 69).**

Another problem with this accusation is the conflict of ideas and lack of coordination between the members of George Bush's administration. While President Bush stated that "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa". Just a few days before the war, Vice President claimed, "We know Saddam Hussein has been absolutely devoted to trying to acquire nuclear weapons. And we believe he has reconstituted nuclear weapons" **(Pfiffner,2004, p30).**These paradoxical declarations contributed to questioning how reliable these excuses are. Moreover, the British were notified by the CIA Director George Tenet that the claim of Iraq buying uranium from Africa was probably not true because their investigation in Niger showed that the U.S. ambassador had cleared up this hearsay. And even though the CIA expressed their reservation concerning this claim, the president used it in his speech anyway **(Ibid 31).** In a way, the Bush administration managed to conceal facts and exaggerate in many occasions just to go in a war against Iraq no matter what; however, it was only after the war when these accusations were dismissed, as neither the U.S. forces nor the coalition could find any biological or chemical weapons. A report from the CIA's Top Weapons Inspector, Charles Duelfer, professed that Iraq had no actual WMD which made the claims of their existence unfounded and thus the investigation was closed once and for all ***("CIA's Final Report: NoWMD Found in Iraq").***

In an interview with Aljazeera TV, after 9 years of the invasion of Iraq, Collin Powell who was the Secretary of State blew the lid off the information he gave to the UN Security Council concerning Iraq's WMD and described it as a blot on his record (Aljazeera).

7. Real Objectives of the War

Investigations revealed the truth and dismissed all the justifications used in George Bush's Doctrine toward the war in Iraq. Jimmy Carter, the former President of USA described the coalition's justifications as lies and that they had no solid reason to go in a war against Iraq. He stated that both of Blair and Bush knew that the intelligence reports that they got against Iraq were unreliable but they went into the war anyway saying, "And I think that President Bush and Prime Minister Blair probably knew that many of the allegations were based on uncertain intelligence....a decision was made to go to war (then they said) 'Let's find a reason to do so'"(Buncombe).This leads us to realize that there were other substantial motives for this war, other than the pretexts that were given to the public.

8. Ensuring Oil Supplies

Before the 2003 invasion, Iraq's domestic oil industry was fully nationalized and closed to Western oil companies. A decade of war later, it is largely privatized and utterly dominated by foreign firms. From ExxonMobil and Chevron to BP and Shell, the West's largest oil companies have set up shop in Iraq. So have a slew of American oil service companies, including Halliburton, the Texas-based firm Dick Cheney ran before becoming George W. Bush's running mate in 2000.

The war is the one and only reason for this long sought and newly acquired access.Full coverage: The Iraq War, 10 years onOil was not the only goal of the Iraq War, but it was certainly the central one, as top U.S. military and political figures have attested to in the years following the invasion. "Of course, it's about oil; we can't really deny that," said Gen. John Abizaid, former head of U.S. Central Command and Military Operations in Iraq, in 2007. Former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan agreed, writing in his memoir, "I am saddened that it is politically inconvenient to acknowledge what everyone knows: the Iraq war is largely about oil." Then-Sen. and now Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel said the same in

2007: "People say we're not fighting for oil. Of course, we are."

(http://edition.cnn.com/2013/03/19/opinion/iraq-war-oil-juhasz/)

For the first time in about 30 years, Western oil companies are exploring for and producing oil in Iraq from some of the world's largest oil fields and reaping enormous profit. And while the U.S. has also maintained a fairly consistent level of Iraq oil imports since the invasion, the benefits are not finding their way through Iraq's economy or society.

09. The Total Conspiracy of the UN against Iraq

The nation of Iraq was an ally to the Soviet Union during the cold war. Because of this and rising tensions with neighboring countries in the late 1980s, the United States placed Saddam Hussein and Iraq on its list of State Sponsors of Terrorism. Around that same time and into the 1990s, Iraq became increasingly aggressive toward the nation of Kuwait, which occupied land Hussein claimed belonged to Iraq.

Saddam Hussein complained Kuwait was exceeding its OPEC oil production quotas, lowering the cost of oil to around $10 a barrel. This resulted in an estimated $7 billion dollar deficit for Iraq each year. In the wake of the Iran-Iraq War, Iraq was trying to rebuild much of its infrastructure and considered this deficit the equivalent of “economic” warfare.

(https://veterans.nv.gov/remembering-the-gulf-wars-differences-and-similarities/)

Iraq also accused Kuwait of slant drilling across the Kuwait-Iraq border. In July 1990, Saddam Hussein commanded 30,000 of his troops to the border. In response, the US Naval Fleet in the Persian Gulf was put on alert. As a result, Hussein believed many surrounding countries had turned to what he called “American policies” and there was a “conspiracy” against Iraq.

On February 15, the Iraqi Revolutionary Council issued the statement which made the first reference by Iraq to Resolution 660 of the U.N. Security Council, which required the immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Kuwaitand to the issue of withdrawal itself. However, this announcement not only avoided when and how Iraq would withdraw from

Kuwait but also linked a number of conditions, such as the Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories, with its own withdrawal from Kuwait. It was therefore not acceptable to the international community. On February 18, Foreign Minister Aziz of Iraq visited the Soviet Union and met with President Mikhail Gorbachev. Based on this meeting, the Soviet Union announced on February 22 an eight-point proposal concerning Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait. The Outline of the U.N. Security Council Resolution Relating to the Gulf Crisis. While highly valuing the Soviet efforts, President Bush issued on the same day a condition that Iraq should start withdrawing from Kuwait immediately and unconditionally by noon January 23, U.S. Eastern Standard Time, if Iraq was to avoid a ground war. Iraq did not respond to this demand and the multinational forces began a major ground operation against the Iraqi forces on January 23. The operation proceeded with an overwhelming superiority of the multinational forces. As Iraqi soldiers surrendered or fled in droves, President Hussein announced on February 26 that Iraq would completely withdraw from Kuwait on the same day. On February 27, President Bush announced that the American and multinational forces would cease hostilities against Iraq at midnight February 28, U.S. Eastern Standard Time (100 hours after the commencement of the ground operation). On February 28, Iraq finally announced its acceptance of the 12 U.N. Security Council resolutions in a letter from Foreign Minister Aziz to the Chairman of the U.N. Security Council, who confirmed the receipt of the letter on the same day. With this, the use of force by the multinational forces ended and the cease-fire, in effect, took hold. On April 3, the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 687, which is on the formal cease-fire. On April 11, the Chairman of the U.N. Security Council handed a letter declaring the cease-fire to the Iraqi Ambassador to the United Nations and the cease-fire based on Resolution 687 of the U.N. Security Council was officially established.

Thus, the Gulf Crisis came to an end.

(https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/1991/1991-2-1.htm)

The role of the United Nations is to promote peace and harmony in the world. Its Security Council monitors and supervises the respect of its resolutions by all possible means to make them effective. It is supposed to be a neutral body in dealing with international crises. However, its role diminished during the Gulf crisis, because the United States deliberately ignored the UN efforts to solve the Iraqi crisis without bloodshed. The interests of the U.S. went in the opposite side of UN objectives. Therefore, one may enquire about the efficiency of international peacekeeping bodies in the light of such violations. Here appears their weakness in front of a superpower like the United States.

In 1999, the UN Security Council resolution 1284 dissolved the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and established the UN Monitoring, Verificationand Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC). It appointed the Swedish diplomat Hans Blix as head of the commission. Its task was to continue the inspection undertaken by the UNSCOM in Iraq in cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It also recalled the previous resolutions. Under the provisions of resolution 1284, Iraq had to pay the full costs of UNMOVIC and IAEA inspection operations, which constituted a heavy burden on Iraq's shoulders. The reports that the commission intended to release after inspections were decisive in the design of the policy to pursue with Iraq; especially that Iraq had already objected and obstructed the commission's inspection according to inspectors' report**(Edmund A. Ghareeb, , 2004, p16).**

The United States sought a smoking gun to launch an offensive on Iraq, achieve the plan of regime change and thus revive the old proxy in the region. Therefore, it recommended the UN to issue resolution 1441 to reinforce the previous resolutions and deplore the Iraqi lack of cooperation. This led to the suspending of UN monitoring and inspection in Iraq since 1998. The resolution explicitly warned Iraq to comply unconditionally with UNMOVIC as a final opportunity. The fifth section of the document showed the denial of Iraq's governmental sovereignty within its territory. The clause stated that,

> "…Iraq shall provide UNMOVIC and the IAEA immediate, unimpeded, unconditional and unrestricted access to any and all, including underground, areas, facilities, buildings, equipment, records and means of transport which they wish to inspect, as well as immediate, unimpeded, unrestricted and private access to all officials and other persons whom UNMOVIC or the IAEA wish to interview in the mode or location of UNMOVIC's or the IAEA's choice pursuant to any aspect of their mandates; further decides that UNMOVIC and the IAEA may at their discretion conduct interviews inside or outside of Iraq, may facilitate the travel of those interviewed and family members outside of Iraq and that, at the sole discretion of UNMOVIC and the IAEA, such interviews may occur without the presence of observers from the Iraqi government…" **(UN Resolution 1441)**

Section 7 went further to order Iraq to allow inspectors have a free, unrestricted and unlimited access to presidential sites, where Saddam had already denied the commission to check on 15 and 22 December 1997. In Sections 13 and 14, the resolution asserted the determination to pursue the inspection until complete disarming of Iraq and warned of the serious consequences that would result for any opposition or refusal of the Iraqi regime to cooperate **(Ibid. sections 13 and 14).**

Thus, the military option seemed likely to come; especially that President Bush expressed his determination to disarm Iraq by force if necessary and even without the assistance of the United Nations. This intention was expressed in December 2002, when Iraq handed a 12,000-page report on its WMD program, which was rejected by U.S. and UK officials. They justified their action by declaring the report as an incomplete and false statement **(*Encyclopedia of Espionage,2007*, p. 164).**

Conclusion

After the September attack new phase of American imperialism emerged .US programmed to fall-down the regimes of the countries that considered a barrier between it and its ambitions in the Middle East .They wanted to show their power and dominance on the world by promoting allegations and providing any lies ,then using military forces to destroy these countries such as what happened in Iraq.US wanted to give the other countries a warning that any one be against their interests will be treated in the same way with Iraq.

General conclusion

General conclusion

Throughout the current work, we come to synthesize that there were new circumstances emerged for the engaging of the affairs after the First and the Second World Wars and the phenomenon of imperialism evolved to contribute for the birth of what is known as “neo-imperialism”. The 9/11 attacks shook the American arrogance and doubted the defense capacities of the most powerful country in the world. To restore its image and to prove its sovereignty, America wanted to maintain the global hegemony and keep its position in the world. It also has shown more military engagement in dealing with international affairs but its war in Iraq that lacked legitimacy represented a blot in its history, as Bush administration misled and lied about the real motives to declare the war against the Iraq which been suffering since its invasion to Kuwait in the year 1991. Using the justification of self-defense from the threat of mass destruction weapons and punishing the sponsors of al-Qaida, America and its allies invaded Iraq. However, there were no WMD found and no evidence that Saddam Hussein had links with al-Qaida after the invasion of Iraq which exposed the real motives of invasion such an oil-rich country. Americans behaved in an imperialistic attitude towards the world and in the Middle East in specific following the tragic attacks. America used the power to achieve its interests the attacks of 9/11 sharpened the imperial policy of the U.S. toward the Middle East resulting in the invasion of Iraq and practicing political and financial pressures.

This dissertation has aimed to demonstrate the rationalization of the Bush administration concerning the war on Iraq. It sought to detect how this war was an imperial act that subjugated the Iraqi to violence and exposed them to puppet governments that serve the American interest in the name of bringing democracy. It also discussed the real payers of this war as the pretexts provided turned to be groundless and absurd.

The 9/11 events represented a focal point in American foreign policy toward the Arab

region. Declaring war on a sovereign country that used to be one of the most powerful countries in the region needed strong reasons to gain public sympathy and legal legitimacy. America engaged in propaganda to convince the world that Iraq participated with al-Qaida in the 9/11 attacks. Persuading the world of the existence of a link between the two seemed a little bit difficult as most of the Bush administration failed to provide real evidence that condemns Saddam Hussein of sponsoring terrorism. Concrete consequences showed that Americans worked on strengthening their position and accused Iraq of developing WMD and gave exaggerated proofs to support their point. However, IEFA and UN inspectors did not find any WMD throughout the period of the international investigation in Iraq. Another pretext used by the U.S. to occupy Iraq is that it wanted to help the country and free it from dictatorship.

Though the lack of legitimacy and the illegality of the war, according to international law, the U.S. decided to wage war on Iraq based on its preemptive right of self-defense. The U.S. claimed that it wanted to protect the world from a general risk and took upon itself the security of the world which reflected an imperialist tendency. The war destroyed Iraq and its infrastructure, caused many civilian casualtiesand ignited a discord that gave rise to a civil war in the country. Eventually, accusations of having links to al-Qaida and developing WMD were nothing but true which made many thinkers and political analysts guess the real motives of this war and prove them.

Verily, Bush's administration misled the world about their intentions and lied about their justifications for the war. In fact, they were motivated by many factors to insist on attacking Iraq. First of all, they wanted to end the regime of Saddam Hussein who did not show allegiance to America and the antagonism of the new American authorities against Iraq since the Persian Gulf War. Some even argue that Bush had held a personal grudge against Saddam Hussein because of the claim that Saddam attempted to assassinate his father, President George H. Bush. Moreover,

General conclusion

Saddam's breaking with petrodollars policy increased the U.S. frustration toward him, which made him the next target. Secondly, the September 11th events shook the image of the U.S. and they thought that their powerful image would be restored by initiating war on terror. However, the most important motive is the temptation of the huge oil reserves in Iraq and how it would prosper their economy and guarantee control over the world. America as a global hegemony power considers oil as the principal means to keep its position in the world because of its edge loss in many fields such as production and economy to China. Furthermore, lobbies groups were the godfathers of this war as they wanted their companies to take benefit from the conflicts.

The willingness to securing oil for military advantage began with the discovery of oil in the Middle East. The colonization in the region engaged itself directly in imperial behaviors in the Middle East. With the creation of OPEC and the nationalization of oil industries in most of the oil producing countries, the OPEC members managed to have control over oil and increased its extraction. Unlike the American old imperialism that was about direct military confrontation or purchasing new lands to extend territories. The new circumstances which resulted in the new order of the world following the Cold War declared the birth of unipolarity. America used its military power to intimidate other nations and intervene in international affairs to serve its interests in the Middle East. Other than military power, America established economic organizations and banks to practice financial and economic imperialism with the third world countries. Also, it compelled nations into agreements that are in favor of American profits. The new form of imperialism is engaging a cultural influence and avoiding military forces to facilitate the intervention of the U.S everywhere. This has been the essence and findings of our work.

References

References

- Abdulrazaq, Tallha. “Invasion of Iraq: The Original Sin of the 21st Century.” *Middle East | Al Jazeera*, 20 Mar. 2018, www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2018/3/20/invasion-of-iraq-the-originalsin-of-the-21st-century. Accessed 12 Oct. 2020
- Andre Gunder Frank & Jaber Salah, The Gulf War and The New World Order, The International Institute for Research and Education, vol. N°14, 1991. p.39.
- Andrew J. Bacevich. *America’s War for the Greater Middle East: A Military History. Random House*, 2016.
- Beveridge, ‘March of the Flag,’ Speech Text.” *Voices of Democracy*, voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/beveridge-march-of-the-flag-speech-text. Accessed 12 &&& Bob, Woodward, *Bush at War*, UK, Simon & Schuster, 2003, p.353
- Bruce W. Jenstleson, *With Friends Like These: Reagan, Bush, and Saddam,* 1982-1992, New York: W. W. Norton, 1994, p. 41 & Will D; Swearingen, “Geopolitical Origins of the Iran-Iraq War”, *Geographical Review*, Vol. 78, No. 4, October 1988, pp. 406- 408
- Bush Administration Claims vs. Facts.” *Leading to War See Where The Truth Lies*, www.leadingtowar.com/claims_facts_atta.php. Accessed 11 Oct. 2020.

Crossref, doi:10.2307/1951902.

- Danju, Ipek, et al. “The Reasons Behind U.S. Invasion of Iraq.” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 81, 2013, pp. 682–690
- Digital History.” *Digital History*, www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp_textbook.cfm?smtid=2&psid=3160. Accessed 17 Oct. 2020.
- Edmund A. Ghareeb, *Historical Dictionary of Iraq*, United States: Scarecrow Press, 2004, p16
- Eilders, Christiane. “Media under Fire: Fact and Fiction in Conditions of War.” *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 87, no. 860, 2005, pp. 639–648.
- *Encyclopedia of Espionage, Intelligence, and Security,* Vol. 2, op. cit, p. 164
- Establishing Borders: The Expansion of the United States, 1846-48.” *Smithsonian Center for Educational and Museum Studies*, www.smithsonianeducation.org/educators/lesson_plans/borders/essay3.html. Accessed 21 Oct. 2020.
- Ferguson, Niall. *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire*. Illustrated, e-book, Penguin Books, 2005Patman, Robert G. “Globalization, the New US

References

Exceptionalism and the War on Terror." *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 6, 2006, pp. 963–86.

- Gibbs, N. (2002, September 11). What a difference a year makes. Time, pp. 20–30.
- Glass, Andrew. "President Bush Cites 'Axis of Evil,' Jan. 29, 2002." *POLITICO*, 29 Jan. 2019, www.politico.com/story/2019/01/29/bush-axis-of-evil-2002-1127725.
- Goodrich, J.N. (2001) September 11, 2001 Attack on America: Impact on Tourism Security. Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing. Vol. 11(4). pp 1-12
- Henry, D'Souza, World War III or Islamic Liberation? 4th Ed, Canada, Henry D'Souza Pub,2002, p.16.
- Herman, Edward S. (1998) The Real Terror Network: terrorism in Fact and Propaganda. Boston: South End Press.
- Hetherington. M. J.. & Suhay. E. (2011). Authoritarianism, threat, and Americans' support for the war on terror. American Journal ofPoliticai Science, 55, 546-560. doi:10.111 l/j.1540-5907.2011. 00514.x
- Hilfrich, Fabian. "Debating American Exceptionalism: Empire and Democracy in the Wake of the Spanish-American War." *Choice Reviews Online*, vol. 50, no. 06, 2013, pp. 50–76.
- Hosenball, M., Isikoff, M., & Lipper, T. (2002, November 25). Al Qaeda: Alive and still killing. Newsweek, pp. 22–25.
- Antonia Juhasz, "Why the war in Iraq was fought forBig Oil." http://edition.cnn.com/2013/03/19/opinion/iraq-war-oil-juhasz/
- Josh Loftis, , "Remembering the Gulf Wars – Differences and Similarities https://veterans.nv.gov/remembering-the-gulf-wars-differences-and-similarities/
- Michio Watanabe, Minister for Foreign Affairs, https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/1991/1991-2-1.htm
- http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/gulf/oral/aziz/1.html)
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_foreign_policy_in_the_Middle_East#Hist or
- https://www.americanforeignrelations.com/E-N/Imperialism-The-cold-war-and-its-aftermath.html
- https://www.history.com/topics/middle-east/iran-iraq-war
- https://www.nplusonemag.com/issue-26/reviews/why-are-we-in-the-middle-east/
- https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/oct/07/usa.iraq1

References

- Huddy. L., Feldman. S.. & Cassese. E. (2007). On the distinct political effects of anxiety and anger. In W. R. Neuman. G. E. Marcus. A. Crigler. & M. MacKuen (Eds.). The affect effect: Dynamics of emotion in politicai thinking and behavior (pp. 202-230). Chicago. IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Huddy. L.. Feldman. S.. & Weber. C. (2007). The political con.sequences of perceived threat and felt insecurity. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 614, 131 -153. doi: 10.1177/00027! 62073059
- Huddy. L. Feldman. S.. Taber. C. & Lahav. G. (2005). Threat, anxiety, and support of anti-terrorism policies. American Joumai of Politicai Science, 49, 593-608. doi: 10.111 l/j.l540-5907.2005.00144.x
- Ian Beckerton & Carla L. Klausher, *A Concise History of The Arab-Israeli conflict.* New Jersey, Englewood Cliffs, 1991, p. 97.
- Imperialism." *The Merriam-Webster.Com Dictionary*, www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/imperialism#:%7E:text=1%20%3A%20the%20policy%2C%20practice%2C,authority%2C%20or%20influence%20union%20imperialism. Accessed10 Oct. 2020
- Internet History Sourcebooks." *FORDHAM UNIVERSITY*, sourcebooks. Fordham. Edu/ mod/1899antiimp.asp. Accessed 5 Oct. 2020.
- Iran–Iraq War. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, edited by William A. Darity, Jr., 2nd ed., vol. 4, Macmillan Reference USA, 2008.
- Jaffa, Harry V. "'Value Consensus' in Democracy: The Issue in the Lincoln-Dougla - Debates." *American Political Science Review*, vol. 52, n
- Jones,Jeremiah."Https://Digitalcommons.Ciis.Edu/Cgi/Viewcontent.Cgi?Article=1079&context=ijtsTranspersonalstudies." *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1–2, 2015, pp. 172–186. *Crossref*, doi:10.24972/ijts.2015.34.1-2.172.
- Judith Miller & Milroi lorie, *Saddam Hussein & the Crisis in the Gulf.* London, Routlege, 1990. p. 116.
- Kam. C. D.. & Kinder, D. R. (2007). Terror and ethnocentrism: Foundations of American support for the war on terror. Journal of Politics, 69, 320-338. doi:10.111 l/j. 1468-2508.2007. 00534.x
- KENNEDY-PIPE, CAROLINE, and RHIANNON VICKERS. "'Blowback' for Britain?
  Blair, Bush, and the War in Iraq." *Review of International Studies*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2007, pp. 205–221. *Crossref*, doi:10.1017/s0260210507007474

References

- Kenneth. M. Pollack, *The Threatening Storm, The Case for Invading Iraq*, New York: Random House, 2002, p.11
- Kenneth. M. Pollack, *The Threatening Storm, The Case for Invading Iraq*, New York: Random House, 2002, p.11
- Lambert. A. J.. Scherer, L. D.. Schott. J. P. Olson. K. R. Andrews. R. K. & O'Brien, T. C. (2010). Rally effects, threat, and attitude change: An integrative approach to understanding the role of emotion. Journal of Personaiity and Social P.sycliology, 98, 886-903. doi:10.1037/ aOO19086
- Laurie Milroie & Daniel Pipes, "Back Iraq: It's Time for a US Tilt", *The New Republic*, April 27, 1987, pp. 14-15.
- Lenin, V. "Lenin: Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism." *Marxcists*, 2008, www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc
- Manifest Destiny, continued: McKinley Defends U.S. Expansionism." *Digital History*, historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5575. Accessed 19 Oct. 2020.
- MANIFEST-DESTINY | 7 Definitions of Manifest-Destiny – Your Dictionary." *Your Dictionary*, www.yourdictionary.com/manifest-destiny. Accessed 18 Oct. 2020
- McSmith, Andy. "Chilcot Report: The inside Story of How Tony Blair Led Britain to War in Iraq." *The Independent*, 5 July 2016
- Micah L. Sifry, & Cerf Christopher, The Gulf War Reader, New York, Times Books, 1991, pp.122-133.
- Patman, Robert G. "Globalization, the New US Exceptionalism and the War on Terror." *Third jk,.....World Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 6, 2006, pp. 963–86.
- Pfiffner, James P. "Did President Bush Mislead the Country in His Arguments for War with Iraq?" *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2004, pp. 25–46. *Crossref*,
- President George Bush Discusses Iraq in National Press Conference." *THE WHITE HOUSE*,6 Mar. 2003, georgewbushwhitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/03/
- President George Bush Discusses Iraq in National Press Conference." *THE WHITE HOUSE*,6 Mar. 2003, George bush Whitehouse. archives. gov/news/releases /2003/03/20030306-8.html. Accessed 19 Oct. 2020
- Renehan, Edward. *Monroe Doctrine: The Cornerstone of American Foreign Policy (Milestones in American History)*. Illustrated, Chelsea House Publications, 2007
- Saad Ed-dine El-chazeli. The Eighth Crusade, Dar el Hikma,2nd edition, 1992. op. cit., p. 16.

References

- Sadler, M. S.. Lineberger, M. Correll. J.. & Park. B. (2005). Emotions, attributions, and policy endorsement in response to the September 11th terrorist attacks. Basic and Applied Social Psychology. 27, 249-258. doi: 10.1207/s 15324834basp2703_6
- Selected Speeches of President George W. Bush." *Whitehouse*, georgewbushwhitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf. Accessed 13 Sept. 2020.
- Skitka. L. J.. Bauman, C. W., Aramovich. N. P.. & Morgan. G. S. (2006). Confrontational and preventative policy responses to terrorism: Anger wants a fight and "fear" wants them to go away. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 28. 375-384. doi:10.1207/sl5324834basp2804_ll
- Steph. "Chapter 18 Section 1 Critical Thinking." *Steph's History WS*, 11 Oct. 2005, stephfratus.blogspot.com/2007/10/chapter-18-section-1-critical-thinking_11.html.
- Take A Closer Look: America Goes to War." *The National WWII Museum | New Orleans*, www.nationalww2museum.org/students-teachers/student-resources/researchstarters/america-goes-war-take-closer-look. Accessed 24 Oct. 2020.
- Take A Closer Look: America Goes to War." *The National WWII Museum | New Orleans*, www.nationalww2museum.org/students-teachers/student-resources/researchstarters/america-goes-war-take-closer-look. Accessed 24 Oct. 2020.
- Telling the Truth about Imperialism." *CHOMSKY.INFO*, 2003, chomsky.info/200311
- The International Institute for Strategic Studies, The Military Balance, London 1991, p. 242.
- UN Resolution 1441 (08 November 2002), section 7
- United States - World War II." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, www.britannica.com/place/UnitedStates/World-War-II. Accessed 21 Oct. 2020.
- Valki, Laszlo. "Iraq War - An Illegal War." *ResearchGate*, 2004, pp. 61–76.
- Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents." *Authenticated US Government Information*, vol. 34, 2002, pp. 1927–2016, www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/WCPD-2002-11-11/pdf/WCPD-2002-11-11.pdf. 20030306-8.html. Accessed 19 Oct. 2020
- William Head & Tilford Jr, , *The Eagle in the Desert, Looking Back on U.S. Involvement in the Persian Gulf War*, Praeger, London, 1996. pp. 25-26

Résumé

Les attentats du 11 septembre ont contribué à façonner le néo-impérialisme américain dans le monde. Les pirates de l'air sont des Arabes qui ont rendu la région vulnérable à l'impérialisme américain injuste. La doctrine Bush et son agenda au Moyen-Orient étaient en faveur de la guerre contre le terrorisme. Cela comprenait l'utilisation de forces militaires en Irak et la chute du régime de Saddam Hussein, de l'idéologie, de l'éducation et même de la culture irakienne. L'Irak et d'autres pays arabes sont des pays riches en pétrole ; un tel fait en a fait un champ d'ambitions coloniales depuis des siècles. Cette étude vise à montrer les actions impériales des États-Unis en Irak après les attentats du 11 septembre. Il met en lumière les prétextes donnés par l'administration Bush pour envahir l'Irak et révèle les véritables causes de l'occupation. L'Amérique a accusé l'Irak d'être impliqué dans des attaques terroristes et de posséder des armes de destruction massive, mais aucune de ces allégations n'a été prouvée. L'invasion de l'Irak par l'Amérique et l'utilisation de forces militaires étaient donc injustifiées, mais plutôt pour réaliser des ambitions coloniales stimulées par des impulsions économiques. En fait, l'Amérique a mené des politiques impérialistes différentes dans le reste des autres pays en fonction de ses relations avec le pays et de la mesure dans laquelle elle est menacée ou pavée pour ses intérêts au Moyen-Orient. Dans cette recherche, les approches utilisées sont les approches historiques et descriptives afin de dépeindre le nouvel impérialisme américain au Moyen-Orient et de faire la lumière sur les objectifs réels des États-Unis en Irak. Cette recherche a permis de découvrir les stratégies et les prétextes des États-Unis et leurs intentions cachées au Moyen-Orient et les véritables motifs d'envahir l'Irak.

الملخص

ساهمت هجمات الحادي عشر من سبتمبر في تشكيل الإمبريالية الأمريكية الجديدة في العالم. الخاطفون عرب جعلوا المنطقة عرضة للإمبريالية الأمريكية الظالمة. عقيدة بوش وأجندته في الشرق الأوسط كانت لصالح الحرب على الإرهاب. وشمل استخدام القوات العسكرية في العراق وإسقاط نظام صدام حسين ، وأيديولوجية العراق ، والتعليم ، وحتى الثقافة. العراق ودول عربية أخرى غنية بالنفط. هذه الحقيقة جعلتهم مجالًا للطموحات الاستعمارية منذ العصور. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى كشف الاستراتيجيات الإمبريالية للولايات المتحدة في العراق بعد هجمات الحادي عشر من سبتمبر. يلقي الضوء على الذرائع التي قدمتها إدارة بوش لغزو العراق وكشف الأسباب الحقيقية للاحتلال. اتهمت أمريكا العراق بالتورط في هجمات إرهابية وامتلاك أسلحة دمار شامل ، لكن لم يتم إثبات أي من هذه المزاعم. لذلك كان غزو أمريكا للعراق واستخدام القوات العسكرية غير مبررين، بل لتحقيق طموحات استعمارية تعززها الدوافع الاقتصادية. في واقع الأمر، اتبعت أمريكا سياسات إمبريالية مختلفة في بقية الدول الأخرى وفقًا لعلاقاتها مع الدولة ومدى تهديدها أو تمهيدها لمصالحها في الشرق الأوسط. في هذا البحث تم استخدام المقاربات التاريخية والوصفية من أجل تصوير الإمبريالية الأمريكية الجديدة في الشرق الأوسط وإلقاء الضوء على الأهداف الحقيقية للولايات المتحدة في العراق. نتج عن هذا البحث اكتشاف الاستراتيجيات والذرائع الأمريكية ونواياها الخفية في الشرق الأوسط والدوافع الحقيقية لغزو العراق.