US Intervention in Iraq

Rinor Rexhepi [1]

[1] *Universum College*
St. Imzot Nikprelaj, Prishtina, 10000, Kosovo

Abstract. The creation and functioning of world peace have always been the mission and goal of international relations, which is based on specific actions and strategies depending on the extent of the situation, but how many successes and results have been cannot always be predicted. The fight against transnational terrorism and the fight against general evil must always rightly be supported by all influential states in the world. The US intervention in Iraq is often seen with criticism and praise from various scholars and states. In our paper, we aimed to present the US intervention in Iraq based on the comparison and presentation of arguments from different studies and experts in the face of the question; was this intervention necessary or not, and was it humanitarian or aggression? We have tried to present the problem in the most scientific and argumentative way through descriptive, analytical and comparative methods, always based on scientific and factual approaches. In conclusion, we can say that based on general facts and arguments regarding the US intervention in Iraq, the goal has not been achieved correctly and that other forms could have been used to achieve the goal. The failure to find nuclear weapons inside Iraq and the failure to democratize it are two key arguments that shed light on hasty military action against Iraq.

Keywords: War; Terrorism; Iraq; US; Intervention; Attacks.

INTRODUCTION

The attacks of 11 September 2001 constitute a significant turning point for many issues in the world and a historic turning point for US foreign affairs and policy. These attacks prompted the US and many countries worldwide to declare the open war on terrorism a global problem.

After the war on terror, a new and challenging era began for the US and the countries host to terrorism which poses a threat to global security. Countries that supported transnational terrorism and cooperated in destabilization and security threats faced harsh attacks and actions against them. One of these countries that were considered in this range of states is the state of Iraq.

The US intervention in Iraq was made under the argument that Iraq, led by Saddam Hussein, had weapons of mass destruction, supported international terrorism, and did injustice to civilians inside the country, violating international.

In our work, we have linked the course of events from the 9/11 attacks to the democratization of Iraq following the overthrow of Saddam Hussein.

We have tried to clarify the fight against terrorism as scientifically and argumentatively as possible in the light of the facts, which began under President Bush's administration, continuing with how Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein was accused of weapons of mass destruction and support for international terrorism.

Also, the US intervention in Iraq has been elaborated in an argumentative manner during this paper, confronting the arguments and facts of various scholars, whether this was a humanitarian intervention or military aggression. We have elaborated on the consequence of all these actions, whether the final goal for the democratization of Iraq has been achieved, and its introduction into a system of functioning democracy with Western features and characters.

In an argumentative and factual way, we have elaborated in an interconnected way our work to produce the most accurate and scientific results based on the confrontation of scientific arguments and studies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

11 September attacks. On 11 September 2001, the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York and the Pentagon were unprecedented and shocking for the United States and the world. The 9/11 attacks were a series of coordinated terrorist attacks, led by the terrorist group Al Qaeda, against the United States. Objects of the attack were important buildings in the US, such as the Twin Towers, where the headquarters of the World Trade Organization was located in New York, the Pentagon building and the White House. Thousands of civilians were killed in the attacks of 11 September 2001. There was an unprecedented fear in the United States and the vast majority of the world when one of the hijacked planes crashed after passengers tried to retrieve the plane); all 19 terrorists died.

This event shocked the US with "the biggest casualties experienced in the United States in a single day since the American Civil War" [10].

The 9/11 attacks had profound and profound effects on the well-being of the US people and all areas in general. The 9/11 attacks surprisingly hit the United States. They showed that no country could guarantee overall security in the maximum possible way. It cannot be untouched by any accidental and planned strike, mainly from various recent groups. So after the attacks, the biggest US law agencies started researching and crafting new strategies to protect the US from any terrorist attack and set out to create new policies for the US.

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 (9/11) in the US remain one of the global events of the decade, exerting a profound influence on world affairs [2]. After 11 September 2001, world affairs at the international level would take different directions. The US, led by President Bush, would change US foreign policy and declare war on terror war of time which must be fought in every way and form, given that it is a threat to every nation and state.

World affairs would now bring unpredictable innovations to most countries, especially the Middle East, known as a haven for terrorism and a constant instigator of the latter by disobeying international law. With an emphasis on Iraq, Eastern countries would enter a vortex of crises, resulting in an inevitable war that would bring instability to the nations and the Middle East region.

The fight against terrorism. Violence is present everywhere in the history of humanity, where it sometimes appears as the only force that regulates the relations between social groups and peoples. Is violence the driving force of history? It is undeniable that we encounter it in various forms, especially in the ideological structure, as a dynamic and indispensable to the essential sequences of the evolution of human societies. Manifestations of ideological violence abound in the history of humanity. Words to express this violence are numerous. War crimes are one of them. Exterminations, expulsions, acts of terror, mass crimes and targeted crimes are other [9]. Thus terrorist acts are a force that expresses violence and poses a general danger.

Terrorism is now a global problem that people today have to face. The West has tried to take some measures trying to combat this phenomenon. Some measures include the legal punishment of terrorists at the national and international level or their punishment through a military war called "war" [9. Terrorism over the years has been constantly on the move, rising and falling, but in general, has it been the action of all means in attacking the objectives and interests it has aimed for. This is the goal of terrorism to act in many ways, comprehensively and in different forms and methods, to promote violinist and fear on a large scale [8].

The terrorism committed against the USA on 11 September 2001 was against the latter and the whole world. Therefore, it was necessary to fight together against this global problem.

While it is widely acknowledged that US foreign policy changed quite radically after the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, what is less apparent in the comments on these events is how the US-adopted foreign policy strategies have continued to evolve and change since then. This is partly because the Bush administration often presents America's responses as part of a relatively continuous or uninterrupted approach [6].

In 2005 before the UN, Bush said that the world has a "very serious obligation" to stop terrorism in its current stage of creation. The fight against poverty is also part of this war because deprivation promotes despair and terrorism. For this reason, all trade barriers, subsidies, and customs should be removed to open up development opportunities for developing countries. "What will spread is either hope or violence," Bush said. "We must foster hope" [4].

In its post-9/11 policies, the administration has shown a tremendous tendency to reassess the terrorist threat and the responses required to deal with it. As a result, when analyzing Washington's reactions to the 9/11 attacks, it is possible to identify three distinct and successive strategies that have been adopted to prosecute the War on Terror: The first of these strategies, which can be termed 'Against' -terrorism ', focused narrowly on the terrorists themselves, incorporated traditional anti-terrorism techniques and logically led to the war in Afghanistan when the Taliban refused to stop al-Qaeda's shelter. Although partly enhanced by the US experience in Afghanistan, the second strategy,' Pre-emption and Preemption,' represented a step-change in Washington's conception of the terrorist threat and how to deal with it. The invasion of Iraq was the ultimate manifestation of this policy. The desire to overthrow Saddam contributed to developing this strategy. However, the invasion of Iraq did not mark the full effect of Washington's policy response to the terrorist threat. A third approach, the 'Strategy for Democratization in the Middle East, has also been developed by Washington. This approach aims to identify both the root causes and long-term solutions to the American War on Terror [6].

So in the aftermath of the events of 11 September 2001, the Bush administration took action and strategy against terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The American system of fighting terrorism and counter-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction would go as far as direct frontal warfare and intervention in countries that would violate these strategies and harbour terrorism.

The US accuses Saddam Hussein of nuclear weapons. The rule and regime that Saddam Hussein had extended saw that it would end soon after the 9/11 attacks. The US and the Bush administration would continue with their strategies to overthrow and fight irresponsible and dangerous leaders in the Middle East.

The Bush Doctrine relies on a definition of threat based on what it sees as a combination of "radicalism and technology" - specifically, political and religious extremism coupled with the availability of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). In his West Point speech, President Bush stated: The greatest danger to freedom lies in the intersection of radicalism and technology. When the proliferation of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, along with ballistic missile technology - when that happens, even weak states and small groups could achieve catastrophic power to strike large nations. Our enemies have stated precisely this purpose and have been caught seeking these horrible weapons [11].

The way the Bush administration conceived of the terrorist threat, as articulated by its answers to its questions, signalled how US foreign policy would respond immediately after 9/11. The model adopted was the traditional counterterrorism technique, linked to a policy focus in Afghanistan, where the preferred approach was regime change. The basic principle that guides US foreign policy was a realistic approach, which identified states as a problem, considered the state system and changed states' primary behaviour as the preferred solution. This approach was, in part, an attempt to construct the terrorist threat in such a way as to restore 'security' in the realm of state-threatening threats, dismissing suggestions that this was a threat that went beyond the state's capacity to deal. In practice, this meant a typical policy response in many ways to what followed previous terrorist attacks: identifying and prosecuting internal and external suspects through the criminal justice system, with the clear indication that if those suspects extend beyond national and international legal achievement, then a military response can be expected [6].

So the Bush administration and the people who supported the latter would invite to invade and invade Iraq on suspicion of possessing nuclear weapons and being a haven for terrorism. Although the Bush administration had previously sent constant administrative threats to Saddam Hussein to stop any claims, development and possession of weapons of mass destruction, the United States was constantly on high alert to respond to Iraq after seeing the threat of danger from the latter. Bush responsibly saw intervention in Iraq as a precaution and a precaution to react in time before it was too late.

The Bush administration's statements and actions regarding Iraq strongly believe that war is imminent. Its readiness to start a war with Iraq is based on the administration's judgment that time is not on the American side. In his address to the nation from Cincinnati on 7 October 2002, Bush asked: "If we know Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons today, and we do, does it make any sense for the world to wait to confront him as he

grows even stronger and develops even more dangerous weapons? … If the Iraqi regime is able to produce, buy or steal an amount of highly enriched uranium a little larger than a single softball, it could have a nuclear weapon in less than a year. And if we allow that to happen, a terrible line would be crossed. Saddam Hussein would be in a position to blackmail anyone who opposes his aggression. He would be in a position to dominate the Middle East. He would be in a position to threaten America and Saddam Hussein would be in a position to pass nuclear technology to terrorists" [1].

Based on all the information and strategies from his administration and coordination policies, President Bush was convinced that Iraq should be attacked and that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction. The Bush administration has repeatedly accused Saddam Hussein of possessing weapons of mass destruction. He had directly and concretely warned and threatened to suspend or face unprecedented US action and allies.

Was the US intervention in Iraq a humanitarian intervention or military aggression? The intervention in Iraq was preceded by a series of threats and sanctions against the latter, which failed miserably due to Iraq's disregard and neglect. The continuation of the old Avaz from Iraq prompted the US and its partners Iran to intervene militarily in this Middle Eastern region. The implementation of US self-defence with a partner and the performance of all forms to maintain international peace and security led the US to intervene in Iraq.

In his speech to the United Nations (UN) in September 2002, President George W. Bush described the possible use of force against Iraq as necessary to implement existing Security Council resolutions and to eliminate a dangerous threat to peace and international security. The Security Council responded by adopting UNSCR 1441, which found that Iraq was in material violation of previous Security Council resolutions and threatened with severe consequences for failing to do so. When Iraq refused to comply with these resolutions fully, the United States led an ad hoc "ready coalition" that invaded Iraq on 19 March 2003, quickly defeated the Iraqi armed forces, and ended Saddam Hussein's regime [14].

President Bush clarified that the major attacks on Iraq received funding that the course of the war and now was on the side of the US and that the situation would be brought under control and would have throughout the region of Iraq. But President Bush could never show whether a nuclear weapon was found or not, which raised great dilemmas and discrepancies around the world and for many well-known connoisseurs of global affairs.

But the question arises whether the intervention in Iraq was military aggression or humanitarian intervention for specific purposes of stability and maintaining general security?

Examination of the factual and legal environment leading to the war in Iraq will show that there was sufficient legal authority for the 2003 conflict with Iraq. On 2 August 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait. The next day, the Security Council adopted Resolution 660, the first of many resolutions condemning Iraq's actions and seeking withdrawal from Kuwait. After the diplomat failed, the Security Council adopted Resolution 678, which gave Iraq until 15 January 1991, to fully implement Resolution 660 Paragraph 2 of Resolution 678 authorizes member states to "use all necessary means to uphold and implement Resolution 660 (1990) and all relevant subsequent resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area" [14].

These and a series of interconnections that continued to try to control Iraq are often used as arguments for the legitimacy of the intervention in Iraq. Until the military intervention in Iraq, many authors and scholars tried to base their intervention in Iraq on international law based on diplomatic actions and the constant threats made to Iraq. They also rely on the inspection of Iraq for nuclear weapons and the latter's elimination, which is against the argument that no nuclear weapons were ever found in Iraq. At least officially, it was never proven by the Bush administration.

One state cannot strike another simply because the second may one day develop an ability and desire to attack it. However, few will make a strike from one war to another against a second state program to create new types of weapons. Between these two, they say that there are countless models of facts. After all, every offer must find legitimacy and what the state believes it has been made to be. Everyone should be judged not on abstract concepts but the events created there. While nations should not use prepayment as a pretext for aggression, being in favour or against preference in the abstract is a mistake.

The use of pre-emptive force is sometimes legal and sometimes not [13].

Can the war in Iraq be justified as a humanitarian intervention? This question received little serious attention before the war because the occupation was primarily to save the Iraqi people from oppression. Indeed, if the Iraqis had overthrown Saddam Hussein and dealt credibly with the issue of weapons of mass destruction, there would undoubtedly have been no war, even if the next government had been just as oppressive. Over time, however, the Bush administration's main justifications for the war lost much of their force. No weapons of mass destruction were ever found. No significant pre-war links to international terrorism were revealed. Establishing stable institutions in Iraq makes the country an increasingly tricky terrain for developing democracy in the Middle East. The administration's primary justification for starting the war is that Saddam Hussein was a ruthless and dangerous tyrant, an argument for humanitarian intervention [12].

In most cases, various authors and scholars offer a range of facts and arguments that the intervention in Iraq was not a humanitarian intervention but military aggression with specific intentions. They also claim that apart from any case of loss of human lives by military nature, there was no aggressive action against the population on particular grounds. "There were no ongoing or imminent massacres in Iraq in March 2003. This absence is crucial in undermining claims that the invasion of Iraq was a humanitarian intervention" [12]. Other peacekeeping operations could also be used, leaving violence and military action as a last resort. Saddam Hussein could be overthrown in other forms of power by excluding the latest military action as happened in Iraq. The Security Council did not approve the intervention in Iraq.

In summary, the invasion of Iraq fails to test for humanitarian intervention [12]. But, to go with arguments and factual support regarding the US intervention in Iraq, we can ask the question, after the intervention in Iraq and its occupation, was Iraq democratized according to the main objectives of the Bush administration's foreign policy?

Did Iraq democratize after the intervention? Peace-building over the years has been part of the main arguments of international relations aimed at resolving conflicts, nation-building and making essential reforms in various institutions and sectors of the state. It includes strategies to prevent future recurrences of the war, which is vital for maintaining global security and protecting the security of civilians [7].

Based on the fact that the countries of the Middle East were far from Western democracy, one of the objectives within the foreign policy strategy of the Bush administration was the democratization of Iraq and the extension of the latter as precisely as possible.

Promoting democracy in the Middle East has been a critical goal of the Bush administration's foreign policy since September 2001. The democratization of the Arab world, in particular, is seen as an essential instrument in the fight against terrorism. To help democratize the Arab Middle East, the US launched some policies that have encouraged reform [3].

Iraq entered a new phase of political transition in 2003 following the intervention of the United States and its allies and the fall of Saddam Hussein. The US intervention in Iraq led to the collapse of Saddam's regime and led to the destruction of the Sunni-dominated Iraqi state. The purpose of the intervention was to build a liberal state with a presence of democracy, human rights, the rule of law and a system where the government is accountable to the country's citizens. The involvement of the United States in Iraq can be explained by its role as a hegemonic power to maintain global peace and security because Saddam Hussein was accused of possessing weapons of mass destruction that could endanger global safety [7].

The US-led invasion and its efforts to rebuild Iraq's political system in 2003–2004 were low-staffing and organizationally incoherent. The violence that prevailed in Iraq from 2004 to 2008 had both regional and domestic leaders [5]. These and many other challenges prove that Iraq was not democratized even after the intervention and was not put on track. However, there has been progress and improvement in some areas. Iraq was not democratized, but it was left in a stifled "transition" with ongoing problems within the system, which today have consequences and difficulties in functioning.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we can say that the US intervention in Iraq did not meet all the merits and goals set. This can be seen from the argument and the result we have clarified during this paper. The attacks of 11 September 2001 and the war on terror were the beginning of military action against Iraq.

The constant threats against Iraq and the accusation of nuclear weapons caused the situation to slide toward military action against Iraq. The overthrow of Saddam Hussein could have been done in other ways before he took the last step, the military one. Although the trumpeting of global security and possible prevention is consistently used as an argument, it still clarifies that the intervention in Iraq was not humanitarian. It has also never been proven that nuclear weapons were found inside Iraq.

The fight against global terrorism and global security should be at the forefront of each state, especially for robust conditions. Still, actions in some instances should be spared as the cause of causing long-term damage to another state. We may ask whether Iraq has been democratized after all those interventions and actions against it. The answer is lacking as well as a result as well. Several internal and external factors have influenced the lack of a satisfactory result. That is why some goals have been achieved, and some strategies have been met.

Railing an adequate democracy in the Middle East in general and emphasizing Iraq requires hard and challenging work, which is often seen as difficult but not unattainable.

REFERENCES

1. Bush, J. (2002, 8 October). President Bush's Speech on the Use of Force. *The New York Times.* Retrieved https://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/08/national/president-bushs-speech-on-the-use-of-force.html

2. Claassen, C. A., Carmody, T., Stewart, S. M., Bossarte, R. M., Larkin, G. L., Woodward, W. A., & Trivedi, M. H. (2010). Effect of 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks in the USA on suicide in areas surrounding the crash sites. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 196*(5), 359–364. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.109.071928

3. Dalacoura, K. (2005). US democracy promotion in the Arab Middle East since 11 September 2001: a critique. *International Affairs, 81*(5), 963–979. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2005.00497.x

4. Deutsche Welle. (2005, September 15). *Lufta kundër terrorizmit zhvendoset në qendër të takimit të OKB*. Retrieved from https://www.dw.com/sq/lufta-kund%C3%ABr-terrorizmit-zhvendoset-n%C3%AB-qend%C3%ABr-t%C3%AB-takimit-t%C3%AB-okb/a-2585942

5. Dodge, T. (2020). "The Failure of Peacebuilding in Iraq: The Role of Consociationalism and Political Settlements." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, 15*(4), 459–475. doi: 10.1080/17502977.2020.1850036

6. Dunn, D. H. (2005). Bush, 11 September and the Conflicting Strategies of the "War on Terrorism." *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, *16*, 11–33.

7. Haji, B. (2019). *Peace Building in Iraq Post 2003* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344324546_PEACE_BUILDING_IN_IRAQ_POST_2003

8. Mekaj, G. (2020). Globalization and Rise of Terrorism. *Path of Science, 6*(9), 5001–5009. doi: 10.22178/pos.62-11

9. Mekaj, M. G., & Aliaj, M. K. (2018). Globalization as a facilitator of terrorism. *ILIRIA International Review, 8*(1). doi: 10.21113/iir.v8i1.400

10. Murphy, S. D. (2002). Terrorist Attacks on World Trade Center and Pentagon. *American Journal of International Law, 96*(1), 237–254. doi: 10.1017/s0002930000221593

11. Record, J. (2003). The Bush Doctrine and War with Iraq. *The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters, 33*(1). doi: 10.55540/0031-1723.2135

12. Roth, K. (2006). Was the Iraq War a Humanitarian Intervention? *Journal of Military Ethics, 5*(2), 84–92. doi: 10.1080/15027570600711864

13. Taft, W. H., & Buchwald, T. F. (2003). Preemption, Iraq, and International Law. *American Journal of International Law, 97*(3), 557–563. doi: 10.2307/3109840

14. Yoo, J. (2003). International Law and the War in Iraq. *American Journal of International Law, 97*(3), 563–576. doi: 10.2307/3109841