

**THE IMPACT OF THE UNITED STATES INVASION OF IRAQ
IN 2003 ON THE SOVEREIGNTY OF IRAQ**

BY

**TANIMU ALIYU MAGAJI
P13SSPS8330**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY ZARIA, NIGERIA IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN POLITICAL SCIENCE**

2015

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this thesis entitled the impact of the united states invasion on Iraq's sovereignty in 2003. Has been written and composed by me in the Department of Political Science under the supervision of Dr. Umar M. Kaoje and Edgar Agubamah. It is record of my own research work it has neither been presented nor accepted in any previous application for higher degree. All quotations are indicated or distinguished by quotation marks and the source of information specially acknowledged by means of references.

Tanimu Aliyu Magaji

Date

CERTIFICATION

This thesis entitled "The impact of the United States invasion on Iraq's sovereignty in 2003" has been carefully read and approved as having satisfied the condition for the award of Master of Science Degree in Political Science of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Dr. Umar Mohammed Kaoje
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr. Edgar Agubamah
Member, Supervisor Committee

Date

Dr. Yusuf Yakubu A.
Head of Department

Date

Prof. Hassan Adamu
Dean of Post Graduate

Date

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the glory of the Almighty Allah and His Prophet Muhammad (SAW), to my beloved mother Hindatu and my father Malam Magaji Aliyu for the effective role they played in my educational career.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the most Merciful. All praises are worthy of none except Allah, the Almighty whose infinite mercies gave me life, courage, health and vision to make this write-up.

In the course of this research many people gave me tremendous support and with sincerity I lack words to express my gratitude for all their assistance and support. I am therefore highly indebted to make this write-up a possibility. I thank them very much.

Firstly, my thanks go to my supervisor Dr. Umar Mohammed Kaoje, in spite of his tight schedules he was able to create quality time to go through this work and provided the guidelines needed for its successful completion.

I also want to thank Professors Paul Izah, Ra'uf Ayo Dunmoye, Ejembi Onobe, and Sabo Bako all of Department of Political Science who thought me during my course work, I also want to thank Prof. Hudu Ayuba Abdullahi (former HOD), for his contribution and academic advice, Dr. Abubakar Siddiq, Dr. Abbass I. Mohammed, Prof. Kayode Omojuwa, Dr. Faal Mohammed the MSC coordinator, and Dr. Samaila Shehu all of Political Science Department.

My thanks goes to Bashir Ibrahim of Unistar Computers who helped in the careful type-setting and printing of this thesis.

Credit for whatever success this research has achieved first and foremost, goes to Allah the Almighty and to all categories of my teachers who have seen me through up to this point in my academic career.

Finally, my entire family, especially my loving wife and children for their patience and endurance because the money that is suppose to be allocated for family or domestic responsibilities was diverted into the mainstream of this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	i
Declaration-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
Certification-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
Dedication-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
Acknowledgment-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	v
Table of content-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vii
Abstract-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	x

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1	Background-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
1.2	Statement of the problem-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
1.3	Objectives of the research-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
1.4	Research assumptions-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
1.5	Significance of the study-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
1.6	Scope of the study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
1.7	Methodology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
1.7.1	Data Collection Procedures	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
1.7.2	Data Analysis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
1.8	Limitation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
1.9	Organization of chapters	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1	Review of the related literature-	-	-	-	-	10
2.2	Theoretical Framework	-	-	-	-	27

CHAPTER THREE

History of the study area

3.1	Geological and Physical Features	-	-	-	-	33
3.3	Climate	-	-	-	-	35
3.4	Oil and Industry	-	-	-	-	35
3.5	Religion	-	-	-	-	36
3.6	Government	-	-	-	-	37
3.7	Background to the Iraq invasion of Kuwait-1990	-	-	-	-	38
3.8	The UN and the International Response	-	-	-	-	39
3.9	UN Security Council Resolutions	-	-	-	-	40
3.10	UN Sanction	-	-	-	-	41
3.11	The UN Position on Possible use of Force	-	-	-	-	42
3.12	Declared Aims of U.S. action in Iraq	-	-	-	-	44

CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis of the impact of the United States of Invasion of Iraq

4.0	Data presentation and analysis	-	-	-	-	49
4.1	Motives behind the U.S. war in Iraq	-	-	-	-	49
4.2	The impact of the U.S. invasion on Iraq's internal sovereignty	64				
4.3	The impact of the U.S. invasion on Iraq's external sovereignty	71				
4.4	The cost and benefit of the U.S. invasion of Iraq	-	-	-	-	73
4.5	The role of U.N. during the U.S. invasion in 2003-	-	-	-	-	85

4.6	Where the world stands on the invasion of Iraq	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86
4.7	Problems of United Nations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88
4.8	Research Findings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1	Introduction-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	99
5.2	Summary of the research	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	99
5.3	Conclusion-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
	Bibliography-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	103

ABSTRACT

Since the evolution of modern state sovereignty donates the final authority of the state over its population and territory. This authority may be exercised by the government of the day. The state which is sovereign is free from external aggression. In the contemporary world the meaning of sovereignty has changed the concept is now associated with different roles and practices rather than the single notion of supreme authority within a given territory or being independent from external control or interference. Based on the new conception of sovereignty the united states decided to invade Iraq on the Pretext that Iraq had some powerful connections with Alqa'ida a terrorist organization who was alleged to have attacked the world trade centre on September 11, 2001. From this point, several commentators have wondered what the invasion of Iraq had suggested about the US and the obligation of the United Nations. The UN as a matter of fact most protect the interest of any nation which is subjected to external aggression, however, the UN folded its arms when Iraq in 2003 was under attack by the United States and its allies, which brings entirely about the question of sovereignty, because the invasion violated Iraq's independent and territorial integrity. The question we may ask is why the US did invaded Iraq? And what role did the United Nations played to protect the sovereignty of Iraq?, this research heavily relied on the secondary data to substantiate its findings. So it was discovered from this research numerous reasons were behind the US invasion of Iraq, such as the Perceived threat by the US that Sadam Husaain produces nuclear weapons and a friend to Al'qa'ida, secondly there was a question of oil. Another case in point is that the UN has not been able to leave up to its expectations because it was unable to protect the territorial integrity of Iraq, it could therefore be said that the US is the United Nations.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Before the collapse of the Soviet Union however, that is during the period of bipolar structure, the concept of international law and that of state's sovereignty was much respected it was used to checkmate any attempt of aggression from powerful state over the weaker ones.

Bipolar structure had strikes a balance between the two world super powers. Nation states especially those from the developing world tends to forge an alliance with either of the two blocks mainly for security reasons.

In most recent years, however, following the end of the cold war political analysts began to be skeptical on what will be the fate of nation states in future world politics as the United States is becoming very aggressive and indicative in achieving her Foreign Policy Objectives. In the submission of (Ziring, 2005:191) the prominence of the United States in the absence of countervailing power was of some consequence to friend and the foe alike.

Therefore, the issue of sovereignty and the place of international law in inter-states relationship remain very critical area of concern.

In the contemporary world, the meaning of sovereignty has change. The concept is now associated with different rules and practices, rather than with the single notion of supreme authority within a given territory, or being independent from external control or interference.

The realization of any pure version of sovereignty of the sort that Bodin and especially Hobbes, embraced is precluded.

It can also be understood that physically or psychologically, despite U.S. extra-ordinary power she could not be separated from the catastrophe perpetrated by suicidal operatives of non state actors with a network of worldwide and well coordinated branches.

However the terrorist assault on the United States, unlike the era of the cold war has a great challenge on the rights of State as sovereign political entity. The concern is with the right of a State to resort to preemptive and unilateral action of a powerful state.

September 11, terror attack has change the idea of traditional conception of sovereignty. In the sense that Bush declaration on States announced that war against Iraq has begun-that every effort would be made to spare the lives of innocent civilians. But the campaign will be broad and concerted and will use “decisive Force” – No outcome but victory will be accepted, - America’s Freedom will be defended, and Freedom will be brought to others (Bush declaration, March 19, 2003).

The war against Iraq by the United States became inevitable because of allegation against Iraq of its connection to Al-Qaeda, a terrorist organization alleged to have attacked the World Trade Centre, in September 11 2001. U.S. also condemned Iraq of producing nuclear weapons. Therefore she could not escaped U.S. invasion in 2003.

1.2 Statement of the Problem.

Several commentators have wondered what the invasion of Iraq suggests about U.S. and the United Nations obligations, because there was no civil war in Iraq as was the case in Somalia that requires intervention.

The United States invasion of Iraq in 2003 brings a new thought to the question of sovereignty; U.S. invasion violates Iraqi independence and territorial integrity. The U.S. invasion in 2003, posed a serious challenge to the concept of sovereignty. Therefore, the problem of this research is to examine the impact of the United States invasion on Iraq's sovereignty. Specifically, the research seeks to answer the following questions:

- i. Why the invasion took place?
- ii. What is the role of the United Nations in order to see that Iraq's sovereignty is respected?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study include the need to:

- i. Find out the motive behind the United States war in Iraq.
- ii. To find out the role played by the United Nations in order to see that Iraq's sovereignty was respected?

1.4 Research Assumptions

The research was carried out within the assumptions that:

The research was carried out under the following assumptions:

- i. The United States War in Iraq is rationally based.
- ii. The invasion of Iraq by the United States is nothing but reflection of the failure of the United Nations to control the behaviour of a powerful state and may have failed like the defunct league of Nations.

1.5 Significance of the study.

On 19 March 2003 the United States invaded Iraq. The President and his advisers expected a quick, inexpensive conflict. The question that everybody asked is that why did U.S. decide to take unilateral action against Iraq in 2003? Why did U.S. repudiate the principle of collective security in 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq?

The importance of this study is to discuss in detail the impact of the invasion on the Iraq's internal and external sovereignty:

- i. Enhance our understanding on why the U.S. invaded Iraq in 2003.

It is hoped that the findings of the study will also contribute to knowledge.

1.6. Scope of the study

The study covers the period of six years that is between 2003 to 2008. The year 2003 marked the beginning of US invasion of Iraq, and the subsequent events that follows. This six year of US-Iraq war is also good enough to provide a solid basis for a systematic analysis of the invasion of Iraq to understand what really caused the invasion and why.

1.7 Methodology

A combination of methods for data collection was used in this study. Extensive use of data from existing works on US-Iraq war in 2003 was made. The purpose is an attempt to bring into sharper focus the position of states sovereignty in international politics especially when a powerful state invaded small one.

1.7.1 Data Collection Procedures

The major technique of data collection employed in this research is the use of secondary sources which are documented reports of events that took place during and after the invasion of Iraq. The piece of information gathered or collected in this manner constitutes the primary

data of the research. Therefore, secondary sources are of paramount importance to this research, because they are those materials which contain an account of an event or phenomenon by someone who actually witnessed the event. The author of secondary source materials tries to collect and synthesize a pool of primary materials. In the course of doing this he or she bring his or her own interpretations, view points and prejudices to bear on the primary materials, Webb (1968). Example of Secondary source materials include: Editorial opinions and news analysis from the numerous newspapers and news magazines, views and comments on the topic of research. Text books, review of research reports, journals, encyclopedias, articles etc. library research also formed a basic source of data. It is chosen because of the nature of the subject matter.

1.7.2 Data Analysis

All the secondary data collected, their contents reflect an aspect of the research problem. A content and descriptive analysis has been employed in handling the data. For printed data such as textbooks, newspapers, journals, articles, content analysis had been intensively used to make inferences from the text and context of the document under study. In the submission of Izah, (1984) content analysis is a technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively

identifying specified characteristics of messages. Objectivity refers to an analysis that is pursued on the basis of explicit rules that enables different researchers to obtain the same result from the same documents. In a systematic content analysis, the inclusion or exclusion of content is done according to the consistently applied criteria of selection; this requirement eliminates analysis in which only materials supporting the investigator's hypothesis are examined.

According to Jibrin in Samaila (2006:15) content analysis is very strategic to a researcher, because it allows one to define what one is looking for and then analyze and discern the meaning embodied in the messages being studied, evaluate their character and assess whether they correlates positively or negatively with issue being investigated. Information obtained in content analysis will help in analyzing the nature and character of the concept of sovereignty in the new world order, and the American dominant role in the contemporary world politics.

1.8 Limitation

A major limitation to this research however, is the use of secondary source, even though it is an accepted method of data collection; secondary sources are always subjected to author's interpretations.

Viewpoints and prejudices which can bias that will bear on the primary materials obtained.

There are also lots of problems with all methods of data collection. These problems do affects the accuracy of the conclusion of any study. Some of these missing gaps in information collected, reliability of some data might be difficult to cross check and some data vital to the study might not be reached.

The potency of the limiting factors addressed above, on the study, has been effectively reduced by the use of methodology that combines library research, and content analysis of editorial opinions of newspapers, article and journal

1.9 Organization of chapters

Chapter one, consists of the introduction which covers the general background of the study, the research problematic, objectives, the research questions, assumptions, importance of the study, and organization of the study and research methodology, data collecting procedures, an analysis of data and finally limitations of the study.

Chapter two, of the study consists of the literature review and theoretical framework.

Chapter three, Iraq's geo-politics: the study looked into the historical background of Iraq as the study area of the research.

Chapter four, contains analysis and interpretation of data also in chapter four it contained the findings of the research.

Chapter five, of the work consists the summary of the research work entirely, conclusion and recommendation followed by the bibliography of the materials used in the study.

CHAPTER TWO

2.1 Literature Review and theoretical framework

Many people have written on the concept of sovereignty. Camilleri and folk (1992:239) in his book therefore titled: "The end of sovereignty? The politics of a shrinking and fragmenting World" held that, although a common part of our contemporary political vocabulary is fundamentally a historical concept. The concept of sovereignty as such was unknown before the sixteenth century. It was completely unfamiliar to the Ancient Greeks, Romans, as well as to the scholars of the Medieval period. They also maintained that although the Roman law provided technical vocabulary to the theory of sovereignty, the Romans themselves spoke only about different layers of authority, not about "supreme power" or about any conceptual notion of sovereignty as such.

From this point Vincent (1987:35) then argued that it does not follow that the reality of state sovereignty did not exist in earlier periods, even though the concept itself had yet to be formulated. Vincent does not sufficiently acknowledge what the questioning of the very concept of sovereignty entails. He conflates the sovereignty with merely being sovereign, or having the authority of command in a certain sphere, which the Romans sophisticated into many different layers of political *autoritas* as was mentioned before.

In the submission of Hoffman (1998:35) a leading scholar on international relations, opined that although Bodin (1520-1596) did not invent sovereignty, he was certainly the first who gave it a serious consideration and conceptualized it in a systematic manner. Bodin's chief concern was this understanding to find a way to end the chaos and war, which he perceived to be the natural result of the labyrinthic feudal order. Bodin argued that for a government to be strong, must be perceived as legitimate it must follow certain rules of justice and reason" comprehensive through the divine law. Essentially however, the power of sovereign is for him the ability to create laws and break them according to one's will. The sovereign's power is thus for Bodin necessarily absolute and indivisible, the sovereign standing above the law and above the society it self.

Sovereignty in this light is ultimately absolutely in dependant of the subjects. Sovereign order recognizes only the state from the multiplicity of feudal communities build upon the natural ties, loyalties and mutual interest-Bodin creates an abstract community of atomized individuals bound together only by the common monarch-the state.

Thomas Hobbes, in his book *Leviathan* (London, 1914) similarly to Bodin, wrote his *Magnum opus Leviathan* during the period of a civil war, wishing to migrate the "worst of all evils". His concept of sovereignty knows however even less limits than that of Bodin. Hobbes accepted only

the right of the individual for self-preservation. To avoid the constant civil war and anarchy to which humans are according to Hobbes prone because of their "evil human nature, people by entering into society agree to give up their "natural sovereign rights in favor of the sovereign. The sovereign, not being a party to the original contract, does not recognize any limits to his authority. He exercise his powers unconditionally. While Bodin based the legitimacy of the sovereign on the divine sanction. Hobbes built his own on the social contract between naturally free and equal individuals, thus relating his argument very much to our contemporary time.

Accordingly, John Locke in Waldron (2003:181) he managed to synthesize Bodin and Hobbes to provide us with the foundations for liberalism and thus for our modern western states. For Locke, certain natural rights can never be taken away from the individual and his preservation is in fact the only reason why utility-maximizing individuals enter the society.

According to Macridis, (1979), it was John Locke who developed the theory of consent in detail. Men and women he pointed out, live in the state of nature with certain natural rights: life, liberty and property. At a given time they discover that is difficult to safeguard these rights without a common authority committed to them and to their protection; i.e. the state.

Macridis (1979) also in his book; contemporary political ideologies, submitted that it was Jean Jacques Rousseau who set up the model of a popular sovereignty. Rousseau believed that the source of political authority is vested in the people. They were sovereign, and their sovereignty was "inalienable, infallible, and indestructible".

Hans J. Morgenthau, (1967) writing on the concept of sovereignty in his book "Politics Among Nations" reviewed the issues surrounding sovereignty. In his submission Morgenthau maintained that the modern conception of sovereignty was first formulated in the latter part of the sixteenth century with reference to the new phenomenon of the territorial state. In the span of a century, it became unchallengeable either from within the territory or from without. In other words, it has become supreme. Morgenthau also observed that sovereignty as supreme power over a certain territory was a political fact, he said that the doctrine of sovereignty has retained its importance throughout the modern period of history. According to him also, for without the mutual respect for the legal enforcement of that respect, international law and a state system based on it sovereignty may not exist.

Once again, Morgenthau opined that the sovereignty of the nation as the intended object of a law-enforcing action manifests itself in what is called the "impenetrability" of the nation. This is another way of saying that on a given territory only one nation can have sovereignty-supreme

authority and that no other state has the right to perform governmental acts on its territory without its consent. So are three other principles of international law synonymous with the concept of sovereignty and, these are independence equality and unanimity independence signifies the particular aspects of the supreme authority of the individual nation which consists in the exclusion of the authority of any other nation. The statement that the nation is the supreme authority-that is, sovereign within certain territory-logically implies that it is independent and that there is no authority above it. Consequently, each nation is free to manage its internal and external affairs according to its discretion, in so far as it is not limited by treaty or what is called common or necessary international law so the duty to respect that independence is a rule of international law.

The second principle is equality pointing to a particular aspect of sovereignty. If all nations have supreme authority within their territories, none can be subordinated to any other in the exercise of that authority. No nation has the right in the absence of treaty obligations to the contrary, to tell any other nation what law it should enact and enforce, let alone to enact and enforce them on the latter's territory.

And the third principle is unanimity, it signifies that with reference to the legislative function all nations are equal regardless of their size,

population and power. The rule of unanimity declares: Without my consent your decision does not bind me.

Morgenthau also contended that, a nation may take upon itself legal obligations that give another nation final authority over its law giving and law-enforcing activities. Nation A will lose its sovereignty by conceding to nation B the right to vote any piece of legislation enacted by its own constitutional authorities or any act of law enforcement to be performed by its own executive agencies. In this case, the government of A remains the only lawgiving and law-enforcing authority actually functioning within the territory of A, but it is no longer supreme since it is in turn, subject to the control of the government of B through exercise of that control, the government of B becomes the supreme authority and hence, sovereign within the territory of A.

The other way in which sovereignty can be lost according to Morgenthau, consist in the loss of what is called the impenetrability of a nation's territory. Here the government of A is superseded as the lawgiving and law-enforcing authority by the government of B which, through its own agents, performs the lawgiving and law-enforcing functions within the territory of A. The government of A having authority altogether within the territory of A survives in name and appearance only, while the actual functions of government are performed by the agents of B.

Therefore, Morgenthau concluded that, the location of sovereignty depends upon a dual test: (a) in what respect is the government of a state legally controlled by another government? and (b) which government actually performs governmental functions within the territory of the state? The location of sovereignty is a matter of political judgment as well as legal interpretation. The location of sovereignty may be in temporary suspense if the actual distribution of power within a territory remains unsettled. Sovereignty over the same territory cannot reside simultaneously in two different authorities; that is, sovereignty is indivisible.

From this stand point, the United Nations declaration on sovereignty reaffirmed that no state has the right to intervene directly or indirectly for any reason whatsoever in the internal or external affairs of any other state. Reaffirming further the fundamental principle of the charter of the United Nations is that all state have the duty not to threaten or use force against the sovereignty, political independence or territorial integrity of other states (UN Charter).

International law approaches the problem of war from essentially different points of view. In the first place, international law governs the creation of a legal state of war; second, it governs the conditions under which such warfare may be conducted. (Greene, 1983:520).

The charter of the United Nations provides in effect, that war is prohibited, although the pertinent article does not employ the term "war". Thus Article 2, section 4, provides that "all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the international integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations. This provision withdraws from the members of the United Nations the right to embark unilaterally upon war and upon the aggressive use of war like force. This provision and others clearly seek to confer upon the United Nations a monopoly of war and war like force. Despite the monopoly of force conferred on the United Nations in Article 2, the wronged state is expected to report the situation to the United Nations. It then becomes the collective duty of the members of that organization-or of a regional organization-to take such action (within the practical range of its capabilities) as is deemed necessary in order to restore international peace and security. (Greene, 1983:521).

Under certain treaties, including the charter of the United Nations, the rights to engaged in war unilaterally except as an instrumentality of national self-defense, is proscribed. (Greene, 1983:521).

Collective security finds its philosophical basis in the belief, that there are just and unjust wars, wars of unjust aggression and just defense. The just war concept became part of the covenant of the League

of Nations, of the Kellogg-Briand. Peace pact, and of the charter of the United Nations. It is based upon the practical idea that when an arsonist has started a fire, it is to the advantage of the entire community to join in putting it out. The state that fails to assist in putting out the fire may be regarded as an inactive supporter of the arsonist, (Greene, 1983:523). The charter of the United Nations requires members to assist the attacked state against the aggressor, this giving the concept almost universal support.

Thomas and Daws, (2007) also recognized that the purpose of UN is to strengthen World order, the basic purpose of the UN is to provide a global institutional structure through which state can sometimes settle conflict with less reliance on the use of force. And the U.N charter is based on the principles that are equal under international law; that states should have full sovereignty over their won affairs; that states should carryout their international obligations-such as respecting diplomatic privileges, reframing from committing aggression, and observing the terms of treaties they sign.

The UN charter establishes a mechanism for collective security the banding together of the world's states to stop an aggressor. Chapter 7 of charter explicit authorizes the security council to use military force if the non-violent means called for in chapter 6 have failed; (Thomas and Daw, 2007).

The question one could ask: If the governments of the United States or the United Kingdom commit atrocities or violate international law which of the organizations in the UN can hold them accountable? The UN authorized collective use of force to reverse Iraqi aggression against Kuwait in 1990. However, because of the great power veto, the UN cannot effectively stop U.S. aggression of the same Iraq in 2003.

It can be noted that Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was illegal under treaties signed by Iraq (including the UN charter and that of the Arab League) and under the custom Iraq and Kuwait had established of living in peace as sovereign states. Beyond treaty or custom, the invasion violated international law because of the general principle that one state may not overrun its neighbour's territory and annex it by force. Is U.S. above international law? Of course, because of power preponderance, a state may think it can get away with such a violation of international law.

But (Barnett and Finnemore, 2004) opined that the UN and other international organizations have both strengths and weakness in the anarchic international system. However, state sovereignty also severely limits the power of UN and other international organizations because governments reserve power to themselves and are strongly in delegating it to the UN or anyone else. States have full sovereignty over their own affairs; therefore, the UN has had a mixed record with these strengths and weakness-in some ways providing remarkable global level

management and in other ways appearing helplessly against the sovereignty of even modest-sized states.

The establishment, maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security are founded upon freedom, equality, self determination and independence, respect for the sovereignty of states, as well as permanent sovereignty of states over their natural resources, irrespective of their political, economic or social systems or the levels of their development (Malcolm, 2003).

According to scholars of international law and organization, most international conflicts are not settled by military force. Despite the anarchic nature of the international system based on state sovereignty, the security dilemma does not usually lead to a breakdown in basic cooperation among states. States generally refrain from taking maximum short-term advantage of each other each as by invading and conquering).Rather, states work with other states for mutual gain and take advantage of such other only "at a margin".

This sub-section will review particular areas of international law and how each area counters the exercise of state sovereignty. But before going into this length, it is however at this juncture to see the previous works or writings of scholars on international law. Morgenthau (1967), Greene et al (1983) and Joyner, (2005) all writes on the concept of international law.

As noted by Greene (1983:515), the academic discipline of international relations, as part of political science, encompasses the more specific fields of international law, international politics and international organization. International politics emphasizes power and constant maneuver in the international arena... international law, like all law, rest upon moral and practical foundations. And all the three operated within the context of power and in a constantly changing environment. All help to explain the external conduct of nation-states.

From this stand point Greene explored more, he said; perhaps the most important point to be made concerning international law, new or old, is that most states normally seek to comply with the concepts of right and wrong contained in existing international law. He said, this is true even though a state, movement may not be especially enthusiastic about particular rule of law. Certainly, in time of international crisis, the ready charge of violation of international law supplies adequate evidence of existence and significance. Law provides boundaries between permitted and prohibited conduct.

Green also held that the idea that there should be a form of law governing the behavior of sovereign states may be traced back at least to the time of Grotius (1583-1645), who in 1625 wrote the first work on international law entitled "Dejure belli ac pacis".

Grotious and other writers were immediately confronted by a developing concept that has come to be called "sovereignty".

It is extracted from Oppenheim in (Morgenthau, 1967:265), where he submitted that the balance of power is an indispensable condition of the very existence of international law. He said, six morals can be deducted from the history of Nations:

The first of the six morals is that a law of Nations can exist only if there be equilibrium, a balance of power between the members of the family of Nations. If the powers cannot keep one another in check, no rules of law will have any force, since an over powerful state will naturally try to act according to its discretion and disobey the law. As there is not and never can be a central political authority above the sovereign states that could enforce the rules of the law of Nations, a balance of power must prevent any member of the family of Nations from becoming omnipotent.

International law is much more difficult to enforce. There is no world police force. Enforcement of international law depends on the power of states themselves, individually or collectively to punish transgressors.

In the submission of (Holsti, 1967) second rule of the modern system is that all states are equal with respect to legal rights and duties. All are, theoretically, sovereign and independent, all possess equally the

rights of territorial integrity and self-defense and all are equally obliged to avoid interfering in other states internal affairs, observe treaty obligations, and since the adoption of the united nations charter, avoid the threat or use of force (except in self-defense) in relations with other states. From these basic rules flow a number of more specific limitations on state action, as defined in treaties, international custom, and general principles of international law.

The question that one should ask in respect of the above illustrations on the concept of state's sovereignty is that what contemporary developments, if any, are leading to fundamental alteration of the post war polar structure? What conditions favour perpetuation of sovereignty and which help to erode or destroy it?

The answer is given by a professor of political economy (Samir Amin, 2007) he opined that the United States benefited enormously from the Second World War, which had ruined its principal contenders- Europe, the Soviet Union, China and Japan. It was thus in a position to exert its economic hegemony, since more than half of global industrial production was concentrated in the United States, especially the technologies that would shape the development of the second half of the century.”

In addition Amin (2007) also contended that “U.S. alone possessed nuclear weapons-the new total weapon. The present American project did

not spring from the head of George W. Bush to be implemented by an extreme right junta that seized power through dubious elections. This is the project the United States ruling class has unceasingly nurtured since 1945, even though its implementation passed through ups and downs and could not always be pursued with the consistency and violence demonstrated since the disintegration of the soviet Union-it is called the Monroe doctrine, which is overwhelming, even crazy and criminal in its implications. The project always allocated a decisive role to its military dimension, very quickly, the United States devised a global military strategy, dividing the planet into regions and allocating the responsibility for the control of each of them to American military command. The objective was not only to encircle the soviet Union (and China), but also to secure the position of Washington as the ruler of last resort throughout the world. In other words, it extended the Monroe doctrine to the entire planet, which effectively gave to the United States the exclusive right of managing the whole globe in accordance with what it defined as its national interest.

This project implies that the sovereignty or the national interests of the United States is to be placed above all other principles controlling legitimate political behavior, it engenders a systematic mistrust toward all supranational rights.”

Amin observed that “the 1973-1974-OPEC oil boycott and the invasion of Kuwait in 1990 by Iraq, are both dramatic examples of how regional forces have challenged United States access to oil in the Middle East. Therefore, since from that time, the authorities in Washington always felt ill at ease with the concept of the United Nations and today brutally proclaimed what they were forced to conceal up till now; that they do not accept even the concept of international law superior to what they consider to be the exigencies of the defense of their own national interests. The collapse of the Soviet Union permitted the project of the United States to be deployed with extreme vigor in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. Even on the political level, it is clear that initially the Europeans and Japanese aligned themselves with the American project they accepted the marginalization of the United Nations for the benefit of NATO at the time of the 1991 Gulf war and the 2002 Wars in Yugoslavia and central Asia. That is why America proclaims openly that it will not tolerate the reconstitution of any economic and military power capable of questioning its monopoly of dominion over the planet, and for this purpose, it gave itself the right to wage preventive wars. Because the United States no longer has a serious competitor, their first option is to destroy the ravaged Russian adversary permanently and completely. In the second place, China, whose growth and economic success worry the United States the U.S. strategic

objective is to dismember this large country. Amin also argues that today's world is military unipolar. And the major reason is that American economy lives parasitically, to the detriment of its partners in the world system, "The United States depends for ten percent of its industrial consumption on goods whose import costs are not covered by the exports of its own products".

Similarly, (Todd in Amin (2007:8) argues that "the world produces, and the United States (which has practically no national saving) consumes. The advantage of the United States is that of a predator whose deficit is covered by loans from others, whether by "consent or force". Washington has employed three primary means to compensate for these deficiencies; repeated unilateral violations of liberal principles; arms exports; and search for greater profits from oil (which presupposes systematic control over the producers.

Unipolar world in the submission of (Pervez; 2003) as characterized by a new political game, by looking at the U.S behaviour in global issues. Although, many Americans still cling to the belief that their country's new unilateralism is a reasonable outgrowth of "injured innocence", a natural response to terrorist acts. The difference since Sept, 11 and it is a significant one is that, now that there is no other super power to keep it in check. The U.S. no longer sees a need to battle for the hearts and minds of those it would dominate. In today's Washington, the United

Nations has become a dirty term. International law on the way to irrelevancy except when it can be used to further U.S. goals.

Also(Donald Kagan 1997:1) maintain that “the United States is the World’s only super power, combining pre-eminent military power, global technological leadership, and the World’s largest economy. At present the United States faces no global rival. America’s grand strategy should aim to preserve and extend this advantageous position as far into the future as possible.

Over the decade of the post cold war period, however, almost everything has changed. The Cold War World is for the moment at least decidedly unipolar, with American as the World’s “Sole super power”.

American’s strategic goal used to be containment of the soviet Union today the task is to preserve an international security environment conducive to American interests and ideals. The military’s job during the Cold War was to deter soviet expansionism. Today its task is to secure and expand the ”Zones of democratic peace; to deter the rise of a new great power competitor, “*Defend key regions*” of Europe, East Asia and the Middle East; and to preserve American pre-eminence though the coming transformation of War made possible by new technologies.”

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The theory adopted in this research is the “realist theory” based on its capacity to provide explanations for the content and context of the concept of sovereignty in the new world order. The core value of the

realists theory is the interest defined in terms of power. In Ajene (1987:309) realism as an attempt to understand the behaviour of statesmen and nation states is as old as the advent of Nicollo Machiavelli. The realists theoretical convention has drawn scholars from different historical epoch since Machivelli. Each of these scholars has based his analysis on the political practice of his day, and also used historical data derived from his past. The strength of realism is not only in its endurance as a theoretical convention, but also in our conviction that it remains a useful basis for understanding international society. Realism also provides a more informed guide for basing policy than its principal opponent "Utopian idealism".

Ajene, also submits that Utopian idealism was essentially a projection of the domestic order into the international arena; furthermore, it was a moral prescription for a peaceful world that would be devoid of international conflict.

In the submission of (Palm, 2005:4) Utopia has been defined as an "imaginary state" where everything is perfect, Utopia is a form of social theory which attempt to promote certain desired values and practices, by presenting them in an ideal state of society; Utopians advocate for reforms that most of the times impracticable, or present situation based on impossible state of perfection. Utopianism is essentially individualistic, because it made "human conscience "the final court of

appeal in moral questions. The purpose of human society is to provide the greatest happiness to the greatest number, which indeed, is the foundation of natural law. The idealists posit that a pre-condition for world peace and stability lies at least, in three possible lines of actions:

- 1) Establishment of international institutions to replaced what was perceived as anarchical.
- 2) They advocates for the legal control of war, transnational legal processes such as adjudication, and arbitration to settle disputes and inhibits recourse of war, e.g. international law.
- 3) They also believed that to avoid war is to eliminates weapons i.e. disarmament, to them is one of the best way to achieve world peace, or peaceful co- existence among nation-states.

According to Schumann in Ajene (1987:311), a central idea underlying the Utopian-idealist prescription for world order was the assumption that there is an essential harmony of interest between nations, in their rejection of the idea of harmony of interest, the realists point to the state system, composed of autonomous political entities, devoid of a central authority i.e. existence of international system which is a “self help system”. The will to survive in such system inevitably, leads to conflicting national objectives among nation states in their interaction with one another. Nicholas and Hans Morgenthau were the pioneers and leading proponents of the realists school of thought.

Realists see the world as dominated by anarchy and power struggle, as such, it is imperative for each state to seek to define her sovereignty and national interest. The central concern to which realism addresses itself, namely, is the interactions and behaviour of statesmen, as representatives of nation states in the anarchic state system; the foreign policy goals; the nature of power; techniques for managing power; the purposes and practices which ought to guide political leaders remained central to the study of international politics.

Ajene also contends that Morgenthau saw the concept central to realism is “Power”. Morgenthau defines international politics as the struggle for power, and this view is shared by most realists. Power itself, is defined as man’s control over minds and actions of other men”. National interest, is also a central concept of realism, because the world is divided into nations, Morgenthau contends that “national interest is the last word in politics.”

2.2.1 Relevance of the Realist Theory

The relevance of the theory in relation to this research can be seen from the practical example which is clearly demonstrated by the United States action in the Middle East particularly, Iraq as interest defined as power. The argument of the realists on the believe that the international organizations like the United Nations, is competent and capable of settling differences among nation states, and thus prevent the outbreak

of war is utopian. That is why For example, U.S. neglected the United Nations Security Council and went ahead to attack and invaded Iraq in 2003. Realists believed that sovereign nations pursues their national interest through any means available to them, for example, U.S. is using diplomatic tools in pursuing her national interest with the kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. While using a mixture of diplomacy and threat on Iran, U.S. sorted for a military diplomacy with Iraq. Therefore, U.S. policy in the Middle East can be summarizing with Morgenthau's postulations of realism in international politics; as follows:

- a. U.S. leaders, past and present, acting on behalf of their respective sovereignty think and act in terms of interest defined as power.
- b. United States policy is not expected to be guided by the imperatives of political and economic consequences of such policy, indeed, any policy that does not promotes nor supports the power of the United States does not come into existence and if it does, will never last long.
- c. The U.S. leaders whether from Republican Party or the Democratic, and diplomats are not generally guided by Universal moral principles in their interactions with nation states. On the contrary, their actions and activities are conditioned only by the circumstances of time and space.

CHAPTER THREE

3.1 History of the study area (Iraq)

Iraq a republic of South-Western Asia, the ancient Mesopotamia, has an area of 171,599 square miles and is bounded on the east by Iran; on the North by Turkey, on the West by Syria and Jordan, and on the South by Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Iraq possesses only 36 miles of sea coast consisting of the mud-fiats between Khar Zubair Shatt el Arab. The country is divided into 14 Liwas and the capital is Baghdad.

3.2 Geological and physical features

Iraq falls into three Zones: to South-West, the eastern part of the Arabian plateau which slopes gently down to the Euphrates; to the North East, the Folded of the Kurdish hills; and lastly, the intermediate alluvial plain.

The Western desert consists of rocky limestone steppe, Fringed along the lower Euphrates by sand dunes. The general line of Folding on the Kurdish hills runs North-West to South-East. The South-Westerly Folds are gentle, producing such ranges as the Jebel Hamrin (700-1, 500 feet) and the intervals between the ridges are filled by alluvial plains like mountains proper, a series, serrated ranges rising to 10,000 feet and penetrated by the gorges of four important tributaries of the Tigris, the greater and lesser Zab, the Adhaim and the Diyala. The lower ranges are mainly formed of Massive limestone strata, and the Kurdish mountains

of thin limestone beds, alternating with shale and slate, red charts and white marble.

The alluvial plains has been formed by the deposits of the two great rivers of Iraq the Euphrates and the Tigris, and the tributaries of letter. The two rivers originally entered the Persian Gulf near Hit and Tekrit and have gradually silled up its Northern half. The process was accelerated by the action of the Persian river Karun, whose delta built a barrage across the gulf near Basra about 400BCI; thus reducing the upper part of the gulf to a stagnant lagoon. Even the Northerly part of the plain around Baghdad is little over looft above sea level. In the South there are large areas of lake and marsh such as the Hor el sanniya which lies west of the Tigris and South of Kut, and the Hor el Hammar, though which the Euphrates flows, South of Nasiriya; even larger areas are liable to seasonal Flood.

The Euphrates receives no tributaries within Iraq. At first it Flows through a wide gorge cut into the desert plateau and then at Hit, it emerges into the plain where it soon divides into several branches and loses it self in Swampy lakes before joining the Tigris to form the shaft ell 'Arab'. The Tigris is the Swifter stream and receives four major tributaries from the Kurdish mountains. It has cut defiles through the successive ranges of the Kurdish foot hills and emerges into the plains at Samarra, its course thenceforth, though tortuous, being better defined than that of

the Euphrates. Both rivers floods annually, the Euphrates April-May, the Tigris a month earlier at lower water the rivers discharge only 8,800 and 12,000 cubic feet per sec respectively; in Flood, 60,000 and 100,000 runs above the level of the plain between high embankments when in Flood, and have frequently changed their courses in historical times.

3.3 Climate

Iraq has two main season, the hot weather (May to October) and the cold weather (November to April). What little rain falls in the plains comes mostly in December to February. Rain falls increase towards the North-West, from six inches or less west of the Euphrates to ten inches East of the Tigris.

3.4 Oil and Industry

Oil is the main mineral and the royalties from Iraq export sales rose rapidly from 1950 onward. The oil is produced by the Iraq petroleum Co. from the Kirkuk fields, the Mosul petroleum Co. at Al Enzallah near Mosul, and the Basra petroleum Co. from near Basrar the main channel of exports is by the pipeline across the Syrian desert to the Mediterranean, through ports at Tripoli and Baniyas, but the sea-tanker channel out of Basra down the Persian gulf assumed greater importance after the closure of the Syrian pipeline during the Suez Crisis of 1965.

There is sulphur in Iraq, both in solid form and in waste gases from the oil fields, and in 1960 their industrial exploitation was planned.

3.5 Religion

The Iraqis are sharply divided by both race and religion. By race, the majority are Arabs: the largest minority are Kurds who occupy the mountains of and foot hills of North-Eastern Iraq: lesser minorities are the Turkomas who lives in Korkuk, Erbil, Tell Afar and neighboring towns and the Persians, whose principal centers are the Shi'a holy cities.

In religion, while the vast majority are Muslims they are split into two main sects the "Sunnis" and the "Shi'as:" the Arab population South of the Diyala (excluding Baghdad and Basra) is Shi'a, as are the Persians; while the settled Arabs of upper Mesopotamia, the Bedouin of the desert and the population of Baghdad and Basra are Sunni, as are the Kurds. Among the Arabs Shi'a out number Sunnis by about three to one. Religious minorities comprise the Yezidis, who reside chiefly North of Mosul and in Jebel Sinjar, the Serbians or mandaens, in the towns of lower Mesopotamia, and the Christians including Greek orthodox, Nestorian, Jacobite and Armenian Orthodox as well as the united churches, Syrian, chaldean, Armenia and Greek Catholics, of whom mostly live in Baghdad and Mosul, and the remainder mostly in villages in Mosul province.

3.6 Government

Iraq ceased to be a monarchy when the Hashemite dynasty was overthrown by the revolution in July, 1958. Inspired by Nasser, officers from the Nine-tenth Brigade known as “the four colonials” under the leadership of Brigadier Abdal-Karim Qasim and col. AbdulSalam Arif overthrew the Hashemite monarchy on 14 July 1958. The new government proclaimed Iraq to be a “republic” and rejected the idea of a Union with Jordan.

A period of considerable instability followed. Qasim was assassinated in February, 1963, when the Ba’ath party took over power under the leadership of General Ahmad Hasan Al-Bakr (prime minister) and Col Abudl Salam Arif (President). Nine months later Abd As-Salam Muhammad Arif led a successful coup against the Ba’ath government. On 14 April 1966, president Abdul Salam Arif died in helicopter crash and was succeeded by his brother General Abdu Rahman Arif. Following the six day war of 1967, the Ba’ath party felt strong enough to retake power (17 July 1968). Ahmad Hassan Al-Bakr became president and chairman of the Revolutionary command council (RCC).

In July 1979, president Ahmad Hassan Al-Bakr resigned, and chosen his successor, General Saddam Husein, assumed the offices of both president and chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council.

Territorial disputes with Iran led to an inconclusive and costly eight-year war, the Iran-Iraq war (1980-1988, termed “Saddam’s Qadisiyyah), which devastated Iraq’s economy. Iraq, backed by \$40 Billion worth of Weapons from the United States, declared victory in 1988.

3.7 Background to the Iraq Invasion of Kuwait-1990

A long standing dispute led to the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq in 1990. The swift move made by Saddam Hussain ended any immediate hopes for closer ties with the West and further polarized the Arab World.

Roy (2002:541) submitted that in August 1990 Saddam Invaded Kuwait. His sin was not so much that he had committed an act of war, but that he acted independently, without orders from his masters. This display of independence was enough to upset the power equation in the Gulf. So it was decided that Saddam be exterminated. Similarly, Bryle (1992) opined that evidence had shown that American intention to control Middle East is a dated phenomena as far back as the period of 1973 Arab oil boycott.

The oil boycott brought U.S and European to their knees, and subsequently Arabs were able to increase the price of oil to a point of economic fairness.

United States government through CIA assisted and directed Kuwait in its action of violating OPEC agreement to undercut the price of

oil for debilitating Iraq's economy. In extracting excessive and illegal amount of oil from pools shared with Iraq during the Iraq-Iran war (1980-88), and in breaking negotiations with Iraq over these disputes as to provoke Iraq into aggressive military action against Kuwait that they knew (i.e. the U.S.) could be used to justify U.S military intervention into Persian Gulf for the purpose of destroying Iraqi and taking over its oil field.

The U.S. showed absolutely no opposition to Iraq's increasing threats against Kuwait, indeed, when Saddam Husein requested U.S. Ambassador April Glaspie to explain to State department's testimony in congress about Iraq's threat against Kuwait, the Ambassador assured him that the U.S. consider the dispute to a regional concern and it would not intervene militarily, by so doing, Saddam was given a green light by the U.S to commit military aggression against the neighboring state Kuwait. Only this time the defendants knowingly intended to lead Iraq into a provocation that could be used to justify intervention and warfare by the United states military forces for the real purpose of destroying Iraq as a military and seizing its oil field in the Persian Gulf.

3.8 The UN and the International Response

The UN security council met repeatedly during August in Response to the Gulf Crisis and passed five resolutions, moving on from US first and immediate condemnation of the Iraq invasion of Kuwait (Resolution

660 on August 2), to impose mandating sanctions (Resolution 661 on August, 25), while also rejecting the Iraq annexation of Kuwait (Resolution 662 on August 9), and demanding freedom of departure from and consular access to foreign nationals in Kuwait and Iraq (Resolution 664 of August 18).

3.9 UN Security Council Resolutions

Permanent members are; China, France, Soviet Union, UK. USA. Non-permanent members are; Canada, Colombia, cote d'voire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, Malaysia. Romania, Yemen, Zaire.

Resolution 660 August 2 passed unanimously, but with Yemen not participating after one hour meeting commencing at 5:00am, condemned Iraq invasion of Kuwait. Demanded immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraq forces and called for negotiated settlement.

Resolution 661 August 6 passed by vote 13 – 0 with Cuba and Yemen abstaining. Imposed mandatory sanctions against Iraq and Kuwait trade, affecting all purchases of transshipment of oil and other commodities and products, banning new investment, and banning sale or supply of any products, including arms, but excepting medical supplies and food stuffs “In humanitarian circumstances.”

Resolution 662 August 9 passed unanimously declared Iraq annexation of Kuwait “null and void”. Demanded that Iraq rescind its declaration of “merger” called all states and institutions not to recognize

the annexation and to refrain from actions which might be interpreted as direct recognition.

Resolution 664 August 18 passed unanimously demanded “that Iraq permit and facilitate the departure from Kuwait and Iraq of the nationals of third countries”, and that consular officials be granted immediate and continuing access to such foreign nationals. Demanded that Iraq “take no action to Jeopardize” their safety, security or health. Demanded that Iraq “rescind its orders for the closure of diplomatic and consular offices in Kuwait and for the withdrawal of diplomatic immunity from their staff.

Resolution 665 August 25 passed by vote 13 – 0 with Cuba and Yemen abstaining. Called with immediate effect, on member state deploying maritime forces in the area, to use “such measures commensurate to the specific circumstance as may be necessary under the authority of the security council to halt all inward and outward maritime shipping in order to inspect and verify their cargoes and destinations” and ensure the strict implementation of mandatory economic sanctions. Invited all states to co-operate by political and diplomatic state to ensure compliance with sanctions.

3.10 UN Sanctions

The principal sanction under resolution 661 was the ban on importing oil from Iraq or Kuwait. Neither country had other exports of any consequence. The on sales and supplies to Iraq and Kuwait

specifically included arms; it excluded medical supplies and in wording made less specific following initiative by Ethiopia, the supply of food for humanitarian circumstances. On August 16 Perez de Cuellar said that 40 countries had so far notified him of sanctions measures, as they were required to do by August 24, and on August 28 the committee on compliance heard that well over half of all UN member countries were committed to the embargo.

3.11 The UN Position on Possible Use of Force

Article 41 of the UN Charter, Covering Sanctions, stated that “the security council may decide measures not involving the use of armed forces are to be employed to give effect to its decision.” Having taken such measures, as she did on August 6, the security council could go further if sanctions “proved to be inadequate,” by taking under article 42 “such action by air, sea or land forces as may be necessary to maintain international peace and security,” and specifically including blockade. There was no precedent for the use of Article 42’s provisions; the “Beira patrol” conducted by the UK to deter sanctions breaking over Rhodesia in 1966-68 had the approval of the security council but was mounted as an operation independently of it.

James Baker expressed on August 10, the U.S. view that resolution 661 gave “the legal authority necessary to constitute such embargo or blockade, provided the request comes from the legitimate government of Kuwait.” (By implication, this was an attempt to present blockade as

legitimate under Article 51, on self defence). The U.S. government received such a request on August 12, as did the UK on August 13 and both gave order on August 13 that their naval personnel should board vessels believed to be breaking sanctions and do “whatever necessary.”

Perez de Cuellar on August 13, and again on August 17 dissociate the UN from any attempt at this stage to impose sanctions by force, but Bush on August 14 reaffirmed his view that the USA was acting within its legal rights, and called for clarification of the position of the permanent security council members, in advance of a possible further resolution. On August 17, US naval vessels intercepted two Iraqi coasters in the Gulf, but allowed them to proceed after they were found to be empty; on August 18, U.S. vassals fired warning shots across the bows of two Iraqi tankers in the Gulf of Oman. (The U.S. government using the word “blockade” at this time, preferring to describe its intention as the “interdiction” of sanction breaking.)

The French government on August 18 ordered its naval commanders to apply sanction “with firmness” France, however, had been among those Security Council members reportedly expressing concern on August 13 over the prospect of individual members, rather than the Security Council, deciding to move to enforce a blockade.

Similar emphasis on the Security Council’s authority was advocated by the Soviet Union, whose government also proposed

reactivation of the effectively moribund UN Security Council military staff committee to take control of any enforcement action.

By August 24 when the security council military staff committee met the USA had drafted a proposed resolution which would give UN legitimacy to the use of the necessary force to maintain a blockade, but which would leave the decision on such interventions to the naval command (i.e. to the U.S. Navy, in practice, or the British or French, Since it was expected that those other countries which had contributed naval forces on a smaller scale would wish to avoid this controversial step). The resolution as passed on August 25 represented a significant modification of the US draft, which had referred to the use of “such minimum force as may be necessary” but was changed at Chinese insistence to read “measures commensurate to the specific circumstances.”

3.12 Declared Aims of U.S. Action in Iraq

Rengger (1995:404) confirmed that the declared aims of the U.S. response were summarized by Bush in a televised address on August, 8 they were

- The immediate, complete and unconditional withdrawal of all Iraq’s forces from Kuwait
- The restoration of the deposed Kuwait government;
- The protection of the lives of U.S citizens held in Iraq and Kuwait and

- The establishment of regional security and stability in the Persian Gulf.

During this address Bush also stressed “American does not seek conflict the mission of our troops is wholly defensive ... they will not initiate hostilities, but they will defend themselves, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and other friends in the Gulf.

The last of the stated U.S objectives was considered by some commentators to indicate an “unacknowledged agenda” which involve the removal of Saddam and neutralization of Iraq’s military capability.

In April, 1991, Iraq agreed to UN terms for a permanent cease-fire, coalition troops withdrew from Southern Iraq as a UN peace keeping force moved in to police the Iraq-Kuwait border,. Meanwhile Hussein used his remaining military forces to suppress rebellions by Shia in the South and Kurds in the North. Shi’a activities from the underground Da’awa party and the supreme council for Islamic Revolution in Iraq overthrew the Ba’ath throughout the Southern provinces. Although the United States had called for the Iraq’s to rise up to overthrow Saddam Hussein, the U.S military did not intervene when he used helicopter gunship to put down the rebellion, killing hundred of thousands of Kurdish refugees who fled to Turkey and Iran, and U.S. British, and French troops landed inside Iraq’s Northern border to established a Kurdish enclave with refugee camps to protect another 600,000 Kurds

from Iraqi government reprisals. In addition, international force or the U.S government 'set up no-fly Zones' in both Northern and Southern Iraq to ensure the safety of the Kurdish and Shi'a populations although the Shi'a continued to suffer from severe repression.

However, in November 1994 Hussein signed a decree and territorial integrity. The decree effectively ended Iraq's claim to Kuwait as a province of Iraq.

In 1994 Iraq continued its efforts to crush internal resistance with an economic embargo of the Kurdish-populated North and a military campaign against Shi'a rebels in the Democratic Party (KDP) asked Saddam to intervene in the clashes between troops into the Kurdish enclave protected by international forces, capturing the PUK stronghold of Irbil. International forces decided to leave the enclave rather than intervene in the dispute between the rival Kurdish factions. The KDP was quickly installed in power. The United States responded to Hussein's incursion with two missile strikes against Southern Iraq.

By the Mid-1990s Iraq was suffering an economic crisis. Prices were high, food and medicine shortages were rampant. Although the sanctions continued, in April 1995 the UN Security Council voted unanimously to allow Iraq to sell limited amounts of oil to meet its urgent humanitarian needs. Iraq initially rejected the plan but then accepted it in 1996; it began to export oil at the end of that year. In 1988 the UN

increased the amount of oil Iraq was allowed to sell, but Iraq was unable to take full advantage of this increase because its production capabilities had deteriorated under the sanctions.

Beginning in the late 1990s Iraq increasingly faced the possibility of another military crisis, because of its nuclear programmes. Despite interference by Iraq authorities, UN weapons inspectors succeeded in destroying hundreds of missiles and numerous weapons production facilities before leaving Iraq 1998. It was believed by the inspectors that 85 percent of the Iraqi original stock piles had been destroyed.

Despite WMD inspection in Iraq the United States was not convinced with the results of the team, with the support of Britain and several other nations, built up a military force in the Persian Gulf in preparation for a possible war against Iraq. Other countries, including France, Germany, and Russia, opposed military action, arguing that diplomacy and inspections should be given more time to work.

An episode that warranted for the direct attack of Iraq in 2003 was the terrorist attack on New York and Washington in September 11, 2001. American foreign policy began to call for the removal of the Saddam's Ba'ath government in Iraq.

In response to September 11 terrorist attack on the United States George W. Bush made a public speech, he declared in his speech that:

“New threat requires new thinking. Different circumstance requires different methods, all nations that decide for aggression and terror will pay a price. We will not leave the safety of America and the peace of the planet at the mercy of a few mad terrorist and tyrants. We will lift this dark threat from our country and from the World.” (Encyclopedia Britannica online, 2007).

Therefore this statement provides United States the opportunity to attack Iraq in 2003, in order to fight terrorism and to establish a regime change in Iraq. In March, 2003 the U.S. and the Britain, together with military aid from other nations invaded Iraq, without the support of the United Nations, and against a backdrop of unprecedented millions of people demonstrating Worldwide in protest. In April Baghdad fell to United States forces. In December Saddam was captured at farm near Tikrit. He was later put on trial for crimes against humanity.

CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis of the impact of the United States invasion of Iraq on Iraq's sovereignty

4.1 The Motives behind the U.S. War in Iraq.

The United States and its "coalition of the willing" invaded Iraq. The shock and awe" attack was seen on televisions around the world, and people watched the destruction, people wondered what would become of that country. Saddam Hussein's forces were crushed almost immediately.

Why did the U.S. invade Iraq?

According to (Jim Lobe,2008), the official reasons the threat posed to the U.S. and its allies by Saddam Hussein's alleged Programme of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and the possibility that he would pass along those arms to alqa'eda. Secondly, liberating Iraq from the tyranny of Hussein, particularly unforgiving and blood thirsty version of Baath government, and thus setting an irresistible precedent that would spread throughout the Arab world-a theme pushed by the administration of President George W. Bush mostly after the invasion.

Then there is the theory that Bush-whose enigmatic psychology, particularly his relationship to his father, has already provided for several book-publishing mills-wanted to show up his father for failing to

take Baghdad in 1991. Or he sought to "finish the job" that his father had begun in 1991; and/or avenge his father for Hussein's alleged (but highly questionable) assassination attempt against Bush in Kuwait after the war, (Jim Lobe, 2008).

Then there is also the question of oil. There was a claim that the administration of George W. Bush acting on behalf of the oil industry and desperate to get his hands on Iraq's oil that has long been denied it access as a result of U.N and unilateral sanctions prohibiting business between U.S. companies and Hussein, (Jim Lobe, 2008).

And the invasion was a force-indeed, a shock and awesome demonstration to the rest of the world, especially potential strategic rivals like China, Russia, or even the European Union, of Washington's ability to quickly and effectively conquer and control an oil-rich nation in the heart of the energy-rich Middle East/Gulf region any time it wishes, perhaps persuading those lesser powers that challenging the U.S. could well prove counter-productive to long-term interest, if not their supply of energy in the short-term.(Keegan, 2004)

Indeed, a demonstration of such power could well be the fastest way to formalize a new international order based on the overwhelming military power of the United States, unequalled at least since the Roman Empire. It was that same vision that formed the inspiration for the 27 charter signatories-a coalition of aggressive nationalists, neo-

conservatives, and Christian Right leaders that included Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Libby, Khalizad, and several other future senior Bush administration national-security officials of the project for the New American Century (PNAC) in 1997. It was the same project that began calling for "regime change" in Iraq in 1998 and that, nine days after 9/11 attack on New York and the Pentagon, publicly warned that any "war on terror" that excluded Hussein's elimination would necessarily be incomplete. (Keegan, 2004)

Usama Bn Laden in an interview with a BBC reporter, John Muller of ABC in May, 1998, Bn Laden talks about why he seeks to attack U.S. This nation is about to embark upon the first test of a revolutionary doctrine applied in an extraordinary way at an unfortunate time. The doctrine of preemption..... the idea that the United States or any other nation can legitimately attack a nation that is not imminently threatening but may be threaten that the future..... is a radical new twist on the traditional idea of self defense. It appears to be in contravention of international law and UN charter.

This speech was delivered by a U.S. Senator who was not on the opinion of U.S. invasion of Iraq on false reasons of war on terror and WMD.

To justify its war against Iraq, (Russett, 2006) submitted that George W. Bush administration does not need the UN's permission to define its national security; i.e. Self defense.

Few years after U.S. attack on Afghanistan, Iraq was attacked by the same U.S. government in the name of fighting terrorism. President George W. Bush, in order to legitimate his war on Iraq few days before the war begins he says to his country men, I quote;

The dangers to our country (US) are growing, Saddam Hussein posses biological and chemical weapons.....the regime continue to ties with terrorist organizations, and there is alongside terrorist inside Iraq.

(Jim Lobe, 2008)

However, in many occasions part of the reasons president Bush offered to the Americans for invading Iraq were;

- i. Iraq has weapons of mass destruction (i.e. Nuclear).
- ii. Iraq tried to forestall UN inspectors.
- iii. Iraq had invaded and occupied its neighbour Kuwait before.
- iv. Iraq had brutally occupied the Kurdish area of Iraq.
- v. Iraq was danger to United States.
- vi. Iraq had violated UN resolution such as resolution 1441.

Iraq is undemocratic, there human rights abuses.
(WWW.davidduke.com).

The invasion of Iraq by U.S. in 2003, was very controversial, (Michael T. Klare: 2003) of World security studies posed the question, “was the U.S. invasion of Iraq justified? Unlike most other foreign wars in which the United States becomes involved, the invasion of Iraq was not preceded by an attack on United States, or on its allies. For example World War II (1939-1945) commenced when the United States naval base in Pearl Harbour was attacked by Japanese air force; the Korean War (1950-1953) when North Korean troops crossed into South Korean and the 1991 Persian Gulf War when Iraqi troops invaded Kuwait. In each of these cases, the outbreak of hostilities was precipitated by the aggressive action of a hostile power, and thus the decision to respond in a military fashion was justified by legitimate self-defense or the obligation, embedded in the United Nations Charter, to aid the victims of aggression. But this justification cannot be used in the case of the 2003 U.S invasion of Iraq; as the Iraqi did not attack the United States, the decision to initiate hostilities was made by the U.S alone, and without being triggered by the hostile action of an aggressor state.

Klare (2003) made good observation and a critical analysis over what he called “deciphering the Bush administration’s motives”. Why is U.S going to War in Iraq? What are really motivating president Bush and his senior advisers to incur this enormous risk?

Klare (2003) noted that “in their public pronouncements, President Bush and his associates have advanced three reasons for going to war with Iraq and removal of Saddam Hussein

- 1) To eliminate Saddam’s Weapons of mass destruction (WMD) arsenals;
- 2) To diminish the threat of international terrorism; and
- 3) To promote democracy in Iraq and the surrounding areas.

1) *Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction:* Klare noted that the reasons most often given by the Bush administration for going to War with Iraq are to reduce the risk of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) attack on the United States. To be sure, the significant WMD attack on the United States would be a terrible disaster, and it is appropriate for the president of the United States to take effective and vigorous action to prevent this happening. If this is, in fact, Bush’s primary concern, then one would imagine that he would pay the greatest attention to the greatest threat of WMD usage against the United States, and deploy available U.S. resources troops, dollars, and diplomacy-accordingly. But is this what Bush is actually doing? The answer is no. Klare also maintained that any one who takes the trouble to examine the global WMD scenarios would have to conclude the greatest threat of WMD usage against

the United States at the present time comes from North Korea and Pakistan, not Iraq.

North Korea and Pakistan Pose a greater WMD threat to the United States than Iraq for several reasons says Klare. First of all, they both possessed much bigger WMD Arsenals. Pakistan is known to possessed several dozen nuclear war heads along with missiles and planes capable of delivering them hundreds of miles away; it is also suspected of having developed chemical weapons. North Korea is thought to possess sufficient platinum to produce one to two nuclear devices along with the capacity to manufacture several more; it also has a large chemical weapons stock pile and a formidable array of ballistic missiles. Iraq, by contracts, possesses no nuclear weapons to day and is thought to be several years away from producing one, even under the best of circumstances. Iraq may possess some chemical and biological weapons and dozen or so scud-type missiles that were hidden at the end of the 1991 Gulf War, but it is not known whether any of these items are still in working order and available for military use. Equally is the question of intension: how likely are these countries to actually use their WMD munitions? Nobody can answer this with any degree of certainty, of course. But there are a few things that can be said.

To begin with, Pakistani president Pervez Musharraf (now Former) has publicly stated that he was prepared to employ nuclear weapons

against India in 2002, when New Delhi massed its forces on Pakistan's border and threatened to attack unless Pakistan curbed the activities of Islamic militants in Kashmir. This does not mean that Pakistan would use nuclear weapons against the United States, but it does indicate a readiness to employ such weapons as an instrument of War; is also easy to imagine a scenario in which someone else comes to power that is far more anti-American than Musharraf.

On the other hand, the CIA has concluded that Saddam Hussein will not choose to use his country's WMD capabilities against the United States so as long as his regime remains intact, it is only in the case of imminent U.S. conquest of Baghdad that he might be tempted to use these weapons. According to the (observer (2003) the news paper stated that United States showed no objections to India's nuclear tests.

Similarly, (The analysis, 2003:30) also submitted that Bush cited a report by the International Atomic Energy Agency which he said "proved" that the Iraqis were on the brink of developing nuclear weapons.

I would remind you that when the Inspectors first went into Iraq and were denied, finally denied access, a report came out of the IAEA that they were six months away from developing a weapon, I don't know what more evidence we need

The analysis opined that no such report existed. The IAEA did issued a report in 1998, around the time weapons inspectors were denied access to Iraq, but what it said was,

Base on all credible information to date, the IAEA has found no indication of Iraq having achieved its program goal of producing nuclear weapons or of Iraq having retained a physical capability for the production of weapons useable nuclear material or having clandestinely obtained such a material”

IAEA spokesman, Mark Gwozdecky confirmed this statement, responding to the Bush speech, “there has never been a report like that issued from this Agency”

In his September, 12 2002, address to the United Nations, Bush spoke ominously of Iraq’s purchase of thousands of high-strength aluminium tubes, which he said were “used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons”.

The IAEA said in a January 2003 assessment, the size of the tubes made them ill-suited for uranium enrichment, but they were identical tubes that Iraq had used previously to make conventional artillery rockets. Nevertheless, Collin Powell repeated the aluminum-tubes charge in his speech to the U.N. on February 5, 2003.

Finally, in Bush’s spring 2003 state of the union speech, he cited alleged documents showing that Iraq had attempted to buy 500 tons of

uranium from the country Niger. However, officials of the IAEA looked at the documents and concluded that they were crude fakes. A team of forensics experts examined the documents and agreed unanimously.

The Bush administration has also indicated, according to Klare, that “War with Iraq is justified in order to prevent Iraq from providing WMD to anti-America terrorists. The transfer of WMD technology to terrorist groups is a genuine concern but it is Pakistan where the greatest threat of such transference exists, not Iraq. In Pakistan, many senior military officers are known to harbor great sympathy for Kashmir militants and other extremist Islamic movements; with anti-Americanism intensifying throughout the region, it is not hard to imagine these officers providing the militants with some of Pakistan’s WMD Weapons and technology. On the other hand, the leadership of Saddam Hussein in Iraq has no such ties with Islamic extremists; on the contrary, Saddam has been a life long enemy of the militant Islamists and they view him in an equally hostile manner.

It follows from all that a policy aimed at protecting the United States from WMD attacks would identify Pakistan and North-Korea as the leading perils, and put Iraq in a rather distant third place, but this is not, of course, what the Bush government is doing. Instead, it has minimized the threat from Pakistan and North-Korea and focused almost exclusively on the threat form Iraq. It is clearer then, that protecting the

United States from WMD attack is not primary justification for invading Iraq: If it were, U.S would be talking about an assault on Pakistan and/or North-Korea, not Iraq.

2. *Combating Terrorism:* Klare also submits that “Bush administration has argued at great length that invasion of Iraq and the ouster of Saddam Hussein would constitute the culmination of and the greatest success in the war against terrorism. Why this is so has never been made entirely clear, but it is said that Saddam’s hostility toward the United States somehow sustains and invigorates the terrorist threat to the United States. It follows; therefore, that elimination of Saddam would result in a great defeat for international terrorism and greatly weaken its capacity to attack the United States.”

We can agree that elimination of Saddam and his alleged linkage to international terrorism did not eliminate terrorism, because terrorism continue to persist, as it happens in U.S during the X-mas eve, 2009, when a Nigerian citizen Farouk Mutallab had attempted to bombed down a northwest airline flight 253 in Detroit on Christmas day 2009. Once again, terrorist are non-state actors, therefore, they will continue to remain a threat to U.S. and they cannot be hunted no matter how by the powerful United States. From what we know of Al Qeeda and other such organizations, the objective of Islamic extremists is to overthrow any government in the Islamic World that does not adhere to a

fundamentalist version of Islam and replace it with one that does. The Baathist regime of Saddam Hussein does not qualify as such a regime.

Also the (Analysis, 2003:30) opined that the idea of an alliance between Alqaeda and Iraq was un-likely, since Osama bin Laden's hatred for the "infidel" regime of Saddam Hussein was long-standing and well known before September 11. Much of the public speculation about a link between Alqaeda and Iraq was based on an alleged meeting between 9/11 hijacker Muhammed Atta and Iraqi intelligent officials that supposedly took place in Prague, the Czech Republic between the dates of April 8, and 11, 2002. Reports of this meeting first came from Czech officials in October 2001, during the period of intense speculation that followed the terrorist attacked.

The story was thoroughly investigated by the FBI in the United States. It was confirmed that the record revealed that Atta was in Virginia Beach, Virginia, in early April, during the time he is suppose to meet al-Ani in Prague. Czech president Vaclav also stated that there is no evidence to confirm earlier report that Mohammed Atta, met with an Iraqi intelligence officials in Prague.

Despite the lack of credible evidence that the Atta-Iraq meeting ever occurred, Bush administration officials people like Paul Wolfowitz, Dick Cheaney, William Safire, Donald Rumsfeld, Richard Perle (the

conservative think-tanks) continued to promote the rumor, playing a delegate game of not quite-lying insinuations.

Also in the submission of Scowcroft (2002:295) he believed that “Saddam’s strategic objective appears to be to dominate the Persian Gulf, to control oil from the region, or both. That clearly poses a real threat to key evidence to tie Saddam to terrorist organizations, and ever less to the September 11 attacks.

Indeed Saddam’s goals have little in common with the terrorists who threaten the United States, and there is little incentive for him to make common cause with them. There is little evidence to indicate that the United States it self is an object of Saddam’s aggression.

However, Klare noted that “it is necessary to keep the Israeli-Palestinian struggle in mind. For most Arab Muslims, whatever their views of Saddam Hussein, the United States is a hypo critical power, because it tolerates (or even supports) state terrorism i.e. Israel against the Palestinians while making war against Baghdad for the same sort of behavior. It is this perception that is fueling the anti-American current now running through the Muslims World. An American invasion of Iraq will not quiet that current, but excite it. It is thus exceedingly difficult to see how a U.S. invasion of Iraq will produce a stunning victory in the war against terrorism; if anything, it will trigger a new round of anti-American violence. Hence, it is very difficult to conclude that the Bush

administration is motivated by anti-terrorism in seeking to topple Saddam.”

3. *The Promotion of Democracy*: “The ouster of Saddam Hussein, it is claimed, will clear the space for the Iraqi (under American guidance of course) to establish a truly democratic government and serve as a beacon and inspiration for the spread of democracy throughout the Islamic world, which is said to be sadly deficient in this respect. Certainly, the spread of democracy to the Islamic World would be a good thing, and should be encouraged. But is there any reason to believe that the Bush government is motivated by a desire to spread democracy in its rush to war with Iraq?”

There are several reasons to doubt this says Klare (2003). “First of all”, many of the top leaders of the Bush government, particularly Donald Rums Field and Dick Cheaney, were completely happy to embrace Saddam’s dictatorship in the 80s when Iraq was the enemy of United States enemy (that is Iran) and thus considered their defacto friend (Saddam). Under the so-called tilt toward Iraq, the Reagan-Bush administration decided to assist Iraq in its wart against Iran during the Iran-Iraq War of 1980-88. As part of this policy, Reagan removed Iraq from the list of countries that supports terrorism, thus permitting the provision of billions of dollars worth of agricultural credits and other forms of assistances to Saddam. The bearer of this good news was none

other than Donald Rumsfeld, who traveled to Baghdad and met with Saddam in December 1983 as a special representative of President Reagan. At the same time, the Department of Defense provided Iraq with secret satellite data on Iranian military positions. This information was provided to Saddam even though U.S leaders were informed by a senior State Department official on November 1, 1983 that the Iraqi's were using chemical weapons against the Iranians "almost daily", and were aware that U.S satellite could be used by Baghdad to pinpoint Chemical Weapons attacks on Iranian positions. Dick Cheaney, who took over as secretary of Defense in 1989, continued the practice of supplying Iraq with secret intelligence data. Not once did Messrs. Rumsfeld and Cheaney speak out against Iraqi CW use or suggest that the United States discontinue its support of the Hussein dictatorship during this period. So there is no reason whatsoever to believe that the current leadership of Bush care about Saddam's tyrannical behaviour."

It is however noted by Klare (2003). "That there is every reason to be skeptical about Bush commitment to democracy in the middle and some Asian countries; it is a fact that Bush has developed close relationships with a number of other dictatorial or authoritarian regimes in those areas. Most notably, the United States had developed close ties with the post soviet dictatorships in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan. Each of these countries is ruled by a Stalinist dictator who

once served as a royal agent of the soviet empirical empire Heydal Allayer in Azerbaijan, Nursultan Nazarbaev of Kazakhstan, and Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan. Only slightly less odious than Saddam Hussein, these tyrants have been welcomed to the White House and showed with American aid and support. And there certainly is nothing even remotely democratic about Kuwait or Saudi Arabia, Americans other close allies in the region. So it is hard to believe that the Bush government is motivated by a love of democracy, when it has been so quick to embrace patently undemocratic regimes that have agrees to do its bidding.”

4.2 The impact of the invasion on Iraq internal sovereignty.

Iraq was occupied by the U.S.-led troops from 20 March to first of May 2003. Five year have passed since the Bush administration launched the war on terror beginning with the campaign entitled "Operation Iraqi Freedom" to toppie Saddam regime in Iraq. Yet the panoramic picture of Iraq continues to remain in a sombre situation. The U.S. was yet to reach its target to "disarm" Saddam Hussein's regime of weapons of mass destruction in the fight against "terrorism" but nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons were never found in Iraq after the military occupation (Keegan, 2004)

However, what is developing in Iraq has gone beyond the U.S. expectations. Iraq is failing in a chaotic situation and the sectarian and religious conflicts are pushing into bloody violence. The most devastating

effect of the invasion to Iraq internal sovereignty was the disintegration of Iraq into three divided regions: the South dominated by the Shi'ite, the central part by the Sunnis and the north by the Kurds. The U.S. forces failed to ensure security and daily minimal needs for the Iraqi people, talk less of national reconstruction. (Keegan, 2004)

Implicit in the accusations the charge that Sunni politicians were complicit in a number of bombings over the past two years that have killed hundreds of Shi'ites. At present, the conflict is political; and judicial, but it mat not be settled by dialogue and legal rulings.

Sunni Iraqis want to establish an autonomous region in central Iraqi; regional Sunni powers, who oppose Iranian- Shi'ite influence, support the goal. Shi'ite Iraqis want to keep the Sunnis a week minority; their Iranian ally seeks to punish the Sunni powers conducting clandestine warfare against it. There is considerable danger of a return to sectarian warfare and also of regional conflict.

The Sunnis see the U.S. as a foreign power that arrogantly and unwisely ended their domination of the country. The Shi'ites see the U.S. less as the power that ousted Saddam and made Shi'ite surge possible, rather more as benefactor of the Sunni tribes since the surge, as well as an enemy of Shi'ites militias, ally of the House of Saud, and linchpins of an anti-Iranian coalition with Israel and Saudi Arabia.

The increasing problems in Iraq are affecting in the U.S. itself and creating outstanding changes in the face of the region and the world at large.

Another consequence of the invasion is the emergence of IRA-the U.S. knows but ignores the fact that IRI is formed from a group of Islamist thugs, masquerading as a state which is responsible for the main problems of the region. With a huge military potential, the IRI is emerging as a power in the region. Bush's opponent in the U.S. pressurized his administration to make "grand Bargain" with the Mullah's regime and Syria to help stabilize the security in Iraqi. (Jim Lobe, 2008).

Iraqi is now overshadowed by sectarian violence and lack of stability and the country is facing the danger of a civil war. Violence occurred every where in Iraq up to the closing end of 2006. The outside observer, as well as the Iraqi people, the cause of violence was obscured, as development came faster than could easily analyzed. Some people believed that it was Al-qaeda in Iraq that uses terror and extreme acts of violence, (Naomi, 2004:48).

It was also perceived that the aims of these attacks were not completely clear, but it was argued that between 2006-2007, these attacks were aimed at fomenting civil conflict within Iraq to destroy the legitimacy of the newly created collaborationist Iraq government (which

many of its nationalist critics saw as illegitimate and product of the U.S. government), and creates an unsustainable position for the U.S. forces within Iraq (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2007).

The most widely reported evidence of this argument stemmed from the mass killings on 23 February, 2006, on the Al-Askari Mosque in Samarra one of Shi'ite Islam's most holiest sites. Analysis of the attack suggested that the Mujahidden Shura council and Al-Qaeda in Iraq were responsible and that the motivation was to provoke further violence by out-raging Shia population. (Britannica, 2007).

In another development, majority of people in Iraq argued that these events are connected to Bremer's reforms as the single largest factor leading to the rise of armed resistance (Britannica, 2007).

In human terms, it is the loss of life and the destruction of Iraqi society that is the most gregarious. Meanwhile, cost continues to mount for the Iraqi people and their economy. For most Iraqis, daily life has become unbearable-to the point that those who can afford to leave their country have done so. By September 2007, a stunning 4.6 million people-one of every seven Iraqis-had been uprooted from their homes. This is the largest migration of people in the Middle East since the creation of Israel in 1948, (office of the UN High commission on Refugees, 2007).

However, the neighboring countries are themselves feeding the strain of accepting so many refugees. Syria, for example, will no longer accept Iraqis without visas. This has forced some Iraqis return home, but in September, 2007, there were still 2,000 Iraqis affirming at the Syrian border everyday. By late November, 2007, despite the fact that the Iraqi government was offering to pay \$700-\$800 to refugees if they returned home, plus free bus and plane rides, the UN-HCR pointed out that large scale repatriation would only be possible when proper return conditions are in place-including materials and legal support and physical safety. Presently there is no sign of any large-scale return to Iraq as the security situation in many parts of the country remains volatile & unpredictable. (Jennifar, 2007).

There are also "disappearance" by March, 2006, some thirty to forty Iraqi's were being kidnapped daily. Many of those kidnappings ended with the victim's death. By December, 2007, the official tallies of civilian casualties of the war had grown to 39, 959. But this number, large as it was, was a vast undercount. The Brookings institution's Iraq index puts the total at a just shy of 100,000. The violence has risen to such a level that the Brookings researchers commented:

Starting in 2006, we have found it is no longer practical to differentiate between acts of war and crime". During much of 2006, officially recorded deaths numbered more than 100 a day. Beginning in

2007, a new category of killings was introduced into the table3: extrajudicial killings ("death penalty punishments" without the sanction of courts or government) amounting to some 5,150 in the first seven months, (O'Hanlon & Campbell, 2007:43).

One of the symptoms of the deteriorating living conditions in Iraq has been the outbreak of cholera-before the war, cholera was extremely rare in Iraq.

A cholera outbreak was first detected in Kirkuk, Northern Iraq, on August, 14 2007.it has spread to nine out of eighteen provinces across Iraq. Over 3,315 cases have been confirmed-more than in all of Asia in 2006 and 30,000 people have fallen ill with acute watery diarrhea (cholera symptoms). An increasing number of cases have also been reported in the cities of Baghdad, Basra, Mosul, and Tikrit, in the province of Diyala, Dahuk, and Wasit, (WHO report, 2007).

The cost to Iraqi's economy: The war in Iraq has dealt a heavy blow to the country's economy, which was facing serious difficulties even before the invasion. Iraq had spent eight year in a fruitless war with Iran. It had suffered a humiliating defeat in the Gulf war of 1991. The embargo on Iraqi oil, imposed by the United Nations and the United States after the first Gulf war ended in 1991, also had taken its toll. In 2001, Iraqi's GDP was 24 percent lower than it had been ten years earlier (in purchasing power terms). Like so many other Middle Eastern countries,

Iraqi's economy was dominated by oil-accounting for almost two thirds of the country's GDP. We noted that earlier that Iraqi's GDP, in real terms, is no higher than it was in 2003, in spite of a near quadrupling of oil prices; that at least, one four Iraqi's are unemployed; and that Baghdad gets only nine hours of electricity per-day less than it had before the war. Oil exports have dropped and have yet to recover to their prewar level. (O'Hanlon and Campbell, 2007:34-35).

The economic cluster is of course, an integral part of the Iraqi debacle. It has been both cause and consequences: It has contributed to the insurgency has had a devastating effect on the economy. In some places, destruction is out pacing construction. Some 59 percent of Iraqi's view their economic conditions today as "poor" and only 11 percent as 'good" or "excellent". The failure to provide jobs and income has, rightly, lost the U.S.-barked government what little support it had. Worse, U.S. have created an explosive combination of high levels of unemployed males between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five and ready access to arms. (O'Hanlon and Campbell, 2007).

On the political front, Iraq now has a religious government (Shi'ite)-whereas it had secular governments for eighty years prior to the U.S. invasion. This vastly complicates the challenges of bringing political stability to different parts of the society. So far Iraq's own government) of

Nur Al-Maliki) was not been able to unite the country. (Ahmad and Jamail, 2007).

4.3 The impact of the U.S. invasion on Iraq's external sovereignty.

A sectarian conflict in Iraq with one side backed by Iran and the other by Saudi Arabia has extraordinary impacted on the external sovereignty of Iraq after U.S. invasion. And it becomes difficult to contain within the borders of Iraq. (Brian, 2012).

It can be understood that events taking place in Syria are already shapping events in Iraq. The overthrow of the Shi'ite Assad regime and the advent of a majority Sunni government would bolster the Iraqi Sunni drive for autonomy and perhaps lead to their integration into a Sunni-dominant Syria. Alternatively, Iraqi Shi'ite may come down hard on the Sunni's and drive large numbers of them into Syria where they may gladly help, to overthrow the Shi'ite regime there. The Saudi's will be eager to assist in either scenario (Brian, 2012).

The new resistance's coherence and discipline suggest considerable indigenous political organization and also substantial foreign support- almost certainly from Saudi Arabia. Riyadh cautioned Washington angrily that ousting Saddam would lead to Shi'ite and Iranian ascendance, and it now seeks to contain or even roll their power. Therefore, the conflict coming to a head in Iraq, then, is not simply

conflict between indigenous Sunnis and Shi'ites. Amid concern over Iran's nuclear ambitions and Shi'ites restiveness in Sunni-ruled countries, it has become part of the geopolitical contest between Saudi Arabia and Iran, (Keegan, 2011).

However, Fallujah and Anbar have been taken from salafist control, but the consciences and aspirations of Iraqi salafist have not been eased. The intellectual and financial wellspring of salafism is Saudi Arabia, which has encouraged its study as a means of spreading its influence through young militants in this respect, salafism links various nationalities not only to Saudi religion but also to Saudi geopolitics, (Brian, 2012.)

Brian also submitted that Salafist in Iraq share Riyadh's hostility to Shi'ism in general and also to Shi'ism in Tehran and now in Baghdad. They are the most ideologically motivated soldiers in the anti-Shi'ites forces coalescing in Iraq. They mesh well with the anti-Iran states that Riyadh is coordinating among the Gulf States. Anti-Shi'ites forces in Iraq will not lack funds or safe havens-or plausible denials of foreign support.

At a time when democratic leadership is needed to heal sectarian wound and entrench national reconciliation, Prime Minister Naouri al Maliki has instead established an autocratic single-sect power base. By so doing, he has plunged Baghdad into a deep crisis, which has escalated in recent weeks with thousands taking to streets in Sunni

areas to protest against his Shia-led government. In the 2010 elections, Iraqiya, national, non-sectarian coalitions won 91 seats and gain a parliamentary majority, with two seats more than Maliki's state of law coalition. But Iranian pressure ensured that Maliki emerged as the Prime Minister, (Keegan, 2011).

Maliki's sectarian tendencies have become more excessive in recent months with the waning of Bashar al Assad's power in Syria. Damascus is an important element in the alliance that extends from Tehran, through Baghdad, to Hezbollah in Lebanon. Maliki and the Iranians fear that the fall of the Syrian will encourage the Sunnis and Kurds in Iraq regime to demand a greater share of the political cake. Although Tehran does not want to start a big sectarian conflict in Iraq, it will, nonetheless, continue to support Maliki for that reason, (Keegan, 2011).

4.4 The cost and benefit of U.S. action in Iraq.

On 19 March 2003 the United States invaded Iraq. The President and his advisers expected a quick, inexpensive conflict. It turned out to be one of the costliest mistakes ever made (Stiglitz, 2009).

It is a well known fact that the notion that invading Iraq would bring democracy and catalyze change in the Middle East now seems like a fantasy. When the full price of the war has been paid, trillions of

dollars will have been added to U.S. national debt, the war has weakened the U.S. economy.

Numerous writers thought that it may seem callous to even think about the financial cost. In the submission of (Stiglitz, 2009);

The war has turned out to be hugely costly in both blood and treasure. We estimate that the total budgetary and economic cost to the United States will turn out to be around \$3 trillion, with the cost to the rest of the world.

The mission had not been accomplished, the Bush administration was wrong about the benefits of the war. The president and his advisers expected a quick, inexpensive conflict. Instead, U.S. have a war that is costing more than anyone could have imagined. The cost of direct U.S. military operations-not even including long-term costs such as taking care of wounded veterans-already exceeds the cost of the twelve-year war in Vietnam and is more than double the cost of the first Gulf war, and twice that of World War. The only war in the U.S. history which cost more was World War II, U.S. troops fought in a campaign lasting four years, at a total cost (16.3 million dollars, after adjusting for inflation) of about \$5 million. With virtually the entire armed forces committed for fighting the Germans and Japanese, the cost per troop (in today's dollars) was less than \$100,000 dollars in 2007. By contrast, the Iraq war is costing (directly) upward of \$400,000 per troop, (Stiglitz, 2009:6).

The price in blood has been paid by U.S. military and by hired contractors. The price in treasure has, in a sense, been financed entirely by borrowing; (Stiglitz, 2009:7).

The rising price of fuel is a second reason that costs have increased so much. A modern army runs not just on its stomach but also on fuel oil. The world price of oil has risen from around \$25 per barrel when the war started to close to \$100 as from 2009. the price of fuel delivered to Iraq has risen even faster, driven by heavy transport costs from long and dangerous supply lines, (Stiglitz, 2009:15).

Another example of hidden costs is the understating of U.S. military casualties. The Defense Department's casualty statistics focus on casualties that result from hostile (combat) action-as determined by the military. Yet if a soldier is injured or dies in a nighttime vehicle accident, this is officially dubbed "non combat related" even though it may be too unsafe for soldiers to travel during daytime. In fact, the pentagon keeps two sets of books. The first is the official casualty list posted on the DOD Website. The second, hard-to find set of data is available only on a different website and can be obtained under the freedom of information act. This data shows that the total number of soldiers who have been wounded in combat (Bilmes, 2007).

The upfront cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the amount congress has appointed and the military has spends or about to spend,

now exceeds \$800 billion. Factors driving up the spending, were three factors, one of course, is the rising cost of personnel, the growing use of contractors doing every thing from cooking and cleaning to servicing weapons systems and protecting U.S. diplomats, expenditure on security guard (Belasco, 2007).

Social security disability compensation to veterans of the conflict is another major cost of the war. The criteria-for social security is that, any veteran who cannot work or hold down job is eligible. The compensation benefit is currently about \$1000 per month. Veterans who have a 50 percent or more service-connected disability under the VA's guidelines (for physical handicaps or mental health conditions such as post-traumatic stress disorder) will likely meet the social security criteria. Many of the 45,000 Americans who were injured seriously enough that they had to be medically airlifted out of the combat theaters will qualify. Individually, these amounts might seem small; but when added up over the four years these individuals had received an estimated of \$25-\$44 billion; (Stiglitz, 2009).

At the onset of the Iraqi war, the U.S. government was already running a deficit. Given that no new taxes have been levied (indeed, taxes, especially for upper income Americans, were lowered shortly after U.S. went to war and non-defense expenditures have continued to

grow..... almost \$1 trillion to U.S. national debt of \$9 trillion to pay for the war so far, (Stiglitz, 2009:53).

The Iraq war has placed an unremitting burden on the U.S. troops in the field, (CBO report, 2007). More than half of those who serve are under twenty-four, some are barely out of high school. Many have been required to remain on active combat duty for longer than their original commitment of the total number so far bent to Iraq. Some 36 percent have been drawn from the National Guard and Reserve-Men and women who typically have to leave husbands, wives, jobs, and small children at home. While on duty there is no place to get away from the incessant fighting and the constant threat of death, this group of men and women also contains an unprecedented number who have been wounded or injured and survived. One of the major economic costs is the loss of the productive capacity of young Americans who have been killed or seriously wounded in Iraq. Using a value of statistical life (VSL) of \$7.2 million, the economic cost of more than 4,300 Americans deaths in Iraq and Afghanistan to date already exceeds \$30 million. (Stiglitz, and Bilmes2009).

The Dole Shalala Commission estimated that in 20 percent of families of veterans who were wounded injured, or otherwise incapacitated (e.g. with mental illness). Someone has been forced to leave his or her employment in order to become a full-time caretaker. Many

other families have make some significant adjustments in their lives in order to accommodate the returning veteran, (Annal Benefits, 2005).

Many people around the world, not just in the Middle East, believe the U.S. government went to war because it wanted to get its hands on Iraqi oil. To estimate how high a price there is need to answer three questions: How much of the increase in the price of oil can be attributed to the war? What have been the direct costs to the U.S. economy from these price increases? And what have been the secondary effects-the effects on the overall macro economy?

Oil prices stated to soar just as the war began, and the longer it has dragged on, the higher prices have gone. This suggests the war has something to do with the rising prices. On this, almost all oil experts agree. But what fraction of the total price increase is due to the war? To answer this question had been asked: What would the price have been had there been no war? (Stiglitz & Bilmes 2009).

Futures markets work on the basis of "business as usual" that is they assume nothing out of the ordinary is going to happen. The war in Iraqi was the most notable out of the ordinary event at the time prices began to rise, and it is hard to identify any other disruption that could be given similar credit for the changes in demand or supply, especially in 2003 and 2004. (The 2005 arrival of Houricanes Katrina and Rita however, did cause a large temporary drop in U.S. oil production, which

in turn lifted prices). Now, business as usual means that the turmoil that the Iraq war let loose will remain high for the next several years, prices cannot be gauged with precision, two estimates were put forward: a conservative one assumes only \$5 per barrel of the price increase is due to the war; and a more realistic one assume the figure is \$10. With these estimates in place, we can calculate the direct cost to the U.S. economy. The United States imports around 5 billion barrels a year, which means that a \$5 per barrel increase translates into an extra expenditure in our conservative estimate that is \$175 billion. For our \$10 realistic-moderate estimate, which assumes the effect will last for eight years, the cost is \$400 billion; (Stiglitz, 2009).

As oil prices reaches \$100 a barrel and as futures markets continue to predict that high prices will persist years into the future, we feel that \$5 to \$10 a barrel for just seven or eight years is really too conservative. If even of the difference between the current price (\$95-\$100 a barrel) is attributed to the war, then oil costs of the war today are \$35 a barrel-not \$10. More generally, attributing just half of the price increase in the post-Iraq war over the period for which we have futures markets (2015)s brings the direct costs of the oil price increase alone to some what in excess of \$3 trillion). (Stiglitz, 2009:119).

By the end of fiscal year 2008, the war in Afghanistan and Iraq will led to an increase in U.S. indebtedness in excess of \$900 billion. In our

realistic moderate scenario, over the time horizon of this study through (2007), the increase debt from just the increased military spending (ignoring veteran's benefits and health care), including the cumulative interest on the debt-financed war borrowing, exceeds \$2 trillion, (Stiglitz, & Bilmes,2009).

Global consequences; in global terms, the jump in oil prices since the start of the war dwarfs all the other economic costs. The higher oil prices assured in our moderate scenarios represent a direct cost to the world economy of approximately \$1.1 trillion, taking into account the macro economic repercussions, (Stiglitz & Bilmes 2009:132).

The rhetoric about a global coalition notwithstanding, the war in Iraq has been largely an American venture, with some political cover provided by the United Kingdom. The total military deaths for the allies in Iraq stood at 306 in 2007, with a further 675 injured. Although these numbers will certainly rise before the war is over, the increase will probably be small, particularly since United Kingdom, which provides the largest contingent, is rapidly reducing its presence in Iraq (Stiglitz and Bilmes, 2009:144).

Afghanistan has paid a high price for U.S. decision to invade Iraq. As Pennsylvania congressman Joseph Sestak, a veteran of the conflict in Afghanistan, has pointed out:

The war (in Iraq) was undertaken at exactly the wrong time. By not allowing U.S. to first finish the work needed to fully secure peace in Afghanistan, the Al-qaeda leadership that struck the U.S. on September 11 is still free. I know from the first hand experience; I was first sent into Afghanistan two months after we begin fighting there, and returned to the country a year and a half later. At the beginning of the war I saw what needed to be done to win the peace. I then later saw how much was left to do in Afghanistan, as we turned our attention & valued resources toward Iraq, where the terrorist threat was not (Joe Sestak, 2006).

British casualties and veterans: As of the end of 2007, the United Kingdom had some 5,000 troops in Iraq and some 7,00 in Afghanistan. British casualties in Iraq included 174 deaths, 206 serious injuries, and 2,372 other injuries requiring hospitalization. The budgetary cost to the United Kingdom of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan through 2010 will total more than \$18 billion (U.S. \$ 30.6 billion). If a social cost is included in the total impact on the United Kingdom will exceed \$20 billion (Journal of Risk and uncertainty, 2006).

Other global costs: The most direct global cost imposed on the rest of the world results from the increase in the price of oil, a price paid by all oil importers of course, the costs to some have been a benefit to others-namely, the oil exporters. The losers include traditional U.S. allies in Europe and Asia. Those who have gained (benefited) are, by and large

dictators in the oil producing countries-including some who have been quite open about using their increased wealth to advance an agenda that is anti-American and some cases anti-Western. (Stiglitz and Bilmes, 2009:157).

Global peace and security: The dream of the U.S. invaders was to create a stable prosperous and democratic Middle-East. But America's intervention in Iraq is laying-the foundation for precisely the opposite result and the consequences of America's Iraqi venture for global peace and security extend beyond the Middle-East. It has helped feed extremism throughout the Islamic world and beyond. This growth of extremism has made the task of leaders in moderate Islamic republics all the more difficult. They have been forceful in encouraging Bush to withdraw, knowing that if the war continues, they will face an increasingly hard time containing more fundamentalist's forces. (Stiglitz, and Bilmes, 2009:160).

Of course, there have a always been mixed feelings: envy mixed with admiration, respect for American democracy and its advocacy of human rights mixed resentment toward its brashness and overconfidence. But the positives have outweighed the negatives in most countries. This was true not just of traditional allies, such as Great Britain (where 83 percent of the population had a favourable rating of the United State in 1999-2000), and Germany (78 percent), but even in

Islamic countries, such as Indonesia (75 percent), Turkey (52 percent), and Morocco (77 percent). Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Bill Clinton were global heroes, even more in some places abroad than they were at home. The war has dramatically changed this picture: compared to 2002, favourable ratings of America are now lower in twenty-six of thirty-three countries surveyed by the Pew Research center. The situation has worsened in most Muslim countries in the Middle East and Asia-and even among historically steadfast U.S. allies (Andrew, 2007).

By 2007, favorable ratings had fallen to 9 percent in Turkey and 29 percent in Indonesia. That same year, confidence in President Vladimir Putin's leadership exceeded that of President Bush in Canada, Britain, Germany, and France. It was noted that citizens of many countries saw America in Iraq as a greater threat to Global peace than Iran.

More remarkable, another recent Pew survey showed that in every country surveyed the U.S. presence in Iraq was viewed as a great to world peace than North Korea. In short all over the world, the United States was viewed as a greater danger than the countries President Bush included in his "axis of evil". In Indonesia, a moderate Islamic republic, 70% percent of the public reported being either "very" or "somewhat" worried about American as a military threat to their country. Indeed, a

vast majority of those in Islamic countries-and a majority among many of U.S. allies-believe that the Iraq war has made the world a more dangerous place. In Islamic countries, majorities (in some cases, large majorities) see America's motives as dominating the world and gaining control of Middle East oil. Most disturbing is that America is no longer seen as a bastion of civil rights and democracy. The Iraq war "for democracy" has almost given democracy a bad name. Changing perceptions of America have hurt U.S. business and the U.S. economy. It is inevitable that those who see the Bush administration and its conduct of the war unfavourably also begin to see America and its conduct of business in the same light. Today, there is a serious lack of confidence in American leadership. (Andrew, 2007).

In the long-run though, the squandering, of America's leadership role in the international community, and the diversion of attention from critical issues like global warming and nuclear proliferation in North Korea that simply wait go away on their own, and that cannot simply wait to be addressed-may represent the largest and most long-standing legacy of this unfortunate war. (Anne, 2007).

4.5 The Role of the United Nations during the United States

Invasion of Iraq in 2003.

In the submission of Eduard Mc Whinney (2004), before the invasion United States presented a draft resolution to the UN Security Council that would legally permitted use of force and armed intervention against Iraq. U.S. demands had failed to rally enough advance commitments among Security Council members to secure its adoption if put to a vote. Earlier speculation on a possible veto by one or more of the remaining permanent members (France, Russia, and China) in the Security Council had become irrelevant, once it was apparent that the members were simply not there to secure passage of the resolution.

In the end, apart from U.S and Britain themselves, only Spain co-sponsored the US/Britain draft resolution, was assured of voting for it in the council. Equally irrelevant therefore, was a U.S/Britain fail safe strategy of counting on the “moral” if not legal persuasiveness of a simple majority of the council in the event of a permanent members veto. The U.S/Britain draft resolution was accordingly withdrawn after a heads of government meeting by its three sponsors on 17 March, had issued a communiqué warning president Saddam Hussein of Iraq, in language borrowed from the UN Security Council resolution 1441 of 8 November 2002, of “serious consequences” amounting to euphemistically to a

declaration for war against Iraq. For all practical purposes, the invasion of Iraq reduced to a coalition. Of the two main “Anglo-Saxon”, English speaking states; the U.S. and the Britain, without support of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

4.5 Where the World Stands on the Invasion of Iraq January 12, 2003.

According to a newspaper; The Observer (2003) the following were the reactions of different countries on the US invasion of Iraq:

India

India is adamant that the United States and Iraq abide by United Nation resolutions.

Iran

Iran is one of the Bush’s axes of evil states. Even so, Tehran has called on Iraq to admit weapons inspectors and comply with United Nation resolutions.

Canada

Defense minister John Mc Callum has affirmed support for U.S. led war and says the government may commit forces without United Nations authorization. He assured U.S. defense secretary Donald Rumsfeld Canada will be militarily involved if the Security Council approves an invasion.

Australia

The government of Australia is approaching the point of decision on participating in Iraq. But sources say that Australia will wait until the chief UN weapons inspector, Hans Blix, delivers his final report on 27 January, before making a commitment to go to war.

China

The Chinese are historically suspicious of any U.S. movement in the Middle East, but seek to improve relations with America are showing support for the Security Council vote. They officially backed the UN's decision on the Iraq situation, but would reluctantly support the US led war as the people fear terrorism even more.

Russia

The government of Russia is against a war in Iraq, Moscow said that multilateral attack against Iraq would be legitimate provided it had UN backing.

France

President Jacques Chirac calls for a diplomatic solution to the crisis. A survey indicates three-quarters of all French citizens oppose a war on Iraq.

Israel

Israel will support the United States if it attacks.

Germany

Chancellor Gerhard Schröder took a strong anti war stand during his campaign for re-election in September 2002, claiming that under his leadership Germany will not take part in a military intervention. Germany has granted U.S. forces the use of its bases and airspace in the event of war. But Germany will not become involved in military action.

Saudi Arabia

In an interview with the BBC in August, foreign minister prince Saud al-Faisal condemned the planned war and insisted that Iraq future must be determined by the people alone. He later stated that even if the UN passes a resolution authorizing the use of force, we hope a chance will be given to the Arabs states to find a political solution.

4.7 Problems of the United Nations

According to Anderson (1983:495) opined that after the establishment of the united nation the noble sentiments expressed in the introductory paragraphs of the charter once again involved the principle of international co-operation to keep the peace. Building upon the experience of the League of Nations, a concerted effort was made to construct a durable and practical organization to with stand the stress and strains of international politics. Subsequent events have proved that the machinery of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the

international court of Justice is adequate but that the spirit of the member Nations for its proper operation is lacking.

The greater power veto each major state pursues its vital interests, is primarily outside the framework of the United Nations. Members of the Security Council exercised the veto to prevent interferences with their programs and policy objectives; other tactics included refusal to assume assigned financial obligations for the UN projects, obstructionist procedural maneuvers, non-compliance with adopted policies and economic and military intervention in the affairs of the other states, contrary to the spirit of the UN charter.

Anderson (1983:495-496) also believed that there are a number of reasons why the United Nations has not lived up to the expectations of its devoted supporters: First, it is not an international government, and its members have been reluctant to accept group decisions that place limitation on their sovereignty or freedom of action. Before the Security Council can act decisively in substantive matters involving the use of sanctions and military force, the charter requires unanimity among its principal members, as initiated by the founding members. It has become difficult to achieve a working majority to endorse controversial policies and to sort out the wide variety of conflicting interests. Solutions to problems are stalemated by the lack of unanimity among members.”

The above analysis can be justified by the submission of Charles Burton (1965:117), by the practical activities of the U.S. within the international community in which he said:

The hegemonic position of the United States was the main political circumstance affecting the United Nations as it emerged into reality. In this phase the U.S. turned significantly to frameworks of action outside the United Nations. It renounced the United Nations relief and rehabilitation Administration as a channel of assistance abroad-thereby recovering control of its aid as an instrument of policy. It moved on to imaginative undertakings for bolstering Greece and Turkey against communist penetration and for the economic rehabilitation of Western and Central Europe. It adopted a program for military strengthening of areas under communist pressure. As a matter of high importance, the United States turned to the creation of structures of collaboration for security apart from the United Nations-First, with the North Atlantic treaty organization, an updated counter part of Wilson's abandoned project to contract the United States into the security of Western Europe.

Also in a similar argument cited by Rengger (1995:404), submitted that:

The United States hegemony was operative during the Iraq invasion of Kuwait in 1990 is within as well "outside" the United Nations. The United

States turned to the Security Council, first, and the General Assembly trying to bring back the once lost sovereignty of Kuwait, also with the support of 28 countries and to set up a legitimate government of AL Sabah in Kuwait after the withdrawal of the Iraqi Forces. The United States carries the “operation Desert Storm” outside the framework of the United Nations by use of a so-called “Baira patrol”, a term borrowed from Britain to deter sanctions-breaking over Rhodesia in 1966-68 had the approval of the Security Council, but was mounted as an operation independently of it.

The above mentioned problems are the products of American attitude in the United Nations as one of the founding members state unfortunately, a major violator of the UN charter.

It is to the US belief that in any case, American policy cannot continue to be crippled by a misguided insistence on unanimity in the UN Security Council.

Dr. Mahathir in citizen (1992:22) mentioned that because of the nature of United Nations problems if international democracy, as represented by the UN, is to be meaningful and effective; there must be an infusion of some of the current ideas and realities. The world needs policing, as the Gulf War demonstrated to us. But are we to have a police force that is beholden to this august body the UN?

Police action by the UN needs to be governed by principles and rules. But can our conscience remain clear if a whole nation is starved into submission? He also asked this question: is the Geneva Convention still relevant in the conduct of war? The UN, which is playing the role of inspector in Iraq, should extend that role to see the destruction of all nuclear weapons everywhere. More, it should suppress the invention and production of other diabolical weapons. Weapons for defense should be solely for defense, and their capabilities must be such as to prevent them from being used as weapons of aggression except in a limited way. Research into new weapons by all nations should be reduced and no weapons should be sold by anyone without permit issued by the UN. Anything that goes beyond domestic process should merit UN intervention if a request is made. Today developed nations consider it their right to tell us how to rule our country. They are helped by the Western media, which also consider it their duty to tell us how to run our country. All these combine to make independence (sovereignty) almost meaningless. Our only hope lies in the democratization of the UN especially as the option to defect to the other side is no longer available to us. We want to remain independent, but we also want to conform to international norms as determined not by some NGOs (non Governmental Organizations) or the so called advanced democracies, but

all the nations of the world. If we default, then it is the UN and not some Robin Hoods which should chastise us”.

Similarly, Gaddafi in Daily Trust (2009) slams the Security Council in his First UN visit. Libyan leader Gaddafi issued a slashing attack on the Security Council and chastised the world body for failing to intervene or prevent some sixty five wars since the UN was founded in 1945. Gaddafi called for reform of the council – abolishing the veto power of the five permanent members or expanding the body with additional members to make it more representative.

According to him, it should not be called the Security Council, it should be called the “terror council” because the veto – wielding Security Council members treat smaller countries as “second class, despised nations”. Now there is no respect for the United Nations, no regard for the General Assembly; Gaddafi also railed against the inequality of UN member states quoting from a copy of the UN charter that calls for equality of Nations, and then noting, that the five Nations holding veto can block actions contrary to their interests. Gaddafi said the use of military power was contrary to the spirit of the UN, unless such actions are sanctioned by the United Nations. The powerful states in the contemporary world would continue to take advantage of small and weak states by the display of military power to the detriment of their respective sovereignties.

4.8 Research Findings.

One of the important finding of this research is that the official reasons behind the U.S. invasion as a motive for the Iraqi war, was a perceived threat posed by Saddam's alleged nuclear Programme and the possibility that he would pass along those weapons to Alqa'eda. Secondly, liberating Iraq from then tyranny of Hussein, particularly unforgiving and blood thirsty version of his Baath government. Thirdly, it was also discovered that the war turned out to be a personality conflict between the two leaders; George W. Bush and Saddam Hussein, which had begun in 1991 and/or avenge his father for an attempt against Bush senior in Kuwait after the Iraqi invasion. Fourthly, there is also the question of Oil. There was a claim that the administration of George W. Bush was desperate to gain access to Iraq's oil that has long been denied it access as a result of UN sanction prohibiting business between U.S. companies and Iraq. Fifthly, the invasion serve as a deterrence to those lesser powers that challenging U.S. could well prove counter-productive to long-term interest, indeed a demonstration of such could be the fastest way to formalized a new international order based on the overwhelming military power of the United States.

It was also discovered in this research that the invasion had compromised Iraq's internal sovereignty into sectarian conflict which led to the disintegration of national unity and cohesion in Iraq. It is pertinent

to note that the country had fallen into a chaotic situation, whereby Iraq was divided into three regions; the south dominated by the Shi'ite, the central party by the Sunnis and the north by the Kurds, which is affecting the U.S. itself and creating outstanding changes in the face of the region and the world at large.

Secondly, in human terms, it was the loss of life and the destruction of Iraqi. Society that is the most gregarious. Meanwhile, cost continues to mount for the Iraqi people and their economy. For most Iraqis, daily life has unbearable to the point that those who can afford to leave their country have done so. By September 2007, a stunning 4.6 million people of every seven Iraqis had been uprooted from their homes. This is the largest migration of people in the Middle East since the creation of Israel in 1948.

Thirdly, in 2003, in spite of a near quadrupling of oil prices; that at least, one four Iraqi's are un-employed, oil export have dropped and leave yet to recover to their pre-war level.

However, it was also a finding of this research that the invasion had impacted so much on the external sovereignty of Iraq. The invasion has compromised Iraq's external sovereignty under the influence of outside forces e.g. the Shi'ite group inside Iraq were backed by Iran, while the Sunnis were backed by the Saudi Arabian government. And it becomes difficult to contain within the borders of Iraq.

Secondly, the situations in Syria are already shaping events in Iraq. The overthrow of the Shi'ite Assad regime and the advent of a majority Sunni government would bolster the Iraqi drive for autonomy and perhaps lead to their integration into a Sunni-dominant Syria. Alternatively, Iraq Shi'ite may come down hard on the Sunni's and drive large numbers of them into Syria where they may gladly help, to overthrow the Shi'ite regime there. And the Saudi's will be eager to assist in their scenario.

It was also discovered in this research the only benefit of the U.S. in this war was getting rid of Saddam Hussein and the death of Ba'ath government. The cost to the American government outweighed the benefit. It was estimated that the total budgetary and economic cost to the United States turned out to be around \$3 million dollars. Bush and his advisers expected a quick, inexpensive conflict. Instead, U.S. has a war that costed more than anyone could have imagined. The Iraq war had costed upward of \$400,000 dollars per troop. And the price in blood has been paid by U.S. military and by hired contractors offering different services in Iraq. The price in treasure has, in a sense, been financed entirely by borrowing.

Secondly, in global terms, the jump in oil prices since the start of the war dwarf all the other economic costs. The higher oil prices assured in our moderate scenario represent a direct cost to the world economy of

approximately \$1.1 trillion dollars, taking into account the macro economic repercussions.

Other global cost to the United States: Those who have gained are, by and large dictators in the oil producing countries-including some who have been quite open about using their increased wealth to advance an agenda that is anti-American and in some cases anti-Western.

However, it was the dream of the U.S. invaders to create a stable prosperous and democratic Middle East. But America's intervention in Iraq had laid foundation for the opposite result and the consequences of America's Iraqi venture for global peace and security extend beyond the Middle East. The impact of the invasion has helped feed extremism throughout the Islamic world and beyond. This growth of extremism has made the task of leaders in moderate Islamic publics all the more difficult.

It was also discovered in this research that the United Nations does not lived up to the expectations of its members, it seems that powerful states like the U.S does not accept group interest that placed limitations on the their sovereignty and national interest. Sometimes the U.S acted within and outside the framework of the United Nations. It is to the U.S belief that in any case, American policy cannot continue to be crippled by a misguided insistence on unanimity in the Security Council. Therefore, UN failed to control the US action against Iraq.

Finally, the U.S. invasion had dramatically changed American picture globally. The favourable ratings of America are now lower in twenty-six of thirty-three countries surveyed by the Pew Research center. The situation has worsened in most Muslim countries in the Middle East, Asia, and even among historically steadfast U.S. allies. Confidence in President Vladimir Putin's leadership exceeded that of President Bush in Canada, Britain, Germany and France.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Introduction

This chapter attempts to summarize, conclude and make recommendations on what has been done in the previous chapters. As we all know, the whole work embodied on the study of the concept of sovereignty in international politics, Iraq as a case study.

5.2 Summary of the Research

Chapter one of this research discusses the background to the study. The basic arguments arising from the problem of the study can therefore be summed up in the following phrases:

September 11, terror attack has changed the idea of traditional concept of sovereignty. The war against Iraq by the US became inevitable because of allegation against Iraq of its connection to Al-Qaeda a terrorist organization. Therefore the research focused on the impact of the United States invasion on Iraq's sovereignty.

Secondly it is clear that given the nature of the substance of the study, the use of the realist theory, offers greater possibility for deeper appreciation and understanding of the concept of sovereignty in international politics.

Thirdly, from the view of existing literature on the subject matter of the study in chapter two, it is clear that most of the works have pointed out the fact that sovereignty in the contemporary unipolar world can only be related to the might of security and military capability of a state to defend itself against external aggression.

The subsequent chapters in this study focus on the following issues. Chapter three discusses Iraq brief political history as the study area and chapter four discusses the analysis and interpretation of data and findings of the study. In Chapter four an analysis was made of the controversial debate on the reasons behind the US invasion of Iraq in 2003. The emotions, sentimental outbursts and ironies that characterized the debate are brought to fore and finally the discussion of findings.

And chapter five contains the summary, conclusion of the study. Some recommendations for policy considerations are also suggested in this chapter.

5.3 Conclusion

In conclusion the concept of National sovereignty in today's world contravenes the traditional conception of sovereignty and international law. It is purely bent on the National interest, of the U.S.A.

National interest in many cases is the interest of a selected group of national leaders.

This simply tells us that the invasion of Iraq by America and British government was purely based on their national interest. All nation states are interested in self-preservation, e.g. national security as well as stability of the being, economic stability, the fight against inflation, the fight against unemployment, against exploitation and against unfavourable trade relations with others.

It is these factors that nations use against each other in order to revamp their national economies. This can therefore be true of the U.S.A. to turn deaf ear on the utterances of the UN together with Britain and went ahead with whatever, to masterminded and to accomplished its national interest in Iraq.

Unfortunately, the perpetrators of these international laws and the concept of sovereignty, viz; U.S.A. Britain, have Kicked against the very concept they have defined in favour of their national interests. In essence, sovereignty means having sophisticated weapons to counter any nation, then, that nation can maintain peace and tranquility in its territory and beyond.

U.S.A. has the guts to invade Iraq because of its military might in spite of calls from the UN not to do so, yet it did unperturbed by the U.N. so it means U.S. is another United Nations and vice versa. Mass

destruction of weapons was undertaken in Iraq and in all the nine places which the late President Saddam had built. But that did not satisfy U.S.A and British, where in now lies the concept of sovereignty as postulated by Hans Morgenthau and his colleagues?

Might is right and might is sovereign as we are forced to put it these days. One can see that immediately after the fall of Iraq, Libya which had a radical leader and was always at logger heads with U.S.A invited the UN to come and inspect a company in his country which was accused of building weapons of mass destructions. He did this because just as the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, was a warning to Tokyo, so was the invasion of Iraq a warning to Libya.

All nations are therefore; out to value weapons of mass destruction in order to protect their territorial integrity for without it a nation is not sovereign.

In a nutshell, the concept of sovereignty in the new-world order turns to means a different thing i.e. in simple term, a nation is sovereign if only it can boast its military power.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad Ali and Dahr Jamail, (2007) "Iraq Slashes Food Rations, Putting Lives at Risk", Inter Press service.
- Andrew Kohut (2007) "America's Image in the World". Findings from the Pew Global Attitudes Project" Sub-Committee on International Organizations, Human Rights, & Oversight.
- Anne Applebram (2007) "Why They Don't Like Us", The Washington Post, October, 2nd.
- Ajene, O. (1987), Nigeria's African policy since independence An Analysis of the character and conduct of foreign policy in Nigeria alternatives Department of political science, ABU, Zaria, Gaskiya corporation Zaria.
- Amin, Samir, (2007), "*U.S. Imperialism, Europe, and the Middle East*". International relations geostrategy and Middle East affairs journal.
- Greene et al (1983), Introduction to political science Mc Graw Hill incorporation USA.
- Brent, Scowcroft 2002, "*Don't attack Saddam*" published and appeared in the wall street journal.
- Bryle, Frances A. 1992 "*International War crimes the search for justice.*" To a law symposium., held on February 27th .
- Bush declaration on States: an article March 19, 2003. (internet).

Bilmes, L. (2007) Soldiers Returning from Iraq & Afghanistan: The Long-term Cost of Providing Veterans Medical Care & Disability Benefits Kennedy School of Govt. faculty Research Working Paper RWP07-001, Harvard University.

Belasco, (2007). Statement Before the House Budget Committee Hearing on the Growing Cost of the Iraq War.

CBO Report (2007) "The All-Volunteer Military: Issues and Performance:

Veterans Benefits Administration, Annual Benefits Report, Fiscal year 2005.

Camilleri, J.A and Falk, J (1992) The End of Sovereignty.

Vincent, A. (1987) Theories of the State. Oxford.

Charles, Burton M. 1965. The Exercise of Sovereignty Papers on Foreign Policy, John Hopkins Press, Baitimore, Marry Land, USA.

Daily Trusts Wednesday, February 24, 2010, "*Latin American and Carribean Nations Backed Argentina's claim of Sovereignty over Farklands Island*".

Donald, Kagan and Garry, Schmitt (1997), "*Rebuilding America's Defences, Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century*".

Encyclopedia Britannica on line, (2007) "U.S. war in Iraq, 2003"

Encyclopedia Britannica, on line 2007 George W Bush (2002), "*New Threats Requires New Thinking*": June 1st, speech to the

graduating class at the United States Military Academy at West point New York.

Haas, Richard (2006) "Sovereignty and globalization". Council on Foreign relations. An article.

Haas, Richard (2008), "*Huckabe Exposed as new World order puppet.*" National Exposition.

Hencrich Der Glikezere (1967), Chambers encyclopedia New revised edition, Pergaman press, London.

Holsti, K.J. (1972) "International politics" A framework for analysis. (second edition), prentice-hall Inc. U.S.A.

Izah, Paul (1984), Empirical political research method, Longman.

Jennifer Pagonis, UNHCR New Release: The Iraq Situation: UNHCR Cautious About Returns." November, 23 2007.

Joe Sestak (2006)."Iraq and the Golbal War on Terror, at [http//www.sestakforcongress.com](http://www.sestakforcongress.com).

Journal of Risk and Uncertainty (2006) Vol. No. 9 No. 1

Joyner, C.C.(2005) International Law in the 21st Century: Rules for Global Governance Oxford.

Lemann, Nicholas (2002), "*The Next World Order*" An article Published in the New Yorker on April 14th

Letter to Bill Clinton, January 26, (1998) Project of the New American century: "*remove Saddam Husein from power.*"

- Mc Whinney Edward, (2003), *"The U.S./British Invasion of Iraq and the United Nations charter prohibition of the use of force "*. The paradox of unintended consequences.
- Michael, KLare T. (2003), *"Deciphering the Bush Administrations Motives"*. Issue on foreign policy in focus of the Atomic scientific Bulletin, University of Massachusetts, U.S.A.
- Moammar Gaddafi, *"An address to the United Nations General Assembly"*. Daily Trust Thursday, September 24th 2009.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. (1967), *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Fifth Edition, Revised (New York) Alfred A. Knopf.
- Muhammad, Mahathir, (1991), *"New World Order prey, hegemony or domination."* An Address to the 46th session of the United Nations G.A Sept. 24th Citizens Magazine, 2009.
- Naomi Klein, (2005), *"Baghdad Year Zero."* Pillagin Iraq in pursuit of a neocon utopia Harpe's magazine.
- Office of the UN High Commission on Refuges, "UN-HCR Double Budget for Iraq Operations", New Release, July, 12 2007. <http://www.unher.org>.
- O'Hanlon and Campbell (2007) Iraq Index December, 3rd. WHO, Epidemic and Pandemic Alert and Response Report Cholera in Iraq" Update 3, 2007. <http://www.who.int/crs/don>
- Palm, D.P (2005), *International Relations*, New Delhi A.I.T.B.S publishers.

Peace keeping. From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Wikipedia.org

Pervez, Hood Hoy (2003), "America's Dreams of Empire." Published in on January 26, in the Los Angeles Times.

Rengger, N.J. (1995), *Treaties and Alliances of the world*, Sixth edition carter mil publishing, London.

Rourke, J.T. (2005), "International politics on the World stage" (tenth edition). Mcgraw-Hill companies, Inc. New York.

Roy Arundahati (2002), "*War are never fought for altruistic reasons*" published on September 27th 2002, Guardian, London.

Stiglitz Joseph, (2009). *The Three Trillion Dollar War: The True Cost of the Iraq Conflict*.

Shehu, Samaila (2007), "Broadcasting and Class Conflict in Nigeria: A Study of the Viscisitudes of Radio Kaduna. Phd Thesis (unpublished), Department of political science, ABU, Zaria.

The Analysis Magazine, Vol.N0.3. September, 2003.

The observer, January 12th 2003, "*Where the World stands on an invasion of Iraq.*"

United Nations General Assembly 9 December, 1981. " Declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention.

Webb, G. 1998, *the principles of Research method in technical studies*.

Ziring, I. et al (2005) The United Nations: International organization and world practices (fourth edition). Wadsworth Learning, Belmont, U.S.A.