

Post 2003's War: US' Failure in Political and Economic Restructure of Iraq

Enas AL.Yasiry * A

^A University of Warsaw, Poland

Received: October 01, 2020 | **Revised:** October 24, 2020 | **Accepted:** October 31, 2020

DOI: 10.33445/sds.2020.10.5.1

Abstract

The key purpose of this article is to understand the proclaimed purpose of the US invasion of Iraq and subsequently analyze Americans promises to build new infrastructure and develop a new economy of the country. By discussing the steps taken by the US government after the invasion of Iraq towards restructuring and reconstruction of the country, the author defined reasons for the American failure in restructuring of the state. The qualitative methods of research was employed to analyze the failure of the United States in the political and economic restructuring of Iraq. The data was collected from different sources including scientific journals, research papers and articles published by the different websites. This paper concludes that war cannot be summarized as a humanitarian intervention. Especially invasion of a country without UN's Security Council's approval itself creates doubt on the legitimacy of the political reforms and economic restructure of the invaded country. Author verified that beside the post 2003 complex political situation in Iraq, the American intervention brought the country's economy back to the zero point.

Key words: US, Iraq, intervention, political, economic, infrastructure.

Introduction

United States occupied Iraq in order to topple the Saddam's regime in 2003. Additionally, apparently declared aim of the invasion which took place under the excuse of weapons of mass destruction, was to make political reforms and rebuild the economic infrastructure of Iraq. It was seemingly planned to introduce modern democratic system and develop a new economy in the country, but the declared intentions were not fulfilled in the war turned land. In spite of enormous military success, US failed to implement its entire plan of development of Iraq after dissolution of the Saddam's regime. The invasion had diversely outcome, such as crippling of military forces of Iraq, massive religious encounters, religious and cultural partitions between different segments of the society particularly different sects of the Muslims, creation of Sunni militancy, and the formation of continued warfare. Even, the fights

took place between US and its allies on one side and Islamist militant forces on other side after invasion of Iraq in 2004-2010. Even though the United States conquered the radicals in the west of Iraq with the assistance of Iraqi Sunni prevalent militaries, it remained unsuccessful to create a strong economy and a stable government in Iraq. Eventually the US had to abandon its efforts in mid-way of Iraqi state-building in post 2009 period and extracted its troops from Iraq after 2011. This created a vacuum of control that exposed Iraq to radical forces like Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). In this entire period, the US could not create any dynamic plan to handle the civil war and stabilize Iraq but instability encourage ISIS – trusting deeply on Kurds from Syria in the route and in 2016-2018 scored added success by terminating the caliphate of ISIS (Ishiguro, K., 2017).

* **Corresponding author:** Doctoral Candidate, Faculty of Political Science and International Studies, e-mail: enasalyasiry2020@yahoo.com

The main purpose of this study is to first understand the proclaimed determination of the US invasion of Iraq and secondly to define reasons for its failure in political and economic developments of the country. This paper discusses the key steps and development initiatives adopted by US in Iraq in order to rebuild infrastructure and develop a new economy and improve the capability of security force. In light of such claims, a question arose that whether the invasion can be called a humanitarian intervention, or it was an intentional war for oil? By analyzing the incidents took place after the US invasion of Iraq in March 2003, the article identifies post invasion American failure in political and economic restructure of Iraq.

This article discusses whether the US was successful in its efforts to rebuild the economy of the country. The author explains the steps taken by the US government after the invasion towards restructuring and reconstruction of Iraq and as well as reasons of the failure have been also discussed by the author. The article endeavors to answer the question that what were the consequences of this invasion and why the target of rebuilding the economy and a democratic system in Iraq could not achieved?

At the end, the article gives conclusions that the war missed most of the presumptions that it could have been a humanitarian intervention. In essence the UN Security Council was never consulted, while making the intervention in Iraq. It can perhaps be concluded that overthrowing the Saddam rule of Iraq was perceived as having done some good but the war cannot be summarized as a humanitarian intervention. Invasion of a country without UN's Security Council's approval itself creates doubt on the

legitimacy of the political reforms and economic restructure of the invaded country. Secondly, the claim of US' intelligence was incorrect as there were never weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

The basic excuse exploited by the US for invasion of Iraq was to abolish weapons of mass destruction and as well as to cease the Saddam Hussein's regime in order free the Iraqi people from his authoritarian rule. The importance of this topic is clear from the fact that the world has changed since the Iraq's invasion. On March 20, 2003, the so-called Iraqi freedom process formally initiated but it is the most questionable endeavor today. The US positioned thousands of Marines to topple the Saddam's government and free the people of Iraq from his dictatorship.

This article provides a comparative review of the literature of pre-war, middle of war and post-war Iraq in order to highlight the significance of the topic. The U.S. in the initial initiative established an expressive strategy overtime to deal with the economic and political emergencies in Iraq and later it also adopted a plan to tackle the violent group Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and other related challenges. In this advancement, it cracked Syria to Iran, Hezbollah, and Russia. Though, the U.S. was capable to reconstruct moderately official militaries in Iraq, it even permitted Iran in creating an influential Popular Mobilization Force (PMF) tied to Iranian inspiration but finally, the United States was unsuccessful in transpiring any real political and economic development in Iraq or in ensuring that the war affected regions of the country could be reconstructed or gained any considerable support (Salmon, A., 2010).

Material and methods

The following research questions were generated in order to find answers about real purpose of the U.S. invasion of Iraq and reasons for the American failure in political and economic restructure of Iraq:

1. Was liberal project proposed by United State failed in Iraq after 2003 era?
2. Were the U.S. motives behind the military intervention in Iraq in 2003 more than what was apparently proclaimed?

3. Was the liberal project really aimed to set up democratic and pluralistic political system and market economy?

4. Was the larger objective to break down Saddam Hussein's rule and as well as control the militant group Al Qaeda?

5. What was the prime intention of controlling Iraq to take control of the world's second-largest oil reserves existed in the country?

6. Had U.S. also wanted to demonstrate its power to its opponents in the regional scenario?

These above questions were helpful in verifying following main hypotheses formulated in the study:

i. US failed in political and economic rebuilding of post war Iraq because real attention of U.S. invasion was to control Iraq having world's second-largest oil reserves.

ii. Constant complex security situation including challenges like Al Qaeda and ISIS in the post Saddam's era caused hurdles in political and economic rebuilding of Iraq.

To arrive at a wise conclusion, the issue was probed from different political, legal and economic dimensions. The qualitative methods including process-tracing method and comparative method, were employed. The process-tracing method is used to analyze the process of developments causing invasion of Iraq and chains of the events after the invasion of Iraq.

The comparative method was employed to compare the developments in the different periods after the Iraq invasion. Primary and secondary data were used in this article.

Invasion of Iraq by the United States can be understood through the rational choice approach, according to which an individual behavior is motivated by self-interest, utility maximization, or, more simply put, goal fulfillment. The approach of "political change" which means the change in governmental setup, can be also understood much broader – then it is also about the developments of different political processes – in the case of this research change of regime in Iraq through invasion of the country and its impact on the political and economic structure of the state. Through this action, U.S. engaged its military power against the Saddam's regime and the religious militant groups such as Al Qaeda and 'ISIS', in light of the realist concept of states maintaining their national security and economic interests by use of force in order to protect their security influence and material interests. The neorealist assumption of military actions of the states seeking at least their survival is also a key motivation behind the US' offensive behavior in Iraq for safeguarding its national political, military and economic interests from the threats of Saddam's regime to its interests in the region and as well threats from religious militancy supported by Al Qaeda and 'ISIS'.

Results and discussion

Iraq has been always an important country for the American interests in the region. Though, the bilateral relations were wounded by some controversial policies of Saddam's regime in the region but after war of 2003, once again Iraq became important U.S. ally in the region.

Iraq as an autonomous partner state

The United States had already lost excessive ground in the Gulf and Iraq, however, it had to make timely decisions to save the backlash from the world and criticism from a large majority of its people. It was important for the U.S. to stay involved in Iraq in particular and Gulf in general. Total withdrawal from Iraq meant surrendering to radicalism, civil fights, and war struggle between

rival countries.

The option of war for the U.S. were not very good for the effective implementation of its strategies but it was considered necessary at that time. It was also a thought that any erratic change in the internal affairs of any given state in the Middle East could have caused the uncontrollable balance in the region. For example, states like Lebanon, Yemen, Libya, and Syria have encountered several catastrophes. At the same time, U.S. possesses its strategic interests in all of these states. Other American associates like Egypt, Jordan, and Morocco have also unique importance, however, they were not facing an identical amount of uncertainty and threats.

For securing interests in the Gulf region, the strategic importance of Iraq for U.S. was phenomenal; in confronting radicalism and Iran, and in guaranteeing the constant exports of petroleum products to meet the mounting requirements of the international economy. It was also a crucial attention of the United States along with its allies to stop Iraq from getting into a state where it becomes too weak in Gulf and to be overtaken by Iran. The Gulf's complete safety has not been simply achieved by the efforts of the United States alone. To secure its purpose, the US has to make continued efforts in the Gulf, so the region can maintain its strategic importance.

A strong and united Iraq is not only the greatest applied protection against local radicalism, it also acts as an important barrier that restricts the threats such as rising influence of Iran, which is more important for the United States. Other American strategic allies in the region; the Arabian Peninsula and Israel will also be protected comparatively. Regardless of the absence of any strong policy by the White House, the U.S. army has taken many necessary steps to protect its interests and prevent any threat from Iran. ISIS and radicalism will remain to be continuing danger however not to the worry that would need any amount of new devotion by the U.S. *in case of Iraq being* proficient in battling extra partition among Shi'ites and Sunnis in the era of growing radicalism.

Iraq needs to pull off from battle against ISIS and is faced with constant cultural and religious disturbances created due to the invasion of the United States and the removal of Saddam in absence of his suitable substitute. Though, the Iraqi economy and the political arrangement are being rebuilt by the United States over time, but the completion of this process will take years. A security structure should be built to match Iraq's civil progress so it can make the country independent and resilient enough to protect the entire region of Gulf and the wider organization of the Middle East. None of the existing US's strategic allies like Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait, the UAE, Bahrain, Oman, and even Jordan could so far perform a considerable job. Only a sturdy and united Iraq can protect itself and attend to its political and economic wellbeing. According to the

literature available, Iraqi security, which has a broader importance, must be put in the priority (Cordesman, H. A., & Hwang, G., 2020). Not only U.S. can use Iraq's territory as an autonomous partner in order to deal with Iran's influence while Iraq can also protect its borders from terrorist attack, and to spend much of the budget to fight the domestic terrorism.

Iraq's strategically important for US as an ally

The United States had failed to meet its grand strategic objectives in the region, which led the superpower to intervene Iraq, terminate the Saddam regime and to protect its interests in Middle East. Most of the agreements with the post Saddam Iraqi governments also emphasize to protect U.S. interests in the Middle East, help the Iraqi people stand on their own, and reinforce Iraqi sovereignty (Bush, G., n.d) in the post Iraqi invasion by U.S., neither it been successful in making substantial efforts to create stability in Iraq, nor the post war era shows its constant presence in the best interests of Iraq. The U.S. Department of Defense has quoted that it has spent over 750 billion US dollars on the Iraq conflict and the fight against ISIS (as of March 31, 2019). Though, there is no clear way of calculating upcoming the State's USAID spending, but it is believed to be another 100 billion dollars (Cordesman, H. A., 2020).

It is also fact that U.S. has considered Iraq as the potential ally in Middle East due to its largest oil reserves. Second, U.S. also wanted to counter Iran by using Iraq. According to an article, "from the viewpoint of the United States, the priorities are to contain or eliminate the rest of ISIS and to limit Iran's role in Iraq," (Cordesman, H. A., & Hwang, G., 2020). For that, America always desires a pro-Western government in Iraq. America installed and overthrew subsequent Iraqi governments on the pretext of their pro-west and anti-west attitude, respectively. As soon as the United States of America recognized Iraq as an independent and sovereign state, the diplomatic relationships between both the countries were established (Cordesman, H. A., 2020).

The Anglo-American-Iraqi convention was signed on January 9, 1930, which solidified the fragile base of American-Iraq relationship. In fact, after the series of misunderstandings and conflicts

between both the countries, they still consider each other as strategic partners. The American military and political involvement might have weakened the string of relationship yet the surface relation show that both the countries share mutual and deep-rooted relationship post Iraqi invasion by America. U.S. has been feeding the mouths of security forces of Iraq and is providing them sufficient aid, which has reestablished the fractured relationship between the two nations. Moreover, America uses the Iraqi military bases to operate from Middle East and also provide annual training to security forces in Iraq (Sassoon, J., 2019).

As an ally of Iraq, U.S. was concerned that the Soviet Union might attempt to install communism in Iraq, the former formed a Special Committee on Iraq (SCI) in 1959 to protect the country from communist overtake. Thus, the Qasim's administration along with U.S. fought the communism by undertaking some repressive measures. As an ally of Iraq, U.S. provided political, militaristic and economic support to Iraq in the Iran-Iraq war (BRANDS, H., & PALKKI, D. 2012). At that time, the domestic protests regarding the Iraqi use of biological and chemical weapons in U.S. were put to aside by America. U.S. provided military intelligence to Iraq to fight effectively with Iran. It was by that time, when America realized that Iraq is the potential competitor of Iran and can hence act as American partner in the Middle East to prevent Iran to gain regional dominance. Iraq has successfully provided US with multiple economic incentives such as allowing it to exploit Iraqi Petroleum Company through its commercialization. It would not be wrong to assert that Iraq serves USA's vital interests in Middle East. But it is also the true fact that international relations are not permanent and change with the course of time given the change in country's interest. The change in priorities of both countries and Iraq's non-compliance to American interests made U.S. to incur sufficient losses on Iraq, which was formally actualized in 2003 as American Invasion of Iraq ((Sassoon, J., 2019).

The recent Iraqi reaction to the U.S. military strikes in Iraq and the attacks on the U.S. embassy in Baghdad is a warning sign that the United States

is on the edge of accepting defeat from the jaws of "victory" since 2003. A strong and independent Iraq is extremely crucial for the U.S., so it needs to come to terms with the fact that its main goal is to support Iraq to be strong and self-reliant. If the U.S. aims is making Iraq as its strategic partner in Gulf, than it needs to meet the expectations of the people of Iraq. The policymakers must recognize that the goal to combat the outside forces such as the Iranian security interferences is bigger than less critical ambition to form a partnership with Iraq. Similarly, the United States needs to recognize that stability in Iraq and its importance as an oil power and its role in stable oil exports to the world is more crucial than US-Iraq strategic partnership.

Economic obstacles after the intervention and its impact on Iraq

Iraq has been suffering from three major problems for years, which is the reason for its current feeble economic situation. First is the legacy of the Baath Party that ruled Iraq over the past long years until the fall of Saddam, the second is the U.S. occupation of Iraq, and the third is the absence of a proper approach and economic vision of the contemporary rulers.

The Iraq economy entered a new phase after the 1991 war in which Kuwait was liberated by the forces of an international coalition led by the United States of America and then Iraq returned to rebuild its infrastructure as it was destroyed industrially, agriculture, educational and environmentally and particularly It was witness of economic backwardness completely. The Iraqi government before 2003 was about to fall and the Americans came and brought it down easily, but unfortunately, they did not overthrew the government alone, but rather the Iraqi state system completely. Although, Americans came in Iraq for their interests, but they created a vacuum that they invested in directing everything in the direction they want. As other countries have interests in the region, America has also an essential competing interest in Iraq (Cordesman, H. A. 2018).

The Americans were not ready only to liberate the Iraqis, but they preferably waged war for their own interests, as they knew that huge Iraqis reserves of crude oil were undiscovered and

undeclared, so it is known that Iraq is as a lake of oil. It will be the last country to produce oil when other countries stop. As a result, Iraq has turned into a rentier and consumer state that is more backward than before and neither production, no industry, nor agriculture in it, as the crude oil money returns to pockets of those who paid it to Iraq as a value for goods that Iraq imports because all kinds of goods even milk, water, vegetables and fruits were being imported.

The situation resulted into an economically backward country that is completely dependent on the outside, and unfortunately the trends of the Iraqis who came to power after 2003 also went in the same direction, as the state is based on sale of oil and importing needs, and they have no real interest in agriculture and industry. These trends led to lack of capital accumulation weak growth, very wide un-employment, poverty and continued dependency and exposure to the outside. Therefore, Iraq in order to renew and revive its economy, its needs at least 20 years and enormous financial resources. What is in the place in terms of programs and laws that are announced, doesn't mean anything politics and economics are linked and must be compatible and when politics in Iraq is in its current state and with this tension cannot develop the economy.

In post-war state like Iraq, traditional form of infrastructural and economic development efforts has been insufficient. The basic goals of traditional assistance include economic growth, increased competition, and self-sufficiency of individuals and businesses but these goals are not easily achievable in an economy emerging from war. In countries like Iraq where security is lacking, the prime goal of developmental efforts is to reduce conflict. In other words, stabilization must be achieved before other development efforts can take off. The US-funded economic programs had their focus on "market-driven" efficiency instead of elimination of conflict. Hence it is obvious that the goal of economic development cannot be achieved in a region where there is widespread fear, militancy and instability (Mashatt, M., & Crum, J., 2008). The United States needs to appraise its strategic thinking methods to form a policy that enables a fair positioning of Iraq as an authority in world oil exports. Furthermore, the

economic development and strength of the emerging world still remains reliant on fossil fuels, and energy exports from the Gulf for the next decade or so. It means Iraq can be benefitted from the situation but should also develop its other economic sectors because economic development of a country needs development of all concerned areas of the economy.

Multidimensional problems of Iraq

Solving the Iraqi problem is much more than dealing with the aftermath of war and the remains of ISIS and other interim challenges. American author Anthony H. Cordesman in his article describes, "Iraq faces deep structural problems with factors like hyper urbanization, inefficient institutions, increased water and climate problems, breakdown of physical infrastructure, and high population growth," (Cordesman, H. A., 2020). The unintended consequences of U.S. intervention have created multidimensional problems for the country. Iraq not only needs to recuperate from the fight against ISIS but also from severe ethnic and sectarian commotions that resulted due to the removal of Saddam without a proper strategy to replace him.

The United Nations' assistance mission also known as UNAMI was aimed to evaluate the implications of the American airstrikes on the Iraqi territory. After a series of interviews and data gathering by the UN team, a report was issued in 2007 (Cordesman, H. A., 2020). The report signifies that the U.S. military had violated the human rights conventions and bombed several civilian areas in Iraq. The UNAMI, therefore, demanded an independent investigation into the matter and as well as asked the likely report of the impartial investigation should be made public. The UN also sent its mission in Cambodia which achieved many desired results in comparison to the Iraqi mission. In the words of Judy L. Ledgerwood who served in the UN education section, "the most successful step taken by UN was the election operation and setting up of radio system in Cambodia". While he said, "the least successful was the undisciplined civilian police force", (Caroline, H., 1996). The mission also boosted economic infusion and repatriation. Thousands of refugees that had earlier migrated to Thailand were sent back home and they received tools, supplies and money and

in some cases land as well to rebuilt their source of earnings. The large injection of capital from UN mission, supported the Cambodian economy to a large extent (Caroline, H., 1996). But the different between these two missions to Iraq and to Cambodia is that this mission (in Cambodia) made a good work in the context of reconstruction and rebuilding the economy and infrastructure, on the contrary in Iraq, the mission could not work as they planned it. Many reasons that made the mission in Iraq not to complete all commitments are also included weakness of the state in successfully dealing with the terrorism and installing of the new governmental system. It was despite that role of UN in Iraq was encouraged in the post invasion of Iraq era even by the U.S. government. Then American President George Bush in his address at that time also called on the UN to increase its role in Iraq in three ways, (a) facilitating a role with the neighboring countries, (b) encourage a discussion among internal political fractions in Iraq, and (c) increase the presence of UN officials in Iraq (Howard, L., 2007).

Iraq's crises and UN's role

The United Nations (UN) must not be seen as acting in the interest of the United States, instead, it should work on the bilateral rearrangement between Iraq and the U.S. in order to implement a viable peaceful solution in Iraq. With this in mind, the article discusses a couple of possible roles for the UN in Iraq. First is, brokering a political settlement between the two countries and secondly, if it fails to reach a settlement then it should propose a political solution to contain the war. Without these goals, the UN's contribution in the construction of Iraq will be as futile as the U.S. government's efforts (Pascual, C., 2007). The United Nations can present itself as a neutral body and with good diplomacy, it may be able to mobilize support from other countries that have an interest in a peace settlement in Iraq. Although, all efforts should be geared by UN towards brokering a political solution in Iraq but it failed to play such a role in the country.

U.S. and Building of Infrastructure in Iraq

Although America apparently tried to rebuild infrastructure of Iraq after war of 2003 but it failed generally. Various sectors are being mentioned in this paper as the promises were

not completely fulfilled for rebuilding of these sectors:

Health Facilities in Iraq in 2012: A decade after US-led invasion

In the last two decades, the US policymakers made several interventions in Iraq with the aim to rebuilt its infrastructure. The efforts to expand the basic facilities in Iraq had been already undermined by the effect of US-Iraq war, international sanctions, and political instability (Cetorelli, V., & Shabila, N., 2013). In Spite of an increase in population, the countrywide average number of public hospitals per 100,000 people in 2012 was 0.7 as it was in 2003. The security issues also impacted the allocation of resources in Iraq. For example, 50% of the total public spending was allocated to security and a mere 1% was allocated to health care. This led to persistent insecurity and political instability that affected both public and private investments in health infrastructure in Iraq. A study conducted by the World Health Organization (WHO) and Iraq's Ministry of Health indicated that war left insecurity and instability which also impacted the health care system. This further adds to the point that ensuring political settlements are crucial in enabling successful development plans in a war struck country. Hence, instead of spending on the healthcare system, the U.S. government failed in meeting the desired objectives in the context. While some real progress was made, the existed infrastructure has been overshadowed by the disappointment of unfulfilled promises. The polls in Iraq reflected frustration about unmet promises by the U.S. to ensure essential services and infrastructure.

It is fair to say that some progress has been made but the majority of the reconstruction programs showed mixed results (SIGIR, 2009). The sectors that were crucial including electric power and oil production showed less than desired outcomes. Other health sector projects showed delays and a majority of projects won by U.S. firms were canceled or awarded to Iraqis. Only 91 of the 142 new clinics were to be completed with US funding. The International Committee on Red Cross estimated in 2008 that more than 40% of Iraqi people do not have access to clean drinking water. Up until now, a total of 4.1 billion US dollars has been made available to U.S. military forces in

Iraq for the reconstruction efforts intended to win the hearts and minds of people in Iraq. These funds were drawn from the Department of Defense Budget (DOD), (Tarnoff, C., 2007).

Ineffective Democratic System and Gaps in Governance

After the U.S. occupation of Iraq, the United States intervened to put in place a permanent constitution of Iraq. The regime hence changed from a Presidential to a Parliamentary experience, the effectiveness of which only time will tell. Though, the system changed but complex security problems such as Islamic State (ISIS) surfaced and if not properly handle, it will be remained exist. The analyst from Centre of Global Policy at Washington, Hassan Hassan said, "ISIS is not going to launch any big surprises soon but what remains of it after the caliphate will still be a huge challenge", (Analysts, 2019). There is no ambiguity in the fact that the Islamic State remains a strong threat to the stability of Iraq and Syria, as per the military officials on the ground. Many analysts are pointing at the gap left by the U.S authorities from Iraq for a possible reformation of al-Qaida revolt that eventually regrouped as the Islamic state (ISIS). Billions of dollars' worth of destruction was left on the economy and infrastructure of Iraq. Hundreds of thousands of people were displaced from their homes as they do not have any homes to return to. The U.S. has until now failed to rebuild the homes of these people which had led to further anguish and social distances among groups that gave way to rise of the Islamic State.

When the U.S. forces left Iraq at end of 2011, it left behind many unsolved problems especially related to governance and the working relationship between Baghdad and Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG). Many developments since the withdrawal of U.S. troops have created a three-way conflict between Turkey, KRG and the government of Baghdad (Park, Bill., 2014). Iraq's 2005 constitution which was largely developed under the U.S. Government guidance and influence, left several gaps. Massoud Barzani, the (former) president of KRG has over the years many times stressed upon the need of a fully independent Iraqi-Kurdish state (Bengio, O., 2012).

Iraq's existing constitution, is a type of political

system that has been adopted which is now referred to as consensual democracy aiming to take care of transitional phase and for a single-election session (Bengio, O., 2012). This is unanimously agreed by the presidential council consisting of Kurdish President and his Shiite and Sunni deputies, the Council of Ministers as the Prime Minister (Shiite) and his Sunni and Kurdish deputies as well. Ever since this time, Iraq has been practicing consensus form of democracy which is now operational in all state institutions.

Many analysts feel that the democracy has simple failed to achieve the desired goals of resolving the Iraqi crises including its economic and political problems. Instead of representing the interests of the entire parliament, the Iraqi parliament puts forward the interest of respective parties (Bengio, O., 212).

Security Crisis in Iraq

Economic crisis and security problems in Iraq are interlined. The issue of security and economic crisis in Iraq have been studied in detail by the Burke Chair study, "Why Iraq is Burning". The series of events has made it obvious that no U.S. policy towards Iraq can be successful if it only focusses on the short-term (Anthony, 2020). So far, even Iraqi government has not announced any concrete plans to deal with these issues and the United States has not address its estimate of Iraq's requirements or the level of aid required. The U.S. Lead Inspector General's report to Congress on Operation Inherent Resolve has also warned the Iraq's military forces still have persistent quality problems, they require extensive support and advise and are not capable of an effective joint land-air operation on any major scale (Dogig.mil, 2019). The report also does not address the need for reform of Iraq's police and internal security forces that could protect it from outside powers (Dodig.mil, 2019). The report also reflects that Iraq's forces in 2019 totaled 64,000 as opposed to Iran's 523,000. Also, Iraq has only 393 battle tanks as compare to Iran's 1,513 tanks.

These issues are of a grave nature, it is still unclear that Iraq can create stable political progress or avoid another round of civil fights. It is also equally unclear that the U.S. will maintain its presence in Iraq and continue to help Iraq to solve its problems. The recent developments after the

attack on U.S. Embassy in Baghdad have made it clear that United States can continue to help Iraq in its long-term issues (Anthony, H., 2020). From the US's perspective, the ISIS might still have to fight to defend itself from the forces that attacked the U.S. facilities, the pro-Iranian Popular Mobilization Force (PMF), and advisors of General Soleimani (deceased Iranian military commander). From the perspective of Iraq, the statements made by president and acting prime minister of Iraq are assumed that Iraqis oppose the attacks on the PMF's deputy commander and Iranian General Soleimani as they view the U.S. unilateral actions

a violation of Iraq's sovereignty.

How FDI helped to build Iraq

In October of 2003, Paul Bremer, the head of the American led-operation launched a new policy framework for foreign investment in Iraq. First, part of this policy was that it replaced all laws pertaining to existing investments in the country. Second, part was that it allowed foreigners to lease Iraqi land for forty years. The policy framework was criticized by several business owners in Iraq who suggested that foreign ownership should be restricted to 49% in any country (Alessio Azzutti, A., 2016).

Table. Foreign direct Investment (FDI) in Iraq 2007-2013

In millions \$	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
FDI Inflows	972	1856	1598	1396	2082	2376	2852
FDI Outflows	8	34	72	125	366	488	538

Based on data from UNCTAD (2013)- World Inv. Report 2014.

FDI flows were estimated to have increased by 20% in 2013 to \$2.85 billion. This growth was largely associated with the vast wealth of hydrocarbon in the country. In the "ease of doing business" index also Iraq ordered 26 points ahead of other countries in the region

(World Bank, n.d.). Much of the reforms, however, could not bring the desired results mainly because of political instability in Iraq and secondly due to absence of trust in foreign investors, which prevails in many segments of people within Iraq.

Conclusions

The invasion of Iraq was the most controversial and momentous foreign policy decision in recent remembrance. The analysts are deeply divided over explanations for the War. Compared with other wars, the appears to be an especially radical cleavage between the justifications for War advanced by its proponents – Iraqi weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) – which proved to be hollow and the actual motives and causes. Since the War, the deception practiced by the Bush administration has been exposed; but even before it was clear to ex-weapons inspectors and Iraq's specialists that Saddam had no serious WMD capability and certainly not one capable of threatening the U.S. At the international level, the strategy of the new United States government was to share control of Iraq with the main powers involved. In this way, the United States lost the exclusivity of the benefits of the invasion but, in return,

shared the weight and the responsibility of supporting the new Iraq. Keeping it afloat was a complicated task due to the difficulty of guaranteeing a stable government in a state where ethnic and religious differences have worsened as a result of the invasion and which is constantly on the brink of civil War.

As a result of the bombings on September 11, 2001 on the World Trade Center, the United States started a war under the slogan of "war on terror". The United States also considered Saddam Hussein and Iraq under Saddam's regime a threat to the security and safety of the citizens of America and considering her prime duty to protect the lives of American nationals as the U.S. troops invaded Iraq in 2003. Also, since the U.S. is a huge proponent of democracy and the rule of Saddam Hussain was considered undemocratic, the America made a military intervention in Iraq but it is confirmed that U.S.

did not achieve the desired targets of governance, political and economic stability and strengthening of Iraq's military.

Therefore, both hypotheses formulated in this research have been positively verified. First hypothesis assumed that U.S. failed in political and economic rebuilding of post war Iraq because real attention of U.S. invasion was to control Iraq having world's second-largest oil reserves. The study proved that U.S. motives behind a military intervention in Iraq in 2003 were more than what was apparently proclaimed. This assertion was confirmed because US had objectives more than what she claimed. As for second hypothesis, which claims the constant complex security situation including challenges like Alqaeda and ISIS in the post Saddam's era caused hurdles in political and economic rebuilding of Iraq, has been also confirmed. Thus, firstly less U.S. attention and second, security challenges in the post Saddam era caused failures of the aims towards political and economic rebuilding of Iraq.

Conclusively we can say that the U.S. needed to follow a human rights-based approach, a

sustainable growth policy, and fewer armed interventions in Iraq. More importantly, the United Nations had to play a neutral role in reaching a multilateral agreement between Iraq and the U.S. to reach a peaceful solution in Iraq. The U.S. also had to encourage Iraqi government to adopt more inclusive and less aggressive policies towards the regions of Kurdish, Sunni Arab and Shia groups, so the country could gain stability and strengthen its democracy. American military involvement not only cause loss of money but also loss of many American lives. By some estimates, the U.S. has spent close to \$1 trillion in Iraq since 2003, and the spending continues at the rate of billions of dollars every year. Besides approximately 4,500 American soldiers have lost their lives in Iraq and thousands have been wounded but Iraq is still not secure and goals of political and economic stabilities have been not achieved so far. Finally, it is proved reality that political and economic rebuilding of Iraq can be brought the life back to normal and peace can be prevailed in the country.

References

- Althammer, W., & Schneider, M. (2013). Does Oil and Gas Wealth Eat Up Total Wealth? Analyzing the Resource Curse with Measures of Sustainable Wealth. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2209127> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2209127>.
- Analysts: ISIS will linger despite Syria defeat, (2019, March 25). *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from, https://www.postguam.com/the_globe/nation/analysts-isis-will-linger-despite-syria-defeat/article_e14d6c64-4def-11e9-8c14-5bff4b495a5c.html.
- Azzutti, A. (2016). FDI in post-conflict countries: Iraq the Case. *Research Gate*. Retrieved from, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292315250_FDI_in_post-conflict_countries_Iraqi_case?channel=doi&linkId=56ace22708ae28588c5fb4c9&showFulltext=true
- Badie, D. (2010). Groupthink, Iraq, and the War on Terror: Explaining US Policy Shift toward Iraq. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 6(4), 277-296. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24909824>.
- Bengio, Ofra. (2012A, April 22). Will Barzani declare independence? *Jerusalem Post*. Retrieved from, www.jpost.com/Opinion/Op-EdContributors/Article.aspx?id=267115.
- BRANDS, H., & PALKKI, D. (2012). "Conspiring Bastards": Saddam Hussein's Strategic View of the United States. *Diplomatic History*, 36(3): 625-659. Retrieved September 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44376191>.
- Bush, G. (n.d). White House Archives. Retrieved on 6 September 2020 from <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/iraq/>.
- Cetorelli, V., Shabila, N.P. (2014). Expansion of health facilities in Iraq a decade after the US-led invasion, 2003–2012. *Confl Health* 8, 16. Retrieved from DOI: 10.1186/1752-1505-8-16.
- Cordesman, A.H. (2020). America's Failed

- Strategy in the Middle East: Losing Iraq and the Gulf. CSIS. Retrieved from <https://www.csis.org/analysis/americas-failed-strategy-middle-east-losing-iraq-and-gulf>.
- Cordesman, A., & Hwang, G. (2020). *Strategic Dialogue: Shaping a U.S. Strategy for the "Ghosts" of Iraq* (pp. 21-28). Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). DOI: 10.2307/resrep24232.5.
- Cordesman, A. (2018). Iraq After ISIS: The Other Half of Victory Dealing with the Civil Dimension (pp. 2-5, Rep.). *Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)*. Retrieved from, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/iraq-after-isis-other-half-victory>.
- Davies, N. J. (2007). UN Challenges US on Air Strikes in Iraq. *Global Policy Forum*. Retrieved from, <https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/168/36362.html>
- GAS AND POWER: Despite Huge Reserves, Iraq Doesn't Have Enough Gas' (2017, August 30). *Oil and Energy Trends*. 42 (8): 7-8. Retrieved from DOI: 10.1111/oet.12495.
- Hughes, C. (1996). UNTAC in Cambodia: The Impact on Human Rights. *Institute of South East Asian Studies*. Retrieved from, https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=7y_4jU4AAAAJ&hl=en.
- Howard. Lafranchi, H. (2007, September 21). How Much Can UN Achieve in Iraq?. *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from, <https://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0921/p02s02-wogi.html>.
- Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGIR) (2009, July 30). *Quarterly Report to United States Congress*. Retrieved from, <https://www.sigar.mil/pdf/quarterlyreports/2009-07-30qr.pdf>.
- Iraqi Kurdistan: the essential briefing, Strategic Comments. (2015, April 1). *Strategic Comments*. 21 (2). DOI: 10.1080/13567888.2015.1035506.
- Ishiguro, Kaoru. (2017). Strategic Analysis Of WMD Nonproliferation: Iraq And After Iraq. *International Relations and Diplomacy*. 5 (6): 305-321. DOI: 10.17265/2328-2134/2017.06.001.
- Kleponis, G. (2015). Sovereignty & Security: US Legal Authority & Obligations Regarding Detainees In Iraq. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2743224> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2743224>.
- Lecamwasam, Nipunika. (2013). Iraq Invasion: A Just War or Just a War? *E-International Relations*. Retrieved from <https://www.e-ir.info/2013/06/06/iraq-invasion-a-just-war-or-just-a-war/>.
- Lead Inspector General Operation Inherent Resolve. (2019, November 1). *Report to the United States Congress*. Retrieved from, <https://www.dodig.mil/Reports/Lead-Inspector-General-Reports/Article/2020066/lead-inspector-general-for-operation-inherent-resolve-i-quarterly-report-to-the/>>.
- LOOKING AHEAD: Kurdistan Oil Profile Raised Amid Chaos In Iraq. (2014, July 24) *Oil and Energy Trends*. 39 (7). DOI: 10.1111/oet.12173
- Mashatt, Merriam., & James Crum. (2008). Conflict Sensitive Approach in Infrastructure Development. *USIP*. Retrieved from <https://www.usip.org/publications/2008/01/conflict-sensitive-approach-infrastructure-development>.
- Mistrust Prevents Formation Of Iraqi Government (2010, October 20) *Strategic Comments*. 16 (7). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13567888.2010.532003>.
- Mola, S.H. (2019) US Sanctions On Iran And Its Impact On Iraq. *Strategy International Journal of Middle East Research*. 1(1): 36-46. DOI: 10.29329/ijmer.2019.230.3.
- Nayef, K. J. (2020). Political Discourse In Iraq After 2003. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*. 24 (3): 1192-1198. <https://www.psychosocial.com/article/PR200870/11102/>.
- Ocakli, F., & Scotch, M. (2017). Oil-Fueled Insurgencies: Lootable Wealth And Political Order In Syria, Iraq, And Nigeria. *Journal of Global Security Studies*. 2 (1):74–88. DOI: 10.1093/jogss/ogw027.
- Park, Bill. (2014). Turkey-Kurdish Regional Govt.

- Relations After US Withdrawal from Iraq: Putting the Kurds on the Map. Retrieved from <https://www.peacepalacelibrary.nl/ebooks/files/378166689.pdf>.
- Paquin, J., and Beauregard, P. (2014) US Transatlantic Leadership After Iraq. *Cooperation and Conflict*. 50 (4): 510-530. DOI: 10.1177/0010836714558639
- Pascual, C. (2007, September). The United Nations in Iraq, A Policy paper. Pascual, Carlos. (2007). The United Nations in Iraq, Foreign Policy at Brookings (3). Retrieved from, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/pascual200709.pdf>.
- Park, Bill. (2014). Turkey-Kurdish Regional Govt. Relations After US Withdrawal from Iraq: Putting the Kurds on the Map. *Army War College Press*. Retrieved from, <https://www.peacepalacelibrary.nl/ebooks/files/378166689.pdf>.
- Rich, P. (2012) The Iraqi Marshlands And The March Arabs: The Ma'dan, Their Culture And The Environment. *Digest of Middle East Studies*. 21 (1): 234-235. DOI: 10.1111/j.1949-3606.2011.00112.x
- Saeed Q. (2019). Civil Society Organizations And Peace Building In Iraq After 2003 Assistant. *Tikrit Journal For Political Science* (S.I): 251-276. DOI:10.25130/politic.v0i0.166.
- Saramifar, Y. (2018) 'Framing The War In The Post War Era: Exploring The Counter-Narratives In Frames Of An Iranian War Photographer Thirty Years After The Ceasefire With Iraq. *Media, War & Conflict* 12. DOI: 10.1177/1750635218789437
- Salmon, A. (2010). Embracing Evolution Post-Iraq: A response to 'Counterinsurgency Concepts: What we learned in Iraq. *Global Policy*, 1 (1), 221-222. DOI: 10.1111/j.1758-5899.2010.00021.x.
- Sassoon, J. (2019). State of repression: Iraq under Saddam Hussein, by Lisa Blaydes. *Democratization*, 26 (6), 1091-1093, DOI: 10.1080/13510347.2019.1588252.
- Saadoon, A., Albadry, S., & Abdullah, K.B. (2008). Iraqi Parliamentary Institution: Power Sharing in Iraq Parliament. *European Law and Politics Journal*, 1(1). Retrieved from, <http://elpjournal.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/elp-spec-1-1-1.pdf>.
- Tarnoff, Curt. (2007, February 22). Iraq: Reconstruction Assistance. *A CSR Report for Congress*. Retrieved from, <https://crsreports.congress.gov/>.
- Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP) – Iraq (n.d.), *World Bank*. Retrieved from, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/BX.KLT.DINV.WD.GD.ZS?locations=IQ>.
- Younis, N. (2011) Set Up To Fail: Convocational Political Structures In Post-War Iraq, 2003–2010. *Contemporary Arab Affairs*. 4 (1): 1-18. DOI:10.1080/17550912.2011.543780.